

Chicago-Kent Law Review

Volume 3 | Issue 4

Article 2

December 1924

Notes

Chicago-Kent Law Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/cklawreview>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Chicago-Kent Law Review, *Notes*, 3 Chi.-Kent L. Rev. 3 (1924).

Available at: <https://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/cklawreview/vol3/iss4/2>

This Notes is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarly Commons @ IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Chicago-Kent Law Review by an authorized editor of Scholarly Commons @ IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law. For more information, please contact jwenger@kentlaw.iit.edu, ebarney@kentlaw.iit.edu.

THE CHICAGO-KENT REVIEW

Published Monthly during the School Year by the Students of
THE CHICAGO-KENT COLLEGE OF LAW
 10 North Franklin Street, Chicago

Matriculated students are subscribers by virtue of the incidental fee charged them. Subscription price to others \$1.00 per year.

Volume 3.

December, 1924.

Number 4.

Faculty Editor

William G. Wood, '12

Student Editor

Helmer Hansen, '25

Advertising Manager

R. A. Wiseman, Room 2158, 175 West Jackson Blvd. Wabash 4151.

Athletic News

Harold T. Huber, '26

Art Editor

C. James Witherell, '27

Associate Editors

Max Hirsch, '25

Randolph Bohrer, '26

Harold J. Ross, '26

Arthur H. Watson, '25

E. F. Helffrich, '26

Donald R. Murray, '27

It is the purpose of the Review to act as a medium of news and for the exchange of ideas of Chicago-Kent alumni and students. Contributions of news or legal articles will be gratefully received.

FRESHMAN-JUNIOR DEBATE.

The first interclass debate of the season proved a very interesting one. The question was: "Resolved, That the Constitution of the United States should be amended to allow the election of the president by a direct plurality vote." On the evening of November 26, 1924, the affirmative team, consisting of three juniors, Harold T. Huber, F. Allen Minne and Eli D. Langert, met the negative team, consisting of freshmen Carlyle S. Guibor, F. S. Block and John Gould. The debate was held on the fourth floor front and a good sized audience attended. I. M. Jacobs acted as cheer leader and gave the boys a good send-off.

Each of the constructive speakers was allowed eight minutes. The first speaker was Huber of the junior team, who, in tis dry way, gave us a good idea of what it was all about. He was followed by Gould of the freshman team, who set forth some of the evils of the proposed new system. Minne, the next affirmative speaker, dwelt on statistics relating to the recent presidential election, being followed by Block, who, strange to say, disputed both Huber and Minne. The last speaker on the affirmative team, Langert, made a very good closing speech, and after him came Guibor of the negative, who set forth in a scholarly manner the final arguments for the negative. The rebuttal speeches were limited to four minutes and were punctuated by the gentle sarcasm of Block and Huber.

Following the debate the judges, Messrs. William G. Wood, Ernest E. Tupes and Edward Bangs, retired, and during this interval a poll was taken, each member of the audience expressing his or her opinion on the question as they viewed it before and after the debate. The result of this poll was as follows:

Affirmative before and after.....	18
Negative before and after.....	4
Affirmative before and negative after.....	4
Ignorant before, enlightened after.....	3

After what seemed like a very long wait, the judges returned, and Chairman William M. James announced with true professional tardiness the fact that the Junior Team had won by a unanimous decision, the scoring being as follows:

	Juniors	Freshmen
1.....	267	266
2.....	265	257
3.....	275	250
	807	773

The large audience at this debate and the close attention were indicative of present and future appreciation of debating at Chicago-Kent.

The final interclass debate to determine the champion team of the college will be held on Friday night, December 19th, when the winning Junior Team will meet the Senior Team. The question for that night will be: "Resolved, That Congress shall have power to nullify decisions of the United States Supreme Court declaring Federal laws unconstitutional." This is a question of timely interest and one capable of earnest discussion.

The Junior Team will present the affirmative argument, and the seniors the negative. The teams of the Class of '25 have been victorious in three of their four debates, and the present debate may give them an opportunity to win their fourth victory.

WE LOVE 'EM.

In a recent article on "Beds" in the Journal of the Patent Office Society, it is stated that the first patent issued on a bed in the United States was in 1815. The Title of the patent was "Improvement in the Cradle." The "improvement" was an arrangement whereby a cradle was oscillated by means of a sort of clock mechanism. The purpose of the invention will be more readily understood by the following extraction: "We have then here a genuine machine converting energy from one form to another. The pull of the weight presses the tooth of the wheel against the tooth of the pallet and swings the cradle, steadily engaging and disengaging on alternate sides; the innocent occupant, the heir of all the ages, the probable progenitor of future inventions, is rhythmically ticked off down the stream of time, he is put in tune with the rythm of the universe, and by the time the weight has run down, no doubt the purpose of the machine is achieved and peace and quiet will dwell in the household."