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Death Penalty Debate Pits National Figures

By Doug Sachs
Editor-in-Chief

The moment before a killer strikes is the time the death penalty serves its function as a deterrent, according to advocate Ernest van den Haag.

Prof. van den Haag, a distinguished scholar with the Heritage Foundation, made his remarks during a debate Feb. 26 against Hugo Bedau, a Tufts Law School professor and a leading opponent of the death penalty.

The Federalist Society and the National Lawyers Guild co-sponsored the event, which pitted two of the nation's leading proponents from opposite sides of the death penalty issue.

Dr. van den Haag argued that studies have demonstrated a reduction in the number of murders in states within a year of a public execution. He stressed the need for the death penalty as a way of preventing murder in America.

"It is remarkably immoral for the law to promise prospective murderers that what they are about to do will never be done to them," van den Haag said. "That would be an incentive we would hold out to murderers."

Bedau argued against the deterrent effect of the death penalty, as well as pointing out the flaws in several other justifications for capital punishment.

"The burden of proof (for the death penalty)," according to Bedau, "is on those who favor it. The presumption is against capital punishment."

The deterrent argument fails, said Bedau, when he points out that, just as the death penalty may be a marginally greater deterrent to murder than life in prison, he could demonstrate that torture is a marginally greater deterrent to murder than the death penalty.

"It's always open for someone to up the ante," he said.

Small seduced students into bidding on a singing telegram, in complete Elvis costume, with impromptu performances of "Love Me Tender" and "Are You Lonesome Tonight?" both of which brought the house down. He sold two singing telegrams for $65 each.

As usual, meals with faculty members proved to be brisk sellers, with dinner for six at Prof. Frank Upham's home, co-hosted by Prof. Phyllis Goldfarb going to a high bid of $225. A Chinese dinner for four, homemade by Prof. Charles "Buzzy" Baron and co-hosted by Prof. Mark Spiegel sold for $150 and dinner for four with professor and former dean Richard Huber went for $140.

Another traditional item, a Boston College Law School chair, which retails for $235, sold for a whopping $335.

Among the more unusual items were an Instant Gratification basket, which included edible body paint, wine, glasses, chocolate and flowers (it sold for $95) and a day of domestic servitude, donated by 2L Joanne O'Sullivan, which sold for $100.

But certainly the most valuable item auctioned was a date with The A/ledger's very own man of mystery, Nick Danger. Second-year Rina Mayman paid $60 for the chance to spend a romantic evening with the most wanted man on campus, on the condition she keep his identity strictly confidential.

"Nick Danger wrote about me," Mayman said, "so I had to meet him face-to-face. Also, it's for a good cause."

When he learned of Mayman's motivation for staying in the bidding, Danger reportedly said, "I hope she's not mad at me or anything."
From the Editor's Desk
CBS Screws Up Olympic Coverage
By Larry Friedman
Senior Editor

On the final day of the Winter Olympics, one of the CBS commentators said that she noticed a decreased emphasis on nationalism in the sixteenth winter games. A somewhat ironic statement considering that CBS declined to broadcast many athletes who weren't American, or events where Americans didn't have a chance of medaling. It seems as though there were actually two Olympics: the games in Albertville, and the version CBS presented to America. To just look at the CBS version, however, would be to think that the only two Olympic sports were figure skating and ice hockey.

Of course, there were exceptions; unfortunately, those exceptions were devoted to athletes' extracurricular, rather than sporting, activities. Alberto Tomba is the prime example: CBS felt compelled to show us quite a bit more of the Italian skier's social life than we really wanted to see. That commentary by Sylvester Stallone on Tomba's potential acting ability was especially insightful. And thank goodness Katerina Witt was on hand with her own personal message for Tomba; I know I just wasn't getting enough of her in those endless Diet Coke commercials.

