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These are frustrating days with students, faculty, and administration all vitally concerned with the improvement and advancement of our Law School. Yet, we are saddened to find that our administration has not achieved one of the most important tools in our everlasting struggle to better ourselves—membership in the AALS.

What is the AALS? The Association of American Law Schools is the most prestigious accreditation that a law school can receive. Of the 171 ABA accredited law schools in America, 125 law schools have been accredited with an AALS Certificate. Membership in the AALS would join Suffolk Law School in the ranks of the best law schools in the country in the listing with the highest accrediting agency in the legal profession. Isn’t this a modest goal for the nation’s third largest law school?

All this rather well-known information means a great deal to all those connected with our Law School. It would mean prestige, something which “the best kept secret in Boston” has been seeking for a long time. This prestige would be most beneficial to law students and law alumni alike. We would be recognized for what we really are—graduates of a first class law school.

There are more advantages than just prestige by becoming accredited by the AALS. We would be able to attract law professors to Suffolk Law School who before would not have considered us because of our lack of accreditation by the AALS. The quality of a graduate from Suffolk improves in proportion to the quality of instruction he receives. This accreditation would provide us with the best possible education a student of law could receive.

Our Law School would become eligible for government grants and other forms of federal support which are restricted by statute to those law schools accredited by the AALS. These grants are sorely needed if we are to enlarge our physical plant in the near future. Further, graduates of the Law School would now be eligible for government jobs which are only open to graduates of AALS member schools.

Job placement is another beneficial aspect of graduating from an AALS law school. Top firms who would not consider our graduates for positions in their firms, because of our lack of accreditation by AALS, would finally begin opening their doors to them. Prestigious firms would interview on campus and our graduates would be able to compete on their own abilities and not on the accreditation of the Law School from which they are about to graduate.

With AALS accreditation, postgraduate study in law at schools which formerly would not accept a non-AALS law school graduate would now be available to our graduates. This is very important to our graduates who intend to become legal educators. In turn, our Law School would be able to attract higher caliber students to attend Suffolk.

All this recognition resulting from membership in the AALS is necessary and vital to the existence of our Law School. The criteria used by AALS to evaluate prospective member law schools include the school’s admissions policy, academic requirements, and quality of the faculty and library.

Our administration has been making great strides to conform to the AALS membership requirements. Next year’s entering class must meet a minimum score of 550 on the LSAT Exam plus have a broad academic and extracurricular background. The quality of the Class of 1974 will never be questioned from an admissions point of view. Curriculum reform is slowly being evidenced and more relevant electives are being offered to the students. This reform has been long awaited and yet it is being too slowly integrated into our curriculum.

The quality of the faculty has improved but it rivals curriculum reform for rapid implementation into our Law School. We need more qualified full-time professors who can provide the quality of education necessary to produce outstanding young attorneys. Greater emphasis should be placed on participation in the various clinical programs which provide a meaningful purpose and an education in themselves.

Our Law School has come a long way in the last three years but it still has a long way to go. Greater concern by students and alumni alike is necessary if we are to survive the everlasting struggle to improve ourselves. Securing accreditation in the AALS is a necessary. If we are to survive the challenge of legal educational excellence, membership in the AALS must be secured or bust!
Reforming The Judiciary: Para-Judges
by U.S. SENATOR EDWARD J. GURNEY

The legal maxim that "Justice Delayed Is Justice Denied" is axiomatic: it needs no defense or elaboration. Yet, the painful truth is that in our state and local courts, and to a lesser extent in our federal courts, justice is matter-of-factly delayed. The failure of our state courts to discharge their obligations is now beyond dispute, having been documented by countless studies, surveys and reports. This sorry indictment applies to both civil and criminal courts. In most jurisdictions, judges sit on both civil and criminal terms alternately. Delays and logjams in one area necessarily spill over into the other.

In February 1971, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice published the first census of the nation's local jails and prisons. The results were horrendous: fully 50% of the inmates of these institutions were never convicted of a crime. They are in jail awaiting trial. The survey showed even more outlandish figures for juvenile inmates: 66.1% of juvenile inmates of local jails are unconvicted; they too are "awaiting trial".

The same survey shows that of the 3,319 such institutions in the fifty states, 86.4% have no recreational facilities; 89.2% have no educational facilities and 49% have no medical facilities. The report also shows that in many jurisdictions, juvenile offenders are indiscriminately housed with adult offenders. 5,416 cells in use today are over a century old; 12,000 cells are more than 75 years old and nearly 25,000 cells, or 25% of the total cells, are more than 25 years old. One does not have to be a "bleeding-heart" to be properly outraged by these figures. This litany of pitiful conditions in our local jails is and should be a cause for alarm for all men of good will.

In this article, I want to concentrate on one aspect of judicial reform which I think, if implemented, will have a significant role in reducing the backlog in our courts. As President Nixon said in Williamsburg in his address before the Judicial Conference of the United States, the problem cannot be solved simply by creating new judgeships or building new courthouses. We have to look to new, modern and effective techniques for an answer.

One of the avenues which I think we should explore immediately is the use of the para-judge in state and local proceedings.

As all law students know, most of our trial judges, in both civil and criminal term, spend a disproportionate amount of their work day in pre-trial hearings and on motion calendars. If we could free those judges from these time-consuming chores, the judges could spend this recaptured time doing what they were intended to do—that is, presiding at trials. We have it in our power to accomplish this very desirable end. Already there have been experiments in various...
There is no legitimate reason that I can see why para-judges could not be used in motion calendars and in pre-trial hearings of all descriptions. In many cases, these matters are purely procedural. If we were to set up adequate appellate safeguards, the civil litigants and criminal defendants could not complain if their preliminary pleas were heard and disposed of by a competent para-professional employee of the court.

I think that wider use of the para-judge would mean a significant diminution in the staggering and unseemly backlog of cases with which our state and local courts are now confronted.

This program which I envisage, would not be a costly one. The Judicial Conference estimates that it requires an original investment of $250,000 to allow a federal court judge to function and about $200,000 per year thereafter to keep him operational. The para-professional person I have in mind to perform these important functions could be paid a salary of from $10,000 to $15,000 per year and function within the existing facilities.

There would be other beneficial by-products from such a program. As it stands now, there is no training ground for the bench. We have law clerks to judges of course, but they are very limited in number. The para-judge program would provide such a training program for large numbers of young men and women interested in a judicial career. The training received in such a job would give the young lawyer an excellent credential for a future career on the bench.

Technicians—and that is essentially what a para-judge would be—are widely used in the field of medicine. The doctor can and should treat the patient and prescribe the cure. He is not, and should not, be expected to take the x-rays, develop the plates, do the blood counts or carry out the routine tests. He delegates those tasks to technicians—competent and highly skilled persons who can perform those necessary tasks with speed, precision and skill. So, it should be with judges; they must preside at trials and interpret the law and provide the cure by way of judgment or decision. But, they can properly delegate to competent para-professionals the busy-work which he himself now performs: arranging calendars, delineating the facts in dispute in discovery proceedings, hearing pre-trial motions and following up on procedural and administrative details. Such an innovation would, in no way, diminish a judge’s authority over a case; it would enhance it, by allowing him to concentrate his energies and his valuable time on the truly important aspects of a case, be it a civil case or a criminal case. As it now stands, those energies and that time are being dissipated and mis-spent.

Our courts now have more litigation than ever before. They have greater backlogs than ever before. We are in a judicial crisis and we must stop talking about it and act.

