

FOLDER NO.

180 ✓

204.5

Constitutional Convention
Committee on Ordinances and
Transition
December 8, 1955

R. J. McNealy, Esq.
Chairman of the Committee
on Ordinances and Transition

Dear Sir:

Additional research on the subject of transition, (outlined by your chairman) fully bears out the importance of adequately covering this topic.

In the light of past experiences of previous conventions it appears that this particular phase has given rise to more litigation than some of the fundamental principles embodied in the constitutional document proper. The conflict between the status quo of the old territory or state and the inaugural of the new has been giving rise to a number of complex questions forming the basis of such litigation.

A case rather illuminating on the subject which has been cited with approval arose in the State of Texas where, in an action on trespass to try out the propriety of a title to 120 acres of land, involving the validity of a Writ returnable between the period of the new court having jurisdiction over the return date of such Writ, and the former court issuing such Writ. The case of Best et al. v. Albright et al., 59 Southwestern, 391. The constitutional ordinance governing writs and process which was appended to the constitution read as follows:

"Be it ordained by the people of Texas in Convention assembled, that until otherwise provided by law, the terms of the District Courts of the several judicial districts shall be as hereinafter prescribed: ***

Transition, Courts and Elections

"Section 7. That the District Courts of the Seventh Judicial District be holden at the times hereinafter specified, to wit: * * *

In the County of Gregg, on the Eighteenth Mondays after the second Mondays In March and September, and may continue in session two weeks. * * *

"Section 27. All writs and process, civil and criminal, heretofore issued by or from the District Courts, in the several counties of this State, and made returnable to the former terms of said Courts, as said terms are now fixed by law, shall be returnable to the next ensuing terms of said District Courts in each county, as they are prescribed in this ordinance; and all such writs and process that may be issued by or from said courts at any time within five days next before the holding of the next ensuing terms of said courts, as prescribed herein, are hereby made returnable to said terms respectively; and all such writs and process hereinbefore mentioned are hereby legalized and validated, to all intents and purposes, as if the same had been made returnable to the terms or terms of said court, as the terms thereof are herein prescribed."

The court construing the effect of the ordinance stated on Page 894,

"(1) The term of court to which pre-existing and pending 'writs and process' were made returnable was altered to the later date, namely, 'to the next ensuing terms of said District Courts. *** as they are prescribed in this ordinance,' and (2) all such pre-existing and pending 'writs and process' were declared 'hereby legalized and validated, to all intents and purposes, as if the same had been made returnable to the term or terms of said courts, as the terms thereof are herein prescribed.' Such a general provision has, as was intended, the same effect as a saving clause in a repealing statute. A saving clause is intended to save something which would OTHERWISE BE LOST. Legal objection may not be predicated against such cumulative and remedial provisions. A provision of the kind, being only cumulative in its nature, could not operate to the legal injury of a defendant."

In the way of obiter dicta the learned judge makes interesting comment which in a sense is a re-embodiment and an expression of other courts as to the power and function of the constitutional convention, with respect to accomplish its objects: (Page 894)

Overlays - Transition, Courts and Elections

"A constitutional convention is not a co-ordinate branch of the government, but is a body of representatives of the people convened only on special occasion, and for the purpose of revising or framing a Constitution. The powers it has are usually expressly conferred upon it, together with such implied (and inherent) powers as may be necessary to carry into effect those expressly conferred."

As to the transitional aspect and the force of the ordinances, the court stated as follows: (Page 895)

"As an ordinance appended to a Constitution newly adopted, which contains provisions for the adjustment of matters affected by the change from the old to the new Constitution, forms a part of the Constitution so far as its temporary purposes go, such ordinance may not prevail or supersede the provisions of the permanent part of the Constitution."

The latitude given to the Constitution was well expressed in Kemper v. Hawkins 1 Virginia, Cas. 20.

"Though the delegates chosen in 1776 who composed the convention that framed the Constitution of Virginia were not particularly instructed so to do, yet as their work was acquiesced in by the people, it became a fundamental law binding on all branches of the government of the state."

On the effect that the transition era may have on the Courts involving criminal actions the case of Ex Parte Toland reported 1880 in 54 California Reports, page 344 and subsequently cited has an enlightening bearing.

