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To help keep legal education practical and up-to-date, the School of Law of Western Reserve University plans to begin next fall a program of major changes in its curriculum.

These changes include shifting study of Administrative Law and Equity to the second semester of the student's first year; additional emphasis on trial technique; and offering a course in Estate Planning, which will combine materials formerly treated in Trusts, Wills, Future Interests and Estate and Gift Taxation.

Under the new program the first two years of law school work will be prescribed—except for one elective course. But the final year will give the student a wide array of electives and enable him to obtain most of the public law which law schools everywhere have been trying to make room for.

Candidates for the LL.B. degree who start law studies in the winter semester of 1949-50 or thereafter will be required to complete satisfactorily a minimum of 80 semester hours of work, instead of 76 hours now required for graduation.

An additional prerequisite to graduation will be successful completion of a course in Accounting—either before entering law school or between the first and second law school years.

Students will be encouraged, but not required, to attend one or more summer sessions to cover important materials which, owing to lack of time, cannot be covered in three school years.

In addition to regular examinations in individual courses, students enrolling in law school in the future will be required to take two comprehensive examinations. One will come at the beginning of the second year of law study, the other at the start of the third year. Each of these examinations will cover all the areas of
law studied by the individual up to that time. The weight to be given the grade received in a comprehensive examination has not yet been determined.

Another innovation will be an experiment with "reading courses" in a limited number of elective subjects. These will be taught by assigned readings in cases and text materials. Class meetings may be held, at the option of the instructor, to clarify parts of the material and to answer questions. An examination will be given at the end of each reading course.

The purpose in moving study of Administrative Law and the beginning of Equity study to the first year of law training is to give the student at the most formative period of his law school experience a complete picture of the legal system as it functions in law, in equity and before administrative tribunals, and thereby enable him better to understand the courses that follow.

Combining Trusts, Wills, Future Interests and Estate and Gift Taxation into one course is designed to give a more complete picture of and a more practical approach to estate planning than is possible when these subjects are taught in separate courses.

The comprehensive examinations are intended to add incentive to review, help emphasize the interrelation between "branches" of the law and give additional training in analysis of legal problems.

Through the reading courses the student is expected to increase his proficiency and confidence in "learning" a field of law with little outside aid—a task which he must eventually face in many fields of law not covered during his law school experience.

Who May Complain in a Federal Court of an Unlawful Search and Seizure

In *McDonald v. United States,* the most recent decision of the Supreme Court dealing with search and seizure, the court was faced with the question of who may move to suppress evidence which has been obtained in violation of the Fourth Amendment. While lower federal courts have developed a considerable body of law on the subject, the question had not heretofore been passed on directly by the United States Supreme Court. It is the aim of the writer to evaluate the *McDonald* decision in the light of the prior federal cases.

The facts in the *McDonald* case were as follows: Federal officers suspecting McDonald of engaging in the numbers racket,