With this in mind, I introduced in the Senate on April 1, 1971, a Bill which I called the National Court Assistance Act of 1971. My Bill would create a new administration within the Department of Justice which would be authorized to make grants to the several states and localities, under a five year program, to assist the modernizing of state and local courts. One of the functions of this administration, to be called the National Judicial Assistance Administration, would be to give the states up to 90% of the funding needed to carry out a program aimed at introducing the para-professional, the para-judge, into those jurisdictions which need and request them. My Bill respects the independence of the states and funds would only be provided on request. The Administration would also be authorized to assist in the introducing of computers in state courts to control calendars and provide for the orderly flow of court business. Similarly, the Bill would allow the state and local courts to introduce the office of court administrator which has been tried and found useful in the federal jurisdiction and in some states.

In his address before the American Bar Association in St. Louis last summer, Chief Justice Burger said that in the second decade of the space age, our nation's courts are being run by horse and buggy methods. He was right. Philosophically, I am a conservative and I revere our past. I resist the notion that change should be made for the sake of change. But, a conservative should be neither a reactionary, a stand-pat, or a mossback. It is time, in my judgment, for the nation to up-date the creaky and inadequate legal machinery which we now have. We have neglected reform for too long. Changes, modernization and streamlining are not luxuries; they are practical necessities. Justice is too important to our way of life to be allowed to atrophy. Chief Justice Warren Burger stated the need for reform beautifully last month at Williamsburg:

“The administration of justice is the adhesive—the very glue—that keeps the parts of an organized society from flying apart. Man can tolerate many shortcomings of his existence but a civilized society cannot remain so without an adequate system of justice and by that I mean justice in the broadest sense.”

It is up to us, all of us, in our honorable profession of the law—judges, attorneys and those about to become attorneys—to live up to our enormous responsibilities and do our duty to make sure that justice in America is not a memory, but a vital and functioning reality.

**NOTES**

*The Federal Magistrates Act of 1968 allowed federal district court judges to appoint magistrates to preside at certain pre-trial hearings and motion calendars and to act as special masters in various proceedings. These magistrates are being used more and more in the federal courts today and the results are almost universally satisfactory.*
Arthur Sherman is a graduate of Harvard College and the Harvard University Law School. He has been a practicing attorney in the City of Boston since September of 1953 and is a partner in the firm of Ravech and Sherman.

Mr. Sherman is a member of the Massachusetts Bar Association, Boston Bar Association, and the American Judicature Society.

The Expense of Political Exposure
by ARTHUR SHERMAN, ESQ.

For some months the Ninety First Congress was in various stages of considering the imposition of a dollar limitation on the amount that candidates seeking to attain elective office might spend for radio and television promotion. This will certainly be a matter of concern for the Ninety Second Congress. Notwithstanding the fact that the Legislation that resulted was vetoed and that there was a failure to override the veto, the handwriting appears to be on the wall. Some type of legislation limiting expenditures, and/or providing funds or free exposure on an equitable basis will be forthcoming.

Political winners as well as losers have come to the realization that in our audio-visual age, the quality of the candidate, the man to be chosen to deal with the problems of Government, should not be determined by the quantity of the dollars backing his candidacy.

However, limiting campaign expenses per se would naturally tend to limit the ultimate exposure which a candidate receives as the result of the dollars available to him in bringing before the public, not only his image but also the issues. The continuance of such a situation would certainly be detrimental to the electorate unless alternative procedures were to be made available to bring before the public for its examination, the candidate, his image and the issues involved in the particular campaign.

Prior to the conclusion of the Massachusetts Democratic Primary in September of 1970, the then incumbent Republican Governor, Francis W. Sargent, a leader by the calculation of the pollsters, obviously ahead in the solicitation of funds for the waging of a vigorous campaign, and with full knowledge of the fact that his Democratic opponent (not then determined in a four-way battle) might not have the same financial resources at his disposal to wage an expensive campaign, challenged the yet to be chosen Democratic candidate to a publicly televised debate.

Obviously, Governor Sargent must have realized that such a debate would simultaneously serve the following specific purposes:

1. bring the issues to the public; and
2. bring the image of the candidates before the largest possible viewing audience.
3. give his opponent free television time.

At that time at least one of the television and radio stations serving the most densely populated Metropolitan area of Massachusetts had indicated its willingness to donate prime time for the benefit of the candidates and the public.

The Congressional proposal which would limit radio and television campaign expenditures based upon $.07 for each vote cast in the preceding election for the same office was completely unrealistic in the light of the cost of campaigning as it exists not only in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts but in the Nation. With such a limitation not many candidates for public office could reach a significant portion of the potential voting public via the radio and television media. It is doubtful as to whether or not any such candidate could pay to convey his position to the public with the imposition of such a limitation even if the proposed limitation were doubled, and yet it is only through the media of television and radio that the voter is given the greatest opportunity of evaluating the candidates and hearing and viewing the issues directly discussed.
As a result of competition with soap, soup, and cereal commercials appearing during prime radio and television time, 15 and 30 second messages take on horrendous proportions when measured in dollar cost. One cannot measure the impact of a 30 second television appearance against a 30 minute press conference.

The solution to the expenditure of campaign dollars lies not with the candidates but with the cooperation of the radio and television media and their contribution of prime television and radio time to the candidates as a public service. Whether such contributions take the form of spot announcements, head-to-head debates, or the format of a question and answer period in which the candidates appear before politically oriented but unbiased panels to answer questions on determined or undetermined subjects is of no consequence. Ground rules can always be determined by the candidates.

If two and one half million votes were to have been cast for a particular office in a particular year and a candidate were limited to the expenditure of $.07 per voter, prime radio time and television spot announcements (exclusive of the cost of the preparation of the same) would dissipate that fund with little benefit to the candidates or the voting public. If the funds were to be expended for a lengthy presentation (15 to 30 minutes during prime time) by the candidates, the funds would be even more rapidly dissipated.

If dollar limitations were to be imposed without an acceptable substitute it would appear fairly obvious that pressure would be brought prior to each ensuing election for the Congress to either repeal the limitation or, to amend the existing law so as to increase the amount originally imposed. There would never be a “be all and an end all” to the potential battle between the financially strong and the financially weak for changes in the formulae.

Consider the estimates of the funds spent recently in the Senatorial and Gubernatorial elections and primaries in New York State. The amounts spent by the candidates in the Senatorial race alone by the three candidates were staggering. It is not for this writer to determine whether we are benefactors or victims of the audio-visual age. However, it is unrealistic to assume that the “Position papers” of candidates published and republished are read to the same extent as televised debates and announcements are viewed.

The days in which a candidate was able to “stump” throughout the political arena spending his time meeting people, shaking hands, patting backs and explaining his position have virtually disappeared in light of the exodus to the Suburbs. The move from the Cities has made it impossible for the candidate to “meet” the electorate without the benefit of audio-visual exposure. The imposition of a limitation with respect to the expenditures which a candidate might make via radio and television must have substituted therefor free-time via these media based upon a public service concept.

Since there has not been brought to the attention of this writer a proposed limit on the expenses which might be incurred in the production of print material, billboards and promotional and informational material, the significance, (but not the cost) of this type of exposure must also be evaluated in the establishment of any expense limitation.

The Congress as well as the President realizes that some limitation on campaign expenses and the competition for the voting public’s dollar must be imposed. Shot-gun Legislation is not the answer. The solution lies in a comprehensive study of the problem and a realistic dollar and sense approach.

There is no simple or single solution to the problem of political exposure. The problem lies in a fair study of the actual cost attendant to the purchase of radio and television time combined with the requirement that barring the availability of funds on an equal basis, that each candidate be given the opportunity to reach the electorate by the media as a public service.

