FEATURES

LAW DAY REMARKS
The Honorable Walter H. McLaughlin 4

REFLECTIONS OF A THIRD YEAR LAW STUDENT
Raymond K. Clement 9

TEMPORA MUTANTUR! SED NOS?
The Honorable Edward Allen Tamm 10

SIMILAR PROBLEMS, DIFFERENT SOLUTIONS
Joseph T. Cefalo 13

DEPARTMENTS

EDITORIAL
REFORM OR CHANGE?
James Byrne Callahan, Editor-in-Chief 26

REPORT
THE SBA, 1971-72
William N. Batty, Jr., Chairman, Student Bar Association 15

LETTERS
2

NEWS BRIEFS
16

ALUMNI NEWS
27

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
James Byrne Callahan

FEATURE ARTICLE EDITOR
Emil James Cappelli

ALUMNI EDITOR
Robert Samuel Damiano

PHOTOGRAPHY EDITORS
William N. Batty, Jr.
John D. Schatz

STAFF MEMBERS
Thomas R. Barbieri
Joseph Charles Bonk
John T. Donoghue
John I. Fitzgerald
William Kenneth O'Donnell

FACULTY ADVISOR
Charles P. Kindregan

SPECIAL APPRECIATION
Judge Edward Allen Tamm
Judge Walter H. McLaughlin
Raymond K. Clement
Joseph T. Cefalo
Louis B. Connelly, Director of Public Relations, Suffolk University
Dorothy M. McNamara, Secretary of General Alumni, Suffolk University

POLICY STATEMENT
The objectives of THE ADVOCATE are to publicize the activities and outstanding achievements of the Law School and to present articles by students, faculty and guest writers on timely subjects pertaining to the law.

All articles and editorials reflect the personal views of the authors and are not necessarily the views of the administration or faculty of Suffolk Law School.

Guest editorials by students and faculty are welcomed by THE ADVOCATE which recognizes its obligation to publish opposing points of view.

COVER
The annual Voluntary Moot Court Competition, held this spring, featured leading student advocates of the Law School appearing before an impressive three judge panel.
AALS OR BUST

In the spring of 1971, Philip J. Adams, Jr., then editor-in-chief of The Advocate, wrote an editorial entitled "Membership in The AALS or Bust," in which he emphasized the need for membership in the Association of American Law Schools. In order to hasten acceptance by the AALS, Mr. Adams advocated, among other things, a stricter admissions policy with higher minimum standards.

TO THE EDITOR:

I am writing this letter in response to an editorial of the Spring 1971 edition of The Advocate. It is entitled "Membership in the AALS or Bust!" I am also directing this letter to the admissions committee, because of recent admission policies that I have become aware of. It seems to be that both the editorial and the admissions committee are taking the position that any future applicants to Suffolk Law School will have to have a minimum LSA T score of 550. I do not know what the minimum cumulative point average will be, however I suppose that you will set an arbitrary limit there also.

I sincerely do not believe that either LSAT scores or under-graduate marks have any relation to one's success in law school. If there was a direct relation, or for that matter any relation at all neither I nor many of my classmates would be practicing law now. I was #380 out of 400 students in my graduating class at Franklin and Marshall College. My LSAT scores were 540. At least six law schools said that I would never pass my first year, Suffolk took a chance on me. I was no ball of fire academically; I think I was in the 50th percentile of my graduating class. But contrary to all the dire predictions of my failure, I passed both the Connecticut Bar Exam in June 1969, and then went on to pass the Massachusetts Bar Exam in December, 1969. Presently I have my own law practice in the Town of Plainville; also I am the City Attorney for Bristol, Connecticut which has a population of over 60,000. I was the Public Defender for the Seventeenth Circuit Court in Connecticut for one year also. Maybe this may sound egotistical but I am proud of what I have accomplished since 1969, and corny as it may sound, I owe it all to Suffolk.

My roommate in my last year of law school was in the same situation that I was in, when he applied to Suffolk; only his law boards were well below 500. He graduated in the top 10% of my class. Another friend of mine never finished college. Both graduated with me and are now practicing law in Massachusetts. I could go on and give you over 100 examples of people who were never "destined" to be lawyers according to standards set by other law schools, but I think that is unnecessary.

Suffolk gave us a chance to prove to others that we were not the failures that our marks told them we were. Suffolk in the past has given many people this chance and it has done very well by them. I am proud to say that everytime I see the results of the Massachusetts Bar Exam, Suffolk always has more of its graduates pass the Exam than any other law school.

If you establish these minimum standards, then I am afraid you will deny both the law school and the people, of many excellent lawyers who might have been admitted to Suffolk had it not been for their grades or LSAT scores. I am sure that you know as well as I do that neither grades nor LSAT scores are a valid criteria to be used. This was pointed out to me all too often when I applied to different law schools. The dean of admissions at a New York law school told me that the attrition rate at their law school was no different when they had the high standards that you are trying to set, than when their standards were lower. The dean of admissions of a Connecticut law school told me that he felt sorry for me but that they had to raise their standards even though the attrition rate was the same. His reason was that with higher standards it was easier to ask for and obtain money from the Board of Trustees.

The standards that you are trying to impose mean nothing except that they are a very general indication of what the prospective student may be like. They cannot measure the desire that an applicant might have, nor do they
tell you anything at all about his ability to use what he has learned. They do not even tell you if this person can truly be an attorney. They are merely indications of what one person did on certain given days throughout the year, but even this is limited also. They merely show one’s ability to take a certain type of test, namely college exams and the law boards. They do not show a person’s ability to recognize a problem and seek a solution based upon his past knowledge. The law boards try to do this to some degree but their success is limited to those people who can think quickly, i.e. those taking the test that day.

You will be cutting off many like us from a tradition that should be carried on, that Suffolk have an open admission policy. If this means that Suffolk will not be accepted into the AALS then I think we should forego that honor. Just because Suffolk is accepted into the AALS does not mean that more jobs will open up to its graduates. It has been my experience that law firms do not look beyond the school name. If graduate schools deny our grads admission because we are not members of the AALS, then challenge these policies. If you can bring actions in the courts to help the underprivileged, why can’t you do the same to help yourself?

Law has been known for its reluctance to change, but this is one area that must not be subject to this attitude. As law students, professors and attorneys we must also recognize another quality inherent in the law that many tend to overlook, i.e. the lawyer’s imagination or creativity.

This is what creates the law and gives it life. Any lawyer who is not able to look at a problem, and based upon the facts and the law, create a solution for it, is not worth his salt as an attorney. Each new client brings in a new challenge to an attorney. The basic problem may be one that the attorney has seen many times over, but there is always that fact which gives the problem, the client, and your solution its individuality.

I only hope that you can apply your imagination to this problem that confronts Suffolk. Do not venture down the path taken by so many other law schools and shut your doors to those who may be more deserving than others. Mr. Adams seems to think that Prestige would be forthcoming to Suffolk immediately upon its acceptance into the AALS. If it does come, then it will have a false and hollow ring to it. It will be like putting a new suit on a beggar; everybody will still know who stands before them. The Prestige that Mr. Adams is looking for must be earned through hard work. If he would only look about him at the many graduates of Suffolk Law School, he will see that we have earned the Prestige that he wants so badly.

We are one of the largest law schools in the nation; so why can’t we act the role? There is absolutely no reason at all why we should be followers. We have nothing to lose and everything to gain if we would only set out on our own. Only then would we get the so-called academic recognition that Mr. Adams desires. Try a new admissions policy, anything but a closed one. But just remember the students from the past when you do institute a new policy. We are not only working for ourselves; every success that we have is also a success that rightfully belongs to Suffolk Law School and its students.

Kenneth John Laska
Plainville, Connecticut

It is not the quest for AALS membership that has resulted in a stricter admissions policy at Suffolk University Law School; it is the ever increasing volume of applications for admission. It is agreed, and indeed unfortunate, that many of the applicants who are turned away, have the potential for success in law school and in the legal profession. But with over four thousand applications this year, it is obvious that an open admissions policy is impossible. However, the committee on admissions is not bound by any particular LSAT cut-off, but rather bases its decision on a combination of all data submitted.
This year’s principal speaker at the Law Day Dinner sponsored by the Student Bar Association was the Honorable Walter H. McLaughlin, Chief Justice of the Massachusetts Superior Court. A graduate of Suffolk University Law School, Judge McLaughlin was appointed to the Superior Court bench in 1967 and became its chief justice in 1970. Judge McLaughlin’s address appears here in its entirety.

LAW DAY REMARKS

May I, for over two thousand years, has been seized upon by the Communist world as an occasion for display of their military might, their instruments of fear and terror. Fifteen years ago the 87th Congress of the United States declared May I as Law Day, USA — a day when Americans everywhere would pause and reflect that we have no vested rights to our liberties, and no Divine Providence will preserve them for us and our children unless we are willing to protect, defend, yes, even fight for them if necessary. Today we rededicate our society to the Rule of Law and all the principles of a free people that these words encompass. No man is above the law and no man is below it, and all men are entitled to equality under the law.

Today, when the world behind the Iron Curtain is goose-stepping to the rhythmic rattling of the sword, when their orators are declaiming the totalitarian philosophy of force and murder, the tenets of dictatorship and the degradation of the individual liberty and dignity of man, let us contemplate for purposes of contrast the life which they salute with the liberty and dignity of man which we enjoy as free as the air we breathe.

Our Declaration of Independence is founded on three basic principles:

1. There is a Creator.
2. Man as an individual has the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, not by the generosity of man but endowed upon him by his Creator.
3. Men as individuals shall form a government to formulate laws to protect and defend those rights from the cradle to the grave, to the end that this shall be a government of laws and not of men.

In the other world:

1. There is no God.
2. Man has no rights.
3. The State is supreme.

1. They cannot peaceably assemble without the permission of the State.
2. They have no right to petition for the redress of their wrongs.
3. Their persons and their homes are subject to search and seizure without cause — anytime, day or night — without warrant in law — and without recourse to law, only to the intruder from whom they beg his mercy.
4. Private property can be seized without redress — without compensation.
5. There are no independent courts; they are creatures of the State. They operate at the whim of the government.
6. A man accused of crime is presumed to be guilty until he can prove himself innocent.
7. They have no jury of their peers; trials are in secret, and in a secret trial justice is prostituted.

Judge McLaughlin, extreme right, poses with Judge Fenton, chairman of the Board of Trustees, and John C. Deliso, president of SBA, at Law Day Dinner.
And so today we contemplate “The Rule of Law” or “The Rule of Force.”