CBS also went into detail about Japanese figure skater Midori Ito. All well and good, but one can't help but wonder if the attempt to humanize Ito, Yuko Tate, and three other of the Japanese competitors is to do a disservice to them and America.

American athletes were not spared the insipid prodings and probings of CBS reporters; what did they say to speed skater Dan Jansen was unforgivable. Why not just leave the guy alone? CBS also overserved American viewers on the few American winners. How many of us were really interested in what Bonnie Blair's family ate for dinner every night?

The Olympics that America saw were especially disappointing when we realize that every time CBS showed us another so-called human interest story, somewhere an actual Olympic event was taking place. Sure, it may have been something like the biathlon or curling, or another event alien to North Americans; but isn't the spirit of the games? Would we really rather see an unforseeable-looking Tim McCarver try to get excited about a piece on ice sculpture?

The next Winter Olympics are in 1994, in Lillehammer, Norway, and CBS will once again be providing American coverage. Let's hope that they will have learned from this experience and presented a more balanced program, not forgetting that jingoistic nationalism can be set aside, at least for two weeks, and that the events themselves (not the human interest sideshows) are why we watch.

Women's Law Center Sponsors March on Washington
By Katie D'Urso
Co-Chair Women's Law Center

On April 5, 1992, in Washington D.C., thousands of women and men from across the country are gathering for what promises to be an historic march for women's rights. The declaration of the march, "We Won't Go Back! We Will Fight Back!" calls for an end to the attacks on abortion rights, all civil rights as well as progress towards reproductive freedom for all women. The Women's Law Center is mobilizing to send a delegation dedicated to Women's voices to the march. If you support reproductive freedom and women's rights this is an opportunity that you do not want to miss.

There are four reasons why you should join us in Washington on Sunday, April 5, 1992. The first reason is anger at the under representation of women in the American political system. The second reason is to show our support of the U.S. Senate and seven percent of the U.S. House of Representatives. The result of this lack of representation is that during the Clarence Thomas confirmation hearings women's voices were ignored and trivialized. If you were angered by the Thomas confirmation hearings this is your chance to show your anger.

The second reason is that abortion rights are in jeopardy. The Supreme Court, through its Webster and Rust decisions has been vacillating between abortion rights and without really overruling Roe v. Wade. This April the Supreme Court will have the opportunity to further erode abortion rights when it reviews an extremely restrictive Pennsylvania anti-abortion law.

If the Supreme Court decides to punt the abortion rights issue into the hands of the state, even Massachusetts is in jeopardy of losing its pro-abortion rights status. The Massachusetts Legislature and the Judicial Court are pro-choice by only one vote and its members are aging. The Massachusetts Senate is pro-choice by only one vote as well. The Massachusetts House of Representatives is anti-choice by a vote of two to one. We need federal laws, not Supreme Court decisions and state laws, to protect women's rights. Your presence at this march-which is a step toward equality for women- will present a forceful message to those seeking election.

The third reason is that it will be an incredibly unifying and empowering experience. Megan Gates Koderia, IL, described the 1989 march for women's lives as a memorable and powerful experience. "It was wonderful to see people of all ages and from all walks of life marching to support the common cause of women's equality," she explained.

This year's march on Washington promises to be the largest march for women's lives in history.

Fourth and finally, the Women's Law Center has made it easy to get there. All you have to do is buy a bus ticket and your own transportation to Washington D.C. and join the B.C. Law School delegation. The bus tickets will be available for the next few weeks in the snack bar or by contacting the Women's Law Center.

The bus will leave from the Newton campus on Saturday evening, April 4 and will return to Newton on Sunday night at 2 am. The time is right both politically and socially, this could be a once in a lifetime experience. So, whatever you do, don't miss this opportunity to register your support for abortion rights and women's equality.