The alternatives to the media providing equal time to the candidates on a voluntary basis would be the enactment of statutes requiring the same. The question then arises as to whether unaffiliated candidates would qualify under the same terms and conditions as candidates endorsed by recognized and established political parties. What standing would be established for the independent candidate?

Serious consideration might further be given to proposals previously made whereby tax deductions might be granted on a limited basis to the public to the extent political contributions were made. This last proposal might encourage the “little man” who desires to support his candidate but who considers his contribution to be too costly, to obtain the benefit of a tax deduction. Similarly, the regulations concerning corporate donations might be amended so that “closely held” corporations which do not directly or indirectly conduct business with any Municipal, State or Federal Agency might also obtain the benefit of such a tax deduction.

The alternatives are clear:

a. limit the amount of expenditures without a clear view of its implications.

b. provide free television and radio time to all candidates by law with some limitations as to who might be considered a candidate.

c. enact Legislation designed to encourage contributions from sources now unavailable so as to create a larger pool from which the candidates might draw.

Nothing contained in this analysis purports to create a solution to an obvious problem. The author’s sole purpose is to bring to the attention of the reader the scope of the problem and a brief analysis which presents the obvious fact that the solution is not an easy one.
Massachusetts born and educated, State Senator John M. Quinlan has served in the Massachusetts State Senate since 1965. He serves on the Committee on Ways and Means, Education, Public Safety, and Public Service Committees. He is a graduate of Harvard College (Class of 1967), and has served as Executive Director of the Council for Constitutional Reform in Massachusetts in 1963. In addition, Senator Quinlan is a member of the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education and the National Committee for the Support of the Public Schools.

Senator Quinlan has filed legislation which would reduce the blood alcohol level allowable in judging capability of operating motor vehicles safely under the Massachusetts Implied Consent Law. The current carnage on the highways, in which alcohol is playing such an important role, will have to be attacked on several fronts. Senator Quinlan’s statement before the Committee on the Judiciary follows.

Carnage On The Highways
by MASS. STATE SENATOR JOHN M. QUINLAN

Senate Bill 682, legislation to lower the prima facie level of presumption of operating under the influence of intoxicating liquor to ten one hundredths of the percentage, by weight, of alcohol in the defendant’s blood, deals with a chronic sickness that is sweeping the Commonwealth and the Nation. This is no ordinary illness, no communicable disease in the normal biological sense. It is an epidemic of needless and senseless slaughter—a slaughter of shocking proportions.

For years now this plague has been raging out of control across the nation’s highways, striking down more American lives each year than have been lost in Vietnam in an entire decade.

In the growth of this crisis, the role played by alcoholic beverages in motor vehicle accidents and fatalities cannot be ignored. A study by Dr. William Haddon, President of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety and former Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau in the United States Department of Transportation, has revealed that 73% of all traffic fatalities involve drinking. Sadly, 44%—almost half of all people killed on the highways—are innocent victims of drunk drivers.

To date, despite studies such as these, we have not made current law compatible with reduced carnage on our state’s highways. The prima facie level of presumption of operating under the influence, established by Chapter 773 of the Acts of 1967 (the Implied Consent Law), is 150 milligrams of alcohol per 100 milliliters of blood or 15% by weight—an absurdly high figure. S-682 proposes to lower this level from .15% to .10% by weight or 100 milligrams per 100 milliliters.

Though the significance of this bill is probably not immediately clear, Dr. Julius Waller, Professor of Community Medicine at the University of Vermont Medical School, gives some indication as to what these statistics mean. Subjects with blood alcohol levels close to .04% are about as likely to cause accidents as completely sober drivers. Yet when an alcohol level of .06% is reached, the estimated probability of causing an accident is double that of the driver in the no alcohol group. And drivers with a .10% alcohol level are more than six times as likely to cause an accident as one having used no alcohol. But when the .15% alcohol level is reached (the minimum level of presumption of operating under the influence under current Massachusetts law), the probability of accident is more than 25 times as great.

Beyond this, in single-vehicle crashes between 1950 and 1958, Dr. Haddon found, in a study undertaken in New York State, that 20% of those killed had blood alcohol concentrations of between .05% and .10%, whereas a staggering 49% had concentrations of .15% or more at death.

Little wonder then that the American Medical Association considers a .05% blood alcohol concentration impairing for many drivers and a .10% blood alcohol level definitely debilitating to all drivers and that the United States Department of Transportation has urged a standard ceiling of not more than .10%. In fact, the British Medical Association has gone even further to say, “a concentration of .05% while driving a motor vehicle is the highest that can be accepted as entirely consistent with the safety of other users... The Association is impressed with the rapidity with which deterioration occurs at blood levels in excess of .10%.”
This epidemic of needless and senseless slaughter on the highways is complicated by the fact that most medical authorities are convinced that a significant number of traffic accidents are caused by alcoholics. By lowering the prima facie level, those people who abuse drinking will be more likely to be apprehended; and since people arrested for drunken driving typically are not drinkers who have had only a couple of drinks, much of this problem on our highways would be solved.

In interviews conducted by Dr. Melvin L. Seltzer of Boston University, noted authority on driving and the alcoholic, not one in 50 alcoholics say they avoid driving when affected by alcohol, whereas 14 of 50 non-alcoholics affirm that they do.

In Sweden, figures show that of 2,100 convicted drivers studied, 45% were alcohol "misusers". Dr. Seltzer and others in an Ann Arbor, Michigan, study found that of all drivers arrested for operating under the influence, 57% were alcoholic, 15% were thought to be "probably" alcoholic and 6% were considered "pre-alcoholic". Taken together, 78% of the arrested drivers had pathologically serious drinking problems.

In general terms, studies have proven that alcoholics have between two and two and a half times as many accidents as non-alcoholics.

It is not intended by this that the problems of the alcoholic, as an alcoholic, will be solved by lowering the prima facie level for drivers. Their personal problems will remain—necessitating understanding, medical help, and rehabilitation. What this legislation will accomplish, however, is the removal of these dangerous drivers from the road.

As stated previously, the average drinker will not be restricted by this reduction of the level of presumption. For the 150 lb. man who has not had anything to eat in 4 hours, 5 ounces of 80 proof liquor in an hour is necessary to reach the .10% level and almost 8 ounces for .15% (the minimum level under current law). This same man who has had a meal before drinking would have to consume 7 ounces to reach .10% and about 9½ ounces to reach .15%.

I hardly feel that a reduction from 9½ ounces to 7 ounces per hour for a 150 lb. man or 13 to 9½ for a 200 lb. man (the amounts included in a reduction from .15% to .10%) constitutes any serious inconvenience to the average drinker. The alcoholic—the major danger on the road—will feel the change most.

Today, 43 states have recognized this problem and have passed chemical test laws. Of these states, 25 have moved from the .15% blood alcohol level to the .10% concentration. Utah goes further .08%.

We have reached the point at which we must face the increasing death toll on the highways and take steps to reduce it. The 10% figure has now become a matter of life and death in a very real sense. The leniency of our chemical laws is an encouragement to the crime of driving under the influence. Surely it is time to enact some sensible and reasonable legislation on this matter. S-682 is such legislation. Without it the shocking slaughter on Massachusetts highways will continue.

---

Health Law Program at the University of Pittsburgh

The University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of Public Health has been awarded a training grant by the United States Public Health Service to prepare law school graduates for careers as legal advisors to state and local health departments, federal health agencies, and voluntary organizations and institutions concerned with health services and environmental protection.

Students admitted to the Health Law Training Program are eligible to receive monthly stipends ranging from $300 to $500 per month, and additional allowances for their dependents.