Martyrs have died to dignify the stature of man as an independent individual with freedom of thought and mind, freedom of speech and deed, and the protection of our Bill of Rights which shine with a brilliance unmatched throughout the world.

Today in our country the lowest person under our flag enjoys more equal social justice, more protection of life, liberty and property, a broader opportunity to pursue happiness, a greater personal freedom than has ever been provided for the common man by any other system of government in recorded history.

Communism cannot be destroyed by force. You must awaken in their people a thirst and a drive to embrace the Rule of Law under which, thank God, we live.

The Rule of Law is many things to many people. To some it is the policeman on the beat; to others the judge upon the bench; the lawyer in the courtroom; our Congress and our elected leaders of government — state and federal; the District Attorney; the jury system; the far-reaching decisions of our Supreme Judicial Court in the field of Criminal law reestablishing the basic constitutional guarantees our forefathers wrote into the Bill of Rights. Consider it as you will — it is:

The right to equal protection of laws and equal justice in the courts;
The right to be free from arbitrary search or arrest;
The right to equal educational and economic opportunity;
The right to choose public officers in free elections by secret ballot;
The right to own property;
The right of free speech — free press;
The right to peaceably assemble and to petition your government for redress of wrongs;
The right to attend the church of your choice;
The right to have legal counsel of your choice and a prompt trial if accused of crime;
The right of trial by jury, which we exemplify here today, if accused of crime or in claims involving more than $20 — which our Constitution in Massachusetts says is a sacred right. Rights do not come any higher than being sacred.

Many centuries of human misery have shown that once a society departs from the Rule of Law and every man is a law unto himself and each decides which laws he will or will not obey, only the strong survive and the shadows of doom and destruction are cast upon its peoples.

The only route to justice is through a system of law and courts before which all men stand as equals.

The supremacy of the law in our lives we must today reaffirm and to it rededicate ourselves without reservation.

I recently came across an excerpt from an address by Mr. Justice Robert H. Jackson, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Fall of 1953. He said:

"Paradoxical as it may seem, in this age of general education our Nation is plagued with unprecedented juvenile delinquency, gangsterism and shocking crimes followed only by long-delayed punishment or by none. The administration of our criminal law, from one cause or another, is a humiliation and a discredit to our profession and our country. And even civil justice is still delayed or denied, and often beyond the reach of deserving men and women."

The lamented Justice referred to gangsterism. Abominable as it then was, it is surpassed by the terrorism of today. He deplored "shocking" crimes. In the year that Mr. Justice speaks, robbery by firearms was a shocking crime as it is today. The difference is that in his day the victim was only robbed; today he is frequently murdered as a sequel to the robbery. The commissions of crime, he declared, "are followed only by long-delayed punishment or none." Today, when we are unable to provide the speedy trial our forefathers enshrined in the constitution, we have the alternative under Rules of Court of either providing a trial within six months or opening the doors of our jails to permit them again to prey upon society. The alternative is to try them or free them.
We are living in a wondrous age — an age of transition, an age of change, and with it has come violence. On this day dedicated to the law, let us look back and contemplate where we have been; let us stand still and see where we are; let us look forward and see where we are going.

We have seen drugs and heroin gnawing at the very vitals of our youth. The peace and tranquility our forefathers spoke of in such stirring words in the charters of our freedom has turned to violence on our streets. The right to dissent, a precious heritage, has given a bastard birth to respect for all law evidenced by sit-downs, by takeover of private property, by blocking public streets, by destruction of private and public buildings, by burning draft cards, by destruction of governmental records, by rebellion against all lawful authority, even in our prison system where dissent (and you can define it as lawful; I won’t) resulted in two million dollars’ worth of damage to the security of our principal institution at Walpole.

The right to dissent has rapidly turned to riot, mayhem and murder and has now engulfed our entire prison system where the press appears at the snap of one’s fingers.

All under the cloak of legitimate dissent, police officials — the guardians of our children and our society — have become “pigs”; the citadels of justice itself, our courthouses, have been burned and even a judge upon the bench in California has been assaulted and murdered. Serious trials are now conducted, for simple security, in an armed fortress and disruptive trials challenge the very right of the courts to arraign and try them before the bar of justice. The very system which cloaks and drapes them with the most precious heritages and guaranties of liberty and freedom and protection of one’s civil rights known to the civilized world, they seek to destroy.

Pornography is no longer contained or restrained by any bounds of decency, and the moral fibre of our people has so disintegrated that it now recognizes abortion as a birthright of woman and no longer a sin. God has become subservient to conscience.

Peaceful dissent and lawful change within the structure of government is a right no one can deny, but to force change by violence and disrespect for all law — to change the law by breaking it — erodes the Rule of Law. And I echo the lesson of history. A people cannot depart from the Rule of Law and still survive — it is the balance wheel in an ordered society.

Let us look in capsule form at the box score of crime, USA, today. According to the FBI:

One murder every 36 minutes;
One forcible rape every 14 minutes;
One aggravated assault, and by that I mean with a gun or a weapon, every 2 minutes;
One robbery every 2 minutes;
One burglary every 16 seconds;
One larceny every 21 seconds;
A major crime of murder, rape, robbery or assault with intent to kill every 48 seconds;

66% of all criminals are repeaters and 50% of all crime is committed by youths under 18 years of age. How many are never solved? How many who outrage society are never brought before the bar of justice to have the scales of justice balanced between them and the six million people of Massachusetts?

Robberies, our most vicious crime — jumping out from behind a hedge on a dark street — 70% are never caught;

Rape — 40% are never caught;
Aggravated assault — 35% are never solved;
Burglaries — 79% are never solved;
Larcenies — 82% are never solved.

In Massachusetts last year we had 25,000 arrests for major felonies, and 25,000 major felonies is more criminal business than 46 judges in my court could dispose of in one year if I devoted their services to nothing but criminal business. I recently issued a press release that I was devoting May and June to the trial of cases of defendants who are on bail to the exclusion of those who are unable to provide bail because I am informed by the district attorneys and by the police that 50% of all crime committed today is committed by persons who are on bail. Before we can catch up with them and try them for an offense for which they stand indicted, the records show they commit from three to six additional crimes. I believe in bail, but I am not going to face the long, hot, dry months of summer and in effect pass out licenses to commit crime by those who have not yet been tried for previous crimes.
In this age of demonstrations and dissent, when police are loath to arrest because of criticism and cries of police brutality, when the right of private citizens are trampled underfoot, I don't recall that part of a police officer's oath which says that a police officer, in suppressing riots and violence and the destruction of the rights and liberties of innocent people shall not take the offensive and make arrests; that he should exercise force only in self-defense while mobs run wild committing every excess. I really didn't know until these violent days were upon us that police departments were organized to protect each other. Somehow or other I always thought that police departments were organized to protect the public, and when the rights of others were being outraged to make arrests and to bring the perpetrators to justice. This kind of mobbery has no place in a free America. It must be contained.

No man living in human society can be his own law. If the philosopher can make his own law, so can the fool. If the virtuous can make his own law, so can the criminal. Is that where we are headed? Every man a law unto himself? If we are, then chaos must certainly follow.

With all my distress, I wonder in amazement at the agility and ingenuity to dream up causes to dissent. I prefer the exuberance of swallowing goldfish when Spring first wafts its gentle breezes.

I recently attended a Citizens' Conference held at this very hotel two or three weeks ago. It was formed to bring forcefully to public attention that the Judicial branch of government should no longer be the neglected orphan of society; that we need men and dollars and buildings to effectively dispose of the business of our people. I could sense a deep feeling of hostility towards our judges, and it finally surfaced in an item which was part of a Consensus Opinion composed by that group at the conclusion of the conference. They ascertained that within this Commonwealth we did not have equal justice under law in our court system; that there was discrimination in the application of the law to the indigent and to minorities. The constructive criticism of our court system and our judicial procedures have been joined by a chorus of destructive critics who ask the public to believe that our courts are engines of injustice. The problems of delay are portrayed as deliberate withholding of the citizen's day in court. The attempts by judges to maintain an atmosphere of order and deliberation are portrayed as repression and coercion. The setting of bail is a discrimination between the rich and the poor, and the punishment of criminal acts is discrimination against minorities even though minorities, to a greater degree, commit the excesses of the law. And our correctional systems, which we know can stand improvement, are portrayed as an intentional policy of oppression. Punishment is no longer a proper disposition of a criminal offense. True it is that the Citizens' group was liberally sprinkled with former convicts who had felt the stern hand of the law, and law reform and court watchers groups who sit day by day to criticize honest and conscientious and dedicated judges in the administration of their courts, with the usual assortment of bleeding hearts unless they or their loved ones happen to be a victim.

Be that as it may, let us not sidestep the charge.

At least since Gideon, no indigent and no one has appeared before any court in this Commonwealth charged with crime who has not been represented by a lawyer, in many instances a public defender paid for by the State, paid for by you, paid for by your taxes.

I know of no other society where a young lady forceably raped — or an old man brutally beaten and robbed — or a police officer shot down in the line of duty — turns around and by his taxes pays the bill for a lawyer to defend his aggressor. Criminal law is fast becoming a contest between the State agencies, the district attorney and the public defender.

And on the civil side of the court, millions of dollars are poured into free legal services to the poor through OEO and federal funding. Neighborhood law offices and legal aid societies are as prolific as dandelions. No one today need be without legal counsel on any issue. A simple eviction writ for nonpayment of rent is now being tried before juries of twelve with more solemnity and more constitutional issues than a capital case. And so it is in the whole spectrum of our civil business. No longer do the poor appear unrepresented. And so it should be. Injustices in the past we may have had, but they are the relic of a bygone day.

And on the issue of a denial of equal justice of minorities at the hands of our judges, I would indeed be a poor chief justice if I let that go unchallenged. The personnel of our judiciary, those who grace our bench and administer justice, is replete with minority representation. Judges of all ages, all ethnic groups, statewide in their selection, all political and religious persuasions, are all motivated by an intense and consuming desire to see to it that basic justice is borne out of the courtroom when the curtain is drawn at the end of the day in court. Never in my days with the court or for 35 years as a lawyer before its bar of justice has there ever been a complaint, a breath of suspicion, or even a hint of a denial of equal justice. On the contrary, we are more careful, more cautious, if possible, when dealing with minorities to avoid criticism, even by those whom we have no alternative but to punish. We have a solemn
oath of office to discharge and our own consciences to satisfy. Like the Goddess of Justice we emulate, we are blind, I hope, to race, color or creed; to poverty or wealth; to fear or favor; to arrogance or humility; and within our human frailties we dedicate ourselves and our actions to simple and true and pure justice. And that goes for all our judiciary at all its levels. Criticism in generalities is sinful. We want our people to look to our bench with confidence and we will respond.

