



1933

First Restatement Completed/ Unemployment Reserve Plans/ Why Not Be Sensible?/ Thanks/ Fell Short On Our Wish

North Dakota Law Review Associate Editors

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr>

Recommended Citation

North Dakota Law Review Associate Editors (1933) "First Restatement Completed/ Unemployment Reserve Plans/ Why Not Be Sensible?/ Thanks/ Fell Short On Our Wish," *North Dakota Law Review*. Vol. 9: No. 2, Article 5.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol9/iss2/5>

This Note is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Law at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in North Dakota Law Review by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

"The restatement of contracts is now presented to the profession. It may be taken as the well-considered opinion of Bench and Bar and School as to what the Common Law is on the subject. But it is more than that. It is intangible evidence that the difficulties inherent in the Common Law system with its increasing mass of decisions—difficulties which might eventually overwhelm the system itself with an impossible task—can be met by the united efforts of the profession. It promises the complete rescue of 'Our Lady of the Common Law'."

UNEMPLOYMENT RESERVE PLANS

The Commission appointed by Governor White of Ohio presents the following proposal for enactment into law, in order to deal with future unemployment situations: Employers are to contribute two per cent of their payrolls, and the workers are to contribute one per cent of their wages to a reserve fund. This fund will be administered by the state. An unemployed worker, after waiting three weeks, will be able to draw from this fund 50% of his former wages for the first 16 weeks of idleness, but not to exceed \$15 per week. Any earnings gained through part-time work are to be deducted from such payments.

WHY NOT BE SENSIBLE?

The editor isn't a "dry." Birth and early training in Germany explains that. He believes in the American Constitution. Its adoption by him and of him explains that. Amendment of the Constitution is the only American road to "wetness." Let's be sensible, and admit that Congressmen who fail to vote for "beer bills" prior to such amendment are not entitled to criticism.

THANKS

Hon. A. G. Divet, Washington, wrote (re August "Versailles—Lausanne—?" editorial): "It is the best I've seen." Mr. A. E. Clark, Portland, writes (generally re Bar Briefs): "They are very interesting and attractive, indeed the best of publications of this kind that I have seen."

FELL SHORT ON OUR WISH

Our expressed desire to have at least a 90% return of ballots on the Bar Board referendum was not gratified, but we did make a record over all previous referendums by obtaining an 84% return—483 ballots out of a possible 574.

The canvassing committee, consisting of Hon. John Burke, F. E. McCurdy and L. J. Wehe, announced the following result of the balloting:

Herigstad, O. B., Minot.....	180
Jacobsen, H. P., Mott.....	122
Knauf, John, Jamestown.....	248
Kvello, A. M., Lisbon.....	276
McIntyre, W. A., Grand Forks.....	294
Weeks, J. J., Bottineau.....	153
Scattering	36