The one year academic Program, which leads to a Master of Public Health or a Master of Science in Hygiene degree, is designed to develop the student's understanding of public health, health administration, and to enhance his capabilities to work with clients in the health field. The student's academic work will be tailored to fit his individual needs, and the students will participate in providing legal services on health matters under the supervision of faculty and practicing attorneys. The School will attempt to assist students in placement upon completion of the Program.

Six students will be accepted for the academic year beginning September, 1971. Further information can be obtained from Nathan Hershey, Research Professor of Health Law, Graduate School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.
CLINICAL PROGRAMS – PROGRESS REPORT
by PROF. WILBUR G. HOLLINGSWORTH

In the fall of 1969, at the request of the law school faculty, Dean Simpson recommended to the President and Board of Trustees that all clinical programs be placed under the full time supervision of a member of the faculty. As a result of that recommendation, I was added to the faculty slightly over a year ago and the following sets out very briefly what the students and I have done, or attempted to do, during the past year.

At the outset it seemed that it would be difficult to include evening students in several programs. No problems presented themselves, however, and all programs are open to, and participated in by, both day and evening students.

Prosecutor Program

With some difficulty, because of the number of law schools in the area with similar programs started years before ours, we are putting together, on a county basis, teams of senior students for the prosecution of cases before six man juries under the supervision of assistant district attorneys. We have had such a program operating in Plymouth County for nearly a year, all of the work being done by evening students and hope to have trained groups ready to work in several other counties next September.

High School Teaching Program

This program was started two years ago as a federally funded project. Entitled “The Law and Poverty Program” it was supervised by a director with offices at Boston University. Last summer, when funds ran out and the program was abandoned, it was decided that, because of the popularity of the program, it would not only be continued at Suffolk but would be expanded. Presently, nearly fifty students have classes which they regularly address at English High, Dorchester High and Woodrow Wilson High. They use only material which has been prepared for them and the general purpose of the program is to present a given problem to the class which will involve the entire class in discussion.

Suffolk Voluntary Defenders

This program is by far the most popular one in the school. Under Supreme Judicial Court rule 3:11, senior students with the written approval of the dean of his character, legal ability, and training, may appear without compensation on behalf of indigent defendants in criminal proceedings in any District Court under certain specified supervision. The rule provides that the supervising attorney does not have to appear in court with the student.

At the present time thirty day seniors and sixteen evening seniors, have been approved by the dean and cover the East Cambridge District Court and the Boston Juvenile Court on a daily basis. When a student has been assigned to a case by the judge, a continuance is requested and granted; the case is prepared as to the facts and law by the student to the best of his ability; the interview with the defendant, the investigation and research are then written up and the case submitted to me. At this point the student and I discuss the case in detail as to possible pleas—trial tactics if it is to be a trial—possible motions—factual or legal points overlooked by the student. In short, everything the student needs to furnish adequate representation to his client.

The program is essentially a two year program. Second year day and third year evening students are accepted at the beginning of the school year. The class has a designated time to meet with me once a week and attendance is taken with the understanding that only those who regularly attend will be recommended to the dean for his approval when they become seniors. During the first semester every conceivable district court activity is covered and during the second semester the student is sent into court to observe and to assist the student who is actually handling a case.

There are presently eighty-nine second year day and twenty-two third year evening students who will be recommended to the dean for approval at the end of the year.

Ed. Note: Since the above has been written, several courts have been added to the defender and prosecutor programs. The Voluntary Defenders now appear regularly in the Dedham District Court and in September, 1971, will appear in the Lynn District Court on a daily basis and in the Salem District Court three days a week. In addition, a prosecutor program will be commenced in the Lynn Court on a daily basis.
Rebuttal to

DISCIPLINE AND THE LAW

by ROBERT P. L'ESPERANCE

In a recent editorial entitled "Discipline and the Law", the author, Philip J. Adams, Jr. discussed a broad and complex problem of society in narrow and simplified terms.

Mr. Adams' two basic premises were: first, all dissent which takes the form of violence, with the resulting damage, is unlawful; second, this "unlawful" dissent, which he believes to be prevalent today, is the product of a too permissive society.

In stating his first premise, Mr. Adams has unfairly equated the ghetto riots, such as Detroit, Newark, and Watts with violent acts such as the Manson Murders and the Cambridge disturbances. The latter events seem to have been forms of dissent which had as their motivating force the personal aggrandizement of the organizing persons and whose alleged purposes and sincerity were suspect.

In contrast, the former events were expressions of dissent which arose from the social ills of our society and the frustration of the participants in attempting to conquer these maladies. The violent events affected substantial segments of large communities and served to force the power structure to commence positive action to relieve the societal oppressions.

To simply assume these latter discussed events were unquestionably unlawful and criminal is to discount both American history and the thoughts, ideas, and works of many well-accepted Americans. Was the Boston Tea Party an unlawful dissent? Were the Sons of Liberty's violent acts in achieving the repeal of the Stamp Acts unlawful dissent? Should those involved have been criminally punished with superior force? Should the British have taken away what permissiveness that did exist? Some famous Americans who have recognized this problem and discussed it, are Thomas Payne in his essay Common Sense, Thoreau in his essay The Duty of Civil Obedience, and William Douglas in his book Points of Rebellion. Why did Mr. Adams dismiss this problem so abruptly?

Mr. Adams' second premise explaining the cause of these violent events is just as simple and narrow as his first premise. In opposition, I would suggest that hypocrisy, dishonesty, and greed were the real causes of the violent acts.

For example, the right to vote, the right to a free press and the right to free assembly are not as powerful avenues of dissent as Mr. Adams would have us to believe. The two party system preserves the status quo and does not offer the citizenry with any real alternatives in any crucial election. How much difference exists between a Nixon and a Humphrey? How many opportunities exist for the citizens who are not wealthy to enter the political arena? If the guarantee of free press were a reality, there would not have been the need for radical papers to go underground and for phases such as "Banned in Boston". Isn't it hypocritical when those who wish to protest the policies of those who hold the power are required to approach that power structure to obtain a permit to gather in a public park?

To state, as Mr. Adams did, that permissiveness was the incentive for the violent events is utterly ridiculous. Our society and its institutions are permeated with greed, dishonesty, and hypocrisy. Our religious institutions preach brotherhood and charity while each year they gross and keep more tax free dollars than most large corporations. Our government pleads poverty when discussing the ills of the ghettos, but always has enough to support a war which the majority opposes and to finance defense projects that have cost overruns that soar into billions of dollars. It gives lip service to problems such as environmental control while activity promoting and financing endeavors such as the SST.

I agree with Mr. Adams that the legal profession has a unique opportunity to aid this country in its development and to formulate a program to cope with violent dissent. However, hasn't the legal profession had this same opportunity throughout history? The ills that cause these violent events have not spared the legal profession and can be found throughout it. If anyone doubts that statement, I suggest he read Martin Mayer's The Lawyer and Murray Teigh Bloom's The Trouble With Lawyers. Before the legal profession can grasp the great opportunity at hand, it must first put its own house in order.

If permissiveness is the root-cause, as Mr. Adams believes, it is not the type of permissiveness that protects the legal rights of the poor and illiterate, but rather the type of permissiveness that allows and condones the above hypocrisy, greed, and dishonesty. The permissiveness which Mr. Adams disdains I find very heartening. Only through this type of permissiveness can there be a communication of, an exposure to, and a growth of new ideas and approaches to what seem to be insoluble problems. This resulting communication, exposure, and growth promotes the education of the citizenry. Through the education of the citizenry, those less fortunate will be better equipped to challenge and defeat their problems and the need for violent dissent will surely diminish.