While I am talking about equal justice under law, let us remember that for every crime of violence there is also a victim. A defendant at the bar is not the only one entitled to due process of law. Equal justice to all includes in the “all” you and me, our families, our friends, and our neighbors. There are two sides to the coin of justice. One is for the defendant and the other is for the people — 5,600,000 of them in this Commonwealth, decent, law-abiding citizens. A judge must look at both sides of the coin or else he is a poor judge.

I never thought I would see the day when the decent, law-abiding citizens of the City of Boston would retire to their homes, behind locked doors, when the sun went down, and when our wives and sisters and mothers would be afraid to walk some of the streets in our city in broad daylight with a handbag on their arm. I have seen that day. I hear it every day in the criminal courts of this Commonwealth.

Of course, a judge tries first to rehabilitate — continue without a finding — probation — suspended sentences — but inevitably there comes a time when serious crime just has to be punished. The most powerful of human emotions are love and fear. Fear of being caught, fear of being punished, must be a deterrent; and if it isn’t, when all else fails what does society have left to restrain the lawless? And there is nothing wrong with punishment. It is of Divine origin. The Lord created Heaven and Hell From biblical days and on through the ages one of the greatest deterrents of crime has been the policy of swift and certain punishment of the guilty.

The ideals of Law Day, I cherish. Due process and equal justice to all is as consoling to me as the Lord’s Prayer, but there comes a time in the tides of men when the pendulum has swung too far.

We have heard it said in the past that a bold bar could offer leadership in public affairs. I suggest that the time is at hand when a bold bench can offer leadership in coming to grips with crime and violence. I would never suggest to the courts of our land, no matter how dark the hovering clouds of crime, that there be the slightest deviation from the constitutional rights and guaranties so long afforded to the accused. But I do suggest that our courts give him that and no more. I would suggest that we start trying the defendant on his guilt or innocence and stop trying the police on how they got the evidence.

On this day dedicated to the law, I think it is good for all of us to stop and look and listen. Either our basic freedoms and Rule of Law — applied with equality to all, to society and to defendants — are mere rhetoric to be parroted by school children on the Fourth of July or they must be a compelling force in the daily lives of all of us commanding our total respect without reservations.

Did this man recognize you in May?
REFLECTIONS OF A THIRD YEAR LAW STUDENT
by RAYMOND K. CLEMENT

Well, here we are! A few more weeks to finals and then, if the gods smile, we get that Juris Doctor. We will be Law School Graduates or survivors (depending on your point of view). We have run the gauntlet, conquered Everest, crossed the Rubicon. We've made it!

Of course there are a few minor details left; like passing the Bar, and getting a job. Minor impediments when measured against the signal achievement of getting that J.D.

Three years ago (doesn't seem that long does it?) we entered these sterile halls. Fresh yeast. Now, with the leaven added we are about to emerge from the oven. For each of us the experience has been quite different. To be sure each one of us is oriented in one general direction; towards the practice of law, but the experience has facets which will show themselves only upon reflection.

At this time, a point where an end truly marks a beginning, it is worthwhile to pause, momentarily, and review the ascertained past, and the uncertain future.

Many of us have become jaded as we near the end of our law school careers. We wonder why we are subjected to “mickey mouse” requirements, like exams in two credit courses. We want out, and fast!

One awakes at two o'clock in the morning: What are the elements of a Tort for Deceit; is a Mechanics Lien a Common Law form or is it now codified in the UCC; how many exceptions are there to the Hearsay Rule? How very much we have forgotten! We sit at the Bar review, scribbling notes, and a cold feeling sits in the pit of our stomachs. We remember nothing! Three years shot to hell and we can remember nothing!

The practice exam questions to which we dutifully apply ourselves; those questions which we reread five times and still fail to see the issues. Those all important, potential career wrecking, elusive issues — we can't recognize. Then we get the answers, and how obvious they seem. From Torts to Contracts to Commercial Paper, then back to Torts. We review, then review again. It seems so hopeless, so impossible that anyone could remember all this.

We look around the room. Fifty percent will make it, the same percentage won't. In which group do I fall?

Then there is our Cumulative Average. Almost to a man all swear they have little or no interest in their final class standing. (If I had an 84.79 I wouldn't be concerned either.) At the commencement of the last semester we made a steadfast vow to “bring that average up”, a re-dedication to solid, unremitting study. This dedication wained along about the end of February. Now the sole goal is to get through, with as little sweat as possible. What is the cumulative anyway? It's the man, not his average that counts. Right? Right!

The final weeks drag by. We submit the necessary papers to the Bar Examiners, finally get our tuition paid, and get the final exam schedule. We reread and review some more... those fifty minute classes drag on. Everyone counts the days, and then the hours. Moments of euphoria when we see the end in sight. Utter depression as we think of those pages of white paper with those blue lines upon which we must put the sum total of three years of our lives.

We joke, we talk banalities, but in each of us those secret fears reside. The cold grip of what inevitably lies before us all. Our personal moment of truth!

The dichotomy hits us. “I should be happy, I've almost made it, why should I be so damned scared?” This question has no answer.

Time is of the essence (who said that?). We don't have enough of it. What man has the constitution to take a bar review course and study for final exams at the same time? Time plus pressure equals exhaustion. You look at what-his-name and he looks like he doesn't have a care in the world. How does he do it?

But you can't give up now, so close to the end. The final days pass by. Where did this year go? It went the same way the other two did.

A sense of relief crests in your gut. One thing at a time. Hell, the Bar Exam comes at the end of June. Exams will be over before Mid-May. Take that intensive Review course. It will all work out. Thousands have gone before, and thousands will follow.

Enjoy, man, enjoy. Take it all in; remember these last hectic days. File them away to drag out twenty years from now. Twenty years from now when you sit in the silence of your office at one a.m. — redrafting Mr. Magillicuddy's will for the fifth time in the past year.

Mr. Clement, a graduate of Queens College in New York, makes his home in Boston.
Each year, Judge Frank J. Donahue, life member of the Board of Trustees at Suffolk University is instrumental in organizing the Law School Alumni Dinner. This year's principal speaker was the Honorable Edward Allen Tamm, United States Circuit Judge of the Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, whose address appears below.

TEMPORA MUTANTOR!* SED NOS?

My address to you tonight, will present a strange mixture of legal ingredients, judicial experience, suicidal courage, deep concern and uncomfortable truths. It will, I hope, be devoid of packaged emotions, philosophical speculation, soft boiled intellectual squashiness, sentiment, sentimentality, hyperbole of hysteria and the chanting of traditional warnings. Recognizing that what I espouse may well evoke the sort of reception formerly accorded Christians in Nero's Rome, I hope to arouse in you that emotional response which is the fuel which feeds the intellect. Our nation is rich in speakers who pontificate on the reasons for and the solutions to our crime problems by comfortable and optimistic assumptions and conclusions which current events prove to be without merit. Because I believe it to be better to live one day as a lion than one hundred years as a lamb, and because I remember that kites rise against the wind, I boldly will assert to you my views as to the naked inadequacy of a major aspect of our law enforcement program. In so doing I intend no criticism of our police agencies, Federal, State or local, to whom we owe more than we are ever willing to concede. Since every reform was once a private opinion my views are offered to you in the hope that from a daring proposal we may establish a modus vivendi.

The Chief Justice of the United States in a recent address stated: “The American semanticist, Alfred Korzybski, terms Man as a ‘time-binder’ who links present with past and past with future because of his ability to build upon what has gone on before, and to adapt and to innovate and adjust.”

He continued: “Man is distinguished from all other creatures in his capacity to look about him, to be dissatisfied with what he sees, to see new and better ways and then make changes. In constructing change Man begins where his forbears left off. The zoologist-philosopher, William Morton Wheeler, pointed out that although Man and the ant each has a highly developed society, the ant’s society has remained static for 65 million years. Man has constantly changed his institutions during the past 50 centuries.”

It is in this spirit then that I propose a basic and hopefully far-reaching change in our criminal law procedures. The crisis in major crime, especially street crimes, is a man made crisis and it can be stopped by men if they have the wisdom, the courage and the willingness to act. Believing that shooting a policeman from a coward’s ambush, and blowing up buildings in therapeutic protest have nothing to do with making real or lasting changes in our society, I suggest that we reject the science of the fashionable in favor of the art of the possible.

* Times are Changing! But are We?
I suggest to you that the time has arrived when we should reevaluate priorities within criminal justice agencies. We demand that our police departments be more effective in apprehending those who commit violent crimes in city streets. At the same time we ask our police officers to silence barking dogs, to act as arbiters in family disputes, to respond to complaints that a radio is turned up too loud in a neighborhood area. Some cities require police departments to register bicycles, operate ambulances, conduct census, and arrest kite fliers. We judges are constantly complaining about the long delays in bringing those suspected of violent crimes to trial and yet we know that our courts are expected to provide the manpower to deal with minor traffic offenses, family altercations, and a variety of what should be social problems rather than criminal violations. Uniformly, we condemn the inhumanity of overcrowded and antiquated detention facilities, but we crowd those facilities by using them as detoxification centers for public drunks. In short, we have tended to view our criminal justice apparatus as the machinery for dealing with a wide range of unrelated social ills. The uniform result is that we have lost sight of the primary goal which we have set for the criminal justice process in the maintenance of domestic order and tranquility. Violent crimes in our cities present the greatest threat to that goal, but the priorities of criminal justice agencies seldom reflect that primary goal. This leads me, then, to suggest that our misplaced priorities have created a condition which I can only describe as over-criminalization. Included in our criminal system are a variety of victimless crimes in which neither the perpetrator nor other participants consider themselves as being harmed in any way. An illustration is prostitution in which neither the prostitute nor her customer feels victimized, but society, under moral principles has condemned their conduct as criminal. I need not recount the endless variety of objectionable conduct which we somehow believe can be deterred by the imposition of a criminal sanction, but in this area our statistics belittle any claim or hope of determent. The Violence Commission in its report identified three principal areas of over-criminalization: (1) moral statutes which regulate such forms of sexual conduct as adultery, homosexuality and fornication; (2) illness statutes, which regulate public intoxication and possession of narcotics and (3) nuisance statutes, which govern such diverse offenses as disorderly conduct, vagrancy, the use of profanity in public and kite flying. When we ask the criminal justice agencies to enforce those and similar prohibitions, we necessarily divert their attention and resources from the more compelling task of controlling major crime. Reports disclose that 52% of all the arrests made in Atlanta, Georgia are for public intoxication, but in St. Louis only 5% of arrest are for public drunkenness. Is drunkenness a less meaningful transgression in St. Louis — or is there a better system in St. Louis? Of the six million arrests made throughout the nation in 1969, some two million were for drunkenness. A study made in New York City disclosed that in a single month 40 times as much money was spent on enforcing gambling violations as was collected in fines for these offenses. In that one month extensive police activities resulted in the arrest of 172 defendants, 47 of those arrested were convicted, but none of the convicted offenders went to jail. The 41 convicted defendants were fined a total of $5600 and the estimated cost of arresting the 172 defendants and prosecuting them was $229,000. Doesn't this type of example suggest that we should seriously rethink our priorities and resource allocation to insure a more meaningful operation of the criminal justice system? Do you think that two million arrests for drunkenness in a single year has served as an effective deterrent to intoxication? Isn't the factual situation one in which the alcoholic simply moves repeatedly through the revolving door of the criminal procedure — arrest, incarceration, release — without ever receiving the treatment he needs for his disease? Have we not in this area been doing little more than supporting a self-preserving illusion? Is not much of our sincere effort and expensive activity in reality a meaningless pantomime carried on for the sake of tradition? I hasten to add that while I have no disagreement with the moral issues of homosexuality, prostitution and public drunkenness, I propose a different view on how we should deal with it. As I continue into the area of narcotic addiction as a major cause of crime, ask yourselves if the time has not arrived when we should seek to recover from our self-inflicted wounds?

