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Accomplishments of the Missouri Bar Association in Improving Judicial and Governmental Administration, 1926-1936*

By RALPH F. FUCHS

Professor of Law, Washington University, St. Louis

It would not be possible for a member of the Missouri Bar Association to address his brethren in the terms employed at the 1926 annual meeting by one of the speakers drawn from the roster, who lamented truthfully that "Somewhere amidst the animosities and failures of the hour there is lost the fellowship of the bar." Since that time, largely as a result of the initiative of the Association, the Missouri Supreme Court has adopted rules which elevate the standards for admission to the bar; establish bar committees in each judicial circuit for the enforcement of these regulations; provide a judicial Council to report to the Court in regard to improvements in procedure; and levy an annual license fee upon all practitioners in the state to finance the activities conducted under the authority of the Court. In the meanwhile the Association itself has established the monthly Missouri Bar Journal; has adopted a new constitution which provides for the affiliation of local associations, and as a result has grown in membership from less than 1,400 in the early twenties to more than 2,200 in 1935. In the particulars mentioned and in collateral accomplishments during the same period the Association has established a brilliant record and generated spirit and power which are certain to carry its work still farther.

Shortcomings and warning signals there are, of course, whose presence raises questions as to the entire adequacy of the methods so far employed and gives ground for suggestive improvements in the Association's future program. The writer was commissioned to report upon "the actual accomplishments" of the Bar Association "in the matter of improving the administration of justice, either as to methods of procedure or personnel, and improving the administration of government, either state or local."

The Missouri Bar Association has had virtually no program outside the sphere of strictly judicial administration. Its efforts to influence the passage of legislation by the Missouri General Assembly have resulted in practically complete failure, and there is no reason to expect greater success soon. These factors must appear in any calculation of the course to be followed in attaining the Bar's ultimate objectives.

Prior to the decade under review the Missouri Bar Association had instigated a movement of major proportions in the reform of the administration of criminal justice. By the authorization of its executive committee and as a result of the efforts of its president, Guy A. Thompson, and a special committee appointed by him, a meeting was summoned in 1924 which resulted in the formation of the Missouri Association for Criminal Justice by the representatives of numerous organizations throughout the State. This Association raised a large sum of money for the first statewide survey of the Administration of the criminal laws to be made in the United States. Its report, published in 1926, received wide attention and acclaim. It undoubtedly makes a permanent contribution to the national literature of the criminal law, largely limited, however, to the provisions of the course to be followed in attaining the Bar's ultimate objectives.

The Administration of Criminal Justice

3. 5 Mo. Bar J. 71, 83, 98 (1924); 6 Mo. Bar J. 5 (1925).
4. The rules embodying this development and the others referred to, which became effective Nov. 1, 1924, are printed in vol. 326 of the Missouri Reports. Supplementary rules affecting disbarment proceedings were adopted Dec. 21, 1924, and April 15, 1935. 6 Mo. Bar J. 16 (1935).
5. 10 Mo. Bar J. 312 (1924).
8. 6 Mo. Bar J. 3 (1926).
10. Secretary's Report (1924) 5 Mo. Bar J. 150.
12. The Association of American Law Schools was asked in May, 1925, by the Chairman of the National Conference of Judicial Councils to designate an individual in each state to report the desired information. The writer has been designated in Missouri.
13. Exceptions will be noted below.
14. "It is a regrettable, but nevertheless a historic truth that at no session of the Missouri legislature, at any time in a quarter of a century, has the Missouri Bar Association been able to make effective its convictions in legislation." Address of President Joseph W. Jamison, 6 Mo. Bar J. 120. D. 3 (1926).
15. See the account in the Introduction to the Missouri Crime Survey (1926), p. 5-6.
cudal aspects of the subject. A program of legislation, based upon its findings, met with practically complete failure at the legislative session of 1927.14

Neither the Association for Criminal Justice nor the Bar Association continued its efforts for legislation. The Bar Association fell back upon authorizing investigation into the causation and treatment of crime, to be conducted by the members of a Committee on Legal Aspects of Criminology. Fragmentary reports of the studies of the Committee were followed by renewed recommendations for procedural reform through legislation. The failure of the legislature to heed the Committee's recommendations was duly reported after the close of the next legislative session. A minor reform reducing the time for perfecting criminal appeals from one year to six months, was, however, effected contemporaneously. The Committee had recommended a four months' period. Its last report directed toward specific changes. Upon the initiation of Labor, and the Associated Industries of the State was appointed in 1934 to look into the matters of the committee's representation of the General Assembly Uniform State Laws, without success. The Committee had recommended a four months' period. Its last report directed toward specific changes. Upon the initiation of Labor, and the Associated Industries of the State was appointed in 1934 to look into the matters. The Bar Association's advocacy of the establishment of a State judicial council has, of course, been motivated largely by a desire for improved procedure in civil cases. The Association has not engaged in specific studies or made definite recommendations of procedural changes. A resolution calling for the appointment of a committee of five to study the causes of delay in the administration of justice and suggest remedies seems not to have borne fruit.

