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CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

William D. Guthrie was one of the counsel for the Holy Name Sisters in the Oregon School Cases and is President of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

Benedict Elder is a member of the Louisville, Kentucky, Bar, and is the editor of The Record, published for the Louisville diocese.

The article by Dean Thomas F. Konop, was read before the members of the Round Table at South Bend in December, 1925.

GIFTS TO THE LIBRARY

Judge Dudley G. Wooten, of the Law School, has recently induced two old friends of his to make some desirable gifts to that department of the University. One of these friends declines to have his name made public, but he donated money to buy a Mimeograph for use in the Law School, and for the Law Library Warren's "United States Supreme Court History", 3 volumes; Veeder's "Legal Masterpieces", 2 vols., in one book; Snyder's "Great Speeches by Great Lawyers". Also, Hon. Walter M. Chandler, of New York, who was for some time in Judge Wooten's office at Dallas, Texas, presented to the Law Library through Judge Wooten his famous "Trial of Jesus", in 2 volumes, 2nd Edition, which is universally considered the most learned and accurate work on that subject, being a history and discussion of the Judaic Roman laws relating to the manner in which the Savior was tried and executed. The Judge wants
thus to begin the building up of a section of the Library devoted to the history and literature of the law from a cultural point of view, a much needed addition and one which is neglected in most of the law school libraries in the country.

DEFRAUDING THE LAWYERS

The letter below, received from the Inspector in Charge, Cincinnati Division of the Post Office Department, is reproduced to insure our readers against the possibility of being swindled in the manner described.

Gentlemen:

Clever swindlers are making a specialty of victimizing lawyers throughout the country by working a fraud scheme involving the use of worthless checks. This scheme, in substance, is as follows:

A stranger calls at a lawyer's office and leaves a sham note for immediate collection from some party residing at a distance, explaining that this party is perfectly good for the amount and that the note would not be turned over to the lawyer for collection but for the fact that the money is sorely needed. The address which the stranger gives as that of the maker of the note is simply a fictitious address for himself or a confederate. When the lawyer's letter demanding payment of the note is received at the fictitious address a reply is made at once, enclosing a bogus check to meet the note or the major part thereof, and in the latter case promising to remit the balance in a few days. Such check, as usually prepared, is a skillful counterfeit of a cashier's check, with the amount indented by means of a protectograph, and seems above suspicion. As soon as sufficient time elapses for the letter enclosing the check to reach the lawyer's office, the stranger again calls and makes inquiry as to the progress of the collection, and when informed that the check has arrived, endeavors to prevail on the lawyer to let him have the money or part of it without delay. If successful in this respect, the stranger promptly vanishes before it can be discovered that the check is
worthless. The losses thus sustained by lawyers have been heavy, running into thousands of dollars.

Attempts to work this trick, whether successful or not, should be reported immediately by wire or telephone, Government rates, collect, to the Post Office Inspector in Charge having jurisdiction in the State where the offense was committed. Such reports may be made direct or through the local postmaster. Of course, steps should be taken to have the offenders detained by the local authorities, pending action by the post office inspectors.

Respectfully yours,

G. F. H. BIRDSEYE,
Inspector in Charge.