Are there not social agencies which should handle, to the complete exclusion of the criminal justice system, the problems of public drunkenness, prostitution, homosexuality and other social ills and evils which are not diminished by criminal sanction? In short has not our policy in many areas been one of perseverance rather than reasoning? Has not our administration of criminal justice crumbled into a kind of tepid porridge? Are we so blinded by traditional procedure, ancient rituals, and ceremonies, legendary phrases, and immemorial habits that we have anesthetized the nerve of experience? My own unrepentant belief remains that the public welfare, will never be significantly improved until we apply a legal litmus test to our present evaluation of what constitutes criminal conduct.

Do you believe that after a century of experience with opiate addiction and more than 60 years of statutory restrictions against the opiate drugs, we have effectively and efficiently deterred the narcotic traffic? More than 40 years of close association with law enforcement agencies and the criminal courts have convinced me that heroin addiction is the most readily identifiable cause of a majority of our felonies in the United States. As a class, heroin addicts impose heavier work loads on the law enforcement agencies, over-burden the courts, and menace the safety of the citizens in the streets. In our nation's 34 largest urban centers, the best informed estimates attribute 33 to 50 per cent of the armed robberies, burglaries, muggings and thefts to heroin addicts. Some judges of felony courts conclude that 79 per cent of all of their cases involve defendants with a current history of heroin addiction. I am confident that in my eighteen years as a trial judge I have sentenced as many narcotic peddlers, and narcotic addicts for commission
of felons as any judge in the United States, but in so doing I have not diminished the narcotic traffic by even a miniscule. I suggest to you, then, that the use of criminal sanctions to deter the distribution and use of heroin and other dangerous drugs has proved it is a complete failure. By the imposition of our criminal penalties, we have not only failed to eliminate the drug traffic, but we have succeeded in creating a highly profitable market in forbidden drugs. No adequate estimate of the number of heroin addicts is available, but the best estimate places the nation’s addict population at somewhere in the neighborhood of 300,000 persons. Shockingly, the use of heroin as recorded by the number of men rejected at pre-induction draft board examinations was, in 1970, more than six times the number rejected in 1964. Heroin has killed more New York City residents during the past decade than the entire State of New York lost in Indo-China war deaths. In the same period during which 3,191 New York State residents died in the Southeast Asian combat zone, 4,254 New York City residents died of heroin use. The average New York City addict steals about $8,000 worth of property each year. In Washington, D.C., 15,000 addicts each consume an average of $40 worth of heroin a day with an estimated total cash expenditure for drugs of $175 million a year. Most drug addicts support their habits by criminal offenses. Of the 100,000 people who come through the detention facilities in the New York City criminal justice system in a year, 40,000 are addicts. Forty-four per cent of the defendants in the local jail in Washington, D.C., at any one time are heroin addicts. In Washington, D.C., the police spend $7 million, the courts more than $800,000, correction institutions $9 million and probation and parole agencies $400,000 for a total expenditure exceeding $17 million in dealing with narcotic addictions. In New York City alone, city, federal, and state agencies anti-narcotic expenditures are in excess of $80 million a year.

In New York City narcotic addiction is the greatest single cause of death of adolescents and young adults exceeding deaths from any other single cause, accident, suicide, homicide or natural disease. In a 40 block area in New York City, 31% of the residents are heroin addicts and one half of them are under 22 years of age. In a Washington, D.C. neighborhood, a study showed that 30% of the boys between the ages of 15 and 19 years old are heroin addicts and 36% between the ages of 20 and 24 are addicts. Sixty-seven per cent of the Washington, D.C. addicts are less than 26 years of age.

I have cited statistics from New York City and Washington, D.C., only because the data being compiled in these two cities is generally more detailed than that maintained in most other areas. There is heroin available in the city, county or town where you reside and it is available for purchase without difficulty. The problems of law enforcement agencies in dealing with the narcotic problem are simply overwhelming. Consider first that a package of pure heroin, no larger than a package of cigarettes, has a readily available market value of more than $50,000. Consider also that in the year 1970, more than 105,000 ships entered the United States from foreign ports, that more than 345,000 airplanes entered the United States, that well in excess of 65 million automobiles crossed our international boundaries and that during this period more than 225 million people entered and left our nation. Isn’t it obvious from the figures which I have cited to you that our law enforcement agencies are confronted with a completely insurmountable task in attempting to eliminate the narcotic traffic? Bravely, now I enter an area where I have few friends and even fewer allies. I seek then not to rest on a wisdom of my own but to present a logos which is logically acceptable to all. I have burdened you with a heavy load of statistical and grammatical baggage in the hope of convincing you of the realistic existence of some nonarguable basic premises. Has not the time arrived when we should reevaluate our utilization of criminal sanctions and seek a more promising remedy to this great social problem? My question is not new. A 1960 joint American Medical Association and American Bar Association committee stated that “we have more drug addicts than any other western country, despite forty years of enforcement of prohibitory laws (which) raises doubts concerning the wisdom of the prohibitory approach of drug addiction” because “compulsion to take the drug cannot be stopped by a threat of jail or prison sentences . . . No threat of incarceration prevents an addict from continuing to use the drug.” In passing, I merely point out that attempts at some type of voluntary civil commitment for drug addicts has not proved productive. Experiences in New York and California disclose that voluntary civil commitment procedures have been a disappointment since 70% of those involved are returned to penal institutions after one year’s release from civil commitments, after two years, 80% are reincarcerated and after three years, 90%. It is the conclusion of the states in this area that in spite of the great expenditures for civil commitments, all that actually results is the taking of three years from the addict’s life.

Our society’s policy towards heroin addicts has always had praiseworthy goals in seeking to reduce the number of addicts, to prevent new addicts, and to destroy the black market. The failure, however, of our traditional methods to achieve these ends is too clearly demonstrated by the present status of addiction in our country and with the shocking annual increase in the amount of addiction. The best figures available estimate that in the Washington, D.C. area, the addict population is increasing at an annual rate of 33% and similar startling increases in the rate of addictions are reported in other cities. By relying almost exclusively on law enforcement and penal sanctions, we have ignored the medical realities of drug addiction and the economic realities of the black market in heroin. The evidence is overwhelming that an addict’s desire to consume heroin cannot be discouraged by prolonged jailing, involuntary abstinence or the drug’s exorbitant cost in the city streets. Denying addicts a legal source without substituting an effective treatment program simply drives them into the black market.

SPRING 1972
Admitting that I am blessed with hindsight, and willing to be accused of fomenting law and order, I have reached the cynical point where I must conclude that utilization of criminal sanctions in the narcotic area does not make any sense by standards of national analysis. Our adherence to a philosophy that denies our knowledge of the real, and affirms our ignorance of the apparent has trapped us in a cul-de-sac, from which escape is, I believe, possible. I suggest to you that the time has come when we should adopt a new approach to the narcotic problem. I am convinced that for the past 50 years we have been engaged in endless travel in the wrong direction. I suggest that neither legal technicalities nor sophistries can erase the facts or hide the true nature of the problem and that our posture unfortunately resembles nothing so much as a shorn Sampson standing blindly in the temple as the pillars crash down around him. I believe that our primary emphasis should be devoted to the treatment of addicts. I suggest to you that every major urban center should offer all drug addicts a multimodality treatment program funded by the state and equipped to attract addicts from the illegal black market, treat them, and return them to social productivity. I believe that the expenditure of huge amounts of money is justified and required if we are going to eliminate successfully the heroin addict and his crimes from our society. I believe that methadone maintenance programs and the use of similar substitutes for heroin should be offered to all known addicts in such dosages and at such times as careful medical examination indicates is proper and without charge. I believe that we should no longer utilize criminal sanctions against drug addicts, but should place our major emphasis on programs addressed to the social rehabilitation of the addict. I recommend that procedures should be developed within the criminal justice system so that all addicts accused or convicted of the possession of narcotics and/or accused or convicted of committing a street crime for support of their habit and not otherwise presenting a danger to the community should be referred to treatment programs rather than incarcerated. It is my view that federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies should be concentrated only on the uppermost levels of the domestic black market distribution system, but if our treatment facilities are adequate the black market will automatically go out of existence. If the narcotic addict does not have to commit crime to support his habit we eliminate a major cause of crime; by furnishing addicts with a free source of narcotics under medical supervision addressed to curing the addiction we eliminate the sinister octopus of the narcotic trade — the carrier of the virus — from our society. This suggestion proposes a new approach. It advocates effective measures to offer every addict treatment that will help him become a productive citizen. The highest priority of this program is the use of the latest medical technology to encourage the addict to stop buying in the black market, start finding a job and put an end to his criminal activity. Treatment programs can bring about these improvements in addicts’ behavior if they are free to use any drug, including heroin, found to be necessary, and if they are permitted to employ any procedure that will both rehabilitate the addict and discourage his need to commit crime to support his habit. My theme is a simple one — its potential is extraordinary.

Joseph T. Cefalo, a graduate of the University of Massachusetts, lives in Melrose, Massachusetts. He is in his final year at Suffolk University Law School. Last summer, Mr. Cefalo was one of fifty students from law schools throughout the United States who attended the University of Houston sponsored Mexican Legal Studies Program. Mr. Cefalo, who plans eventually to return to Latin America to live and practice law, was invited by The Advocate to comment on his experience, and to share some of that which he learned while participating in the program.