Ed Note: This article is presented as a rebuttal to an editorial which appeared in The Advocate, Vol. 2, No. 1, (Fall, 1970). The Advocate recognizes its obligation to publish opposing points of view.
One of the ways that the success of this year's student bar activities can be measured is by the performance of its committees. Much work has been done by the various committees with the purpose of contributing to the professionalism of the Law School. I feel that special recognition should be given to the efforts of the committees.

The Alumni Committee has developed a system of direct communication from the student bar to the alumni of the Law School. This is, to my knowledge, the first time that the student bar has attempted to communicate with the alumni on an organized basis. Hopefully this program in years to come will generate among the alumni an increased awareness of the needs of the Law School.

The Placement Committee has researched much background data on legal opportunities. The research of this committee also included an investigation of the placement methods that are used by other law schools in the country. It is the expressed plan of the committee to make this information available to the person that the University hires as Placement Director for the Law School.

Curriculum Committee — A detailed report representing what the committee feels to be needed changes in the current structure of the curriculum was presented to the Association this past semester. The report was unanimously endorsed by the student bar. The committee now plans to present this report to the student-faculty committee for recommendations that the proposed changes be implemented in the upcoming academic year.

Social Committee — I feel that this committee has worked extremely hard to make this year's social program the most enjoyable and comprehensive yet sponsored by the student bar. The committee has put much time into planning of the Law Day celebration. This program will be held on April 30, 1971, at the Chateau de Ville, in Framingham. I sincerely thank Charles Kuenlen for his efforts as social chairman.

My term of office will be complete with the end of the semester. The new Student Bar President, John Deliso, will take over the office at that time. John is an aggressive, intelligent and practical person. John has served as a class representative to the Association during the past year and has worked hard to contribute to the success of the Association. John also is the Chairman of the Law Day Speakers Committee. I feel confident that John will carry out and expand many of the programs established this year. I urge all students to stand in support of John so that the Student Bar Association will be the law student's voice.

The plight of the evening law student is not an easy one. The majority of the students work a full forty hour week, are married with children and spend nine hours a week in class. If I remember my Legal Methods class correctly, it was indicated that for every class hour one must spend at least three hours of preparation—a seventy-six hour week. This figure does not even include family responsibility which can be a very real problem to some students.
One would think that these problems would be enough—they are not. For a law school whose student body is composed of approximately one-half evening students, one would think that the equities would balance. This is not necessarily so. Even if classes had to be offered on Tuesday and Thursday evenings, the evening students should be offered a wider variety of electives from which to choose. If one takes the opportunity to count the number of credits required by the day division as opposed to the evening division and the corresponding tuition rates, it is not very difficult to arrive at the conclusion that the evening student pays more money per credit. The evening law student pays the same Student Bar Association dues as the day student although most events are held at times inconvenient for the evening student to attend.

Another major inequity can be found in the distribution of bids to the Law Review. This past fall, for every eight bids given to second and third year day division students, only one was given to third and fourth year evening students. With an almost equal amount of class representation in the two divisions, this practice seems quite unfair to me. The argument posed against extending more bids to the evening law students is that they do not have the time. Yet, while speaking to the current editor-in-chief of the Law Review, I was informed that he had received excellent results with the evening students this year, not only in participation but also in terms of their productivity and legal acumen. The real problem facing the evening student is not whether he has the time to devote to Law Review but rather that he has not been given the opportunity to participate and prove his abilities—a task most evening students would gladly assume.

It has been said that the more work one has to do, the more one will get done. It is not unusual to find an evening student at the top of the list in the Voluntary Moot Court Competition, or for that matter, four years later when the Bar Examination results are compiled.

Indeed, the problems are many and the solutions slow in coming, yet I think this year we are heading in the right direction. We now have more than equal representation in the Student Bar Association. This year has also shown a marked increase of students in extracurricular activities. We cannot, however allow ourselves to become content with these accomplishments. We must not only voice our opinion, we must be heard and action taken. In so doing, we will not only help ourselves, but more importantly, we will help the Law School as well.

FACULTY NEWS

Professor THOMAS J. CAREY, JR has been named as an associate editor of the Massachusetts Bar Journal.

Professor ROBERT S. FUCHS has been appointed Director of the N.L.R.B. for the Boston Regional Office. He will direct the handling of all unfair labor practice cases and employee representation matters for all of New England except Fairfield County, Connecticut. Professor Fuchs has been with the N.L.R.B. since 1948.

Professor SAMUEL B. HOROVITZ authored the lead article in the Kentucky Law Journal, Volume 58, No. 1 (1970-71). His article is entitled Worldwide Workmen's Compensation Trends.

Professor CHARLES P. KINDREGAN has been invited to participate in a Symposium on Law and Population to be published in the Hastings Law Journal. Richard K. Donahue, the President of the Massachusetts Bar Association, has appointed Professor Kindregan to the Committee to Study the Implementation of the Clark Report on Disciplinary Enforcement of the Bar. He has also recently published reviews in the Fordam and Suffolk Law Reviews.

Professor BASIL YANAKAKIS has been appointed a member of the Massachusetts District Advisory Council for the Small Business Administration. Professor Yanakakis was decorated by the Head of the Orthodox Church, the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I, with the highest title a layman can receive in the Orthodox Church — “Leader of the Church”.

TRUSTEE HONORED

Joseph E. Sullivan

Joseph E. Sullivan, Lowell printer and member of our Board of Trustees, is to be awarded an honorary degree by Merrimack College at its Commencement in the Lowell Memorial Auditorium, May 30.

Although Mr. Sullivan had to leave school at 14, to go to work, he has received honorary College Degrees from the following colleges:

Boston College
Fairfield University
Holy Cross College
Lowell Technological Institute
Rivier College
St. Francis College
Suffolk University
St. Anselms College
The Editorial Board of The Advocate has selected James Byrne Callahan as editor-in-chief and Emil Cappelli as managing editor for the academic year 1971-72.

Byrne Callahan is a graduate of the University of Vermont. Upon receiving his B.A. degree, he served for five years as a Lieutenant in the U.S. Navy. Callahan resides in Middletown, Rhode Island. Emil Cappelli received a B.A. from the State University of New York at Buffalo. He has been active in the Voluntary Defenders Program and is a resident of Utica, New York.

Serving with Callahan and Cappelli on the 1971-72 Editorial Board are:

- Brian Gilligan — Associate Editor
- Tom Barbieri — Associate Editor
- Tony Theophilos — Feature Article Editor
- Bob Damiano — Alumni Editor
- Ken O'Donnell — Technical Editor
- Bill Batty — Assistant Editor

Delta Theta Phi

The Frank L. Simpson Senate of Delta Theta Phi Law Fraternity is about to complete an academic year marked by much success and accomplishment. With close to 60,000 members on the national roles, Delta Theta Phi is one of the largest professional fraternities in the United States. At Suffolk, the Simpson Chapter is composed of 50 brothers and is only in its second year of existence, but the brotherhood has already done much to establish the fraternity as an integral organization in the Law School. The success of Delta Theta Phi has been due in large part to the combined efforts of Dean Robert Snyder, faculty advisor Professor Richard Pizzano, and a brotherhood composed of dedicated hardworking students.

This past year, the brothers instituted a tutorial program to assist first year students studying for composite and criminal law examinations. The faculty cooperated with the brothers in formulating a workable program, and together with an excellent response from the first year students, contributed to the overall success of the tutorial effort. With the valuable experience gained from this initial program, the brothers are confident that next year's tutorial program will prove even more valuable to incoming first year students.

