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"KING OF TORTS" — Melvin M. Belli, center, internationally known trial lawyer, on lecture visit to law school. With him are Deza Frederics A. McDermott, left, Needham, and student Paul L. Wone of Brattleboro, VT.

Famed Atty. Belli Presents Views On Cutter Lab, Chassman Cases

The Salk vaccine case of Cutter Laboratories, Inc. and the Caryl Chessman case, were two of the provocative topics for discussion by the noted San Francisco attorney, Mr. Melvin Belli, on his recent lecture visit to the Suffolk University Law School.

Mr. Belli, well-known as "The King of Torts," was introduced to the student body by Mr. Joseph Schneider, past president of the Massachusetts Bar Association and currently a trustee of Suffolk University.

The audience was soon treated to a manifestation of the art of trial practice techniques. Mr. Belli vividly discussed the Cutter Laboratory case, the Caryl Chessman case, and the developing law of breach of warranty.

In reference to the latter topic, he demonstrated the legal relations among the manufacturer of goods, intermediary parties and the final purchaser of such goods. Mr. Belli stated emphatically that he is a disciple of the doctrine that there need not be any privity of contract shown to maintain an action based on breach of warranty. His sketches on the blackboard of the lecture room indicating the relations among parties in a warranty suit prompted the lecturer to review his method of computing damages in personal injury suits.

Mr. Schneider, in his introduction of Melvin Belli, spoke of the compassion this attorney has for his clients. Many who heard him at Suffolk University Law School were inclined to agree with Mr. Schneider that Melvin Belli is a 20th century apostle laboring in the vineyard of the courtroom for equality and justice on behalf of the individual degraded by the torts of others.

NEW SUFFOLK LAW TEAM FOR NAT'L MOOT COURT

COMPETITION IS NAMED

The S. B. A. Names 1960-61 Leaders

The Student Bar Association recently held its elections for the 1960-61 year. The following were chosen as officers of the Association and representatives to the Board of Governors:

Michael Green, Chairman of the Board;
Edward Parker, Representative of the fourth year (Evening Division);
John T. Sweeney, Treasurer;
Bernard M. Manns, Secretary;
Jeanne Delaunay, Representative of the third year (Evening Division);
Paul L. Wone, of Brattleboro, VT., Representative of the second year (Day Division)

"They said it couldn't be done," but last November, the people exercised their democratic right, that of voting, and elected as the Mayor of Boston John F. Collins, 4q, of Jamaica Plain...despite predictions of the polsters!

Purely as an incident to this thing, they also put into office, for the second consecutive time, an attorney who was educated at Suffolk Law School. And Suffolk was his alma mater—and he brought it pride and respect.

Suffolk's latest "gift" to its mother city—in the form of the top city official, that is—Arthur Eugene Sutherland—took his L.L.B. from the law school in 1950—with honors! He went a mere 21 years ago in the South End, the son of Irish-born parents. But Boston was his city—and he served it well.

Practiced in Rochester. He was associated with the American Commission for Near East Relief in Asia Minor and Thrace in 1919 and in 1926 was admitted to the New York State Bar. He practiced in Rochester in 1926-41 and was secretary to U. S. Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes in 1927-28.

Prof. Sutherland was educated in the United States and Switzerland and took an A.B. from Wesleyan University at Middletown, Ct. in 1922 and his L.L.B. from Harvard in 1925.
Note of course, Catherine T., recently sworn in before the degree evenings at Suffolk, and a member of the Class of 1958, Law School's attractive young registrar, graduated.

Congratulations are extended in advance to those soon to be elected officers of the Student Bar Association for the coming school year.

Although the seniors may be crowded for time due to the coming Bar Exam, an evening of gaiety is planned for them by way of a banquet to be held in the early part of June.

Good Luck to the seniors who will be taking the Exam...

Note of Appreciation

The students of the Law School express their gratitude to the outgoing officers of the Bar Association. Particular thanks are accorded to Dean McDermott, who undertook the task of supervising the drafting of the Constitution of the Association, and to James Lalime, who will be remembered as the first President of the Student Bar Association of Suffolk University Law School.

The students offer congratulations to the newly elected officers and continued success to the outgoing Board of Governors.