SIMILAR PROBLEMS, DIFFERENT SOLUTIONS
by JOSEPH T. CEFALO

The Mexican Legal Studies Program, conducted by the Bates College of Law, University of Houston, was held in Cuernavaca, the capital city of Morelos, located about fifty miles south of Mexico City. The five week program, approved by both the American Bar Association and the American Association of Law Schools, was divided into three general areas. The first area, “Latin American Economic Integration”, conducted by Professor Eliezer Erell of the University of Houston and Professor Covey Oliver of the University of Pennsylvania, dealt with the social and cultural problems which affect the economic situation in Latin America, touching on the Central American Common Market, the Latin American Free Trade Association and the Andean Common Market. The second area, “International Commercial Transactions”, conducted by Professor Charles Heckman of the University of Houston and Professor Soia Mentschikoff of the University of Chicago School of Law, dealt with problems similar to those covered by our own Uniform Commercial Code. But it was in the third area of the program, “Selected Problems in Mexican Law”, that the greatest amount of interest was generated.

Unlike the two other areas, “Selected Problems in Mexican Law” was conducted by two local guest lecturers, Professor Guillermo Floris Margadant of the Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, and Jorge Sanchez-DeVanny, a partner in the international law firm of Baker and McKenzie of Mexico City. The course was structured so as to give a detailed study of Mexican law from its basis in the Neo-Romanist system to its present form. Additional emphasis was placed on the workings of the Mexican Civil Code form of law and how this system differs from the common law form as found in the United States.
The first major difference between the common law and the Civil Code is that in Mexico, all the law is codified. This on its face would seem to be unimportant, but the problem arises when an interpretation of a particular statute is needed. The problem is intensified in that there is no system of reporting cases as there is in the United States. Court opinions are not written down; therefore, there is no source for attorneys to look to in order to see how the court will view a particular situation. Furthermore, the courts are not bound by prior decisions since the basis of the law is the Code. The only time a law will be changed by court decision is when the Mexican Supreme Court decides five consecutive times on a particular matter in the same fashion. But again, the absence of a reporting system precludes one from learning of the decisions and the subsequent change of law.

The Mexican legal system is divided into three sections: public, social and private law. The public law is concerned with the relationship between citizen and state. This takes into consideration the Mexican Constitution. In many ways, it is similar to our own. It sets the requirements for the presidency as well as when and how elections are to be conducted. It also lists the requirements for the election of senators and deputies to the federal congress as well as the matters that are within the legislative scope of the congress. However there is one major difference in the area of individual rights. There is no habeus corpus, nor are there guaranteed rights. If an individual feels that he is aggrieved by a particular law, he must apply for an *amparo*. This is a writ which if allowed will change the law for only that person who applied for it; the law will remain on the books and apply to everyone else. An *amparo* is however, similar to a writ of habeus corpus in that it may be sought in a situation where one is incarcerated, awaiting trial or legal action (which is more the rule than the exception). Here also the *amparo* will only apply to the one seeking it and cannot be relied on by others in similar situations.

The social sector of the law covers labor law and agrarian reform. It also sets the standards for ownership of land. In the labor law field, the emphasis is on protection of the worker. In order to fire a worker, an employer must show incompetence or violation of labor standards. Thus, the burden is on the employer to prove his case. If he cannot, the worker is entitled to an indemnity. This consists of three months flat salary and twenty days pay for every year of service. Most cases take a number of years to settle, so that indemnities can run quite high, i.e. waiting time is considered employment time.

The third branch of the Mexican legal system is the private law sector. This deals with the relationship between citizens, as well as the state. It is divided into two areas: international public law and international private law. The first deals with international treaties and foreign relations. There are a number of foreign doctrines in this category. One of interest is the Calvo Clause. This states that if a foreign individual gets into financial trouble with the state, he should not use the influence of his own country to safeguard his investment. His rights should be the same as those of a Mexican citizen. He should not be in a better position. This clause is not fully recognized by the United States government which will intervene on behalf of a United States citizen only if all local legal remedies are exhausted.

International private law covers administrative, civil and commercial law, as well as conflict of laws. With respect to conflict of laws, the general rule is that Mexican law applies to any foreigner living in Mexico or in transit in the country. There is strict application of this rule in all areas of the law. If the matter is litigated in Mexico, only Mexican law will apply. The field of administrative law is a growing one. It is concerned mainly with visa requirements, tax concessions, trademarks, and immigration. It is a critical field for attorneys dealing with foreign investors and corporations. Civil law comes under the Civil Code, comprised of four books which cover the areas of family law, property, inheritance and obligations, i.e. torts, agency and contracts. The commercial law takes into consideration the various legal business entities and the requirements for each. One addition that is unique is the introduction of a *commissario* into the corporate structure. This person is a member of the board of directors of a corporation, but his main function is to protect the interests of the shareholders, to report to them and represent them in all matters.

Thus the differences between the two systems are apparent. They multiply as you move from the basic to the complex. And so it is that only the solutions differ, for the problems remain the same.
A Report

William N. Batty, Jr. is a graduate of the University of Miami. A native of Marblehead, Massachusetts, he was a member of the United States Marine Corps prior to his enrollment at Suffolk University Law School. During this his final year at the Law School, Mr. Batty has served as chairman of the Student Bar Association.

THE SBA, 1971-72
by WILLIAM N. BATTY, JR.

Change is often necessary and inevitable. Without it we stagnate. Unless people care about the problems existing in our society, they step backward instead of forward. For every issue, one usually finds two diametrically opposing views. These “differences of opinion” constitute our left and right wings of political philosophy. The individuals concerned are usually in the minority, and if either gained power, there would likely be chaos. In the middle of this continuum of political philosophy lies the majority, the stabilizing factor for our continued existence. It is influenced by both extremes, but usually finds a workable and practical solution by which all of us can live. The solutions are not always correct, but we keep moving ahead. As law students and attorneys, we should fight with all our resources for what we believe for ourselves and our clients to be right, but we can never lose sight of the importance of using the most practical methods and means in achieving our goals.

Both myself, as chairman of the Student Bar Association, and John Deliso, the president, were confronted with various problems this year. In the past, the SBA lacked student support and on many occasions could not gather enough members to have a meeting. At the outset, we knew that in order to have an organization that would be effective, it would have to be alive, active and enthusiastic.

Our first task was to define the problems of the Law School. At times the ensuing debates among our twenty-one members became both lengthy and heated. Two very competent and persuasive factions emerged. Instead of tearing the organization apart, the diversity brought us closer together into a cohesive unit. Although we seldom differed on goals, there were frequent disagreements concerning the means by which those goals should be attained. We gained respect for one another, while learning that neither the faculty nor the administration were our foes. A major problem was implementing our ideas. Instead of demanding rights, we negotiated and lobbied for what we wanted. We persuaded, and we compromised. We achieved many of our goals and laid a solid foundation for the years to come. A search committee, composed of students, faculty and trustees, was established to find a successor for retiring Dean Donald R. Simpson. A teacher and course evaluation by the student body was established. With student funds, a non-credit, practical law institute program was begun, opened to both students and members of the community. Respected members of the Bar were brought in as instructors for this program. A student newspaper, the Suffolkate, was published. We revived the student-faculty curriculum committee. We also established a visiting professor chair in memory of Superior Court Judge Eugene A. Hudson, late vice chairman of the Suffolk University Board of Trustees. Working with the trustees, we were instrumental in securing assistants for Professor Lynch in the law library and Professor Hollingsworth in the Voluntary Defenders program. Much more was accomplished in support of other student groups within the Law School, as well as opening the door for further improvements.

The student body supported us, not only in theory but also in fact. Most of our committees were made up of non-members of the Student Bar Association who put in many unselfish hours of dedicated work. The ideas belong to them, and their support of the SBA encouraged the Association in its efforts to implement those ideas.

I am now an alumnus, and what I do from now on will reflect Suffolk’s influence on me. What Suffolk University Law School does in the future will affect us all. The Law School needs your help. More than your money, it needs your support. We need your knowledge and your experience. We need an effective alumni organization. The students, faculty and administration have begun working together for the growth of Suffolk University Law School. We are not complete without the alumni. Come back to Suffolk—we miss you.
PROXMIRE SPEAKS

Senator William Proxmire, Democrat from Wisconsin, was the guest of Suffolk University Law School this winter at a presentation sponsored by the Student Bar Association. The Senator set the tone for his address in his opening remarks. He warned that this country had need to take a hard look at its priorities. He suggested that with limited resources, i.e. revenue, it is impossible to accomplish all things. In determining priorities, it must be established what should not be done, as well as what should be done. Concentrating on three areas where he felt spending could and should be cut, Senator Proxmire directed his remarks toward the space program, public works and military spending.

A brief question and answer period followed Senator Proxmire’s address.

The Senator emphasized the need to rearrange priorities within the space program. By stressing an unmanned program, which he explained would have the same scientific yield, though lack the excitement of manned flights, the cost of the program could be reduced from nine to three billion dollars. In the area of public works, the Senator was referring to huge federally funded projects such as dams and highways. He urged closer scrutiny of the rate at which future benefits are discounted. Benefits must bear some relationship to cost. Concerning anti-pollution, Senator Proxmire stated that tremendously expensive programs were not doing the jobs they were designed to do. He suggested proportionate taxation of those responsible for pollution as a means of creating economic incentives to limit the problem. Prefacing his remarks on military spending, Senator Proxmire explained that he was not in favor of a unilateral reduction of military forces. Citing numerous statistics, he attacked the military procurement system as being a major cause of wasteful spending. He alluded briefly to manpower, calling for a more realistic and concentrated deployment of United States troops throughout the world. Finally, the Senator called for an end to the war, stating that this country had discharged its obligations in full.

Following his address, there was a brief question and answer period before the Senator was returned to the airport for his flight back to Washington.
MOOT COURT

Congratulations were in order this spring to the members of the Moot Court Executive Board. Under the direction of Co-Chairmen Alfred J. Carolan and Barry S. Weinstein, and assisted by Anthony V. Avallone, the Voluntary Moot Court Competition, open to all second year day and second and third year evening students, was a resounding success. Each year the Executive Board seeks to present contemporary constitutional problems as subject matter for the Competition. This year, attention was focused on the pressing issue of a private club's right to discriminate in its membership.