Probably the most valuable achievement of Delta Theta Phi this year has been the establishment of a legal aid office in Beverly. With a $300 grant from the Student Bar Association, the fraternity has acquired office space and has begun handling cases in the Beverly area under the guidance of local attorneys. This program, initiated and being organized under the direction of brother Peter Aloisi, has been met with great enthusiasm in Beverly by the members of the Bar and general populace. This summer, students will obtain training at legal aid offices in Chelsea and Revere, in preparation for a full scale operation of the Beverly office in the fall. Although this project is being sponsored by Delta Theta Phi, it will be open to the entire Law School for participation by all interested students.

Delta Theta Phi Members include: (Seated left to right) Cliff Noy, Pete Raymond, Professor Pizzano, Bob Snyder and Gary Pappas.
Standing (left to right) Peter Aliosi, Steve Needles, Don Belanger, John Nantora and Don Barry Weinstein.

Presently in the planning stage is a program which will be carried out in cooperation with local police departments. If the fraternity is successful in initiating this project, students will work in police stations advising the police on legal matters and will be allowed to accompany officers in squad cars observing and learning the law at the grass roots level.

At the Law Day Dinner on May 1st the fraternity will present the second annual Frank L. Simpson award to the guest speaker. Last year Senator Joseph Tydings was the recipient of this award.

In March of this year, Delta Theta Phi elected its officers for the 1971-72 academic year. Taking the helm for the new year will be:

- Don Belanger — Dean
- John Nantora — Vice Dean
- Peter Raymond — Tribune
- Stephen Needle — Clerk of the Rolls
- Gary Pappas — Clerk of the Exchequer
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PHI ALPHA DELTA

PAD Justice Mike Cantore and Chapter Advisor John E. Fenton, Jr. present John Balzano with the Felix Frankfurter Chapter Scholarship. The scholarship was made available as a result of Frankfurter Chapter placing third in National Chapter Competition.

This year the Frankfurter Chapter received the third place award for most outstanding chapter of Phi Alpha Delta. This was the first time in PAD history that a chapter in existence for only five years has received this award. The winners are chosen each year among the 114 chapters throughout the nation. Presentation of this award, which consisted of an official PAD plaque and a Scholarship fund, was made at the bi-annual PAD convention held in New Orleans. Representing the Frankfurter Chapter and receiving the award were David Leach, Chapter Vice Justice and Leonard Lewin, Chapter Marshall. This scholarship fund was awarded recently to John Balzano, a third year day student and Student Bar Representative.

In addition to this scholarship, the Chapter's Faculty Advisor Professor John E. Fenton, Jr. has pledged an annual scholarship which will be awarded for the first time this coming fall. The Chapter voted to match this scholarship, thus providing additional scholarships to Chapter members. Together with these funds, the national office of PAD offers non-interest loans of up to $1,000 and 40 scholarships of $500 each. All active members of the fraternity are eligible for these funds.

On March 16 the Felix Frankfurter Forum hosted a lecture on Medical Malpractice which was presented by Dr. Richard F. Gibbs, senior anesthesiologist at the Boston Hospital for Women and a 1970 graduate of Suffolk Law. Dr. Gibbs directed his lecture towards the recent increase in medical malpractice litigation in the past decade, the physician's dilemma in respect to obtaining professional liability insurance, and the abolition of charitable immunity for hospitals in Massachusetts. Commenting on the drastic need for more physicians, Dr. Gibbs explained the recent establishment of para-medical training programs throughout many parts of the country. The para-medical program is designed to train high school graduates and college students in basic diagnostic and first aid medicine. After certification by the American Medical Association, these individuals remain under the supervision of physicians and are assigned to service, in a limited capacity, in heavily populated and isolated communities.

On April 3rd, the American Trial Lawyers Association conducted a trial demonstration program at the Yankee Drummer Inn, Auburn, Massachusetts. A number of fraternity members were invited to attend as members of a jury in a hypothetical civil case. Efforts are being made to schedule a similar trial demonstration program at Suffolk for this coming fall.

On April 20, 1971, the Chapter will conduct its final initiation and dinner party. This year the Frankfurter Chapter will bestow an honorary membership upon Robert Merserve, Esq., the new President of the American Bar Association. Former Justice Tom Clark of the United States Supreme Court and other officials from the national office are expected to attend the ceremony.

Since Phi Alpha Delta's basic purpose is to provide the law student, the law school and the legal profession with as many valuable services as possible, the Frankfurter Chapter encourages all members of the student body to avail themselves of our services and to continue to bring forth suggestions for desired professional programs.

Officers for the coming academic year 1971-72 are:
Brian Gilligan — Justice
Jeff Berman — Vice Justice
Tom Dunnington — Clerk
Kathy White — Treasurer
John Capone — Marshall

Dr. Richard Gibbs Lecturing on Medical Malpractice

PAD Officers Tom Dunnington, Jeff Berman, Outgoing Justice Mike Cantore, Brian Gilligan, Kathy White, John Capone.


LAW REVIEW
by RICHARD A. KROLL

The second issue of the Suffolk University Law Review will be published in two parts: part one will contain articles on providing parity for the non-profit employee, the F.C.C. and the license renewal process, and the liability of land owners and occupiers in Massachusetts. The second part will contain the annual First Circuit Review, with an introduction by the Hon. Frank M. Coffin, Associate Justice, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

The third issue of the Law Review will be devoted to a Symposium on Ecology and the Congested Environment. It will be a voluminous issue containing articles by many eminent authors including United States Congressman Michael Harrington. Additionally, the issue will contain an introduction by Massachusetts Governor Francis W. Sargent. Student contributions for this issue have been co-ordinated so as to be consistent with the theme of the Symposium.

The Law Review has selected the following students to comprise the Board of Editors for Volume VI (1971-72):

Bernard M. Ortwein — Editor-in-Chief
Leonard L. Lewin — Managing Editor
Andrea W. Wasserman — Lead Article Editor
Gregory E. Michael — Lead Article Editor
Walter G. Hiltz — First Circuit Review Editor
William F. Lally — Note Editor
Stuart I. August — Note Editor
Michael S. Riselli — Case Comment Editor
Robert M. Cove — Technical Editor
Howard S. Fisher — Technical Editor

Additionally, the Law Review has acquired a new secretary, Miss Susan E. Weston.

PROFESSOR BRIAN T. CALLAHAN
NOT TO SEEK RE-ELECTION

Professor BRIAN T. CALLAHAN, former school committeeman and presently city councilman in Medford, has decided that he will not run again in Medford. He has given The Advocate this opportunity of making this public for the first time, as he has not made this statement to any other publication.

MOOT COURT

Due to the lack of support or interest, the Moot Court Executive Board (not to be confused with the third year advisors) has failed to provide The Advocate with a report on its progress for the second time this year. The Executive Board seems more concerned with planning its annual banquet (sans advisors) and choosing which course to waive than with running an effective program for the Law School. Hopefully next year's Executive Board will be more cooperative.

University of Missouri Kansas City—
Urban Legal Studies Programs

The University of Missouri at Kansas City will offer a graduate Urban Legal Studies Program leading to an LL.M. Degree of Masters of Laws In Urban Affairs. The program will prepare lawyers to specialize in public service, to practice for corporate and financial institutions dealing with problems of metropolitan areas from land planning and governmental structure to housing and poverty programs. The course of study will be interdisciplinary because urban problems transcend legal solutions in the complexity and diversity of their setting.

For admission to candidacy, a student must have an LL.B. or J.D. from an approved law school. To receive the LL.M., the student must satisfactorily complete twenty-four credit hours. A thesis, when elected, may count for eight credit hours.