The petitioner, James Toland, who was tried in the City Criminal Court within and for the City and County of San Francisco, and duly convicted in July 1879 issued out a Writ of Habeas Corpus against the Sheriff on the ground that the process at the time of its execution was issued without authority, since the Court issuing the process enforcing the

Transition, Courts and Elections

judgment was newly created and the trial court was abolished by the 1879 Constitution, the Court however in dismissing the Writ with the following opinion stated as follows:

"In support of this view, counsel for petitioner relies upon Section 1470 of the Penal Code, which provides that, 'if appeal is dismissed or the judgment affirmed, a copy of the order of dismissal or judgment of affirmance must be remitted to the Court below, which may proceed to enforce its sentence'.

"In the present casethis cannot be done, as the 'Court below' has gone out of existence under the provisions of the new Constitution, and therefore, it is argued, the prisoner should be discharged.

"It would be a misfortune if such were the case. The guilt of the defendant was determined by the verdict of a jury in the City Criminal Court, and the judgment rendered upon such verdict has been sustained by the Appellate Court; yet it is claimed that the machinery of the courts is left insufficient, under the operation of the new Constitution, to enforce the judgment. The Court will endeavor to find an escape from such a conclusion, and in this case there is no real difficulty in doing so.

"Section 1 of Art. 22 (Schedule appended to the Constitution) of the Constitution declares 'that all laws in force at the adoption of this Constitution, not inconsistent therewith, shall remain in full force and effect until altered or repealed by the Legislature; and all rights, actions, prosecutions, claims, and contracts of the State, counties, individuals, or bodies corporate, not inconsistent therewith, shall continue to be as valid as if this Constitution had not been adopted'. And Section 3 of the same article provides that 'all courts now existing, save Justice's and Police Courts, are hereby abolished; and all records, books, papers, and proceedings from such courts as are abolished by this Constitution, shall be transferred on the first day of January, eighteen hundred and eighty, to the courts provided for in this Constitution; and the courts to which the same are thus transferred shall have the same power and jurisdiction over them as if they had been in the first instance commenced, filed, or lodged therein'.

"On the 1st day of January, 1880, the County Court of the City and County of San Francisco went out of existence,

Transition, Courts and Elections

the Superior Court succeeding to its powers and jurisdictions. The case now under consideration was then properly before the Superior Court, and that Court had the same power and jurisdiction over it as it would have had if the case had been in the first instance 'commenced, filed, or lodged therein'."

The importance (when framing the ordinances, schedules or for that matter the fundamental articles incorporated in the constitution proper) and following the principle of stare decisis particularly in adopting wording of other constitutions was borne out in the case of Stine v. Morrison 9 Idaho Reports 26 where the Court held as follows:

"Where any constitutional provision or wording is borrowed or adopted from another state the courts of which have placed a construction on its language it will be presumed that it was taken in view of such judicial interpretation and with the purpose of adopting the language as the same had been interpreted by the courts of the state from which it was taken.

"A similar opinion was expressed in the case of Norfolk and West Virginia R. R. Co. v. Cheatwoods 103 Virginia 356 the Court stating 'where any constitutional provision of another state is incorporated in the constitution of this state, the court construction placed upon the provisions by the courts of such other state before its adoption here must be adopted in this state'."

ELECTIONS

The case of State ex rel. v. Moores et al. 7 Nebraska 48 involving dispute over an election of a City Judge and resulting in the institution of a peremptory writ of mandamus, the court held that an election provided for and required to take place by the adoption of the Constitution is self-operative.

The court quoting Section 18, Article 6 and Section 13, Article 10 of the Constitution relating to the general elections to be had under the new constitution stated as follows: (Page 1014)

"that the relator having been elected for a term of two years, to commence in January, 1895, at the regular election held in 1895, regular elections for police magistrate in the district comprising the city of Omaha should be held every two years thereafter; that the office and the district still existed in 1901; that the above-quoted provisions of the Constitution are so far self-enforcing that an election held to fill such office, participated in generally by the people of Omaha at the general election in 1901, was a valid election for that purpose."

I have analyzed and made a list of a great deal of cumulative material enunciating some of the doctrines held by the courts on various subjects. A great deal of the material is purely cumulative and I wish to solicit an expression of an opinion from your Committee as to whether you desire such additional material and also any other questions not covered in the submitted memoranda.