Representing the Dromedary Lodge No. 50 were Brian A. Riley of Providence, Rhode Island and Leonard D. Polletta of Waterbury, Connecticut. Opposing them in this final round was Peter D. Feeherry of Wayland, Massachusetts, who represented the Alcoholic Beverage Commission of the State of Derne. The final argument took place before a three judge panel composed of one judge from each level of the Federal Judiciary. Retired Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Tom C. Clark presided as Chief Justice and was flanked by the Honorable Bailey Aldrich, Chief Judge of the court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and the Honorable Frank J. Murray, District Judge in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts.
From left to right are Mr. Riley, Judge Murray, Mr. Feeherry Mr. Justice Clark, Judge Aldrich and Mr. Polletta.

Messrs. Riley and Polletta were awarded first prize, while Mr. Riley was chosen as the outstanding advocate. Scholarships totaling one thousand dollars were awarded to the finalists. A portrait of Mr. Justice Clark, for whom the Competition has been named, was hung in the Law School’s moot court room at a dedication ceremony prior to the final argument. Because of the limited seating in the moot court room, the Competition was carried over closed circuit television. A reception and dinner in the university dining hall followed the final argument.

Leonard J. Henson, out-going president, has announced the membership of next year’s Moot Court Executive Board. It is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John D. Burrill</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen L. Shulman</td>
<td>Vice-President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony V. Avallone</td>
<td>Co-Chairmen, The Justice Tom C. Clark Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence M. Iacoi</td>
<td>Co-Chairmen, The Justice Tom C. Clark Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas A. McIninch</td>
<td>Co-Chairmen, First Year Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph R. White</td>
<td>Co-Chairmen, First Year Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Henson has also announced that the following will represent Suffolk University Law School on the National Moot court Team:

- James J. Dunn, Jr.
- Marshall H. Fishman
- Leon O. Lemaire, III
- Brian A. Riley, First Alternate

Mr. Burrill and company.
SUFFOLKATE

This year has seen the emergence of a new Law School publication. Entirely funded by the Student Bar Association, the Suffolkate evolved ostensibly to fill a communications gap existing within the Law School. It was soon obvious, however, that the role of the Suffolkate was to be more than a mere informational conduit. A Suffolkate editorial appearing in the February issue spelled out this role. “The students involved wanted the paper to be more than a source of school information, more than a school newspaper. Just exactly what the Suffolkate was to be, in precise terms, was not clear; yet all the people working for the newspaper agreed on an overall goal. Everyone involved felt strongly that the Suffolkate was to be a medium for political change. Implied in this was the further idea that the paper would serve as a medium to encourage political change on a much higher level than simply in our Law School environment.”

Despite certain lapses into crudeness and tired cliches, amidst a projection of political bias, the Suffolkate has performed well in airing controversy and reporting news within the Law School.

COMMUNITY LAW PROGRAM

The Student Bar Association at the start of the second semester initiated a Community Law Program at the Law School. The purposes of the program were to provide law students and others with practical working skills in a particular aspect of the law, to explore the legal and social problems in chosen areas of current interest and concern in the community, and to bring to the community a greater awareness of what problems can and cannot be solved through the present legal system. The program was made up of courses dealing with problems in the following areas: the low income consumer, defending the G.I., criminal trial tactics, the prison system, and tenant problems.

Overflow crowd views the final argument over closed circuit television.

A combined effort between the undergraduate school and the Law School brought Ralph Nader to Boston.
**LAW LIBRARY**

The much needed and long awaited expansion of the law library will begin this summer. Present facilities can accommodate approximately 240 students. The entire fourth floor of the Donahue Building will be turned over to the library, thereby increasing student capacity to 400. Law School faculty presently occupying fourth floor offices will move to the sixth floor. The University has made arrangements to rent nearby office space, in which will move those members of the Business School faculty who presently occupy the sixth floor of the Donahue Building.

**THE ADVOCATE (1948 CALENDAR)**

Regretably, this year’s edition of *The Advocate* was limited to two issues. It was hoped that the Student Bar Association would assume the cost of those copies distributed to the student body, while the University would continue to pay for those copies distributed to friends and alumni of the Law School. Unfortunately, the members of the SBA, who questioned the worth of the magazine in its present form, voted overwhelmingly to deny any financial assistance. Representative Ronald H. Wayland admitted that *The Advocate* had shown signs of improvement, but felt that quality rather than quantity should be stressed, and therefore saw no need for a third issue. Representative Joseph J. Machera, asserting student indifference, saw no reason why the SBA should undertake financially to support *The Advocate*. When told that over 1500 copies of the fall issue had been distributed to students through the law library, Mr. Machera replied that 1948 calendars would disappear as quickly if left for the taking, without charge.

Joseph C. Bonk has been named editor-in-chief of next year’s edition of *The Advocate*. Mr. Bonk, a native of Edison, New Jersey, is a graduate of Seton Hall University.

**LOSE ONE—WIN ONE**

Plans to purchase the building located at 20 Ashburton Place from the Massachusetts Teachers’ Association have fallen through. This disappointment was, however, mollified with the announcement that the Board of Trustees has formally approved purchase of the Wright and Potter Building at 32 Derne Street. The University has been negotiating to buy the five story structure for many months. President Fulham expressed confidence that final papers might be passed by the end of July but noted that the University must also obtain a variance so that the building can be used for educational purposes. He also pointed out that it will be two years before Suffolk can occupy the property because of present tenancy arrangements. Located at the corner of Derne and Hancock Streets, the building is owned by the Wyman Trust and has been used as a printing plant for over 40 years.
Receiving their checks from Professor John J. Nolan are estate plan, first prize winners, from left to right, Messrs. Russell, Dickerson, Cohen and Casey.

JUDGE FENTON HONORED

The Honorable John E. Fenton, Chairman of the Board of Trustees at Suffolk University has had the original building at Bon Secours Hospital in Methuen named in his honor. Judge Fenton has been a vigorous fund-raiser for the hospital for many years. The Judge has also been honored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, which conferred on him its distinguished merit citation for his efforts in demonstrating brotherhood.

ESTATE PLAN WINNERS

Forty-eight students of the law schools of Boston College, Boston University, Harvard University, New England School of Law, and Suffolk University were presented checks totaling $2,580.00 in recognition of prize-winning papers submitted by them in the Sixteenth Annual Estate Planning and Drafting Contest sponsored by Boston Safe Deposit and Trust Company at law schools in the greater Boston area. Henry E. Russell, president of the Trust Company made the awards at a dinner at the Boston Company Building to which winning students and members of the law school faculties were invited. The Honorable Mary C. Fitzpatrick, Judge of Suffolk County Probate Court was the guest of honor.

The four winning teams from Suffolk University Law School are listed below.

First Prize
Edward J. Russell
Robert E. Dickerson
Bernard J. Wolfe
Lawrence E. Cohen
Thomas J. Casey

Second Prize
Anthony Adamopoulos
Peter A. Borrok
Richard K. Gibson
Avrom J. Herbster
John P. Kinhan

Third Prize
James B. Callahan
John C. Deliso
Jeffrey B. Gale
William R. Harvey
Franklin H. Hopkins

Fourth Prize
Arthur D. Breecher
Thomas C. Dunnington
Dale E. Grant
Malcolm H. Houck
Peter C. Raymond

VOLUNTARY DEFENDERS PROGRAM

The Voluntary Defender Program at the Law School has increased tremendously in size in the past two years under the direction of Professor Wilbur G. Hollingsworth. In 1969-1970, the first year of operation, the program was staffed by approximately twenty students who were assigned cases in the East Cambridge and Somerville District Courts. The next year saw participation more than double with forty-six day and evening students concentrating on East Cambridge. (Somerville assignments were discontinued in December of 1970 due to lack of case assignments.) A total of 203 cases were handled.

During the present academic year, ninety-two students (seventy-seven day and fifteen evening) are being assigned to four District Courts: Dedham, East Cambridge, Lynn and Salem. More than 250 cases had been disposed of by these students during the first semester.

In order to participate in the program second year day and third year evening students attend weekly lectures given by Prof. Hollingsworth dealing with the mechanics of the district court system. Results of periodic quizzes determine whom Prof. Hollingsworth will recommend to the Dean for certification to the Clerk of the Supreme Judicial Court.
VOLUNTEER PROBATION SERVICE

At the present time three students are participating in the Voluntary Probation Service Program in the South Boston District Court, acting in two general capacities: 1) as case aide workers, and 2) as members of the Special Resources Committee. The case aide workers are primarily involved in establishing a supporting relationship with both youthful and adult offenders, while those involved with the Special Resources Committee concentrate on examining and solving the practical needs of those on probation. The volunteers are expected to make a minimum commitment of six hours per week and to visit the courthouse at least one afternoon or Saturday morning each week. Students from South Boston were given preference in the selection process because of their knowledge of the community.

BEVERLY LEGAL AID

The Brothers of Delta Theta Phi Law Fraternity, through the organizational efforts of Peter J. Aloisi and Michael Ventresca, have successfully established a Legal Aid office in Beverly. The North Shore law firm of Burg and Fox are advisors to the students, and its name appears on all petitions filed with the courts. The office is staffed by third year students who handle cases dealing with landlord and tenant problems, separations and divorces. To be eligible for the legal service, one must be a resident of Salem, Beverly, Peabody, Danvers, Hamilton, Manchester or Gloucester, be a welfare recipient, or have an annual income of less than $4500 with a $500 deduction allowed for each dependent. In its first semester of operation the office was open three days per week for a total of nine hours. Of the 122 people interviewed, seventy-two clients were accepted, with the remaining found ineligible because of failure to meet financial requirements, lack of grounds for divorce or participation of private counsel.

SBA

William A. Devore, of Mineola, New York, has been elected new president of the SBA. Mr. Devore, a graduate of Nassau Community College in New York, will assume office in September. Assisting Mr. Devore will be Warren R. Kiersh, vice president, and Joseph J. Machera, chairman. The Advocate extends congratulations and best wishes to the new officers.

FRATERNITIES ELECT NEW OFFICERS

Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity:

John W. Capone                               Justice
Curtis G. Levine                              Vice Justice
Paul Kaufman                                  Treasurer
Patricia Pac                                  Clerk
Frank A. Conard                               Marshal

Delta Theta Phi Law Fraternity

Michael F. Farrell                           Dean
John E. Nanorta, Jr.                        Vice Dean
Norman A. Cohen                             Treasurer
Barbara Elaine McAllister                  Secretary
Charles F. Rousseau                        Tribune

Newly elected officers of PAD present Justice Clark with Distinguished Service Award. From left to right are Mr. Levine, Miss Pac, Mr. Justice Clark, Mr. Capone and Mr. Kaufman.
DEAN TO RETIRE

After eight years as dean of Suffolk University Law School, Donald R. Simpson has reached the mandatory retirement age of 65. The Board of Trustees has established a search committee to consider a successor to Dean Simpson who will step down in June. It is as yet uncertain whether the Dean will remain on the faculty and continue to teach.

