



1931

## The Annual Meeting

North Dakota Law Review

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

---

### Recommended Citation

North Dakota Law Review (1931) "The Annual Meeting," *North Dakota Law Review*. Vol. 8 : No. 10 , Article 2.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol8/iss10/2>

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](mailto:und.common@library.und.edu).

## THE ANNUAL MEETING

The common expression of those whom we heard comment upon the annual meeting held at Fargo September 1 and 2 was: "It was the best, finest, most constructive meeting I have ever attended." Naturally, the success of any meeting depends upon the number that attend it. This meeting was attended, the registration list showing the largest attendance ever recorded. The fact that such a registration was effected speaks well for the local Fargo committee. No one else does, or has any right to claim credit for that registration.

The arrangements were perfect. There wasn't a dull moment in either the serious or the frivolous side of the meeting, and the banquet, "the youngsters' innovation," as it was called by some of the Fargo lawyers, proved a decided "hit."

The speakers gave an outstanding performance. They brought information and inspiration at a time when both those qualities are so frequently absent from public addresses. We express our appreciation to these gentlemen, again: Mr. Frederick H. Stinchfield of Minneapolis, Mr. William C. Green of St. Paul, Mr. Jerome Hall of the University Law School, Judge Andrew A. Bruce of Chicago (formerly of North Dakota), and Judge George E. Q. Johnson, of Chicago. We also congratulate and graciously acknowledge our indebtedness to the committee that gathered this group of talented men and brought them to us.

With less than the usual amount of incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial discussion, the Association was able to take definite action on a rather constructive program.

1. It recommended the continuance of the work of the Citizenship Committee.
2. It recommended reference of the very exhaustive, detailed program of the Criminal Law Committee to the district meetings and a new committee, final action to be taken by the next annual meeting.
3. It approved a recommendation to further the adoption of the uniform act providing for attendance of witnesses from without the state in criminal actions.
4. It recommended amendment of Section 7846, relating to appeals, as follows: "and provided, that the provisions of this Section shall apply to all actions or proceedings properly triable with a jury, and in which actions or proceedings a jury trial has been waived and the same are tried by the court without a jury."
5. It recommended amendment of Section 7580 by requiring a schedule of all personal property on claims for exemption in garnishment proceedings.
6. It referred to the incoming Executive Committee for action the proposal to amend the workmen's compensation law by allowing appeals on questions of fact.
7. It instructed the Legislative Committee to prepare an amendment restoring to the courts the power to direct verdicts, thus disapproving the committee recommendation.
8. It directed the new Committee on Unauthorized Practice to prepare a bill defining the practice of law.
9. It recommended the repeal of the bad check law (Section 9971).
10. It recommended amendment of Section 7451 to read: "Sham and irrelevant answers and defenses may be stricken out on motion and upon such terms as the Court may in its discretion impose.

11. It disapproved an amendment to reduce the attorney's license fee to \$6.00 per year.

12. It recommended modification of the Jury System by making trials involving less than \$200 in District Court and less than \$50 in County Court triable to the Court unless a jury is demanded, but disapproved the proposal to charge the jury fees against the litigants.

13. It disapproved a recommendation to allow examination of jurors by the Court as in Federal practice.

14. It approved the recommendation to permit waiver of jury trial in criminal cases.

15. It approved changes in the Fee Schedule as follows: Collection charges to be 15% for the first \$500, 10% for the next \$500, and 5% on the amount over \$1,000; adopted the Lake Region District Schedule of \$1.00 deposit with every collection item, and 50c for reports, printed circulars bearing the signature of the Association to be distributed to attorneys.

16. It approved the recommendations of the Committee on Unauthorized Practice, enlarged the scope of the Committee to include the making of agreements with responsible organizations and associations, and authorized the appointment of a prosecuting committee to start prosecutions where negotiations fail. In furtherance of this recommendation, it approved an amendment to the Bar Board Act to make the license fees available for such prosecutions, and also approved an assessment of \$2.00 per member for the same purpose. (As Article 2 of the By-Laws provides that no assessment shall be for more than \$1.00, the additional \$1.00 will have to be in the nature of a voluntary contribution.)

Officers elected for the ensuing year were: W. H. Hutchinson, LaMoire, President; J. P. Cain, Dickinson, Vice President; R. E. Wenzel, Bismarck, Secretary. These officers, with the District Presidents, constitute the Executive Committee.

The attendance record for the past seven years is as follows:

Year	City	Lawyers	Ladies
1926	Bismarck .....	171	....
1927	Grand Forks .....	125	16
1928	Minot .....	118	39
1929	Valley City .....	114	22
1930	Devils Lake .....	90	34
1931	Jamestown .....	129	38
1932	Fargo .....	227	93

The larger cities of the state had the following registrations for this year: Fargo 61, Grand Forks 27, Bismarck 22, Valley City 9, Jamestown 8, Devils Lake 5, Minot 5, Moorhead (Minn.) 4.

### THINK THIS THROUGH

The development of workmen's compensation legislation has brought to light some erroneous theories concerning it. Certain damage-law principles, theories of proximate cause, independent cause, foreseeable cause, unforeseeable cause, intervening cause, no other known cause, stationary existing condition, while elaborately logical in their applicability to cases in which negligence is the basis of the right, lose most of their applicability when we deal with cases of injury in the course of employment with the mere fact of injury as the basis of the right.