

December 1931

## Legislation--Proposed Bar Committee to Correct Formal Errors in Revised Code

James W. Simonton  
*West Virginia University College of Law*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wvlr>



Part of the [Legislation Commons](#), and the [State and Local Government Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

James W. Simonton, *Legislation--Proposed Bar Committee to Correct Formal Errors in Revised Code*, 38 W. Va. L. Rev. (1931).

Available at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wvlr/vol38/iss1/6>

This Editorial Note is brought to you for free and open access by the WVU College of Law at The Research Repository @ WVU. It has been accepted for inclusion in West Virginia Law Review by an authorized editor of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact [ian.harmon@mail.wvu.edu](mailto:ian.harmon@mail.wvu.edu).

# West Virginia Law Quarterly and THE BAR

---

Published by the Faculty of the College of Law of West Virginia University, and issued in December, February, April and June of each academic year. Official publication of The West Virginia Bar Association.

---

Subscription price to individuals, not members of The West Virginia Bar Association, \$2.00 per year. To those who are members of the Association the price is \$1.50 per year and is included in their annual dues. Single copies, 50 cents.

---

**FACULTY EDITOR IN CHARGE**

JEFFERSON B. FORDEHAM

**MANAGING EDITOR**

LOUISE FARRELL HARTLEY

**FACULTY BOARD OF EDITORS**

THOMAS P. HARDMAN	LEO CARLIN	EDMUND C. DICKINSON
JAMES W. SIMONTON	THOMAS C. BILLIG	
FRANK E. HORACK JR.	ROBERT T. DONLEY	

**STUDENT BOARD OF EDITORS**

BERNARD SCLOVE, *President*

AUGUST W. PETROPLUS, *Secretary*

JOHN H. HOGE	DONALD M. HUTTON	HENRY P. SNYDER
FREDERICK H. BARNETT	E. GAUJOT BIAS	DONALD F. BLACK
JACK C. BURDETT	WILLIAM O. CALLAHAN	LOYD C. HAYNES
ELIZABETH H. SIMONTON	KINGSLEY R. SMITH	

---

LEGISLATION — PROPOSED BAR COMMITTEE TO CORRECT FORMAL ERRORS IN REVISED CODE. — On the whole the new Revised Code is a good piece of work, though one listening to the storm of criticism which has followed its enactment might conclude the contrary. No Board of Revisers could possibly make a revision so perfect as to please everyone. Usually the critic disagrees with what the Revisors have provided in particular sections and would substitute his own idea. Whether his idea would be preferable may be very doubtful. Lawyers as a class are conservative and many of them resent any change in the statutory law they have learned. They dislike to have their knowledge repealed by legislative act. The change necessitates the irksome task of learning the scope and effect of the new statutory provisions. Consequently the great bulk of the criticism of the Revised Code should not be taken too seriously. It indicates lack of approval, not lack of merit. But in a work of this magnitude there is bound to be found what manifestly seems to be errors and oversights which have escaped the notice of those empowered to make changes before enactment—errors and oversights of a kind that practically

everyone would admit ought to be corrected as soon as possible. It would be clearly of great advantage if all of these could be collected and corrections embodied in one bill which could be presented to the legislature for enactment. The writer is informed that various members of the Board of Revisers were of the opinion that some sort of board or committee ought to be provided to continue for some years after the enactment of the Revised Code, said board or committee to be charged with the duty of collecting such manifest errors and oversights and with drafting a bill for their correction. Unfortunately the legislature did not make provision for the correction of such errors and for drafting of such remedial legislation.

Since the legislature has not acted the writer suggests that the Executive Council of the State Bar Association take up this matter with a view to the appointment of some committee of the Bar Association, to which various alleged errors and oversights could be reported, duly considered by the committee and eventually drafted in a bill for the correction of such as the committee believed ought to be corrected. Such a bill properly prepared by such a committee and its passage recommended by the Bar Association would undoubtedly be enacted by the legislature. Service on such a committee would have to be without compensation, but if the members would rigidly exclude everything except those items which clearly seemed errors and oversights, perhaps the task might not prove too onerous. Unless all proposals for mere amendment or change of the code which are not apparent errors of the Board of Revisers were rigidly excluded the whole purpose would be jeopardized. Controversy would arise which might be carried into the legislature, and endanger or defeat any proposed bill. The purpose of the committee ought not to be to revise the Code or any portion of it, but merely to see that proper measures are taken to correct manifest errors and oversights.

The writer has found several alleged errors which he would submit if there were such a committee. Doubtless many members of the bar have likewise found others. In fact such matters are usually not discovered until some one considers carefully the meaning of the language of the code with a view to determining its proper interpretation. It is to be hoped that the Executive Committee of the Bar Association can find some means to create a committee to which such matters may be reported.

—JAMES W. SIMONTON.