Capital Gains Tax Cut: Economic Jolt or Reward for Rich?
By Chris Hurley

Will a capital gains tax cut stimulate the economy, create jobs and boost the country's competitiveness? Or will it merely benefit the rich and widen our already staggering budget deficit? It is difficult, if not impossible, to get answers to these questions by listening to our political leaders. Partisan blowhards like Newt Gingrich (proponent) and Dick Gephart (opponent) caricature capital gains tax cut proposals as either a panacea or a parasitic占用. By turning the issue into a political football, the politicians have prevented any substantive debate from taking place.

Despite this shell game in Congress, a meaningful debate among business leaders and academics illuminating several key points on both sides of the equation. Critics claim that a capital gains tax cut benefits the upper income taxpayers more than lower income taxpayers---and they are right. Almost 70 percent of the president's proposed tax break would go to those who make over $100,000 a year. Taxpayers with incomes of at least $20,000 would get an average break of $5,478, while those making between $30,000-$40,000 would pay $297 less. Opponents say this disparity in tax benefits is simply unfair.

Proponents acknowledge that the rich benefit more from the cut in the capital gains rate in the short-term, but argue that the long-term results from the tax cut, an expanded economy, increased employment, and increased competitiveness, benefit rich and poor alike. Besides, they argue, all tax cuts benefit the rich more than the poor—that is the nature of the beast.

The proponents point out that more than 10 million taxpayers report some capital gains in any given year and the 66 percent of the gains, from taxpayers earning less than $50,000. Thus, while the capital gains tax cut benefits the rich more than the poor, it does not benefit only the rich.

Proponents of a capital gains tax cut claim that the cut will produce the following economic benefits: 1) A lower cost of capital for corporations; 2) Increased use and reliance on debt financing by corporations; 3) Greater availability of venture capital to assist emerging companies and technologies; 4) A longer-term perspective for both investors and managers; and 5) Increased revenue for the Treasury.

Proponents argue that a cut in the capital gains tax rate is an essential step in making the United States more competitive in today's global economy. Investment in plant, equipment, and research and development (R&D) is crucial to global competitiveness. By making equity investments more attractive, a capital gains tax cut encourages investors to put more money into stocks. The tax cut thus encourages investment—i.e., it increases the supply of loanable funds. This increase reduces the cost of capital, making it cheaper for corporations to acquire new plant and equipment and the engage in R&D.

Proponents buttress their argument by pointing out that Japan and Germany, who have enviable levels of savings and investment, have much lower capital gains tax rates than the United States. Critics charge that a capital gains cut is an obstacle and ineffective way to encourage...
of debt financing. The current high capital have to compensate investors for lost yield by corporations.

Proponents also claim that a cut in capital gains taxes encourages corporations to use more equity financing in lieu of interest payments on debt. Good because corporations can deduct their tax is necessary to counteract the current bias in the tax code toward debt financing... gains. In comparison, debt financing looks more efficient and direct ways of encouraging capital investment without providing a windfall to the rich.

But opponents argue that the current bias toward debt can be cured more efficiently by making dividend payments deductible or by removing the deductibility of interest payments on debt. Not only does a tax cut on capital gains reduce firms’ cost of capital, say advocates, it increases liquidity and movement of capital to its most productive uses. New firms, which do not have access to bank credit or commercial paper, would find it easier to get venture capital by selling new stock issues. New companies provide the jobs of tomorrow, and the capital they need to grow and prosper. With so many U.S. industries maturing and in decline, these emerging industries are more important than ever to our economic future.

Proponents also argue that a capital gains tax cut will encourage investors and managers to take a long-term view of their business. Professor Robert B. Reich of Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government suggests a much lower capital gains rate for investors holding assets for more than six years. President Bush’s current proposal similarly taxes assets held three or more years at a lower rate (15.4 percent) than those held one year (28.8 percent). These lower capital gains rates reward investors for buying and holding their shares. Because investors will hold their shares longer, managers can stop focusing exclusively on short-term profits and instead concentrate on long-term economic well-being. Unlike our current system, managers will not be afraid to lose money this quarter if necessary to ensure future competitiveness.

