
Volume 65
Issue 2 *Dickinson Law Review - Volume 65,*
1960-1961

1-1-1961

Book Reviews

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ideas.dickinsonlaw.psu.edu/dlra>

Recommended Citation

Book Reviews, 65 DICK. L. REV. 173 (1961).

Available at: <https://ideas.dickinsonlaw.psu.edu/dlra/vol65/iss2/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews at Dickinson Law IDEAS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dickinson Law Review by an authorized editor of Dickinson Law IDEAS. For more information, please contact lja10@psu.edu.

BOOK REVIEWS

INTERSTATE ENFORCEMENT OF FAMILY SUPPORT, by William J. Brockelbank. Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1960, 195 pages. Price: \$6.00.

One who had failed to support his wife or children, and who could be found within the territorial limits of the State, might be compelled with relative ease to do his duty. Where, however, the father-husband had fled into another State, enforcement of the duty became far more difficult. As a consequence, in many cases, the destitute family was forced to look to the State for support. This problem moved the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws to conduct a study which, in 1950, culminated in its approval of the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act. The Act was received with widespread approval. Indeed, today, the Uniform Act—or a “substantially similar reciprocal law”¹—is apart of the law of every State and territory.² The book under review deals with an analysis and explanation of some of the Act’s basic principles. Its author was highly qualified for the task—having served as a member, and later chairman, of the National Conference Committee which drafted the Act.³

The text proper consists of five chapters—covering only eighty four pages.

Chapter I is devoted, in the main, to a brief statement of the objectives of, and the definition of terms in, the Act.

In Chapter II, the author treats of the extradition or criminal enforcement provisions of the Act. The point is pressed that “teeth” of a criminal nature are necessary in order to reckon effectively with the “shiftless obligor.”

Chapter III is probably the heart of the book—and the lengthiest part. It relates to the “civil enforcement” feature of the Act. Here, the so-called “two-state civil suit” is described: A dependent relative may file a petition for support in the local court of her (the “initiating”) State. The petition must set forth enough facts for the court of the initiating State to conclude that the respondent is liable for support, and that a court in the “responding” State (the State into which the father-husband has fled) may obtain jurisdiction over him. If such a finding is made, the initiating State court so certifies, and forwards copies of the petition and its certificate to a court of the respond-

1. UNIFORM RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT OF SUPPORT ACT, § 2(a).

2. See BROCKELBANK, INTERSTATE ENFORCEMENT OF FAMILY SUPPORT 5 (1960).

3. *Id.* at VI (Preface by George R. Richter, Jr., President, National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws).

ing State. It may, in its certificate, include a request that respondent be arrested, if it appears that he may flee the jurisdiction, and if such a procedure is not inconsistent with the law of the responding State. The court of the responding State docket the case and, if the petitioner cannot afford and does not have private counsel, directs its prosecuting attorney to take appropriate action. The prosecuting attorney locates the respondent and for his property, causes appropriate process to be served, and then represents the petitioner's interests at an ensuing hearing—the petitioner herself need not be present. If the court is satisfied that respondent is under a duty of support, it may order that given amounts be paid and may subject his property to such order. The payments must be made to the clerk of the court of the responding State, who in turn transmits them to the court in the initiating State, and the latter court turns the payments over to the petitioner.

Chapter IV, entitled "Registration of Foreign Support Orders," deals with that portion of the Uniform Act which was added in 1958. It constitutes an alternative civil remedy available to a dependent relative. Having obtained a support order, the aggrieved party may petition for its registration and subsequent enforcement in another State. A registered support order, however, is not enforceable until it has been confirmed. It is confirmed only after respondent has been accorded the opportunity to be heard and to interpose appropriate defenses.

In Chapter V, the author examines the possibility and feasibility of extending the Uniform Support Act to foreign countries. In that connection, the reciprocal arrangement between Michigan and Ontario, Canada, is described.

The balance of the book—some 100 pages—consists of the text of the Uniform Support Act with amendments, and an extremely useful set of forms.

This is a small book, yet it is quietly comprehensive. While one may easily absorb its surface content in one sitting, its full impact can only be gleaned by several careful readings. The author's obvious preoccupation with the presentation of his case clearly, coupled with a sprinkling of pleasing humor, make for interesting and easy reading.

Plainly, this book should be permitted to find its way to the shelf of every practitioner of law. It relates to a virgin area of the law; the Act is calculated to satisfy a strong social and economic need; the book is overflowing with the citation of authorities; it has been written by an author of the Act itself; valuable insights are included and formidable constitutional law obstacles are recognized; and, it points up the pitfalls of which one should be wary.

CHARLES E. TORCIA*

* Assistant Professor of Law, Dickinson School of Law; LL.B., St. Johns University School of Law.

THE WORLDS OF CHIPPY PATTERSON, by Arthur H. Lewis, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1960, 311 pages. Price: \$5.00.

Those lawyers who practice the art of advocacy in the area of criminal law are members of a select clan in the legal profession. The highly dramatic character of his role as defender of the accused places the criminal lawyer into a realm of notoriety far beyond his fellow advocates. Respected and distrusted by a public who has labeled him "mouthpiece," the criminal lawyer occupies a most criticized position among members of the Bar.

