

January 1929

Report of Legislative Committee

Harold H. Healy

Lowell White

Arthur E. Aldrich

Leroy McWhinney

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

Recommended Citation

Harold H. Healy, Lowell White, Arthur E. Aldrich & Leroy McWhinney, Report of Legislative Committee, 6 Dicta 19 (1929).

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.

Report of Legislative Committee

erly qualified. Time is not available to complete the investigation so commenced by your committee but we feel that these records will be of good service to our successors.

Respectfully submitted,

G. WALTER BOWMAN, *Chairman*
 MAHLON L. HARKER
 JAMES R. HOFFMAN
 FRED Y. HOLLAND
 ROYAL R. IRWIN
 RODERICK JOHNSTON
 EDGAR MCCOMB

April 22, 1929.

* * * * *

REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

The Legislative Committee of the Denver Bar Association respectfully submits the following report:

During the three months prior to the convening of the legislature, weekly meetings of the Committee were held, the majority of which were attended by the President of the Association and many of them also attended by the Chairman of the Session Laws Committee of the Colorado Bar Association. A number of subjects more or less fitting for legislative consideration if not action, were discussed. But final action of the Committee narrowed to three concrete recommendations—largely outlined by our predecessor committee of the year 1927-1928.

1. *With reference to the more speedy and adequate publication of Session Laws.* Mr. Edward C. King drafted a bill to provide for earlier printing and distribution, and providing for a greater number of copies which at succeeding and successive meetings of the Committee was redrafted repeatedly until the last day for introducing bills in the legislature. A personal representative of the Secretary of State attended one of the meetings of the Committee. Mr. Arthur Morrison also attended, and made certain helpful suggestions. As a result, several of the 1929 Session laws have been set up in type before the adjournment of the legislature and we are promised an early distribution in final form, considerably ahead of pre-

vious schedules. This much has been done, even if the bill should not be passed.*

2. *With reference to the use of the emergency clause in bills affecting judicial procedure.* In the language of the preceding report, the Committee in the name of our Association respectfully suggested by mimeographed personal letters to each member of the legislature that such clause be sparingly used. In that suggestion the Session Laws Committee of the State Association respectfully concurred and joined in the personal letter. This suggestion may be appropriate for future legislatures.

3. *With reference to accumulation of unexhausted docket fees under the old Fee Bill.* This problem seems to have been peculiar to Denver (other outside counties appearing either to have no surplus, or to have paid the same over to the County Treasurer under a previous statute). The committee has considered availability of such accumulation either as a trust fund for or an indebtedness to respective litigants of the past for library purposes in the new Court house and for use therein of Judges and officers of the Court. To that end Mr. Lowell White drafted a bill designed to fit the Denver situation, both as to unexpended fees in civil cases and probate matters, and attain the desired end. This bill has overslept in Committee—partly by reason of the introduction in and passage by the house, at least, of a new probate fee bill including a provision for payment into the County Treasuries of the respective counties of unexpended probate fees after two years from the closing of estates, and partly because of previous legislation which was thought to cover the question.

Some additional consideration was given to the empty office now existing under the law establishing a Legislative Reference Bureau. The committee feels that a proper appointee could do much good and constructive work upon our statutory law, existing and prospective, all for the benefit of the State of Colorado. We repeat our hope that the Governor and Attorney General may agree upon a properly qualified lawyer for this position.

Several other proposed laws were discussed—such as a proposal to amend the law with reference to transfers of cor-

*ED. NOTE—The bill was not passed.

porate stock to change the requirements for transfer of or liens on stock of irrigation companies, and possible revision of statutes governing original procedure. Such being deemed to be beyond the scope or jurisdiction of the Committee, no action was taken.

Finally, although this is not strictly within the province of this Committee, we again wish to urge the support of all members of the bar and the electorate for the Charter Amendment once more to be submitted for popular vote to increase the number and pay of Justices of the Peace in Denver.

Respectfully submitted,

HAROLD H. HEALY, *Chairman*
 LOWELL WHITE
 ARTHUR E. ALDRICH
 LEROY MCWHINNEY
 ANDREW H. WOOD
 R. H. WALKER

* * * * *

REPORT OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

The Judiciary Committee of your Association begs leave to report that early in March of this year the Committee was requested to make its recommendations concerning a bill introduced in the legislature, the object of which was to increase the per diem allowance to jurors.

The Committee met and recommended that in counties of the first and second classes the per diem for jurors be increased to \$3.50 per day, and that in counties of the third, fourth and fifth classes the per diem be increased to \$4.00 per day. Report of this conclusion was made to the President of the Association.

The Committee was also requested to meet with the Executive Committee of the Association and consider the matter of the Association conducting a bar primary to nominate candidates to fill the vacancy caused by the promotion of Judge Moore to the Supreme Court.

The committees met, and it was the unanimous opinion of the joint committees that no action be taken. It appeared that no request from the Governor or other interested parties had been made.