Efforts to improve the State workman's compensation act, originally adopted in 1925, have been directed toward specific changes. Upon the initiative of the Bar Association a joint committee, representative of the Association, the State Federation of Labor, and the Associated Industries of the State was appointed in 1924 to look into the matter and suggest improvements. It proved impossible to reconcile the views of the industries' representatives with those of the other committee members, and the legislative changes sponsored by the latter met with failure at the ensuing legislative session. Similarly dismal is the record of the Bar Association in sponsoring the enactment of uniform legislation in Missouri during the decade now ending. At each session of the General Assembly from 1929 to date, its Committee on Uniform State Laws, pursuant to action by the Association, has sponsored the enactment of the Uniform Sales Act, without success. Occasionally other uniform acts, particularly the Conditional Sales Act, have shared the Association's endorsement. But as the work of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws has accumulated the Committee has
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confessed its inability to keep pace and on one occasion induced the Association to urge the legislature to appoint a committee to go into the merits of the numerous proposed uniform laws. Without recorded advocacy by the Bar Association, the General Assembly has adopted three uniform acts during the period in question.\textsuperscript{31}

One other excursion by the Bar Association into the advocacy of substantive legislation during the period in question, this time in opposition to a uniform law provision, met with a rebuff. In 1930 a special Committee on Air Law reported that the General Assembly had enacted an inadequate aviation law and recommended various changes and additions. Prominent among these was the elimination of a declaration of the ownership of the air space by the proprietors of land, which has been recommended earlier by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and by the American Bar Association Committee on Air Law. The Association duly recommended the suggested changes.\textsuperscript{32} The following year the Committee reported the failure of its proposals and received a mandate to continue its efforts.\textsuperscript{33}

In the field of governmental administration, apart from judicial procedure and control of the bar, the Missouri Bar Association has persistently advocated a single reform—namely, the increase of official salaries, especially those of legislators and members of the judiciary. As regards the former, the State Constitution provides inadequate per diem compensation. The Association has advocated successively two proposed amendments, one of which would have established adequate biennial salaries for legislators and the other of which would have doubled the per diem pay. Both were rejected by the people after their submission by the General Assembly.\textsuperscript{34} It has been proposed to deal with the increase of judicial salaries by constitutional amendment also.\textsuperscript{35} Submission of the desired amendment to the people was refused by the legislature, but increases in the number of circuit judges in St. Louis City and St. Louis County were authorized.\textsuperscript{36} The following year it was pointed out that only as to the judges of the Courts of Appeals was a constitutional amendment necessary except as to incumbents.\textsuperscript{37}

That year the Association's advocacy extended to increasing the authority of the Governor and Attorney General as well as for the supreme, appellate, and circuit judges.\textsuperscript{38}

The framing of a proposal for a system of judicial retirement was also made the subject of attention at the hands of a special committee.\textsuperscript{39} In 1930 a constitutional amendment covering all points related to judicial salaries and retirement was reported to the Association.\textsuperscript{40} The legislature, however, declined at the next opportunity to submit such an amendment to the people.\textsuperscript{41} The entire matter of the conduct of the judicial branch of the government was attacked by a committee of the Bar Association, whose appointment was authorized at the 1929 meeting. It was charged with the duty, in conjunction with a committee of the Judicial Conference of the State,\textsuperscript{42} of drafting a report upon the establishment of a State judicial council. The following year it presented the draft of a bill concerning power upon the Supreme Court to regulate procedure in all the courts, subject to possible

\textsuperscript{30} 5 Mo. Bar J. 207 (1924).
\textsuperscript{32} Proc. Mo. Bar Assn., 1920, p. 74-75, 115-121.
\textsuperscript{33} Proc. Mo. Bar J. No. 12, p. 22 (1930).
\textsuperscript{35} Proc. Mo. Bar Assn., 1928, p. 47, advocating also the vesting of authority in the legislature to increase the number of appellate judges.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., 1929, p. 21-22.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., p. 84.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., 1929, p. 135-138.
\textsuperscript{41} 2 Mo. Bar J. No. 27, 1923, p. 10 (1932).
legislative veto, and establishing a judicial council to advise the Court. The Association voted to sponsor the bill at the next legislative session. Its defeat was followed by renewed advocacy.