Student Bar Association's Message

The academic year of 1959 and 1960 is swiftly coming to a conclusion. The memories experienced during it will always be remembered by the graduating class and carried in their hearts for many years to come. The accomplishments have been tremendous and the numerous "firsts" extensive. We have witnessed the establishment of the Student Bar Association; the acceptance into the American Law Student Association; our membership in the National Moot Court Competition; the participation of the student body in the varied social activities; and last, the publication of the first law school newspaper. Many wonderful "seeds" have been sown, and with your assistance and cultivation, these seeds will not fail upon rock to wither up and die, but will continue to grow, as they have in the past, through your ardent co-operation.

The office of President of the SBA has been held by me with the greatest of pleasure and incentive. The pleasure being the materialistic honor that accompanies a position of this nature; the humility is the spirit of this office. This in itself will give me great confidence and incentive for the future. I regret that I possess in writing this message is that it will be the last time I will address you from this office. My one desire is that you give the cooperation extended me to your newly elected President in the forthcoming year. It is through your endeavor alone, as the student body of Suffolk University Law School, that will promote the success of this organization.

James L. Lalime '60

Wig and Robe News

The annual Spring banquet of the Suffolk University Law School Wig & Robe Society, one of the oldest law school student groups in the nation, was held Tuesday, May 10, at 7 p.m., in the Casino Room of the Hotel Fenway in Boston. Senior Russell Mahoney of Chelsea, president, presided.

Dean Frederick McDermott left largely to rely upon their own initiative, and the student body, and particularly the Officers and Class Representatives, are to be congratulated upon their pioneering efforts.

Frederick A. McDermott
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Why Bar Exams Are Given

A bar examination is necessary to find out, as accurately as practicable, whether or not the applicant is now ready to practice law. Dean James E. Brenner of Stanford University, upon being asked,

"The primary objectives of a Bar Examination should be to test, as far as possible, ability to reason logically, to make an accurate legal analysis of the problems presented, and to demonstrate thorough knowledge of the law and their application. Bar Examinations should not be directed primarily to the purpose of testing information, memory or experience. The examiners try to draw the questions the answers to which will disclose, or at least cast light on, each applicant’s ability to analyze facts; to grasp the important issues of law and to apply those facts; to test the fields of law involved (unlike school examination questions care labels, indeed most of them could not be because they are not confined to a single field) to recognize the points on which the law is settled beyond argument and those on which there is still room for intelligent difference of opinion to reason intelligently; to use common sense; and to produce a well-organized statement that shows some ability to think and to express oneself like a lawyer.

The Questions

There are two written examinations a year, one in early July, the other in early December. Each is held on two days, each day divided into two three-hour sessions. The examinations are supervised by the Court, provide that the examinations be on some or all of these subjects: Negotiable Instruments Law and the Uniform Commercial Code in the July Bar Examination. There are twenty-four one-light on each examination. Following a pre-arranged schedule by which each of the board’s by three members, prepares questions, the examination will consist of four questions drafted by each of the other members. After the members have drafted their questions, each question is discussed and scrutinized by the entire board critically. Every examiner is made to eliminate ambiguity and to phrase the questions so that the applicant has a fair opportunity to answer the questions raised within the average thirty minutes of allotted time. Every question is a product of the board as a whole.

Taking the Examination

The board has made the following suggestions on the taking of the Bar Examination:

1. Think before you write. Read each question carefully. Understand the facts, and their necessary implications, thoroughly and accurately. Out line in your own mind the issues or problems; state to yourself your tentative conclusions; test each conclusion from the standpoint both of the law and of common-sense; and revise the necessary. Then decide on a logical, orderly, and convincing arrangement for the statement of your views. Until you have done all that you are not ready to write the answer.

2. Do not restate the facts. The examiners know what the facts are and you have no time to waste.

3. Do not state abstract or irrelevant propositions of law. It is generally undesirable to submit an answer with a legal proposition. If the proposition in applicable it will be more appropriate later in the answer, in order to indicate the reason for your conclusion. Although it is seldom necessary to state any applicable rule of law in full detail, make a sufficiently developed reference to it in the answer so that the examiner will not be left in doubt as to your knowledge of it and the propositions which make its application proper. Do not, by speculating on this case would have been if the facts had been different, nor in any other way, work into your answer any point of law which happen to be familiar, but which is not called for by the question. The examiners are not interested in knowing how many rules of law you have learned, but in the way you apply the applicable rules to the facts stated.