Respectfully submitted,

LAZAR DWORKIN

Transition, Courts and Elections

Constitutional Convention
Committee on Ordinances and
Transition
December 8, 1955

R. J. McNealy, Esq.
Chairman of the Committee
on Ordinances and Transition

Dear Sir:

Additional research on the subject of transition, (outlined by your chairman) fully bears out the importance of adequately covering this topic.

In the light of past experiences of previous conventions it appears that this particular phase has given rise to more litigation than some of the fundamental principles embodied in the constitutional document proper. The conflict between the status quo of the old territory or state and the inaugural of the new has been giving rise to a number of complex questions forming the basis of such litigation.

A case rather illuminating on the subject which has been cited with approval arose in the State of Texas where, in an action on trespass to try out the propriety of a title to 120 acres of land, involving the validity of a writ returnable between the period of the new court having jurisdiction over the return date of such writ, and the former court issuing such writ. The case of Best et al. v. Albright et al., 59 Southwestern, 891. The constitutional ordinance governing writs and process which was appended to the constitution read as follows:

"Be it ordained by the people of Texas in Convention assembled, that until otherwise provided by law, the terms of the District Courts of the several judicial districts shall be as hereinafter prescribed: ***

"Section 7. That the District Courts of the Seventh Judicial District be holden at the times hereinafter specified, to wit: * * *

In the County of Gregg, on the Eighteenth Mondays after the second Mondays In March and September, and may continue in session two weeks. * * *

"Section 27. All writs and process, civil and criminal, heretofore issued by or from the District Courts, in the several counties of this State, and made returnable to the former terms of said Courts, as said terms are now fixed by law, shall be returnable to the next ensuing terms of said District Courts in each county, as they are prescribed in this ordinance; and all such writs and process that may be issued by or from said courts at any time within five days next before the holding of the next ensuing terms of said courts, as prescribed herein, are hereby made returnable to said terms respectively; and all such writs and process hereinbefore mentioned are hereby legalized and validated, to all intents and purposes, as if the same had been made returnable to the terms or terms of said court, as the terms thereof are herein prescribed."

The court construing the effect of the ordinance stated on Page 894,

"(1) The term of court to which pre-existing and pending 'writs and process' were made returnable was altered to the later date, namely, 'to the next ensuing terms of said District Courts. *** as they are prescribed in this ordinance,' and (2) all such pre-existing and pending 'writs and process' were declared 'hereby legalized and validated, to all intents and purposes, as if the same had been made returnable to the term or terms of said courts, as the terms thereof are herein prescribed.' Such a general provision has, as was intended, the same effect as a saving clause in a repealing statute. A saving clause is intended to save something which would OTHERWISE BE LOST. Legal objection may not be predicated against such cumulative and remedial provisions. A provision of the kind, being only cumulative in its nature, could not operate to the legal injury of a defendant."

In the way of obiter dicta the learned judge makes interesting comment which in a sense is a re-embodiment and an expression of other courts as to the power and function of the constitutional convention, with respect to accomplish its objects: (Page 894)

"A constitutional convention is not a co-ordinate branch of the government, but is a body of representatives of the people convened only on special occasion, and for the purpose of revising or framing a Constitution. The powers it has are usually expressly conferred upon it, together with such implied (and inherent) powers as may be necessary to carry into effect those expressly conferred."

As to the transitional aspect and the force of the ordinances, the court stated as follows: (Page 895)

"As an ordinance appended to a Constitution newly adopted, which contains provisions for the adjustment of matters affected by the change from the old to the new Constitution, forms a part of the Constitution so far as its temporary purposes go, such ordinance may not prevail or supersede the provisions of the permanent part of the Constitution."

The latitude given to the Constitution was well expressed in Kemper v. Hawkins 1 Virginia, Cas. 20.

"Though the delegates chosen in 1776 who composed the convention that framed the Constitution of Virginia were not particularly instructed so to do, yet as their work was acquiesced in by the people, it became a fundamental law binding on all branches of the government of the state."

On the effect that the transition era may have on the Courts involving criminal actions the case of Ex Parte Toland reported 1880 in 54 California Reports, page 344 and subsequently cited has an enlightening bearing.

