

Washington University Law Review

Volume 20 | Issue 3

1935

Editorial Notes

The Editors

Follow this and additional works at: http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

The Editors, *Editorial Notes*, 20 ST. LOUIS L. REV. 228 (1935).

Available at: http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview/vol20/iss3/4

This Editorial Notes is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington University Law Review by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

ST. LOUIS LAW REVIEW

Edited by the Undergraduates of Washington University School of Law,
St. Louis. Published in December, February, April, and June at
Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Subscription Price \$2.00 per Annum. Seventy-five Cents per Copy.

A subscriber desiring to discontinue his subscription should send notice to
that effect. Otherwise it will be continued.

THE STAFF

CHRISTIAN B. PEPPER, *Editor-in-Chief*
HERMAN A. GORALNIK, *Associate Editor*
THOMAS B. CURTIS, *Business Manager*

ARTHUR J. BOHN	JAMES C. LOGAN
J. C. CRAWLEY	THOMAS S. MCPHEETERS
A. J. GALLANT	I. J. WOLF
EVELYN HONIGBERG	J. D. YOUNG

RALPH F. FUCHS, *Faculty Adviser*
ISRAEL TREIMAN, *Faculty Adviser*

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

WALTER D. COLES
FRANKLIN FERRISS

CHARLES NAGEL

JAMES A. SEDDON
THEODORE RASSIEUR

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

R. W. CHUBB, *Chairman*
R. L. ARONSON
F. P. ASCHEMEYER
G. A. BUDER, JR.
R. S. BULL
J. M. DOUGLAS
S. ELSON

J. J. GRAVELY
A. M. HOENNY
J. M. HOLMES
H. W. KROEGER
R. H. MCROBERTS
D. L. MILLAR

C. H. LUECKING, *Secretary*
M. OPPENHEIMER
R. R. NEUHOFF
R. B. SNOW
K. P. SPENCER
M. R. STAHL
M. L. STEWART

Editorial Notes

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

RALPH F. FUCHS, A.B., Washington University, 1922; LL.B., 1922; Ph.D., Robert Brookings Graduate School, 1925, contributes *Judicial Method and the Constitutionality of the N. I. R. A.* Mr. Fuchs has been a frequent contributor to the St. Louis Law Review of articles concerned with legal problems of social and political import. *His Collective Labor Agreements Under Administrative Regulation of Employment* appears in the current issue of the Columbia Law Review.

EDWARD S. STIMSON, A.M., Ohio State University, 1922; S.J.D., University of Michigan, 1930, submits *Conflict of Workmen's Compensation Laws*. Mr. Stimson is the author of *Jurisdiction and the Power of Taxation*, and of numerous Law Review articles concerned with jurisdictional questions.

Notes

A PROBLEM IN THE PERSONNEL OF THE FEDERAL CORPORATION

I.

The processes of government at times seem recurrent and cyclical rather than evolutionary. In the early nineteenth century the lack of a mature and adequate doctrine of the police power was supplied in this country by a resort to the governmentally owned and operated corporation as a means of controlling through monopoly or competition certain forms of economic activity.¹ Soon, however, this form of horizontal control began to give place to an ever increasing imposition of administrative regulations from above. At the time of the World War the government had almost completely evacuated the field of business enterprise and had retired into a regulatory Olympus from whence it ruled the scene through legislative enactment and administrative orders.² With the War came a temporary reflowering of the government corporation;³ but peace brought speedy

¹ Notable examples are: the Bank of the United States, 1 Stat. 191 (1791); 3 Stat. 266 (1816); and see *McCulloch v. Maryland* (1819) 4 Wheaton 316; the various state banks, see *Bank of the United States v. Planters Bank of Georgia* (1824) 9 Wheaton 904; *Bank of Kentucky v. Wister* (1829) 2 Peters 318; *Briscoe v. Bank of Kentucky* (1837) 11 Peters 257; *Darrington v. Bank of Alabama* (1851) 13 Howard 12; states frequently owned stock in railroad companies, see *Western and Atlantic Railroad Company v. Carlton* (1859) 28 Ga. 180; *State ex rel. Clark v. Stanley* (1872) 66 N. C. 59. For a case in which the United States subscribed for stock in a state chartered canal company see 12 Ops. Atty. Gen. 350 (1868). Refer to Field, *Government Corporations, a Proposal* (1935) 48 Harv. L. Rev. 775.

² Exceptions to this general tendency existed in the colonial possessions of the United States. In the Canal Zone the government purchased and operated the Panama Railroad Company; see 30 Ops. Atty. Gen. 508 (1915); *Panama Ry. Co. v. Curran* (C. C. A. 5, 1919) 256 Fed. 768; *Salas v. United States* (C. C. A. 2, 1916) 234 Fed. 842; *Jacobson v. Panama Ry. Co.* (C. C. A. 2, 1920) 266 Fed. 344; 27 Ops. Atty. Gen. 19 (1908). In Alaska the Alaska Northern Railway, *Ballaine v. Alaska Northern Ry* (C. C. A. 9, 1919) 259 Fed. 183.

³ The most familiar of the War corporations are: The United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation 39 Stat. 731 (1916); The