4. Discuss all the problems that are raised. A group of all the issues is essential. If there are, for example, three issues in a given question, a discussion of only one of them, no matter how masterly, if coupled with an omission to touch on the other two, could not result in full credit for that question. Express yourself clearly, and as a lawyer should. Write as legibly as possible. If you commit any of the following faults your risks of obscuring your own thought, of failing to demonstrate your ability, and of wasting your limited time. Avoid: ambiguous, meaningless, and rambling statements; verbosity, and long, involved sentences; undue repetition; flippancy, slang, and colloquialism.

The Marking of Answers

The members of the board, or are responsible for the correction of, the answers to the questions which are raised within them respectively. Since 1931 the board has had the assistance of a lawyer, appointed by the members, with the approval of the Supreme Judicial Court, at the recommendation of the justices, 579 Mass. 607, 613."

There is no such thing as an exactly correct answer to any bar examination question in the sense that any other phraseology or approach would be unacceptable, or "wrong". Each member of the board carefully prepares and furnishes to his reader or readers, a guide for the correction of the answers, which indicates the elements to be looked for in the answers to the questions which he drafted. The guide covers all the points in each question. Usually the member has his own idea of the law on each of those points; but (except in the absence in which the law is prescribed by a basic statute or settled by leading cases) the intelligent discussion of the guide leads the applicant to a different conclusion from the examiner’s conclusion and he nevertheless receive full credit.

On each question the maximum credit is 10 points, but the number of points on the 24 questions are reduced by the Bar Examination to 100. Each applicant is given a number, which appears on his answer book. No examiner or reader, while correcting any set of answers knows the name of the applicant; nor do the examiners themselves know, until the marking has been completed, which applicants have which numbers.

There is no "quota" of any kind, not in respect of number or proportion to pass, nor of place of residence, law school, sex, age, race, religion, or any other category. The bar examination passing mark has been set at 50%. Anyone who obtains that grade will be recommended for admission, unless some valid objection is made on character grounds.

In the case of every applicant whose first marking falls between 45% and 50%, all his answers are reread by the examiners or under their supervision. This practice results in the increase of a few marks to the passing grade."

Further Investigation

All candidates who have attained passing grades are investigated orally by at least one member of the board. The board inquires into such matters as criminal records, intention to practice or teach law, residency in Massachusetts, Communist affiliations, and the ability to speak English correctly or intelligibly. The purposes of the oral examination also include establishing a friendly contact with the lawyer-to-be, and the opportunity to extend to them a sort of official congratulation and welcome into the profession.

The information contained herein are extracts from "Bar Examination Procedure in Massachusetts" by Walter Powers, Chairman, Board of Bar Examiners, Boston Bar Journal, September 1957.

SENIOR CLASS ELECTS OFFICERS

The Class of ’60 recently held elections to select class officers. After a great deal of debate, nominations were given to a candidate for president. The voting commenced, and out of the smoke came the four class officers:

President — Gerard Doherty
Vice-President — Arisner Der
Treasurer — Richard Walsh
Secretary — Bruce K. Carpenter
CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AS A DETERRENT TO THE COMMISSION OF MURDER

Suffolk Law Reporter

The youthful Democrat, who was a teaching fellow in the department of gov­ernment at Harvard College in 1955 with the biggest vote ever given to a first-time candidate from Medford's 26th District!

The youthful Democrat, who was a teaching fellow in the department of govern­ment at Harvard College in 1955 with the biggest vote ever given to a first-time candidate from Medford's 26th District!

when there was an absolute necessity for producing some result. No one goes to certain inevitable death except by compulsion. Put the matter the other way. Was there ever a criminal who, when sentenced to death and brought out to die, would refuse to accept the punishment, knowing no other way of getting the severest secondary punishment? Surely not. Why is this? It can only be because 'All that is left to a free and rational being is the right to be -free, however terrible, there is hope; but death is death; its terrors cannot be described more forcibly.'

In general, the retentionists postulate the instinct for self-preservation or, conversely, the individual's fear of the loss of his life, as the single most important factor in the determination of human behavior. This fear is a complete and unshakable utilitarian continually engaged in a hedonistic calculus of the pleasures and pains of every action. If one could be induced to kill himself to life itself at all costs, cherishing it above all pains and pleasures, the existence of capital punishment, so the retentionists argue, clearly must be a deterrent to the commission of murder.

