



1931

Who?

North Dakota Law Review

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

Recommended Citation

North Dakota Law Review (1931) "Who?," *North Dakota Law Review*: Vol. 8 : No. 5 , Article 2.
Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol8/iss5/2>

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.

WHO?

Justice Holmes has resigned. Time beckoned and the most youthful mind on the Supreme Court of the United States must needs obey.

In his early professional life he had expounded the Constitution to students; as it closes, the whole nation is listening. Into his opinions have been poured the poetry of his soul, the inspiration of his spirit, the profoundness of his mind. Through them all runs a simple, statesmanlike conception of the structure of our government. His was never the function of passing upon the wisdom of legislative experiments. This he has been content to subject to such gradual tests as the slow progress of time might fashion.

The Constitution is not merely a legal document, it is a vehicle by which people govern themselves. It is now serving a nation whose manners and means of living were undreamed of when it was adopted; it should be preserved to serve a nation whose manners and means of living are now undreamed of. In construing and applying it, courts must see through the written words to the people who stand behind it and sense the invisible generations crowding up behind them. Changing aspirations and convictions must continue to find expression through it. Rigidity is death to it and against rigidity Holmes has struggled,—at times alone. "Some play must be allowed to the joints if the machine is to work."

For many years he has carried the light, but now it is falling from his hands. Who will catch it?—*Chicago Bar Ass'n. Record.*

REVIEW OF NORTH DAKOTA DECISIONS

Rusch vs. Trust Co.: Proceedings were instituted, under Declaratory Judgment Act (Sec. 7712a1 and fol.), which provides for review. HELD: There can be no direct review by the Supreme Court, either on writ of error or otherwise. Appeal must first be taken to the District Court. The remedy of appeal to the District Court (Sec. 8599, 1913) is exclusive in probate matters.

—0—

Enderlin vs. Pontiac Twp.: This case relates to jurisdiction in poor relief cases, and determines what constitutes residence. The facts were stipulated. Summarized, they show: that the family of one M. resided in Ransom County more than twenty years; then moved to another Township in said County in 1929, remaining there about six months; then moved to Richland County, remaining there about three months; then moved to Cass County, remaining there about five months; then moved back to Ransom County, remaining there about five months; then moved to Cass County, remaining there about five months; then moved to Ransom County (City of Enderlin), remaining there about a month; then moved to Cass County, remaining about four months; then moved back to Ransom County (City of Enderlin) remaining there four or five days when, by order of Justice of the Peace, the family was conveyed back to Cass County. Poor relief had been granted the family at the time of the last prior residence in Ransom County. HELD: It may be assumed that the members of the family were deemed public charges, hence, the question of residence is impor-