



1926

## Slightly In Error/We Must Contend/Executive Committee For 1927-28

North Dakota Law Review

[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 (1926) "Slightly In Error/We Must Contend/Executive Committee For 1927-28," *North Dakota Law Review*. Vol. 3: No. 11, Article 10.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol3/iss11/10>

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).

## SLIGHTLY IN ERROR

The July issue of the *Dakota Law Review*, article by Professor Cooley, page 68, makes reference to social legislation, interpreting the changes in that legislation. The interpretation, in our opinion, is not quite in accord with the facts.

In the first place the original eight-hour law for women was enacted in 1919 instead of 1925. The 1925 amendment simply made provision for "emergency" exceptions, after application to the Bureau. While the bill was making its final journey to the enrolling and engrossing room, however, a comma located itself between the words "telegraph establishment" and the words "or office" in the second or third line, the effect of which was to bring all offices in the State within the provisions of the eight-hour law.

The 1927 amendment was primarily for the purpose of modifying the provision regarding "emergencies", requiring proof of the facts constituting an emergency as defined in the law in case an employer is challenged in court instead of proving the emergency to the Bureau before increasing the hours. Incidentally the itinerant comma again disappeared, thus removing the office girls from the restrictive provision.

---

 WE MUST CONTEND

The 1923 session of the Minnesota Legislature enacted a law providing that "territory may be *detached* from an incorporated village or city of the fourth class and annexed to an adjoining city of the first class."

The 1927 session of the Legislature amended that law, the opening words of the amendment reading: "In case such *annexed* territory includes any entire village or city of the fourth class," etc.

What do the words *detached* and *annexed* mean? What was the legislative *intent*? The answer of the Minnesota Attorney General's office is that the statute does not permit the annexation of the *whole* of the village of Robbinsdale to the City of Minneapolis. The contention of other attorneys is that the statute does permit such annexation. As a result, the Supreme Court of Minnesota will, doubtless, have an opportunity to give the final answer. Until then either of the other answers may be wrong.

---

 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR 1927-28

President, Aubrey Lawrence, Fargo  
 Vice-President, John H. Lewis, Minot  
 Secretary-Treasurer, R. E. Wenzel, Bismarck  
 First District, Theo. Kaldor, Hillsboro  
 Second District, Fred T. Cuthbert, Devils Lake  
 Third District, A. M. Kvello, Lisbon  
 Fourth District, N. J. Bothne, New Rockford  
 Fifth District, G. S. Woledge, Minot  
 Sixth District, J. P. Cain, Dickinson