For further information write to:
Office of the Dean
University of Missouri
School of Law
Kansas City, Missouri 64110

INTRAMURAL BASKETBALL

On March 11, 1970, the Law School's "Thirty-Third Street Athletic Club" was crowned as the new Suffolk University Intramural Basketball Champions. The team, made up almost exclusively of second year students completed the season with a 4-0 record.

Following a closely contested opening game against the Law School's Res Ipsas, the A.C. met the defending champions, also a team from the Law School, who were unbeaten over the previous 2 years. The A.C. jumped off to a quick lead and were never headed. Led by the sharpshooting of Bob L'Esperance, Pete Odlum, and Rick Kaiser, and the rebounding of Charlie Murray and Myron Goldenberg, the A.C. romped to a 45-34 victory.

In the championship game, the Spanish Flyers of the undergraduate division provided the opposition for the Athletic Club. The game was extremely fought and the A.C. had to rally from behind to win, 84-75.

The bench proved to be a valuable asset to the A.C. Led by Ted Coonihan, Bob Damiano, Goldenberg, Ron Lombardi, Dick Smoragiewicz, and Avrom "Hoops" Herbster, they repeatedly played key roles in close games to spell the starters and contribute needed points, rebounds, and defense.

Thus, the Athletic Club has retained the Intramural Basketball Championship in the hands of the Law School for another year. The Advocate wishes to congratulate the team and express its thanks to the "Thirty-Third Street Athletic Club" for representing the Law School in championship fashion.

SPRING, 1971
EXAMINATION PROCEDURE

On February 25, 1971, the Faculty adopted an amendment to Regulation Two (current catalogue Page 29) so that the Regulation reads as follows:

"Students may not omit courses scheduled, or take courses or examinations not scheduled for their respective programs, except by prior permission of the Faculty Administrative Committee or the Dean. A student who fails to take a regularly scheduled examination will receive a temporary mark of "Incomplete" which mark will revert to a permanent grade of 'F' if not removed within one calendar year from the close of the semester in which the mark was assigned. Each student failing to take a regularly scheduled examination will notify the Dean of such failure promptly and in writing setting forth the reason therefor."

As a result of the amendment, the procedure heretofore followed which required a student who anticipated omitting a regularly scheduled examination to obtain prior excuse from the Dean or the Faculty Administrative Committee was abolished. Effective immediately, a student who, for a valid reason, fails to take a regularly scheduled examination is required to notify the Dean's Office promptly in writing setting forth the reason the examination was omitted. In this connection, insufficient preparation will not be considered a valid reason.

When a regularly scheduled examination is missed and where the student has notified the Dean's Office, he will receive a mark of "Incomplete" in that course. This "Incomplete" will remain until the examination is taken, which must occur within one calendar year of the date the mark of "Incomplete" was received. If the examination is not taken within one year, a permanent grade of "F" will be entered for that course and this grade cannot thereafter be removed. All students who receive a mark of "Incomplete" in accordance with the new procedure are required to make arrangements with the Registrar during the year to remove the "Incomplete."
SISSION TO RECEIVE
McDERMOTT AWARD

The Advocate has learned that Abner R. Sisson will be the recipient of the Frederick A. McDermott Award for the academic year 1970-71. The award will be presented at the Law School celebration of Law Day.

Mr. Sisson is a 1928 graduate of Suffolk Law School and a partner in the firm of Sisson and Sarrouf, Boston. He was selected for the award on the basis of his distinguished record of achievement with the legal profession and for the vital interest that he has shown to the students of Suffolk Law School.

McDermott Recipient Abner Sisson
at last Spring's Student Advocacy Program

ALUMNI LUNCHEONS

Keesler H. Montgomery, LL.B. '60, LLM. '61
James J. Nixon, JR., LL.B. '54, Roy C. Papalia, LL.B. '34, William F. DiPesa, LL.B '55, Paul R. Tierney, LL.B. '64, were among Alumni who returned to the University to attend an Alumni Luncheon held by President Thomas A. Fulham. President Fulham is holding a series of luncheons with various alumni members of the Colleges and the Law School for the purpose of re-acquainting them with our facilities. Those present were delighted with the changes and the progress that has been made at Suffolk during the years of their absence.

CLASS NOTES

CLASS OF 1921

HON. FRANK DONAHUE marks his 39th year as a Justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Court on May 25.

CHARLES V. HOGAN will serve as Marshal for the June Commencement. Hogan has been a member of the Massachusetts State Senate for 30 years. Prior to becoming Senator, he served in the lower branch of the legislature for five years.

CLASS OF 1930

MICHAEL S. LISPASIO, who is a District State Aid Engineer in Danvers, Dept. of Public Works, has been awarded the Meritorious Service Award by the American Association of State Highway Officials. Attorney Lispasio is a resident of Revere, Mass.

CLASS OF 1931

HENRY E. KEENAN, Arlington realtor and former President of the Massachusetts Board of Real Estate Appraisers, was re-elected as Trustee at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Board of Real Estate Appraisers. The new President, Mr. John J. Reardon, has asked Mr. Keenan to continue as chairman of the Legislative Committee to work in conjunction with the Massachusetts Association of Real Estate Boards in screening proposed legislation on realty and appraisal matters in the coming session of the Massachusetts Legislature. Mr. Keenan is a former State Representative from Arlington.

CLASS OF 1933

GEORGE ABOUMRAD of Shrewsbury, Mass., has announced the opening of Aboumrad Realty Co. in Shrewsbury.

JAMES M. BOWLER has retired as Senior Vice-President and Property Manager of the Niles Co.

CLASS OF 1940

JAMES A. HAMMOND has been appointed aviation editor of the Boston Globe, replacing Arthur Riley who is retiring. Mr. Hammond is from Weymouth. He joined the Boston Globe in 1936 as a copy boy. As a reporter he covered City Hall, federal and state court houses and the State House.
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CLASS OF 1943
MANUEL V. McKENNEY of Jamaica Plain, Mass., has been confirmed by the Executive Council as clerk of the Dorchester Municipal Court. He is a former Assistant District Attorney and past president of the Mass. Trial Lawyers Association and Bay State Law Society.

HENRY MULLOWNEY of Braintree has been appointed to the post of Senior Civil Service Investigator.

CLASS OF 1950
JOHN J. DALEY of Bridgewater, Mass., has been appointed Registrar of New England Law School. Mr. Daley previously served as second assistant clerk in Brockton District Court and has also been a member of the Bridgewater Democratic Town Committee and Director of the Taxpayer’s Association.

CLASS OF 1951
EDWARD DOBIECKI has joined the law firm of Ryan and White of Springfield, Massachusetts. Mr. Dobiecki, who is a resident of Springfield, has served as a former Assistant Attorney General and also served as a Special Justice of the District Court of Springfield.

WILLIAM J. CORKERY of Arlington has been appointed Permanent Rent Control Administrator of the Cambridge Rent Control Board. He is also the Director of the Cambridge Legal Service, Inc.

CLASS OF 1952
RICHARD F. CLAFFIE, who has been associated with his father, Francis G. Claffie, in a Pittsfield law practice since 1953, has joined with his father and Atty. Timothy J. Sullivan in forming a new partnership for the general practice of law in Pittsfield. The younger Claffie serves as the Dalton town counsel and on the town planning board. Francis G. Claffie is also a Suffolk alumnus and has been a member of the bar since 1927. Richard Claffie resides in Dalton with his wife and five children.

CLASS OF 1953
JOHN J. STANTON has recently been appointed associate counsel in the legal department of the Glendale Federal Savings Bank in the Los Angeles area. Prior to joining Glendale Federal he was in private practice in Boston, assistant to the chief counsel of the Massachusetts Public Defenders Office, and legislative counsel for the American Trial Lawyers Association. Mr. Stanton now resides in Lake Forest Village, El Toro, California with his wife and three children.