Linking capital gains rates to holding periods is a controversial topic among capital gains tax cut proponents. The “purists,” who oppose any holding period requirements, believe that capital gains should receive the same preferential tax treatment regardless of whether the asset is held for six months or six years. The purists claim that holding periods will greatly impair the mobility of capital—thus defeating the raison d’être for the cut. They claim that far from supporting “patient capital” in emerging companies, the holding periods will force rational investors to favor existing, proven companies since they will be stuck with the company for the length of the holding period.

Opponents of a capital gains tax cut dismis the long-term investment horizon argument as ludicrous. They claim that any fixed holding period requirement is arbitrary and will likely be mismatched with the ideal holding period for a particular company. They say the ideal holding period for stock should vary with the time horizon necessary to complete each corporation’s particular project. Because the projects will vary greatly depending upon the industry and nature of the project, a fixed holding period may actually shorten investors’ time horizons. If, for example, a corporation had a 10-year R&D project, the President’s proposed three-year holding period would provide investors with an overwhelming incentive to sell after the third year. Without the capital gains tax preference, investors may very well hold the stock for the entire 10-year period.

Finally, proponents argue that a capital gains tax cut will actually increase tax revenue for the Treasury. They claim that a reduction in the tax on capital gains encourages more sales of assets which will result in more tax revenues. Opponents blast this argument as discredited supply-side Reagonomics. They insist that a cut in the capital gains tax will reduce revenue and only widen the budget deficit.

With regard to the effect of a capital gain....
Danger Announces Campaign Platform

By Bradford Babbitt

The following is intended as satiric humor meant to please and entertain. The fact that it is based on reality makes it all the more terrifying.

Times are tough. Money is tight. Jobs are scarce. But fear not, in the immortal words of Dean Dan, "The Law School has always prospered."

And prosper it will, with the new improved tuition rate. It's bigger, larger, greater, faster and higher than you, or your loan officer, could ever imagine! And best of all, just because you're attending this school, its all yours! (Unless of course you are in the class of '92, in which case you can take all your loans, now totalling enough to buy a modest condo in Newtonville, and get out. Thank you for paying.)

Our new tuition rate follows in a long tradition of Boston College Law School Tuition rates by being completely removed from reality. You and I paid an average of 3.1% more for our spaghetti, beer and condoms. Surprisingly, that is the rate of inflation for everybody in the United States during 1991. Everybody, that is, except Boston College Law School. Inflation in the fiscal twilight zone of the law school ran at 6.5% for 1991, more than double that of reality. From the way prices went up in B.C. Laws marketplace, I suspect they shop at the same place the Pentagon gets their $750 toilet seats. Tradition seems to require inexplicable increases, as last year's increase was an astounding 8.5% while inflation in the real world ran at 5.4%. At least these egregious increases are consistent. You know how consistency is important to lawyers.

This year the bad news came with the congratulations of the Administration that we were the lucky recipients of the lowest Tuition Increase in ten years. Don't you feel excited? Did you find a parking space? Then, back on the campus in Newton where you can never find a parking space, Dean Dan and Dean ("No, I am not named after a figure skating jump.") put together a little Law School wish list. Essentially, they play a giant fiscal game of Monopoly-May-I with real dollars; your dollars which you got from some Bank in return for a staggering amount of dollars you have yet to earn from your job which you have yet to...have.