A graduate of Dartmouth College and Boston University Law School, Dean Simpson taught briefly at Northeastern University Law School before being ordered to active duty during World War II. He taught at Suffolk University Law School after the war, from 1945 through 1955. Dean Simpson returned to active duty for four years and later rejoined the Law School faculty in 1959, becoming dean in 1964.

A former assistant attorney general in Massachusetts, Dean Simpson is also a retired colonel, JAGG, U.S. Air Force Reserve. He is the author of the standard work "Massachusetts Law of Landlord and Tenant". With his father, the late Frank L. Simpson, dean and professor at Suffolk University Law School, he wrote and edited "Summary of Basic Law", volume 14 of the Massachusetts Practice Series.

LAW DAY 1972

Nearly 500 persons attended the annual Law Day dinner of the Suffolk University Law School Student Bar Association at the Marriott Motor Hotel in Newton. The Honorable Walter H. McLaughlin, Chief Justice of the Massachusetts Superior Court was the principal speaker. The Student Bar Association presented its annual Frederick A. McDermott award to Judge McLaughlin, a 1930 graduate of the Law School. The award, presented in the memory of the late dean of the Law School, is given for distinguished achievement in the legal profession and for vital interest shown in the Law School. The dinner climaxed a day long observance of Law Day at the Law School. The program was under the direction of John C. Deliso, out-going president of the SBA and William N. Batty, out-going SBA chairman.

STATS

Recent statistics published by the registrar’s office show that Boston College led the list of 260 universities and colleges represented in the Law School student body this year with 226 graduates. Others represented by 100 students or more were Northeastern University (145), University of Massachusetts (140), Boston University (135), and Suffolk University (101). The following is a list of those institutions represented by 15 or more in the Law School student body.

Brown University
Clark University
College of the Holy Cross
Harvard University
Merrimack College
Providence College
Saint Anselm’s College
State Teachers College, Boston
Tufts University
University of Connecticut
University of New Hampshire
University of Rhode Island
University of Vermont

1,904 of the 1,938 students attending the Law School this year came from the following nine states:

Massachusetts — 1,456
Rhode Island — 143
Connecticut — 97
New York — 72
New Jersey — 54
New Hampshire — 39
Maine — 17
Pennsylvania — 15
Vermont — 11

Last year at this time, the Law School notified 188 students of an academic deficiency, of which 101 were dismissed. In the day division, 42 were dismissed of the 72 deficient. In the evening division, 59 were dismissed of the 116 deficient.
Sometimes its not easy to convince a Judge.

**NEW ADMINISTRATIVE POST**

The Law School has announced that henceforth there will be a Director of Admissions. Named to the new position was John C. Deliso, outgoing SBA president. Mr. Deliso, a native of Shrewsbury, Massachusetts, is a graduate of Babson College.

**LAW REVIEW**

On behalf of the Law Review, Bernard M. Ortwein, this year's editor-in-chief, has announced that the following gentlemen will make up next year's editorial board:

- Ronald I. Bell Editor-in-Chief
- William Simon Managing Editor
- Dennis P. Derrick Note Editors
- Carmen A. Frattaroli Case Comment Editors
- Thomas A. Hensley Gerald V. May, Jr.

- Coleman G. Coyne, Jr. Lead Article Editors
- John A. Brennan, Jr. Technical Editors
- Richard S. Gordon
- Robert M. Brady
- Michael K. Noble First Circuit Editor

**FACULTY NEWS**

The Law School has announced the following academic promotions: Law Librarian John W. Lynch, Associate Professor of Law to Professor of Law; Law Registrar Doris R. Pote, Assistant Professor of Law to Associate Professor of Law; Charles P. Kindregan, Associate Professor of Law to Professor of Law; Richard G. Pizzano, Assistant Professor of Law to Associate Professor of Law; and Richard Vacco, Assistant Professor of Law to Associate Professor of Law.

Professor Doris R. Pote is attending Harvard Law School where she is pursuing an LL.M. degree.

Professor Charles P. Kindregan has continued his very active pace. Among his accomplishments this year are an address at Merrimack College, a presentation of a paper on human genetics and law at Boston College Law School.
a chapter in the Uniform Probate Code pamphlet recently published by the National College of Probate Judges, and an article entitled "State Power Over Human Fertility" for the University of California Hastings Law Review. An authority on abortion and family planning, Prof. Kindregan is also the editor of a new reporting service, "Human Reproduction and the Law," which sends and updates recent cases on abortion to law libraries.

Professor David J. Sargent has recently written articles on no-fault insurance for the Minnesota Law Review and the Notre Dame Law Review.

Captain Anthony J. DeVico, Law School Placement Director and Lecturer in Law has retired from active duty after thirty years of Naval service in the Judge Advocate General Corps. Rear Admiral Joseph C. Wylie, Commandant of the First Naval District, presented Captain DeVico with the Legion of Merit citation at ceremonies aboard the USS Constitution at the Boston Naval Shipyard.

Professor Herbert Lemelman has been appointed Vice-President of the Brookline Hospital Association.

Professor Basil Yanakakis recently presented a paper at the "World Peace Through Law" Conference in Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

Professor John W. Lynch has been appointed by Richard Donahue, President of the Massachusetts Bar Association, to a special committee on law book publishing.

GRADUATION

Edwin O. Reischauer, former United States ambassador to Japan, delivered the main address at the June 11th commencement at the John B. Hynes Civic Auditorium in Boston. The former Harvard professor and author of many books was awarded the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters. Among the other honorary degree recipients were: Judge Robert Braucher, associate justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, Doctor of Laws; Judge Anthony J. DiGiovanna of the New York Supreme Court, Doctor of Juridical Science; Governor Frank Welt Licht of Rhode Island, Doctor of Public Administration; Robert W. Meserve, president-elect, American Bar Association, Doctor of Laws; John D.J. Moore, ambassador to Ireland, Doctor of Laws; and Erwin N. Griswold, solicitor-general of the United States, Doctor of Laws. 404 graduates of Suffolk University Law School had degrees of Juris Doctor conferred upon them by the president of the university, Thomas A. Fulham. The following graduates received their degree of Juris Doctor, cum laude:

Richard Berman
Alfred John Carolan, Jr.
Robert Michael Cove
Peter F. Dow
Stanley Driban
Leonard James Henson

Marblehead, Massachusetts
Quincy, Massachusetts
Mattapan, Massachusetts
Chelmsford, Massachusetts
Acton, Massachusetts
Medford, Massachusetts

Robert R. Lalancette
Leonard L. Lewin
Bernard Michael Ortwein,II
Robert Joseph O'Sullivan
Michael J. Riselli
Helaine A. Simmonds
Carol Gibson Smith
Michael A. Ventresca
Andrea Weiner Wasserman

Marshfield, Massachusetts
Milton, Massachusetts
Arlington, Massachusetts
Methuen, Massachusetts
Belmont, Massachusetts
Mattapan, Massachusetts
Plymouth, Massachusetts
Swampscott, Massachusetts
West Hartford, Connecticut

Edwin O. Reischauer delivers commencement address.
REFORM OR CHANGE?
by JAMES Byrne CALLAHAN
Editor-in-Chief

Whenever you have a situation which involves a constant turnover of personnel, you are necessarily confronted with the distinct drive to reform. As a new man or a new group assumes the reins of leadership, the compulsion seems overwhelming to leave one’s mark upon the system. At first glance, this might appear to be a worthy phenomenon. Unfortunately, the distinction between change and reform is often overlooked. Improvement, that vital ingredient of reform which sets it apart, becomes lost in the zeal to make that mark. Because innovation seems not to be limitless, certain cycles begin to form.

This year, under the auspices of the Student Bar Association, a curriculum committee was organized, and eagerly set forth to make its mark. The results of its labor are embodied in a twenty page report published shortly before Christmas. The report includes seven proposals which, as explained in the introduction, “concern short-range curriculum change.”

The first proposal advocates an all elective curriculum for all except first year students, who would continue with compulsory “core” courses. It is agreed that a law student, a college graduate, ought to be free to choose whatever courses he wishes. It is true, as the report points out, that not all of those attending law school intend to practice law. It is agreed that suggested courses should replace required courses. However, the same argument of free choice is applicable to first year students. If a man chooses to jeopardize his future by refusing to elect suggested courses, he ought to be free to do so, whether he be first or third year student.

Secondly, the committee proposes that a two hour free period be incorporated into the schedule of classes to accommodate extracurricular activities. It is unclear whether such a period would be daily or weekly. In either case, this would be an unnecessary delay and a burden upon the majority who prefer to carry out their commitments in the crowded university buildings as expeditiously as possible. Those who wish to participate in extracurricular activities can continue to do so at their own expense — and not at the expense of others.

Thirdly, the committee proposes the adoption of an optional pass-fail grading system. Under the proposal, the record of a student who chooses this system will reflect only a “pass” grade where the mark submitted by the professor is 70 or higher. Apparently the choice must be made when the course is chosen. “D’s” and “A’s” would be treated alike. Understandably, proponents of such a change are not among the scholastic leaders. In a society which increasingly feels the need to reward mediocrity and unproductivity while taxing hard earned success, such a system has no place in a law school, even on an optional basis. The report explains that such an “option would help create a relaxed atmosphere in the classroom where currently the keen competition for grades produces tension.” It is doubtless that such a system would relieve anxiety. But in case you haven’t looked, it’s a very real and competitive world out there. A professional school that tenderly leads its flock through euphoric chambers of constitutional bliss, untrammeled by such painful thoughts as competition and success, has fallen short in preparing the student for what is to come.

Closely aligned to the optional pass-fail system is the committee’s proposal to abolish class rank. The traditional method of measuring someone’s success is that of comparative evaluation. Here again it is obvious whence the support of such a proposal comes. It all begins to smell of some kind of academic socialism where all the rewards are the same regardless of the efforts made. If the committee is worried about too many students crowded into too small a grade range, a proposal to widen that range could cure the ill. 70 is an arbitrary number which bears little relation to material mastered.
Interestingly enough, the largest section of the report which includes the fifth proposal, does not even concern curriculum reform, but addresses itself to admissions. Therefore, the fifth proposal which advocates introduction of a minority admission policy is left for other editorials. In the meantime, reflect upon the following question. How many proponents of such a policy, presently enrolled in the Law School, would be willing to step aside, in order that a representative from a minority group could take his place?