C. Stuart Patterson, Jr., was such a lawyer. "Chippy" Patterson was in fact one of the most successful criminal lawyers ever to stand before a jury. In 401 homicide cases his record of only eight death penalties, five in which the defendant was accused of killing policemen, places him among the Clarence Darrows and Bill Fallons. From 1907 until his death in 1933 it has been estimated that "Chippy" has been the defense counsel in more than 125,000 criminal proceedings. During this period he could be found defending any member of the criminal fraternity. "Chippy" rarely missed a day in appearing before the Court of Oyer and Terminer and the Magistrate's Courts of Philadelphia. Upon his death the *Shingle*, official publication of the reserved Philadelphia Bar Association had this to say of C. Stuart Patterson, Jr.: "On February 17, 1933, the Philadelphia Bar lost a member who was, in some respects so incredibly unique that it may well be doubted whether the legal world has even seen his like."

Arthur H. Lewis, in *The Worlds of Chippy Patterson*, vividly unfolds the life of this extraordinary legal personality. A newspaperman in Philadelphia for almost forty years, the prose of author Lewis is strongly influenced by his journalistic background. While this reporter-like style is rapid, terse and sometimes disconnected it enables Mr. Lewis to transmit an unforgettable portrait of this amazing legal champion. While Mr. Lewis' book is successful, there can be no doubt that his most notable achievement lies in his choice of subject matter. The publication of *The Worlds of Chippy Patterson* brought this remark from Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice Curtis Bok: "I am glad that at last someone has written the unique story of 'Chippy' Patterson. Mr. Lewis has done the job well, and I for one am profoundly indebted to him."

As the title suggests, the life of "Chippy" Patterson was filled with inconsistency. On September 20, 1875, C. Stuart Patterson, Jr. was born into one of Philadelphia's most prominent families. Perhaps, because of a lack of paternal affection, the sensitive Chippy became a chronic drinker at the age of sixteen not conquering his love for liquor until he was thirty. The "black-sheep" of a distinguished family was a bitter disappointment to his high born

friends. Somehow during this bleak period of his life "Chippy" was able to graduate from the University of Pennsylvania Law School, be admitted to the Philadelphia Bar and serve his Country for four years in the Philippines.

In 1905 "Chippy" finally gave up drinking altogether and decided to devote his energies to the practice of law. Instead of entering into the lucrative corporation practice of his father and brother as was expected, he took a path which veered off in a most unusual direction. Abandoning his own social class, "Chippy" found his practice with clients from the depths of society. For the remainder of his life he championed the poor, befriended the friendless, and rendered legal service to any who needed it. A typical day in "Chippy's" life would begin at seven o'clock in the morning when he arrived at his shabby office near the courthouse. There he was greeted by an assorted array of humanity—some in search of legal aid and others simply looking for a "handout." "Chippy" never disappointed either group. From ten o'clock in the morning until ten o'clock at night, "Chippy" devoted his entire time to being a trial lawyer. At times he would be defending two cases at once and often he would argue as many as twenty-five separate causes in a single day. When not mapping out his strategy for the next day's trials, the evenings found "Chippy" roaming the streets of "Chinatown" and "Skid Row" emptying his pockets to any and all he found in need. The inhabitants of these streets greeted him with respect wherever he went, for these were his clients and he never let them down.

"Chippy's" personal habits give another view of this strange man. Once the "fashion-plate" of Philadelphia society, "Chippy" would often appear in court in fishing boots, a tattered jacket and old worn pants. His generosity with money often caused "Chippy" some embarrassment. Twice evicted from his office for failure to pay the rent, he was forced at the height of his career to set up his legal headquarters in a phone booth in the courthouse. This problem was rectified by an occasional paying client. A brief marriage which ended in divorce was merely the most serious of his many affairs; helping his clients was his first love.

The way "Chippy" practiced law was not indicative of his record of court room victories. His office contained not a single law book and he rarely had time to prepare a case or interview witnesses, yet his clients were always more than adequately represented. Among "Chippy's" most powerful court room weapons were his great personal charm, a keen insight into human nature, and his ability to marshal the emotions of the jury. The full force of these trial techniques is illuminated by Mr. Lewis' colorful portrayal of "Chippy's" more sensational cases.

While "Chippy's" legal ethics were never questioned and his integrity was highly respected by both bench and bar, one may wonder in reading *The*

Worlds of Chippy Patterson whether or not "Chippy" at times played too lightly with the scales of justice. One particularly amusing incident where "Chippy" made a mockery of the criminal court concerned the trial of a professional confidence man charged with looting a large department store of rare perfumes. Posing as a new salesclerk the defendant had managed to slip over \$13,000 worth of perfume in oversized inside pockets and was on his way out of the store when, in an ironic twist of fate, a fleeing shoplifter knocked him down breaking most of the concealed containers. "Chippy's" client was caught "red-handed." On the morning of the trial an unidentified woman carefully sprayed perfume on each person entering the court room. With even the judge smiling at the unusually pleasant aroma which filled his court, "Chippy" proceeded to explain the theft as the practical joke of a fun-loving man. So eager was the jury to acquit the obviously guilty defendant they returned in ten minutes with a verdict of "Not Guilty." "Purge the sin, not the sinner" "Chippy" would tell the jury, but often the net effect of his efforts was to free the sinner and do nothing to eliminate the sin.

Why did "Chippy" choose this curious way to live and practice law? The answer to this question is left open for the reader himself to decide. No matter what conclusion is reached *The Worlds of Chippy Patterson* introduces a legal personality whom the reader will not soon forget.

THEODORE D. PARSONS, JR.

GERALD S. LESHER