Vigorous efforts to obtain legislative authority for regulation by the Supreme Court of admission to practice, which were being put forth in the meanwhile by the Bar Association, met with a similar fate. A bill conferring such authority, which the Association's committee sidetracked in 1931 in the interest of the judicial council measure, had met with defeat at the two previous sessions after its preparation and advocacy by the Committee on Legal Education and Admission to the Bar, acting for the Association. The prime object of this proposed legislation was the establishment in Missouri of the American Bar Association's minimum standards for admission to the bar, which the State Association persistently endorsed — refusing on one occasion to heed the suggestion of its committee that expediency dictated the temporary advocacy of somewhat easier requirements. It was suggested in 1930 that judicial action without legislative authorization might solve the problem.

The matter of bar discipline, however, proved to be the weight which tipped the judicial scales in the direction of an assertion of freedom from legislative shackles. Here again the Bar Association took the lead and, after a period of failure to secure legislative action, turned to the judiciary for relief. Many years of thankless and largely fruitless effort on the part of the grievance committee of the local and state voluntary bar associations produced a feeling of frustration in the presence of mounting public criticism of abuses within the profession. In 1926 a special committee of the Missouri Association recommended the legislative enactment of the American Bar Association's code of ethics. In 1928 the Committee on Grievances and Legal Ethics suggested legislation to cope with the growing evil of damage suits on the highways. In 1929 the Committee asked that the Executive Committee be directed to formulate a more definite policy for it to follow. Its request was granted and specific authorization was given for carrying out the apparently unprecedented idea of the expenditure of money in the Committee's work. The following year the Association directed explicitly that its committee would entertain complaints against any lawyer in the state, whether a member of the Association or not. In 1931 the Association appropriated $2500 for the work of its Grievance Committee during the following year and, further, authorized the assumption of one-half the expenses of disbarment proceedings brought by local committees outside of St. Louis and Kansas City. The St. Louis Association's committee, in the meanwhile, had become extremely vigorous in proceeding against unethical practitioners. The Joplin and Jasper County Bar Associations voted to proceed in an important case. Clearly a new spirit was abroad in the organized profession.

It was strongly felt, however, that additional powers were needed in two directions. These were (1) the authoritative promulgation of a code of ethics and (2) effective procedure (compulsory testimony, etc.) in enforcing the rules against wayward practitioners. To consider the situation the President of the Missouri Bar Association issued a call for a conference of the presidents and grievance committee chairmen of all bar associations in the State, to be held at St. Louis in advance of the Association's 1931 annual meeting. The Conference submitted a resolution to the Association which the latter adopted, asserting the independent powers of the Judiciary and requesting the Supreme Court to promulgate a code of ethics and itself take cognizance of violations of the code.

The response of the Supreme Court was partially made in the now-famous case of In the Matter of Richards. In that proceeding the grievance committee of the St. Louis and Missouri Bar Associations united in filing a disbarment proceeding against the respondent, a practitioner who was alleged to have been guilty of "a misdemeanor and malpractice in his professional capacity" in acting as "go-between" for the family of a kidnaping victim and the kidnappers. The respondent had previously been acquitted of criminal charges growing out of the kidnaping. Repeating upon an earlier decision construing the disbarment statute, he pleaded his acquittal as a defense. Characterizing its earlier decision as a "judicial aberration" and holding that the statutes warranted disbarment upon the facts of the case, the Supreme Court said in addition that "Since the object sought is not naturally within the orbit of the legislative department the power to accomplish it is in its exercise judicial and not legislative, although in the harmonious co-ordination of powers necessary to effectuate the aim and end of government it may be regulated by statutes to aid in the accomplishment of the object but not to frustrate or destroy it." It stated further that "Any statutory enactment undertaking to make an acquittal in a criminal prosecution a bar to such an investigation would be, as heretofore suggested, an unconstitutional encroachment of the legislative upon the judicial department of government, and such is the weight of well reasoned authority."