In the end, the Law School spends whatever permitted by the bureaucracy on the Main campus. Sometimes the Law School is given back as much as the law schools gave the main campus. Usually it's not. The Main Campus Machine justifies this by pointing out that every once in a while they do some great capital improvement to the place—like putting up the picture in room 315—so they are entitled to keep our money to themselves. They also use this explanation when asked why the deal bulbs in the library take three months to change. Consistency, you know. So there you have it. Fiscal nightmare in a nutshell. There must be a silver lining to it, perhaps. It is this: law school is only three years. So grab your ankles and kiss your wallet goodbye—glad in the knowledge that they can only raise your tuition twice!
Wayne: The Review

By Mike Klein

It's easy to fill a four-minute skit on Saturday Night Live with jokes about burling, splinctor, and excellent bibles. Those skits even attract loyal followers, known to their friends to yell "Wayne's World! Wayne's World!" down the hallway. Wayne and Garth parody the rampant adsutery of the 1980s, an era that they themselves came of age in. Wayne, the singer for a heavy-metal band (the most excellent Tia Carrere), Lowe tries to steal her away, and Garth falls down a lot. Wayne falls in love with Cassandra, the lead singer for a heavy-metal band. She introduces Kafka to her com­petitors, a group of pseudo-intellectual revolutionaries bent on toppling the government. It turns out Rabin was summoned to the castle, but never made it. Rabin and her friends believe it was the authori­ties who did him in, but Kafka doesn't buy it, writing it off as "too convenient." At this point he is unable to envisage law and order as the enemy, yet. But when Rossman also disappears, Kafka becomes even more de­termined to solve the mystery of why Rabin was summoned to the castle. Searching through endless records, and remaining unbowed despite bureaucratic obstacles, Kafka be­gins to piece the puzzle together. The au­thorities, however, are also aware of what is going on, and an attempt is made on Kafka's life. He takes it upon himself to complete the task Rabin set out to do, deliver a bomb to the castle. Stealing through a graveyard whose headstones are a jumbled mass of color, and the evil doctor Murnau (Ian Holm) lures Kafka into his lair. There he shows Kafka his grand scheme to examine the inner workings of the human mind so that he can recondition the "faceless masses." In a recognition of Kafka's brilliance as a modernist, Murnau attempts to convince him of the necessity of making a better worker in order to bring about the progress and indus­trialization society craves. Kafka, however, is horrified by the complete subversion and destruction of the individual. Kafka returns to work the next day hop­ing that something will be different. Unfortunately, AleGuinness is still there, pasty faced, and bloated; nothing has changed, the state is still that indomitably monolithic, everready to swallow the common man. Setting off the bomb has accomplished nothing, because the gears of the machine continue turning and the cogs are replace­able. Kafka has undergone a metamorphosis within himself, realizing the he is part of this world and cannot escape it, and as part of this world he chose to learn the truth, rather than live in ignorance.

Soderbergh's depiction of Kafka in his own enigmatic world is a cleverly stylistic approach, to Kafka's development into one of the great modernists of the 20th century, similar to Cronenberg's interpretation of William S. Burroughs' Naked Lunch. It is an interesting and darkly entertaining film for readers and non-readers of Kafka alike. Unlike some films in which a back­ground in the subject is a necessity, Soderbergh is able to reproduce and reduce that Kafkaesque feeling and recreate the night­mares that Kafka may have envisioned in his own works.

The irreverent adolescent attitude of Wayne and Garth carries over from their Saturday Night Live appearances, and the audience is invited to come along. There are plenty of parodies to the audience, well­ing the viewers to join each "NOT!" and "Noway...WAY!" There is even some high brow stuff, including an extended conversation in Cantones (with subtitles) between Wayne and Cassandra. Given their own TV show, Wayne and Garth make fun of their hometown. Given their own movie, they target all of Hollywood and high-tech entertainment. Wayne and Garth parody the rampant sponsor-plugging in recent movies by munching Doritos, drinking Diet Pepsi, and eating a Pizza Hut slice while staring at the camera. The "gratuitous sex scene" is clearly labeled. And arcade games present the eternal question: what's the difference between Pacman and Ms. Pacman, really?

