



1930

President Invites Discussion

North Dakota Law Review

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

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

Recommended Citation

North Dakota Law Review (1930) "President Invites Discussion," *North Dakota Law Review*: Vol. 7: No. 6, Article 5.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol7/iss6/5>

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.

out of ten indigent prisoners plead guilty, and that in twelve years there have been but four acquittals); 5. The advent of the Public Defender means a new political job; whether this is good or bad is debatable, but the general opinion seems to be that the new job means new patronage, favors and corruption; 6. Creation of the office of Public Defender would result in a majority of cases being prosecuted and defended by the same set of men because of the fact that the Prosecutor and the Public Defender would in many cases act together.

PRESIDENT INVITES DISCUSSION

President Traynor is quite insistent that the rank and file of the Association comment upon the proposals advanced by him in Bar Briefs. By way of encouraging those who may be reluctant to express their views publicly, we take the following from an address by Frank E. Atwood, Judge of the Supreme Court of Missouri, concerning the President's views on opinion-writing. Judge Atwood said: "One of the most active fields of investigation today is that of judicial thinking. Not whether judges do think, for I believe it is now conceded that they do after a fashion, but how they think. It was a canny observer who said to a newly elected judge: 'Give your decision—it will probably be right; but don't give your reasons—they will almost certainly be wrong.' That advice is all right for trial judges, but it merely accentuates our difficulties. We not only have to give our reasons in writing but are expected to state enough facts for the *alleged* reasons to be understood. Even if the Legislature did not require this I believe you lawyers would. Most of our decisions are probably right, but, if this bit of judicial advice and motions for rehearings mean anything, many of our opinions are almost certainly wrong. . .

"Many of those who come up on law points really want us to adjust the law to fit their cases and to that extent unsettle it and in a sense render it less certain. . . and what do we do about it? . . . Our answer will have to be much like that of Judge Roy Bean, the self-constituted Justice of the Peace who forty years ago dispensed justice along the Rio Grande and was known as 'the law west of the Pecos'. Among other social adjustments undertaken by him . . . was that of granting divorces in rather promiscuous fashion. . . An inspector finally mustered enough courage to tell him that he had no such jurisdiction, and was immensely relieved when, instead of shooting him, Judge Bean calmly replied: 'Well, maybe I don't—but I do!'"

OVERCROWDED PROFESSION

Statistics recently gathered in 47 states and the District of Columbia, to which must be added the Indiana estimates, show that 17,288 candidates took the bar examinations in the year 1927-28. 9,114, 52.7% of these, passed. This total was brought to 9,731 by the addition of 617 who were admitted on law school diplomas in thirteen states. The next year, 1928-29, 9,290 were admitted on examination and about 600 on diploma, constituting 50.7% of the candidates. For the year 1929-30 the number of candidates increased to 19,830. 46.4% passed, to which were added 567 admitted on diploma, making the total of additions 9,860.