The Executive Committee of the Bar Association, seizing upon this judicial declaration of in-
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dependence, almost immediately requested the Court to appoint an advisory commission "with power to investigate the means of regulating professional matters and that said commission report to the Court . . . its findings and recommendations with respect to the regulation of the practice of law in this State." 42 The Court responded promptly by issuing an order appointing a commission of eleven lawyers to make the requested investigation "of the subject of regulation of the practice of law, particularly with a view of ascertaining its most practical and effective scope and administration in this state." 43 The Commission without monetary compensation or provision even for its expenses, finished its labors in less than six months and rendered a report embracing admission to the bar, regulation of the practice of law by non-lawyers, and the establishment of a judicial council, whose adoption by the court resulted in the developments which were noted at the outset of this paper. Thus in three years from the meeting of the conference of bar association officials which urged the use of judicial powers for the effective regulation of the bar of the state, there went into effect a thorough-going system of control of the practice of law to which all of the lawyers of the state are harnessed, at least financially, accompanied by machinery for suggesting improvements and by provision for continuous study of the larger problems of the judicial department. 44

In the regulation of the practice of law in Missouri the problem of the encroachment of lay agencies has loomed large. Before the Supreme Court's Assumption of control and since that time the organized bar of Missouri has done battle with collection agencies, automobile associations, and trust companies—more particularly with the last-mentioned agency. The St. Louis Bar Association took the lead by procuring the filing of quo warranto proceedings against certain trust companies, challenging their right to draft wills and trust agreements. The Missouri Bar Association lent its own support and sponsored an Inter-Bar Association Conference on the Unauthorized Practice which likewise rallied to the cause. 45 The result was a sweeping victory for the bar, announced in a decision which followed soon after the adoption of the report of the Supreme Court commission. 46 The resulting sense of solidarity on the part of the bar has been invaluable in keeping alive its disposition to grapple aggressively with the problems still confronting it. Nor has its attitude, once wholly, been regarded cynically by the public. The economic stake of the profession in limiting the unauthorized practice is undeniable. That there are factors of professional responsibility which bar genuinely bears in mind and which are entitled to protection against weakening from without, is a fact which has not been ignored by the press and other commentators. 47

An additional failure to procure desired legislation, which accompanied the development just outlined, remains to be reported. Entirely independent action by the judiciary was not, prior to its accomplishment, the sole or even the principal reliance of the Bar Association for attaining its objectives. In 1930 the idea of a bar, incorporated by statute and given regulatory powers in accordance with California and Oklahoma precedents, was taken up. The Association, which was provided for by resolution on for a committee of three to frame a bill for introduction into the legislature. 48 Nothing daunted, the Association proceeded to draft a new proposal 49 and to sponsor it at the 1933 session. 50 After a determined fight, in which the Association mobilized all of its resources, this proposal also was lost, by a narrow margin. 51 Great was the disappointment of the failure, soon to be dispelled by the Richards decision. 52

In two important respects the present system of control differs from the proposed statutory integration of the bar. 53 The latter would not only

42. 4 Mo. Bar J. 130 (1933).
43. 4 Mo. Bar J. 191 (1933).
44. 5 Mo. Bar J. 67 (1934).
45. Ibid. 12.
46. Ibid. 72.
47. That the Court will not permit itself to be hampered in effecting procedural reform by legislation as to the incidents of trial is indicated in the opinion of Atwood, J. (who also wrote the opinion in the Richards case) in the case of Dorman v. East St. Louis R. Co., 256 Mo. 772, 68 W. (Wd.) 454 (Oct. 19, 1934). There a statute authorizing instructions to jurors in civil cases was held not to prejudice a judicial holding required by the requested instructions where the proper decision of a case made them necessary. Again the Court overruled its own prior holdings and asserted as to legislation that if the accomplishment of this end (of the administration of justice), for which courts were primarily created, is hampered or supported by rules of practice, whether of legislative or judicial origin, it will scarcely be said that a constitutional court of competent jurisdiction should omit or stay performance of any of its judicial functions because of prior legislative encroachment, or until the present legislative act is repealed.
49. State ex rel Miller v. St. Louis Union Trust Co., 251 Mo. 478, 137 S. W. (2d) 645 (1940).
51. State ex rel Miller v. St. Louis Union Trust Co., 251 Mo. 478, 137 S. W. (2d) 645 (1940).
53. State ex rel Miller v. St. Louis Union Trust Co., 251 Mo. 478, 137 S. W. (2d) 645 (1940). As a result of the subsequent action to curb unauthorized practice, the abuses of law list publishers, etc., had been carried forth by the General Chairman of the Bar Committees, assisted by his Advisory Committee. 5 Mo. Bar J. 116, 156, 172, 339 (1933): 7 ibid. 347 (1934). The success of these activities has made Missouri the "key" state in the conflict between collection agencies and the Bar. A court test of the extent of the power to limit these agencies with national support for the latter is now under way. See the communication of Stanley R. Didden of New York, 9 Mo. Bar J. 149 (1935).
54. These are well reviewed in the report of the Association's Committee on Unauthorized Practice of the Law for 1931. 2 Mo. Bar J. 41, p. 49 (1931).
55. The most striking recognition of the organized bar's public service in the activities here reviewed appeared in the confering of the annual "St. Louis Award" for the year 1935 upon the Bar Association of the Bar by the distinguished public service of its Grievance Committee and of its members who contributed to the Supreme Court's assumption of control over the Bar. 5 Mo. Bar J. 290 (1936); 21 A. B. A., J. 720 (1935). Ordinarily the award is made to a single individual.
59. 2 Mo. Bar J. 116, 149 (1932).
60. Ibid. 177.
61. 3 Mo. Bar J. 25 (1933).
62. The Beardsley, Effective Bar Organization, 7 Mo. Bar J. 7 (1936). 8 Mo. Bar J. 18 (1934). The Proceedings of the Bar Association's Committee on Incorporation of the Bar by the action of the Supreme Court "is large but the purposes and objects of an incorporated bar have been accomplished." 5 Mo. Bar J. 190 (1934).
have taxed the practitioners of the State for the support of professional activity but would also have entailed them to participate in the selection of a Board of Governors for the Bar and in the deliberations of the annual meeting. It would also have swallowed up the voluntary State Bar Association. Now, there is judicial control by means of appointees from the profession, paralleled by an unofficial organization of less than half of active practitioners.