The utilitarian tion which underlies the retentionist theory of human nature and its relation to the death penalty is suggested by the death statistics from all over the world have pointed up the fact that a high proportion of murders are committed by persons who have been1

'restricted to its secondary aspect in an attempt to justify the conclusion of the capital penalty. Generally unrolling and under it to rest their case upon the basis that the death penalty is equitable and just because it can be shown to clearly prevent crime.

In marked contrast to the general weakening of the retributive aspect of punish­ment, the emphasis upon the rehabilitative objective of social punishment has steadily increased. It has been the critical test of any objective as to whether it can support the presence of the death penalty. While retribution in the retributive sense still plays an important part in intellectual theorizing about the objective and subjective theories have been pressed to the point of making an argument about the existence of the death penalty. Hence, the retentionists have buttressed their position considerably by ex­plaining why, if life is dear above all else, a soldier suddenly throws himself upon a hand grenade to shield his comrades from the explosion by sacrificing his own life. The same line of argument could be made while the normal individual will not be driven to such a course of action by his fear of the death penalty, there is a real want and a real fear of death among human beings which is strongly felt.

in its more positive, less vengeful expressions, retribution contended the social desire to censure or dissuade a particular act by a punishment roughly proportionate to the seriousness and nature of social protection and its objective as to whether it can support the presence of the death penalty. While retribution in the retributive sense still plays an important part in intellectual theorizing about the objective and subjective theories. Hence, the retentionists have buttressed their position considerably by ex­plaining why, if life is dear above all else, a soldier suddenly throws himself upon a hand grenade to shield his comrades from the explosion by sacrificing his own life. The same line of argument could be made while the normal individual will not be driven to such a course of action by his fear of the death penalty, there is a real want and a real fear of death among human beings which is strongly felt.

The deterrent argument which law enforcement officials raise on the basis of their experience with violent crime is generally covered by abolitionists in their arguments against the ground generally covered by abolitionists in their arguments against the existence of the death penalty. In this article, however, I do not propose to retain the familiar

In attempting to maintain this burden of proof which the dialectics of their posi­tion has established, the retentionists have been forced to rely primarily on the deterrence aspect of the death penalty in order to justify the continuous existence of the capital penalty. Generally unrolling and under it to rest their case upon the basis that the death penalty is equitable and just because it can be shown to clearly prevent crime.
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Capital Punishment

(Continued from page 4)

ly analyzed personal experiences. On the crucial question of the statistics of deterrence, it is not without major significance that the British Royal Commission on Capital Punishment, which from 1949 to 1953 made the most comprehensive and searching inquiry into this subject which has ever been made, reached the conclusion that the incidence of murder was not dependent upon the presence or the absence of capital punishment, but seemed to be affected by other factors completely unrelated to capital punishment.

While the deterrence argument which occupies such a crucial point in the whole retributionist position cannot be scientifically substantiated, either by reliance on statistics or other carelessly analyzed empirical data, it is not to be expected that many determined retributionists can be dissuaded from the continuing advocacy of the retributionist cause. For the deterrence argument has become a social myth, conveniently used to mask or conceal other less popular arguments about the objectives of social punishment or unconsciously serving to satisfy basic, unemotional needs in particular individuals or groups of individuals. As a social myth, it has transcended reason, logic, and science itself and acquired an independent validity all its own. Its continued existence no longer depends, therefore, upon any claim it might make to truth or objective reality. It persists and will continue to persist, regardless of its demonstrable falsities, because it is an elaborate argumentative superstructure firmly rooted in utilitarianism, it is supremely useful, lending a significant measure of social acceptability to what would otherwise in this day and age be socially unacceptable — the unqualified expression of the desire for vengeance and the urge to punish.

A Suggested Placement Service

After overcoming such obstacles as graduation and a bar examination, the goal of the vast majority of present-day law students is to find employment in the legal profession. It is with this goal in mind, and the intention of making its achievement less difficult, that the S.R.A. has undertaken to establish a legal placement service in conjunction with the already existing placement service of Suffolk University.

Present operating procedures of the undergraduate placement service require the registration of any student seeking employment by his filing with the employment bureau the following information: 1) a photo, 2) an employment form and progress sheet, 3) a personal data sheet, 4) recommendations from two professors, 5) academic transcript of grades.

Such information will serve as a reference file for preliminary screening purposes, as well as source material for recommendations. It is further hoped that the applicant will receive individual job counselling, in order to obtain a job suitable to his abilities and interests.