Hellilbeer, this movie is worthy, Wayne's World not only won't make ya hurt, it'll make ya laugh.
Inside the LSA

Law Student's Association Offers Variety of Events

By Bob Goldstein

The Law Student's Association has been extremely busy this year addressing student concerns, planning social events, maintaining cohesiveness with the administration, and promoting a healthy environment at BCLS. Our fall and winter have been extremely successful and we plan to continue to make improvements throughout the spring.

At the beginning of the school year we reorganized and improved our book coop. More books than ever before were bought and sold through our office. We tried to make the process easier and it seems to have worked. Even old editions of books that were not picked up by their owners have been put to good use—they have been donated to the prisoners in the Dedham Jail for their reading pleasure. By the way, many of you still have checks that you have not yet picked up—come in to the office and get them!

In addition to Bar Review throughout the year, we have sponsored some incredibly successful social events including the Halloween bash, the holiday party, Inter-School seating at the BC-Miami football game. The best may be yet to come, however. Opening day at the Red Sox is just around the corner (hopefully Roger will be with the organization by then) and Field Day, the mother of all social events, will take place in early May.

Although it has taken quite a while, the Quonset Hut is fully open—finally basketball can be played without having to worry about chunks of plaster falling from the ceiling. The LSA sponsored hoops leagues are now in full swing, following the extremely successful softball season. Open times to use the facility are posted throughout the school—we managed to set aside quite a few hours for law school use so hop on the rowing machines as much as possible.

Many of you may have noticed continued improvements in the physical plant of the school. We have been working closely with Steven McGrath of Buildings and Grounds, as well as the administration to improve the look and feel of the law school. Fresh paint has been applied in many areas, the ventilation systems in the bathrooms beneath the library have been repaired, and new carpeting and furniture will be installed in the lounge within a few weeks, among other improvements. More importantly, soon there will be much improved handicapped access to all facilities and long-term problems are currently being addressed. Mr. McGrath and the deans have been extremely receptive to our suggestions and efforts to improve the physical environment. Plans for constructing graduate student apartments and improving the east wing of the law school are well under way, though presently there is no set timetable. With many concerns about future employment and the economic climate, we have been working closely with the placement office to help alleviate anxieties, provide alternatives where they are desired, and make the recruiting experience much more enjoyable. Because this is a difficult process which requires us to determine important concerns of the student body, please make sure you inform us as to what types of programs are of interest.

Working with the administration to help clarify and improve school policies, grading procedures, and scheduling have been a major focus throughout the year. Dean Coquilette has been extremely receptive to our complaints regarding timeliness of grading and has significantly improved the situation. The administration has included us in discussions regarding school policies and we are working together to make all improvements necessary to maintain the excellence, both academically and socially, of BCLS, and to move continually forward.

We are presently working on a student survey of courses and professors. Although it is in the beginning stages, it will be completed by the end of the spring semester, so that the evaluations may be used to help select classes for the 1992-93 year. Any suggestions or comments would be appreciated and should be addressed to Don Camara.

Finally, graduation plans are taking shape nicely, thanks to some hard work by our third year representatives. A plethora of exciting and interesting events have been planned and an excellent speaker will address the graduating class at the ceremony. If anyone has suggestions for graduation events, please drop by the office at any time, or see Tony Rozzotti, Dane Dudley or April Pancella.
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DEATH, from p. 1

sion, only six members of the group reportedly have committed additional murders and four have been found not guilty, he said.

"Now, we could have prevented those six murders by killing all members of that group, but the cost would have been at least four innocent lives," Bedau said. Bedau also attacked the "justice" argument, criticizing the "eye-for-an-eye" rationale for the death penalty.

The concept of the punishment fitting the crime may be justifiable in a broad, philosophical discussion, Bedau said, but not as a public policy decision among lawmakers and officers of the court.

He pointed out that such an imitative method for determining punishment cannot be applied across the board. A rapist, he said, cannot be sentenced to be raped, nor could Jeffrey Dahmer be sentenced to have his body eaten by humans.

"Who's going to do the eating?" he asked.

