

July 2021

Upon Information and Belief

Dicta Editorial Board

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

Recommended Citation

Upon Information and Belief, 20 Dicta 70 (1943).

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.

DICTA

Published monthly by the Denver and Colorado Bar Associations.

20 cents a copy

\$1.75 a year

BOARD OF EDITORS

CECIL M. DRAPER..... *Editor-in-Chief*

CHAS. H. HAINES, JR.

THOMAS KEELY

WM. HEDGES ROBINSON, JR.

IRVING HALE, JR.

ROYAL C. RUBRIGHT

SYDNEY H. GROSSMAN, *Business Manager*

Address all communications concerning:

Editorial matters of the Denver Bar Association, to Dicta, Cecil M. Draper, Editor-in-Chief, 810 Tramway Bldg., Denver, Colo.

Editorial matters of the Colorado Bar Association, to Wm. Hedges Robinson, Jr., 812 Equitable Bldg., Denver, Colo.

Advertising, to Dicta, Sydney H. Grossman, Business Manager, 617 Symes Bldg., Denver, Colo.

Subscriptions, to Dicta, Fred E. Neef, Secretary Denver Bar Association, 902 Midland Savings Building, Denver, Colo.

Upon Information and Belief

As every lawyer knows, there is now pending before the General Assembly a bill for an act which would allow the Supreme Court to order the integration of the Bar of Colorado. The proposed act would not in itself effect integration. It would permit, but not require, the Supreme Court to do so. As we understand, a majority of the members of the court have stated that they would put the integration plan in force, provided specific power to do so were given by the Legislature, and provided further that the court were convinced that a large majority of the lawyers of the state favored the plan.

Since the proposed statute would be merely an enabling act, and since the plan cannot be put into effect unless favored by a majority of the Bar, it would seem that both opponents and proponents might well have held back their heavy guns until the matter was actually before the court. Both sides could certainly expect to receive their day in court and the utmost consideration. By that method, such soiled linen as we have might have been kept from public view, and some of the ill-advised and unfortunate statements credited by the press to some of the members of our profession might have been given proper private interment.

However, be that as it may, because we felt that all members of the Bar should be adequately advised concerning both the objections to and the benefits hoped to result from the plan, we asked for an article from each side. Both articles are contained in this issue. Read them carefully—both of them.