

Mercer Law Review

Volume 2
Number 1 *Annual Survey of Georgia Law*

Article 1

12-1950

Table of Contents

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.mercer.edu/jour_mlr

Recommended Citation

(1950) "Table of Contents," *Mercer Law Review*: Vol. 2: No. 1, Article 1.

Available at: https://digitalcommons.law.mercer.edu/jour_mlr/vol2/iss1/1

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Mercer Law School Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mercer Law Review by an authorized editor of Mercer Law School Digital Commons. For more information, please contact repository@law.mercer.edu.

MERCER LAW REVIEW

VOLUME 2

FALL, 1950

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	iv
ANNUAL SURVEY OF GEORGIA LAW: JUNE 1, 1949— JUNE 1, 1950	
Administrative Law	<i>Maurice S. Culp</i> 1
Agency	<i>Griffin B. Bell</i> 12
Bills and Notes	<i>Frank C. Jones</i> 14
Constitutional Law	<i>Morris B. Abram</i> 19
Contracts	<i>Edgar Hunter Wilson</i> 29
Corporations, Partnerships and Bankruptcy	<i>Charles E. Nadler</i> 35
Criminal Law and Procedure	<i>H. T. O'Neal, Jr.</i> 42
Damages	<i>Edgar Hunter Wilson</i> 54
Domestic Relations	<i>John L. Westmoreland</i> 57
Equity	<i>Charles J. Hilkey and Robert H. Hall</i> 68
Evidence	<i>Eli M. Spark</i> 88
Insurance	<i>Edgar Hunter Wilson</i> 122
Landlord and Tenant	<i>Stephens Mitchell</i> 127
Municipal Corporations	<i>Oliver A. Rice</i> 130
Practice and Procedure	<i>Wiley H. Davis</i> 150
Property, Personal	<i>Roy Friedin</i> 185
Property, Real	<i>Stephens Mitchell</i> 189
Sales	<i>Oliver A. Rice</i> 198
Security Transactions	<i>Eli M Spark</i> 208
Statutory Construction and the Legislative Process	<i>James C. Quarles</i> 215
Taxation	<i>James H. Wilson, Jr.</i> 220
Torts	<i>Edwin Maner, Jr.</i> 238
Trusts	<i>Henry S. Barnes</i> 246

Who Gets The Welfare In A "Welfare State"?

That's easy. There's a formula. You've seen it. Be sure you recognize it next time. Here's how it goes:

Somebody promises to give you something (a subsidy, or a wage increase without a production increase), if you'll give him a little something in return—just a little something—a vote, perhaps.

So, you give and you get. Or you think you do. Maybe what you get increases the national debt or decreases corporation profits. What do you care? Let's see:

National debt? That's mortgaging your child's future. Let the rich pay it? That's silly. Take every penny every one of them has, and you wouldn't make more than a dent in the national debt. Every dollar added to it by the giveaway bureaucrats has to be paid back by you and your children and your grandchildren.

Take it out of corporation profits? If all the profits of all the corporations were taken, you would pay only a tiny fraction of the national debt.

The plain truth is that no one is giving you anything. Last year it was reported that the federal government "gave" to the states five and a half billion dollars. That money, of course, first came from the states. But we are informed \$625,000,000 of it never got back to the states—that was the cost of taking it away from you, and giving part of it back.

When anyone promises you something for nothing, you can be sure he gets a lot of the something, and you get a lot of the nothing.

Shepard's Citations
Colorado Springs
Colorado

Copyright, 1950, by Shepard's Citations, Inc.

Please mention THE REVIEW when dealing with our advertisers.