Another service of the intended placement bureau will be to obtain any and all information which might be helpful to the forthcoming graduates of the law school. By making such information easily accessible to the student, many opportunities, heretofore unknown, would be brought to the attention of the employment seeking law student. An example of this function is the recent letter received by the S.R.A. from the American Law Student Association. The letter stated that any law student who desires might receive the publication of this association entitled, 1960 Federal Government Job Opportunities For Young Attorneys, by sending twenty-five cents to A.L.S.A., American Bar Center, 1155 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois. At present, it is necessary for each individual student to send for such information on his own, but it is hoped that in the not too distant future this function will be assumed by the Placement Bureau of the S.R.A.
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MOOT COURT IN ACTION — at the "Trial of Jacob Drucker," senior Bruce Carpenter, attorney for the defense, argues his case. At Carpenter's immediate left, seated, is Elaine Cross; Oussiam Alaoulte from Morocco, the Volunteer della Libertà from Italy.

The preceding pages give some slight indication as to both the wide breath of authorities may find valid criticism for this new form of national power, nevertheless, it is pertinent to the question under inquiry, the witness has a constitutional right to answer any and all questions directed to him by the committee. It is well established by both judicial decision and expressly set out in section 192 that a witness need answer only those questions pertinent to the question under inquiry by the committee. In order to judge whether a particular question directed by the committee to the witness is pertinent to the question under inquiry, the witness has a constitutional right to know the purpose under investigation. Either House in creating a particular committee must set forth with reasonable certainty the purposes that the committee is to inquire into. Hence, the uncertainty of the committee's scope may well be a ground of attack on the basis of unconstitutionality. The witness may also inquire as of right, from time to time, while before the committee of the relation that a particular question has to the purpose under inquiry by that committee. U. S. v. Rounse, 345 U. S. 41. In the Rounse case the Supreme Court asserted that a committee may not ask a question outside the scope of the resolution creating that committee. There the committee was created to investigate lobbying activities asked of the witness a question regarding the publication of books. The Court pointed out that, although Congress had power to make the inquiry, it might be deemed improper and the conviction for failure to answer was overturned. And in 336 F. 2d 791, the court said in substance that if the committee has no authority to ask the question because it is outside the scope of the committee's purpose, even if Congress subsequently tries to cure the defect by amendment, one who refused to answer a question before Congress amended the purpose of the committee would be guilty of nothing. If the scope is enlarged, the question must be asked again at another committee session. The court said in substance that if the committee has no authority to ask the question because it is outside the scope of the committee's purpose, even if Congress subsequently tries to cure the defect by amendment, one who refused to answer a question before Congress amended the purpose of the committee would be guilty of nothing. If the scope is enlarged, the question must be asked again at another committee session.

The preceding pages give some slight indication as to both the wide breath of matters discussed. Not only should he consider whether a committee has the constitutional right to ask the question because it is outside the scope of the committee's purpose, even if Congress subsequently tries to cure the defect by amendment, one who refused to answer a question before Congress amended the purpose of the committee would be guilty of nothing. If the scope is enlarged, the question must be asked again at another committee session. The court said in substance that if the committee has no authority to ask the question because it is outside the scope of the committee's purpose, even if Congress subsequently tries to cure the defect by amendment, one who refused to answer a question before Congress amended the purpose of the committee would be guilty of nothing. If the scope is enlarged, the question must be asked again at another committee session.
Bill has the distinction of being Al, as he is called by his classmates, resides in Evening Division, an academy. Bill is still on active duty with the Navy as a Reserve Fleet. During his naval career he has served the USS Alcon in both the Atlantic and Pacific areas in various capacities - from ensign gunnery officer of a cruiser (Marblehead CL12) to commanding officer of his own ship. 

Evening law students are a heterogeneous group; they include public officials, civil servants, accountants, insurance adjusters, engineers, druggists, bankers, salesmen, teachers, and others. All have different reasons for studying the law, for is it not true that the future attorney requires time, study and sacrifices. All hope to become successful, practicing attorneys. All realize that they will have to dedicate a sincere endeavor. We all recognize the limitations of time and abilities; the call is for active membership by all students who are willing to sacrifice their time to launch a precedent in our law school community. Your contributions will serve both our school and your legal training in general. Let’s meet the challenge of success!

If you enjoy tackling an issue of law and reporting on it, if you want to enter most court competition, if you have an idea on oratory or student government, if you have any good thoughts which could find some expression through the machinery of SBA, please don’t hesitate to speak with any of our Board of Governors, see your elected representatives and make your desires known. This pioneer edition is the result of your classroom efforts. It is your volunteer their time and energies to launch a precedent in our law school community. Your contributions will serve both our school and your legal training in general.