According to Bedau, death penalty advocates cannot justify their position on a purely economic argument, either. The cost of appeals by prisoners sentenced to death actually exceeds the cost of maintaining an inmate for life, he said.

Finally, Bedau mentioned the public opinion argument, conceding that opinion polls overwhelmingly demonstrate support for capital punishment in some parts of the country. However, Bedau pointed to Gallup polls which indicate that if asked if they prefer life in prison with no parole plus mandatory contribution to a victim's relieffund over capital punishment, the vast majority of death penalty supporters said "Yes."

van den Haag responded by first pointing out the constitutional basis for the death penalty. He noted that the 5th Amendment states that no one can be deprived of life without due process of law. That means that people must be subject to the death penalty with due process, he said.

Also, the 6th Amendment forbids cruel and unusual punishment, van den Haag said. While the death penalty may be cruel, he noted the amendment says cruel and unusual punishment. The framers desired to prohibit the introduction of new cruel punishments, he said, and not to eliminate the death penalty, which was well known at the time of the Constitution.

van den Haag responded to Bedau's cost analysis by noting that part of the reason death penalty appeals cost so much relates to the judicial system's opposition to capital punishment.

In New Jersey, for example, the state's supreme court rejected 27 out of 28 death penalty sentences it reviewed recently, van den Haag said. Judges, he said, oppose the death penalty because they are rarely victims of murder. Most victims of murder, van den Haag said, are poor blacks living in housing projects.

van den Haag also defended the eye-for-an-eye justification for the death penalty.

PILF Releases Summer Stipend Applications

By Doug Sachs

The PILF stipend applications are now available at the law school library, and must be completed by March 27, said Review Committee Chairperson Denise Chicoine.

Last year, PILF awarded 45 summer stipends ranging from $500 to $1,500, Chicoine said. During the first week the applications were available this year, more than 250 had been picked up, she said.

The applications first became available at a meeting Feb. 27, which featured presentations from the district attorney's office, the attorney general's office and the Disability Law Center, all agencies which qualify for PILF funding, Chicoine said.

The applications ask students to describe the position they hope to hold this summer, along with why they are interested in the public interest, their involvement in and outside the B.C. Law community and how their summer position will help satisfy an unmet legal need, she said.

Students do not need to have a firm offer by the time they turn in the applications, Chicoine said, but they should have at least interviewed with the agency. Also at the Feb. 27 meeting, Graduate and Law School Financial Aid Director Lindsay Carlisle addressed the issue of using PILF stipends to satisfy the employer contribution requirement for summer work study.

Approximately 125 federal grants, each worth $3,400, will be available to qualified students this summer, Carlisle said in a recent interview. The federal government requires the employing public interest agency to contribute approximately 40 percent, or about $1,300, she said.

At the meeting, Carlisle said the financial aid office had no set policy concerning the use of PILF funding to satisfy the employer contribution requirement, Chicoine said. However, such a policy should be in place by the end of March, she said.

Students with questions concerning the PILF stipend program should contact 3L Julia Thompson.

FREE PERSONALS!

Express your desires in 25 words or less and submit them to the Alledger Box no later than Thursday March 19 at 5:00 p.m. Include your name and year (which will be kept strictly confidential) plus $1.00 for distribution of letters received.

The Alledger will assign a box number to all submissions and publish them March 27.

To respond: Simply drop a sealed envelope, with the Box number you desire clearly written on the outside, in the Alledger box, and let cupid do the rest! There is no cost to respond to an ad.
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MASSACHUSETTS BAR EXAM
BAR/BRI PASS RATES*
BY SCHOOL

BOSTON COLLEGE  92%

BOSTON UNIVERSITY  91%

HARVARD  92%

NEW ENGLAND  91%

SUFFOLK  91%

NON BAR/BRI PASS RATE  82%

We thought you would like to know.

* FIRST TIME TAKERS ONLY