Wills and Administration of Estates	<i>Floyd M. Buford and Robert E. Coll</i>	250
Workmen's Compensation	<i>F. Hodge O'Neal</i>	258
Miscellaneous: Bar Admission Requirements	<i>James C. Rehberg</i>	269

CASE NOTES

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Equal Protection Clause as Applied to Segregation in Graduate and Professional Schools (<i>Sweatt v. Painter</i> and <i>McLaurin v. State Regents for Higher Education</i> , U.S. 1950)		272
CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Federal Jurisdiction in Cases Involving Apportionment of Electoral Power—Georgia County Unit System I (<i>South v. Peters</i> , U.S. 1950)		274
CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Federal Jurisdiction in Cases Involving Apportionment of Electoral Power—Georgia County Unit System II (<i>South v. Peters</i> , U.S. 1950)		275
CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Treaties—Conflict Between United Nations Charter and State Law (<i>Sei Fujii v. State</i> , Cal. 1950)		276
CRIMINAL LAW—Robbery—Conviction Sustained Under "Kidnapping Statute" (<i>People v. Chessman</i> , Cal. 1950)		278
CRIMINAL LAW—Validity of Foreign Prior Felony Conviction Under Second-Offender-Felony Statute (<i>People v. Olah</i> , N.Y. 1949)		279
EVIDENCE—Admissibility of Testimony Referring to Liability Insurance (<i>Wilbur v. Tourangeau</i> , Vt. 1950)		280
MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—Relation of Mayor to Elections by Governing Body (<i>Palmer v. Claxton</i> , Ga. 1950)		282
TORTS—Carriers—Duty Owed To Intoxicated Passenger (<i>Swilley v. Economy Cab Co.</i> , Fla. 1950)		283
WILLS—Holographic—Statutory Requirement as to Signature (<i>Hall v. Brigstoke</i> , Va. 1950)		284
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION—Determining Scope of Employment—Deviation (<i>Parr v. New Mexico State Highway Department</i> , N.M. 1950)		285

BOOK REVIEWS:

DUMBAULD: The Declaration of Independence and What It Means Today	<i>Robert V. Jones</i>	287
SOWARDS: Comments, Cases and Materials on Corporate Finance	<i>William P. Tyson, Jr.</i>	287
STEUER: Max D. Steuer, Trial Lawyer	<i>Robert E. Steele</i>	289

The MERCER LAW REVIEW is published in the Fall and Spring of each academic year by the students of the Walter F. George School of Law, Mercer University, Macon, Georgia.

Subscription per annum, \$2.00 (Foreign \$2.25). Single copy, \$1.00 (Survey issue \$2.00). Address communications to the MERCER LAW REVIEW, Mercer University, Macon, Georgia.

Copyright 1950, by Walter F. George School of Law, Mercer University, Macon, Georgia.

INTRODUCTION

As the need for an annual survey of the statutory and decisional law of the State of Georgia has long been felt by many practitioners, judges, professors and students, the *Mercer Law Review* decided to undertake the preparation of such a survey.

The object is to provide busy members of the Bench and Bar and law students with at least brief mention of every case decided by the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals during the period between June 1, 1949, and June 1, 1950, and those acts of the General Assembly passed during the Extra Session of 1949 and the Regular Session of 1950 which have general application within the State.

The Editors have attempted to allocate the decisions and statutes of the survey period to separate branches of the law in such a way as to minimize duplication, but seldom does a case involve only one phase of the jurisprudence of Georgia. As a result of attorneys' combining several avenues of approach to the desired decision, the courts have of necessity dealt with many branches of law in deciding single controversies. When a case in this survey points up matters of interest in more than one field, it is dealt with in more than one section.

This issue of the *Review* is expected to provide students and attorneys with a composite treatment of related cases. When comment is desired on a particular point raised in Georgia during the period under review, the reader may turn to the survey and there find suggestions by contributors who were selected because of their experience in the fields they have treated. As many lawyers seldom find time for careful reading of advance sheets, it is thought that a survey such as here presented will provide them with some idea of the volume of litigation handled by the appellate courts and the points most frequently used as the basis for reversal on appeal. The period chosen, in all probability, is a quite representative one.

When statutes or decisions represent a change in or departure from existing law, the contributors have been constructively critical in an attempt to offer something in the way of a guide to persons dealing with that field.

The survey should afford an opportunity to attorneys to keep abreast of recent changes in the law. This opportunity is afforded in a time-saving (and it is hoped interesting) manner which removes much of the drudgery of common-place case reading.

ROBERT E. HICKS
Editor-in-Chief