The petitioner, James Toland, who was tried in the City Criminal Court within and for the City and County of San Francisco, and duly convicted in July 1879 issued out a Writ of Habeas Corpus against the Sheriff on the ground that the process at the time of its execution was issued without authority, since the Court issuing the process enforcing the

judgment was newly created and the trial court was abolished by the 1879 Constitution, the Court however in dismissing the Writ with the following opinion stated as follows:

"In support of this view, counsel for petitioner relies upon Section 1470 of the Penal Code, which provides that, 'if appeal is dismissed or the judgment affirmed, a copy of the order of dismissal or judgment of affirmance must be remitted to the Court below, which may proceed to enforce its sentence!'

"In the present case this cannot be done, as the 'Court below' has gone out of existence under the provisions of the new Constitution, and therefore, it is argued, the prisoner should be discharged.

"It would be a misfortune if such were the case. The guilt of the defendant was determined by the verdict of a jury in the City Criminal Court, and the judgment rendered upon such verdict has been sustained by the Appellate Court; yet it is claimed that the machinery of the courts is left insufficient, under the operation of the new Constitution, to enforce the judgment. The Court will endeavor to find an escape from such a conclusion, and in this case there is no real difficulty in doing so.

"Section 1 of Art. 22 (Schedule appended to the Constitution) of the Constitution declares 'that all laws in force at the adoption of this Constitution, not inconsistent therewith, shall remain in full force and effect until altered or repealed by the Legislature; and all rights, actions, prosecutions, claims, and contracts of the State, counties, individuals, or bodies corporate, not inconsistent therewith, shall continue to be as valid as if this Constitution had not been adopted'. And Section 3 of the same article provides that 'all courts now existing, save Justice's and Police Courts, are hereby abolished; and all records, books, papers, and proceedings from such courts as are abolished by this Constitution, shall be transferred on the first day of January, eighteen hundred and eighty, to the courts provided for in this Constitution; and the courts to which the same are thus transferred shall have the same power and jurisdiction over them as if they had been in the first instance commenced, filed, or lodged therein'.

"On the 1st day of January, 1880, the County Court of the City and County of San Francisco went out of existence,

the Superior Court succeeding to its powers and jurisdictions. The case now under consideration was then properly before the Superior Court, and that Court had the same power and jurisdiction over it as it would have had if the case had been in the first instance 'commenced, filed, or lodged therein'."

The importance (when framing the ordinances, schedules or for that matter the fundamental articles incorporated in the constitution proper) and following the principle of stare decisis particularly in adopting wording of other constitutions was borne out in the case of Stine v. Morrison 9 Idaho Reports 26 where the Court held as follows:

"Where any constitutional provision or wording is borrowed or adopted from another state the courts of which have placed a construction on its language it will be presumed that it was taken in view of such judicial interpretation and with the purpose of adopting the language as the same had been interpreted by the courts of the state from which it was taken.

"A similar opinion was expressed in the case of Norfolk and West Virginia R. R. Co. v. Cheatwoods 103 Virginia 356 the Court stating 'where any constitutional provision of another state is incorporated in the constitution of this state, the court construction placed upon the provisions by the courts of such other state before its adoption here must be adopted in this state'."

ELECTIONS

The case of State ex rel. v. Moores et al. 7 Nebraska 48 involving dispute over an election of a City Judge and resulting in the institution of a peremptory writ of mandamus, the court held that an election provided for and required to take place by the adoption of the Constitution is self-operative.

Transition, Courts and Elections

The court quoting Section 18, Article 6 and Section 13, Article 10 of the Constitution relating to the general elections to be had under the new constitution stated as follows: (Page 1014)

"that the relator having been elected for a term of two years, to commence in January, 1895, at the regular election held in 1895, regular elections for police magistrate in the district comprising the city of Omaha should be held every two years thereafter; that the office and the district still existed in 1901; that the above-quoted provisions of the Constitution are so far self-enforcing that an election held to fill such office, participated in generally by the people of Omaha at the general election in 1901, was a valid election for that purpose."

I have analyzed and made a list of a great deal of cumulative material enunciating some of the doctrines held by the courts on various subjects. A great deal of the material is purely cumulative and I wish to solicit an expression of an opinion from your Committee as to whether you desire such additional material and also any other questions not covered in the submitted memoranda.

