



8-1-1957

Lawyer Presents

Notre Dame Law School Editors

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.law.nd.edu/ndlr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Notre Dame Law School Editors, *Lawyer Presents*, 32 Notre Dame L. Rev. 561 (1957).

Available at: <http://scholarship.law.nd.edu/ndlr/vol32/iss4/1>

This Introduction is brought to you for free and open access by NDLScholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Notre Dame Law Review by an authorized administrator of NDLScholarship. For more information, please contact lawdr@nd.edu.

THE LAWYER PRESENTS —

The increasingly predominant role of the federal government in the field of labor relations has tended to eclipse the position of the states to such an extent that the co-existence of a body of state labor law is often entirely overlooked when a justiciable issue arises. Yet in the view of Mr. Bernard Mamet, the relegation of state labor law is unjustified both because of its significance in areas not pre-empted, and because of the effects which developments in local labor law have consistently had upon the course of federal legislation. In *The Counterpart of Federal Law in the Labor Equation: Indiana as Illustrative of State Labor Law*, the author supports his thesis by choosing Indiana to typify those states which have a background of statutory and court-made labor law and by examining the development and present status of local labor law in that state as well as effects upon the local law resulting from the growth of the federal labor laws. Mr. Mamet is a practicing attorney in Chicago, and has specialized in labor relations. The present article will constitute a chapter in the author's forthcoming text.

The validity of reasonable restrictive zoning ordinances is beyond question today. However, the power to designate is dangerously close to the power to discriminate so that it is not surprising that questions have arisen as to the validity of zoning ordinances which attempt to distinguish between public and private schools or attempt to zone religious centers out of residential neighborhoods. In *Zoning Out Religious Institutions*, Mr. Paul Brindel analyzes the recent cases in which these questions have arisen, with particular regard to the unique constitutional question involved when the restricted use is a religious one. Mr. Brindel is a retired newspaper editor and feature writer, and is the author of several recent articles dealing with problems created by the suburban growth movement.

Currently, one of the most controversial subjects in the insurance field is the variable annuity contract policy. To its proponents, the variable annuity stands as a step in the direction of realizing a retirement income plan which will provide a constant level of purchasing power despite fluctuations in the price economy. The opponents of variable annuities object with equal vigor that the introduction of a variable factor into annuity policies would destroy the traditional security which has characterized annuity policies. Mr. J. Edward Day, a firm advocate for the cause of variable annuities, treats some of the legal problems associated with variable policies with particular emphasis on the question of federal versus state regulation in *A Variable Annuity is Not A "Security"*. Mr. Day is Vice-President and General Counsel of the Prudential Insurance Company of America.