In view of the record, it is quite natural that large claims to judicial and professional independence of legislative control should be advanced by members of the Missouri Bar. Thus it has been asserted that "The Bar of the nation must be independent of everyone and everything except its own moral code." 82 Moreover, "What is the practice of law is a matter entirely for the courts. This is not the subject of legislative fiat. 83 Specifically, according to the Missouri Lawyers' Association itself has endorsed the Wagoner bill to fix the scope of the annual meeting. It would also have elected them to participate in the selection of a Board of Governors for the Bar and in the deliberations of the annual meeting. It would also have swallowed up the voluntary State Bar Association. Now, there is judicial control by means of appointees from the profession, paralleled by an unofficial organization of less than half of active practitioners.

There is judicial control by means of appointees from the profession, paralleled by an unofficial organization of less than half of active practitioners.
isolated attempt to stimulate an investigation of lobbying met with a prompt rebuff at the hands of the Association.\footnote{4 Mo. Bar J. 162 (1933).}

Now that the more mundane task of policing the profession has been taken over by the Supreme Court, the present seems to be an opportune time for the Bar Association to begin to concern itself with those broader problems of efficiency and responsibility in government upon whose wise solution the success of democratic government and of the bar's own enterprise so largely depends. It is not intended to suggest that the still wider field of economic and social questions be invaded. Manifestly the Bar, like other occupational groups, will divide upon these according to the varying human ideals to which its members adhere. But in the matter of securing legislative decisions honestly and decently and of providing for their fair, effective execution there would seem to be little room for division among sincere people, once the nature of the issues is understood. If the Bar Association should see fit to look into these issues and to employ its influence in their wise determination, its admirable success in setting its own house in order during the past ten years may well be matched by its accomplishments in the reform of state and local governments during the next decade.\footnote{For such purposes the voluntary Bar Association is, of course, the only possible vehicle. Neither legislature nor court could well undertake to compel the payment of dues to an organization whose purposes were other than professional in the limited sense.}

Kansas City Bar Association Holds Annual Meeting

On October 15, 1936, the Kansas City Bar Association elected Harold E. Neibling as its President for the ensuing year. Mr. Neibling is of the firm of Neibling & Lewis. William C. Lucas of Johnson, Lucas, Landon, Graves & Fane, was elected Vice President. Terence M. O'Brien, associate of James P. Ayward, was elected Secretary, and Eugene R. Brouse, associate of Fred Bellemere, was elected Treasurer.

Of Mr. Neibling, the Kansas City Bar Bulletin in its October issue, says:
"President Neibling came into prominence in bar activities in 1934 when he staged a one-man membership drive among the ranks of youthful lawyers who had not affiliated with the Kansas City Bar Association. So successful was he in his efforts that virtually all young lawyers in Kansas City today are enrolled on the membership lists. The results indicated the young lawyers realized the necessity of training for the cloak of leadership destined to fall on their shoulders as time made inroads in the ranks of veterans who fostered the Kansas City Bar Association and insured its progress in earlier and more hectic days.

"Neibling became known as a champion of the struggling, youthful attorneys, and a sympathetic interest in the young lawyer's problems and advancement became an official part of the progressive local bar's program. Official recognition of Neibling's service was given when he was elected vice-president in 1935.

"A former Washington newspaper man, the new president writes and speaks on his hobby, anthropology. He has made expeditions into the South American interior and has studied ancient ruins in conjunction with his field research in that science."