Sixthly, the committee proposes that the Law School limit dismissals to first year students. The report states, “fear of dismissal is clearly a positive motivational force in the first year, but we question whether continued anxiety is a valid educational technique.” The thought of student tenure is totally unrealistic and unworthy of further comment.

Lastly, the committee proposes that student-faculty discussion sessions be established. The value of increased student-faculty dialogue cannot be over-emphasized. And thus such a proposal would be in everyone’s interest.

It seems apparent that those who participated on the curriculum committee spent many unselfish hours trying to present new programs. But in many areas, the proposed changes reflect no improvement, and therefore cannot qualify as reforms. Regardless of what other Boston law schools are doing, Suffolk need not tamely follow suit. There is a distinct personality at Suffolk Law School which combines an eagerness to learn with a willingness to work. It should not be tampered with. Concern for this attitude should be uppermost in the minds of all, before any change which could alter the prevailing competitive spirit is considered.

CLASS NOTES

CLASS OF 1912
ABRAHAM LELYVELD of Rockland, Massachusetts, founder of the Rockland Credit Union, the largest credit union in Massachusetts and the fifth largest in the country, has resigned as president of the Credit Union after having served fifty years in that position.

CLASS OF 1929
ROBERT J. KELLY has been appointed Director of Fiscal Affairs at the Cape Cod Hospital.

CLASS OF 1930
N. J. SOKOLETSKY of Fall River, Massachusetts has been appointed chairman of the Fall River Licensing Board.

CLASS OF 1938
ELLIS F. BROWN of Foxboro, Massachusetts has been appointed Presiding Judge of the Wrentham District Court.

CLASS OF 1942
MANUEL MCKENNEY of Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts has been named corporator of the Home Savings Bank, Boston.

CLASS OF 1949
DONALD J. DONOVAN of Danvers, Massachusetts has been named Town Counsel in Danvers.

CLASS OF 1952
DAVID M. BURKE of Glen Burnie, Maryland has been promoted to the position of Determinations Review Officer, GS-14, for the Bureau of Health Insurance, within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Mr. Burke is married to the former Beryl Margaret Perry and has five children.

RICHARD CLAFFIE of Dalton, Massachusetts has been elected to the Board of Directors of the newly established National Council of Catholic Laity.

CLASS OF 1955
RICHARD A. LEAHY of Norwell, Massachusetts has announced his candidacy for School Committee.

ROBERT E. SCHULTZ, formerly of West Roxbury, Massachusetts was recently appointed manager of the Ohio regional office of the Aetna Insurance Company.

CLASS OF 1956
GEORGE KENNEALLY has been appointed Assistant Counsel for the Massachusetts Senate.
CLASS OF 1965

DR. WILLIAM E. HASSAN of Newton, Massachusetts has been elected to the Board of Trustees, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy.

CLASS OF 1966

PHYLLIS G. BRADBURY of Boston, Massachusetts has recently been promoted to the position of Assistant Counsel in the Law Division of the New England Mutual Life Insurance Company.

DAVID SULLIVAN of Burlington, Massachusetts has announced his candidacy for Selectman.

CLASS OF 1967

JOHN E. BOYLE of North Andover, Massachusetts has been appointed Police Legal Advisor for the Andover and North Andover Police Departments.

SALVATORE J. CICCARELLI of Watertown, Massachusetts has been appointed Legal Counsel for the Watertown Police Department.

EDWARD M. KIERNAN of New Bedford, Massachusetts has recently been named Special Assistant District Attorney for Criminal Sessions in Plymouth Superior Court.

CLASS OF 1968

GARON CAMASSAR of New London, Connecticut has been appointed 1971-72 Cancer Crusade Chairman of the New London Unit, American Cancer Society.

JAMES T. DANGORA of Billerica, Massachusetts has announced his candidacy for School Committee.

CLASS OF 1969

JOHN F. CREEDON of Brockton, Massachusetts has been appointed a regular Assistant District Attorney for Plymouth County.

DAVID GADBOIS of Marlboro, Massachusetts has been named City Solicitor of Marlboro.

KENNETH J. LASKA of New Britain, Connecticut has been named Director of the Heart Fund in New Britain. Mr. Laska is the City Attorney for Bristol.

HAROLD F. MOODY of Rockland, Massachusetts has announced his candidacy for School Committee.

DOUGLAS D. SCHERER was recently appointed Commissioner of the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination by Governor Francis W. Sargent.

STEVEN R. DULY of Lawrence, Massachusetts has announced his candidacy for School Committee.

Gerald S. Hoovenanian has been named Head of the Cambridge Housing Authority.

John F. McGarry of Andover, Massachusetts has been appointed an Assistant Attorney General in the Administrative Division of the Massachusetts Attorney General's Office.

Robert A. Walsh of Winchester, Massachusetts is presently employed at Avco Everett Research Laboratory in the position of coordinator of patent affairs.
MICHAEL A. WIENER of Yonkers, New York has been appointed Associate Counsel with the Criminal Division of the Westchester Legal Aid Society.

CLASS OF 1971

PHILIP J. ADAMS, JR. has accepted a Judicial Clerkship to Judge Stanley of the United States District Court for the District of Missouri.

ANTOINETTE ANTONELLI of Brighton, Massachusetts has been appointed a legal assistant with Governor Sargent's Law Enforcement Committee.

J. MICHAEL CANTORE, JR. of Bridgeport, Connecticut has recently joined the law firm of Theodore I. Koskoff, Bridgeport.

GARY CASALY of Natick, Massachusetts has been named to the Natick Finance Committee.

RICHARD P. COURCHESNE of Holyoke, Massachusetts has been appointed Director of the Model Cities Community Development Corporation.

PAUL P. HEFFERNAN of West Roxbury, Massachusetts has been appointed Chairman of the West Roxbury Heart Fund.

MICHAEL SAWYER of Auburndale, Massachusetts has been appointed assistant house counsel to Rust Craft Greeting Cards, Inc. of Dedham.

WEDDINGS AND ENGAGEMENTS

CLASS OF 1967

WILLIAM T. CALLAHAN, JR. of Peabody, Massachusetts has married the former Kathleen M. Hingston. Mr. Callahan is principal of the Keefe School in Peabody.

CLASS OF 1968

JEFFREY W. SHUB of Swampscott, Massachusetts married the former Dorie Paige Sandler on March 25, 1972. Mr. Shub is a partner in the law firm of Coniaris and Shub, Boston.

CHARLES R. WILLIAMSON, formerly of Portland, Oregon, has married the former Julie Anne Myers. Mr. Williamson is on the faculty at Middlesex Community College.

CLASS OF 1969

ROBERT N. ROOK, formerly of Uncasville, Connecticut, is engaged to Joan Gollinger. Mr. Rook is an attorney with the firm of Rook, Roth and Rubino, Boston.

HOWARD L. VISNICK of Gloucester, Massachusetts is engaged to Betsy M. Winer. Mr. Visnick is an attorney in Gloucester.

CLASS OF 1970

ROBERT CARTY of Norwood, Massachusetts has married the former Donna M. Flammia. Mr. Carty is an attorney in Lowell.

CHARLES CHRISTY of Worcester, Massachusetts married the former Carol Franklin on September 26, 1971. Mr. Christy is an attorney employed by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PAUL V. GIANNETTI of Winchester, Massachusetts married the former Marlene D. DeCrosta on October 9, 1971.

CLASS OF 1971

BENEDICT BADER, formerly of Sea Gate, New Jersey, married the former Greta Markowitz on November 28, 1971. Mr. Bader is a member of the Technical Staff of the Mitre Corporation, Bedford, Massachusetts.

WALTER A. BRICKMAN of Malden, Massachusetts is engaged to Kathleen M. Hachey. Mr. Brickman is Acting Controller of Malden Evening News, Melrose Evening News and Medford Daily News.

JOSEPH F. GRIFFIN of Wheaton, Maryland married the former Susan B. Hughes on September 26, 1971. Mr. Griffin is a law clerk for the National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C.

RICHARD P. MARCH, formerly of Milton, Massachusetts, is engaged to Barbara Koopman. Mr. March is an attorney in Rochester, New Hampshire.
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Necrology

It is with sadness that The Advocate reports the deaths of the following alumni:

CLASS OF 1924

THE HONORABLE EUGENE A. HUDSON, Superior Court Judge of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Vice Chairman of the Suffolk University Board of Trustees died on April 20, 1972 at the age of 70. Appointed to the Superior Court in 1946, Judge Hudson had served on the Board of Trustees since 1957 and had been a life trustee since 1969. In memory of Judge Hudson, the Student Bar Association has voted to establish a visiting professor chair. The SBA donated five thousand dollars from its treasury to establish the fund. Under its proposed terms, a professor from another law school would come to teach for one year at Suffolk University Law School, with a different professor presented each year. It is with deep regret that the Law School acknowledges the passing of this distinguished and dedicated alumnus.

CLASS OF 1925


CLASS OF 1926

JOHN P. CONNOLLY of Dorchester, Massachusetts died on October 2, 1971.

JAMES QUIRK of West Dennis, Massachusetts died on January 17, 1972.

CLASS OF 1927

THOMAS A. QUINN of Bass River, Massachusetts died on December 30, 1971 at the age of 74.

CLASS OF 1930

EDWARD G. BOYLE of Woburn, Massachusetts died on October 27, 1971.

CLASS OF 1931

FRANK B. FOSTER of Mechanic Falls, Maine died on December 6, 1971 of injuries sustained in an automobile accident.

CLASS OF 1932

WILLIAM E. CAREY of Swampscott, Massachusetts died on January 31, 1972 at the age of 61.

CLASS OF 1940

JOHN C. CARR of Silver Springs, Maryland died on January 20, 1972 at the age of 58.

CLASS OF 1941

FRANK H. HARMS of Brockton, Massachusetts died on January 6, 1972 at the age of 59.

CLASS OF 1950

CHARLES O. DAM of Quincy, Massachusetts died on November 15, 1971 at the age of 44.

CLASS OF 1954

NEAL F. CROWLEY of Scituate, Massachusetts died on February 28, 1972 at the age of 46.

CLASS OF 1969

EDWARD J. HEALEY of Alexandria, Virginia died on September 7, 1971.

ROSS O’HANLEY of Needham, Massachusetts died of cancer in April 1972 at the age of 32.
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
56 TEMPLE STREET
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02114
227-1940
EXT. 352
Hon. Frank J. Donahue
Massachusetts Superior Ct.