Respectfully submitted,

LAZAR DWORKIN

Constitutional Convention
Committee on Ordinances and
Transition
December 8, 1955

R. J. McNealy, Esq.
Chairman of the Committee
on Ordinances and Transition

Dear Sir:

Additional research on the subject of transition, (outlined by your chairman) fully bears out the importance of adequately covering this topic.

In the light of past experiences of previous conventions it appears that this particular phase has given rise to more litigation than some of the fundamental principles embodied in the constitutional document proper. The conflict between the status quo of the old territory or state and the inaugural of the new has been giving rise to a number of complex questions forming the basis of such litigation.

A case rather illuminating on the subject which has been cited with approval arose in the State of Texas where, in an action on trespass to try out the propriety of a title to 120 acres of land, involving the validity of a Writ returnable between the period of the new court having jurisdiction over the return date of such Writ, and the former court issuing such Writ. The case of Best et al. v. Albright et al., 59 Southwestern, 891. The constitutional ordinance governing writs and process which was appended to the constitution read as follows:

"Be it ordained by the people of Texas in Convention assembled, that until otherwise provided by law, the terms of the District Courts of the several judicial districts shall be as hereinafter prescribed: ***

"Section 7. That the District Courts of the Seventh Judicial District be holden at the times hereinafter specified, to wit: * * *

In the County of Gregg, on the Eighteenth Mondays after the second Mondays in March and September, and may continue in session two weeks. * * *

"Section 27. All writs and process, civil and criminal, heretofore issued by or from the District Courts, in the several counties of this State, and made returnable to the former terms of said Courts, as said terms are now fixed by law, shall be returnable to the next ensuing terms of said District Courts in each county, as they are prescribed in this ordinance; and all such writs and process that may be issued by or from said courts at any time within five days next before the holding of the next ensuing terms of said courts, as prescribed herein, are hereby made returnable to said terms respectively; and all such writs and process hereinbefore mentioned are hereby legalized and validated, to all intents and purposes, as if the same had been made returnable to the terms or terms of said court, as the terms thereof are herein prescribed."

The court construing the effect of the ordinance stated on Page 894,

"(1) The term of court to which pre-existing and pending 'writs and process' were made returnable was altered to the later date, namely, 'to the next ensuing terms of said District Courts. *** as they are prescribed in this ordinance,' and (2) all such pre-existing and pending 'writs and process' were declared 'hereby legalized and validated, to all intents and purposes, as if the same had been made returnable to the term or terms of said courts, as the terms thereof are herein prescribed.' Such a general provision has, as was intended, the same effect as a saving clause in a repealing statute. A saving clause is intended to save something which would OTHERWISE BE LOST. Legal objection may not be predicated against such cumulative and remedial provisions. A provision of the kind, being only cumulative in its nature, could not operate to the legal injury of a defendant."

In the way of obiter dicta the learned judge makes interesting comment which in a sense is a re-embodiment and an expression of other courts as to the power and function of the constitutional convention, with respect to accomplish its objects: (Page 894)

"A constitutional convention is not a co-ordinate branch of the government, but is a body of representatives of the people convened only on special occasion, and for the purpose of revising or framing a Constitution. The powers it has are usually expressly conferred upon it, together with such implied (and inherent) powers as may be necessary to carry into effect those expressly conferred."

As to the transitional aspect and the force of the ordinances, the court stated as follows: (Page 895)

"As an ordinance appended to a Constitution newly adopted, which contains provisions for the adjustment of matters affected by the change from the old to the new Constitution, forms a part of the Constitution so far as its temporary purposes go, such ordinance may not prevail or supersede the provisions of the permanent part of the Constitution."

The latitude given to the Constitution was well expressed in Kemper v. Hawkins 1 Virginia, Cas. 20.

"Though the delegates chosen in 1776 who composed the convention that framed the Constitution of Virginia were not particularly instructed so to do, yet as their work was acquiesced in by the people, it became a fundamental law binding on all branches of the government of the state."

On the effect that the transition era may have on the Courts involving criminal actions the case of Ex Parte Toland reported 1880 in 54 California Reports, page 344 and subsequently cited has an enlightening bearing.

