## **Denver Law Review**

Volume 29 | Issue 8

Article 6

January 1952

## Correction

**Dicta Editorial Board** 

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.du.edu/dlr

#### **Recommended Citation**

Correction, 29 Dicta 304 (1952).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Denver Law Review at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Denver Law Review by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu,dig-commons@du.edu.

# Correction

This article is available in Denver Law Review: https://digitalcommons.du.edu/dlr/vol29/iss8/6

DICTA

ditions as it might have been committed if prosecuted and convicted in the criminal court for a felony; \* \* \*" then fits into the general scheme of said Sec. 513, *supra*. The sentence is indeterminate in character, and the Parole Board, or the Parole Board plus the warden, can proceed under said Sec. 513, *supra*, as in other reformatory cases.

It must be apparent by this time that the juvenile court needs some new statutes to work with if its work is to be effective. Also, some statutory line of demarcation as to when a county court is sitting as a court with criminal juridiction over misdemeanors, and when it is sitting as a juvenile court with jurisdiction only over chronic or repeated acts of delinquency, although such repeated acts may consist of larceny, burglary or rape. As the situation now exists, confusion has been added to chaos.

#### CORRECTION

The American Bar Association and other groups urge the adoption of an amendment to the United States Constitution which would read as follows:

A provision of a treaty which conflicts with any provision of this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by Congress which it could enact under its delegated powers in the absence of such treaty.

The treaty making power and certain related problems were discussed in the June, 1952, issue of *Dicta*, Volume XXIX, Number 6. On page 197 of that issue your editor noted that the action taken by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association in favoring such a constitutional amendment was not unanimous and was opposed by the Standing Committee on Peace and Law through United Nations. This was error and the Section of International and Comparative Law was meant. The resolution was hotly debated in the House of Delegates. The Section of International Law did not consider a constitutional amendment either necessary or desirable. The Committee on Peace and Law, having drafted the proposed amendment, strongly supported it and the resolution was carried by a very large majority.

#### CORPORATION NEEDS LAWYER

A major oil company in Wyoming is seeking an attorney (30-38 years of age) having from five to ten years experience in general practice. Experience in oil and gas law is desirable but not required. Address inquiries to the Colorado Bar Association, 702 Midland Savings Building, Denver, Colorado, stating salary desired, educational background and experience and references. All inquiries will be kept strictly confidential.