



North Dakota Law Review

Volume 17 | Number 3

Article 1

1940

Freedom - Limited

North Dakota State Bar Association

M. L. McBride

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



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

North Dakota State Bar Association and McBride, M. L. (1940) "Freedom - Limited," *North Dakota Law Review*. Vol. 17 : No. 3 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol17/iss3/1>

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.

BAR BRIEFS

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT DICKINSON

—BY—

STATE BAR ASSOCIATION OF NORTH DAKOTA

M. L. McBride, Editor

Entered as Second Class Matter, Dec. 9, 1936, at the Postoffice at
Dickinson, North Dakota, Under the Act of August 24, 1912.

VOL. 17.

FEBRUARY, 1941.

NO. 3.

FREEDOM—LIMITED

The International Harvester company has informed employees in its plants that their bargaining arrangements are dissolved by order of the national labor board. It was the company's contention that the unions in its plants represented the desires of the employes and that the management had not interfered in or attempted to dominate the organization. The finding of the labor board examiners was otherwise and the company was ordered to desist from dealing with the existing unions.

The management, announcing that it was complying with the order, said that an appeal would have been useless because the law makes the finding of fact as set forth by the board conclusive and final. The examiner heard the testimony, the board made its conclusions, and under our new administrative law the right of appeal to the courts has been virtually annulled.

Congress undertook to remedy this, but Mr. Roosevelt vetoed the act, the Walter-Logan bill, which would have restored the right of judicial review. The veto couldn't be overcome and, consequently, the courts are closed to citizens who may feel that the administrative law has been unjustly applied to them.

As has been pointed out before, this is government by edict, which, whether it is fair and just or unfair

(Continued on Next Page)

(Continued From First Page)

and unjust, is government by men and not government by law. It is Roman administrative law. When a legislative body has set up such a system it finds it difficult to undo what it has done, because the chief executive has the power of veto.

Mr. Roosevelt takes the view of the other social planners that you can't conduct administrative government affecting all the affairs of the people if you permit the people to carry their appeals into a court for a review of the facts and of the rulings based upon them. Government business has become the biggest business in the country and affects all other business, determining conduct and the relations of one person to another. Executive authority demands freedom from the restraints which the courts of law put upon it.

That is another way of saying that such a government is a dictatorship and must work as one. If administrative law is in the hands of fair minded men its operation may be as fair as circumstances will permit, but whether it is fair or unfair its word is final and if it does an injustice the injury is without a legal remedy. This theory is contrary to all previous thinking of the American people who, until they were taken in hand by the New Deal, had been careful to preserve for each man his day in court.

The new system of administrative law and the old system of protected liberties can't live together. It's quite apparent now which one is getting the worse of it.

SEC.

INVITATION

The members of the Association are invited to attend a conference of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals to be held at the United States Court House in St. Louis, Mo., on March 7th, 1941. An open session will be held, at which time Justice Bolitha J. Laws, of the District Court of the District of Columbia, will deliver an address on Pretrial Procedure and Henry P. Chandler, director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, will also deliver an address.

CASE NOTES—CONTRACTS TO ADOPT

In the United States adoption exists only by statute, and apparently the general rule is that the statute must be strictly construed and followed. In *re* Session's Estate, 70 Mich. 297, 38 N. W. 249 (1888); In *re* Estate of Williamson, 205 Iowa 772, 218 N. W. 469 (1928). However, because of the hardships which may arise from such a rule, courts have in many instances liberalized, if not, substantially altered its effect. *Rockford v. Bailey*, 322 Mo. 1155, 17 S. W. (2d) 941 (1929). In some jurisdictions substantial compliance is held to be sufficient.

It is said that adoption, being recognized by statute is no longer contrary to public policy as at common law, and that if an express promise of inheritance is enforceable, it necessarily re-