JOHN H. LOTHRUP has been promoted to Assistant Counsel of Mortgage and Real Estate Law in the Law Department of the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company. Mr. Lothrup is a resident of Westminster, Mass.

MILTON R. SILVA of Swansea, Massachusetts, senior partner in the law firm of Silva and Sahady, has been appointed Presiding Justice of the Second District Court, which covers the greater Fall River area.

ROBERT HERMAN of Arlington, Mass., has been elected Assistant Vice President of the Middlesex Bank. Mr. Herman had previously served as Installment Loan Officer and had been the head of the Master Charge Operation for Middlesex Bank.

ERIC W. ANDERSON has been elected Vice President of the Friendly Ice Cream Corporation.

CLASS OF 1954
HENRY SILVERMAN of Brookline has been elected President of the New England Region of the Zionist Organization of America.

CLASS OF 1955
JAMES J. NIXON, JR. has been elected President of the Middlesex County Bar Association. Mr. Nixon, who is a resident of Belmont, had previously served as Treasurer, Vice President, and Chairman of the Membership Committee of the Middlesex Bar Association.

CHARLES B. GRAY, JR. has been appointed a special assistant with the Massachusetts Attorney General’s Office.

CLASS OF 1957
Judge DAVID F. DOYLE was named a Trustee of the Salem Savings Bank.

CLASS OF 1958
NORMAN W. KING has become a legal counsel for the United States Customs Office in Washington, D.C.

CLASS OF 1964
PAUL R. TIERNEY, Boston School Committeeeman, has been elected chairman of the school board for 1971. Tierney is a former teacher and now assistant corporation counsel in the City of Boston law department. He has been on the School Committee since 1967.

CLASS OF 1965
THOMAS J. LYNCH, JR. has been appointed Public Defender to the First, Second and Third District Courts of Southern Worcester and the District Court of Western Worcester. He resides at 178 Mendon Street, Uxbridge.

CLASS OF 1967
THOMAS M. FRATES has been named an incorporator of the Middleborough Savings Bank. Attorney Frates has also been elected Vice President of the Middleborough Trust Co. and is presently associated with Attorney Fletcher Clark, Jr.
CLASS OF 1968
WILLIAM J. GOLDMAN has recently been appointed Assistant Attorney General for the State of New York. Mr. Goldman has been associated with the Rochester law firm of Nusbaum, Tarriicone, Bilgore, Weltman & Silver. He and his wife, Barbara, are expecting their first child some time late in May. Mr. Goldman took office on January 28th and is working in the Rochester office.

RICHARD M. SHARKANSKY has passed the examination for registration to practice before the U.S. Patent Office. He is employed as a patent attorney for Raytheon Company and is a registered professional engineer of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Mr. Sharkansky resides in Needham with his wife and two children.

CLASS OF 1969
JOHN A. CASSIDY of 41 Hartford Street, Natick, received the U.S. Army Commendation Medal while serving with the 1st Calvary Division in Vietnam.

KENNETH J. LASKA has recently opened law offices at 29 W. Main Street, Plainville, Conn. Mr. Laska is a former assistant clerk of the Hartford County Superior Court and has served as a Hartford County Bar Association volunteer defender.

BRUCE E. BERGMAN has become associated with the law office of John J. Narkiewicz of Hartford, Conn. Attorney Bergman was previously employed by the Connecticut Judicial Department.

LAWRENCE M. MURRAY was selected to appear in the 1970 edition of Outstanding Young Men of America. He resides at 17 Valley Road, Woburn.

IMELDA C. LaMOUNTAIN has been selected as the new law clerk for Mass. Superior Court Justice Wilfred Paquet.

DAVID B. SHEPATIN has been named clerk of the District Court of Littleton, New Hampshire. Atty. Shepatin succeeds retiring clerk John L. Childs. Atty. and Mrs. Shepatin reside in Bethlehem, New Hampshire.

CLASS OF 1970
DONALD T. BLISS has been elected to the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts from the 13th Bristol District.

RICHARD SMITH has been appointed Attorney for the Poor of Cheshire and Sullivan Counties, New Hampshire, by the Office of Economic Opportunity. He resides in Munsonville, N.H.

JOSEPH M. DiGIANFILIPPE has been named law clerk to the Hon. Thomas F. Kelliher, Justice, Rhode Island Supreme Court.

HARVEY F. ROWE has been appointed as Assistant Attorney General in the Criminal Division Office of the Massachusetts Attorney General's Office. Rowe resides at 27 Kenmore Road, Malden.

THOMAS E. DWYER has joined the law firm of Joyce, Copless, Roddy, McNulty & Kilroy. Attorney Dwyer resides at 610 South Street, Needham.

STEPHEN S. ZIEDMAN recently opened his law office in the Presidential Building, 18 Washington Avenue, Chelsea. Atty. Ziedman is a lifelong resident of Chelsea.

DONAL T. DUNPHY has recently joined his father, Judge Edwin P. Dunphy and his brother, Sean M. Dunphy in the general practice of law under the firm name of Stevens & Dunphy. The firm is located in Northampton, Massachusetts where Donal and his wife reside.

W. H. DALE TOWNLEY-TILSON is an attorney for the State of New Hampshire Legislature. Mr. Townley-Tilson has recently wed the former Miss Trina Mae Marden of Reading, Massachusetts, and the couple now reside in Concord, New Hampshire.

HENRY S. ZEMBKO, JR. has recently opened a law office at 9 Grove Hill, New Britain, Connecticut, in association with Atty. Marcus Bordiere. They will practice under the firm name of Bordiere and Zembko. Atty. Zembko resides in New Britain with his wife and three children.

Necrology

Joseph A. Parks ’17
Jerome Suvalle ’30
Philip A. Chapman ’30
Constant R. Dilendik ’40
Henry P. Carr ’71

SPRING, 1971
Study Law In Israel

The American University School of Law will repeat its successful summer program in Israel in late July and August, 1971. The program is open to advanced law students, members of the bar, and interested graduate students.

The total cost of $990.00 includes: round trip transportation, New York—Tel Aviv, four hours of tuition (an additional two hours may be arranged), transferable to U.S. universities, lodging and meals, plus visits with the judicial, legislative and administrative tribunals, and several sight-seeing trips. Time for free travel will be available.

The courses "Current Issues in International Law" and "Comparative Law of the Middle East" will be taught by a distinguished faculty from America, Israel and Europe.

A deposit of $50.00, applied against the total cost will reserve a place. Send the deposit or write for further information to:

Director
Law and Policy Institute Abroad
The American University Law School
Washington, D.C. 20016
IF YOU ARE LOOKING FOR COMPETENT AND WELL-TRAINED LEGAL PERSONNEL, THE SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL PLACEMENT OFFICE CAN BE OF INVALUABLE ASSISTANCE TO YOU.

The placement office is designed to provide law firms and other prospective employers with information concerning law graduates and students. This office will be pleased to recommend persons for your consideration.

The Law School graduates students once a year in June. Since most students conduct their search for employment early in their final year, prospective employers should inform the placement office of their needs as early in the year as possible.

The placement office will be pleased to arrange interviews on campus by prospective employers, and will be happy to make all arrangements. If interviews at the Law School are impractical or inconvenient, provisions can easily be made for a visit to the employer's firm.

The placement office will also be pleased to provide employers with students desiring summer employment in law. This can prove to be a valuable means of evaluating persons for employment subsequent to graduation.

For full details, write or call:

THE PLACEMENT OFFICE
SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL
41 TEMPLE STREET
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02114
227-1040
EXT. 338, 339