The petitioner, James Toland, who was tried in the City Criminal Court within and for the City and County of San Francisco, and duly convicted in July 1879 issued out a Writ of Habeas Corpus against the Sheriff on the ground that the process at the time of its execution was issued without authority, since the Court issuing the process enforcing the

judgment was newly created and the trial court was abolished by the 1879 Constitution, the Court however in dismissing the Writ with the following opinion stated as follows:

"In support of this view, counsel for petitioner relies upon Section 1470 of the Penal Code, which provides that, 'if appeal is dismissed or the judgment affirmed, a copy of the order of dismissal or judgment of affirmance must be remitted to the Court below, which may proceed to enforce its sentence!.

"In the present case this cannot be done, as the 'Court below' has gone out of existence under the provisions of the new Constitution, and therefore, it is argued, the prisoner should be discharged.

"It would be a misfortune if such were the case. The guilt of the defendant was determined by the verdict of a jury in the City Criminal Court, and the judgment rendered upon such verdict has been sustained by the Appellate Court; yet it is claimed that the machinery of the courts is left insufficient, under the operation of the new Constitution, to enforce the judgment. The Court will endeavor to find an escape from such a conclusion, and in this case there is no real difficulty in doing so.

"Section 1 of Art. 22 (Schedule appended to the Constitution) of the Constitution declares 'that all laws in force at the adoption of this Constitution, not inconsistent therewith, shall remain in full force and effect until altered or repealed by the Legislature; and all rights, actions, prosecutions, claims, and contracts of the State, counties, individuals, or bodies corporate, not inconsistent therewith, shall continue to be as valid as if this Constitution had not been adopted'. And Section 3 of the same article provides that 'all courts now existing, save Justice's and Police Courts, are hereby abolished; and all records, books, papers, and proceedings from such courts as are abolished by this Constitution, shall be transferred on the first day of January, eighteen hundred and eighty, to the courts provided for in this Constitution; and the courts to which the same are thus transferred shall have the same power and jurisdiction over them as if they had been in the first instance commenced, filed, or lodged therein'.

"On the 1st day of January, 1880, the County Court of the City and County of San Francisco went out of existence,

the Superior Court succeeding to its powers and jurisdictions. The case now under consideration was then properly before the Superior Court, and that Court had the same power and jurisdiction over it as it would have had if the case had been in the first instance 'commenced, filed, or lodged therein'."

The importance (when framing the ordinances, schedules or for that matter the fundamental articles incorporated in the constitution proper) and following the principle of stare decisis particularly in adopting wording of other constitutions was borne out in the case of Stine v. Morrison 9 Idaho Reports 26 where the Court held as follows:

"Where any constitutional provision or wording is borrowed or adopted from another state the courts of which have placed a construction on its language it will be presumed that it was taken in view of such judicial interpretation and with the purpose of adopting the language as the same had been interpreted by the courts of the state from which it was taken.

"A similar opinion was expressed in the case of Norfolk and West Virginia R. R. Co. v. Cheatwoods 103 Virginia 356 the Court stating 'where any constitutional provision of another state is incorporated in the constitution of this state, the court construction placed upon the provisions by the courts of such other state before its adoption here must be adopted in this state'."

ELECTIONS

The case of State ex rel. v. Moores et al. 7 Nebraska 48 involving dispute over an election of a City Judge and resulting in the institution of a peremptory writ of mandamus, the court held that an election provided for and required to take place by the adoption of the Constitution is self-operative.

The court quoting Section 18, Article 6 and Section 13, Article 10 of the Constitution relating to the general elections to be had under the new constitution stated as follows: (Page 1014)

"that the relator having been elected for a term of two years, to commence in January, 1895, at the regular election held in 1895, regular elections for police magistrate in the district comprising the city of Omaha should be held every two years thereafter; that the office and the district still existed in 1901; that the above-quoted provisions of the Constitution are so far self-enforcing that an election held to fill such office, participated in generally by the people of Omaha at the general election in 1901, was a valid election for that purpose."

I have analyzed and made a list of a great deal of cumulative material enunciating some of the doctrines held by the courts on various subjects. A great deal of the material is purely cumulative and I wish to solicit an expression of an opinion from your Committee as to whether you desire such additional material and also any other questions not covered in the submitted memoranda.

Respectfully submitted,

LAZAR DWORKIN