If you are a Suffolk Law student, you must not think that the future attorney will be engaged in various types of work. The “typical” evening law student is in his middle to late twenties, married with two children, a college graduate, and a white collar worker. Although differing in background and employment, the students have a great deal in common. All have an insatiable thirst for knowledge of the law. All have volunteered their time and energies to launch a precedent in our law school community. You contributions will serve both our school and your legal training in general. Let’s meet the challenge of success!

Sketches of two evening students:

Frederick W. Kinley, as he is called by his classmates, resides in Marblehead with his wife and two children. In 1930 he was graduated from Harvard High School, and in 1933 from the U. S. Naval Academy. Bill is still on active duty with the Navy as a Commander attached to the Boston Group Atlantic Reserve Fleet. During his naval career he has served in the Atlantic and Pacific areas in various capacities - from ensign gunnery officer of a cruiser (Marblehead CL12) to commanding officer of his own ship, the USS Alcon AK 29. Bill has the distinction of being the only officer in the Navy today who was present at Tsingtao, China in 1931 at the commencement of the Japanese occupation and was present when the Japanese occupation forces surrendered in 1945. Bill plans to practice law when he retires from active duty.

Alexander J. Cella, a bachelor from Medford, is serving his second term as State Representative to the General Court. In 1943 he was graduated from Medford High School, in 1951 from Harvard College and in 1953 received a master’s degree in Public Administration from Harvard. Except for his thesis, Al has completed the requirements for a doctorate degree. From 1953 to 1956 he was a Teaching Fellow at Harvard. Al plans to practice law in his community. A interesting article on capital punishment may be found on pages 4 and 5.

George - and the S. B. A.

As you read this publication, you, a Suffolk Law student, may be seized with a spontaneous urge to contribute your talents to activities sponsored by the Student Bar Association. More realistically, however, the legal scholar’s acquired reticence to make commitments has a tendency to extinguish the spark. This article has the object of attacking this hesitancy and its natural by-product, apathy.

To live long enough to build and enjoy a second career is the keynot of evening law students, who, for four years, attend classes three nights a week, three hours a night; studies on Saturdays; and must maintain full time employment. Sundays are usually spent “reconquering” their classrooms after days of work, classes and study, but time being so precious even these hours are budgeted. 

Perseverance is the keynot of evening law students, who, for four years, attend classes three nights a week, three hours a night; studies on Saturdays; and must maintain full time employment. Sundays are usually spent “reconquering” their classrooms after days of work, classes and study, but time being so precious even these hours are budgeted.

In the future attorney, there is a type of student who is more interested in his studies than in the day to day law school activities. He is interested in studying law, for he is not true that the future attorney will be engaged in various types of work. The “typical” evening law student is in his middle to late twenties, married with two children, a college graduate, and a white collar worker. Although differing in background and employment, the students have a great deal in common. All have an insatiable thirst for knowledge of the law. All have volunteered their time and energies to launch a precedent in our law school community. Your contributions will serve both our school and your legal training in general. Let’s meet the challenge of success!

Sketches of two evening students:

Frederick W. Kinley, as he is called by his classmates, resides in Marblehead with his wife and two children. In 1930 he was graduated from Marblehead High School, and in 1933 from the U. S. Naval Academy. Bill is still on active duty with the Navy as a Commander attached to the Boston Group Atlantic Reserve Fleet. During his naval career he has served in the Atlantic and Pacific areas in various capacities - from ensign gunnery officer of a cruiser (Marblehead CL12) to commanding officer of his own ship, the USS Alcon AK 29. Bill has the distinction of being the only officer in the Navy today who was present at Tsingtao, China in 1931 at the commencement of the Japanese occupation and was present when the Japanese occupation forces surrendered in 1945. Bill plans to practice law when he retires from active duty.

Alexander J. Cella, a bachelor from Medford, is serving his second term as State Representative to the General Court. In 1943 he was graduated from Medford High School, in 1951 from Harvard College and in 1953 received a master’s degree in Public Administration from Harvard. Except for his thesis, Al has completed the requirements for a doctorate degree. From 1953 to 1956 he was a Teaching Fellow at Harvard. Al plans to practice law in his community. A interesting article on capital punishment may be found on pages 4 and 5.