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Kansas has discovered a way to make corporations behave themselves without putting them completely out of business. The method is obviously worthy of notice. In 1909 the Legislature of Kansas passed a law permitting limited judgments of ouster in quo warranto proceedings. This statute places corporations within easy reach of the law and subject to its supervision. The present Kansas law now provides that:

"Any corporation which is insolvent or which perverts or abuses its corporate privileges may be dissolved by order of the district court having jurisdiction, on petition of the attorney-general, supported by positive affidavit; and if the court finds that the petition is true, it may appoint a receiver to wind up the affairs of the corporation and decree its dissolution: Provided, that the court may, at its discretion, appoint a receiver at the time of the filing of the petition of the attorney-general: Provided, also, that if the dissolution of any such corporation is not considered by the court to be either necessary or advisable and that the corporate abuses can be corrected without dissolution, receivers may be appointed to manage the corporate property and business under the supervision of the court until fully corrected, after which the corporate management and property may be returned to the owners and managers thereof; and the court may remove any officers responsible for the abuse and mismanagement of the corporate property and business, and may order the calling of an election of the stockholders to fill such vacancies." (Chapter 96, Kansas Session Laws of 1909).

Excellent results have been derived from the operation of the statute in the cases against the Harvester Company, the Sante Fe Railway Company, the Standard Oil Company of Indiana, the Standard Oil Company of Kansas and the Prairie Oil and Gas Company. All of these concerns are now on probation in Kansas. They are doing business under the supervision of the Supreme Court, and according to the attorney-general of Kansas there are now practically no complaints against these companies.

The limited judgment of ouster in quo warranto proceedings has proved to be the most efficient method of dealing with great corporations that have abused their powers and privileges. It is much better than the forfeiture of
the charter and an order of dissolution, which is seldom resorted to by the courts, because such a decree is very often too harsh.

Can a better way to make great corporations behave themselves be found?

JUDICIAL REFORM.

The attempt to practice law with our father's or our grandfather's implements would be equivalent to the attempt to keep up with the procession and still ride in the old stage coach."

Every day we hear or read something about the delay and inefficiency of the law. The delay, expense and uncertainty of litigation is said to be so great that people will suffer almost any bearable wrong rather than take ruinous recourse to the law. Our courts are said to be the most inefficient institutions to be found in any country that can claim to be really civilized.

Whether merited or not, this severe criticism cannot be ignored much longer by the legal profession. There is no question but that the present rules of procedure are so numerous and complicated that shrewd lawyers often find it possible to befog the issue and cheat justice, or delay it until it has become worthless.

Few subjects have been more debated in the last few years than has judicial reform. The people are demanding efficiency and promptness in the administration of the law. Nothing can be done to meet this demand unless both bench and bar co-operate in a sincere effort to remedy the evil. Rules of procedure are absolutely necessary to the enforcement of the law. The present systems are admitted to be far too complicated and involved. But from what source are we to receive the ideal code of procedure, combining simplicity, promptness and efficiency? The legal profession cannot afford to sit back and complacently watch the present machinery of the law defeat justice without raising a hand to remedy the evil. There is clearly a great work to be done, and it cannot be done at one stroke; but much can be accomplished by the honest co-operation of the bench and bar in an earnest endeavor to simplify our present rules of procedure and thus aid the cause of justice and add new glory to the profession.

The Government's success in several recent Sherman law prosecutions calls attention to the record in "trust busting" established by Attorney-General Wickersham and his assistant, James A. Fowler. During the last four years the Attorney-General and his assistant have filed eighty-one civil and criminal anti-trust suits, exceeding by nineteen the total number of prosecutions instituted by all his predecessors since the Sherman law was enacted in 1892. Seven anti-trust proceedings were begun in President Harrison's administration, eight in President Cleveland's, three in President McKinley's and forty-four in Roosevelt's.