Sixth Federal Tax Conference

The Planning Committee for the Sixth Annual Federal Tax Conference at a luncheon meeting. Standing are (left to right): Harry Sutter, James M. Ratcliffe, Walter J. Blum, and John A. Howard. Seated at the head of the table is William A. McSwain, chairman of the Planning Committee.

The Sixth Federal Tax Conference sponsored by The Law School in collaboration with the School of Business and University College was held on October 28, 29, and 30, 1953. Professor Walter J. Blum and Assistant Dean James M. Ratcliffe represented The Law School on the Planning Committee. As in past years, the conference covered current developments in the fields of federal income, estate, and gift taxation.

John E. Jeuck, dean of the School of Business, welcomed the delegates, and the opening session on “Tax Policy and Prospects” was chaired by Professor Blum. Kenneth W. Gemmill, assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, spoke on “The Tax Policies of the Administration,” and Stanley S. Surrey, professor of law, Harvard Law School and chief reporter of the proposed new Income Tax Code, reviewed “The American Law Institute’s Proposed Income Tax Statute.”

The session on “Rulings, Cases, and Tax Accounting” was under the chairmanship of James D. Head, of Winston, Strawn, Black and Towner. At this afternoon session, Vance N. Kirby, of Daily, Dines, Ross and O’Keefe, reviewed “Important Recent Administrative Rulings and Interpretations”; Charles W. Davis, of Hopkins, Sutter, Halls, DeWolfe and Owen, analyzed significant recent decisions in “Taxes and the Courts, 1952-53”; and Herman T. Reiling, of the Internal Revenue Service, in “Tax Accounting for Repricing and Other Reserves” gave a lawyer’s answer to the criticism that income-tax accounting does not give proper recognition to the accounting concept respecting reserves for meeting liabilities.

Paul Johnson, of Ernst and Ernst, served as chairman of the third session, devoted to the areas of “Employer and Employee Problems.” Tax questions arising from supplemental and incidental benefits received by employees were reviewed by Ray A. Hoffman, of Price, Waterhouse and Company, under the heading “Fringe Benefits for Employees.” William C. Childs, of Hopkins, Sutter, Halls, DeWolfe and Owen, discussed “Deferred Compensation Plans for Executives” with reference to their purpose, provisions, and effect and emphasized income and estate tax aspects of such plans. “Employee Stock-Purchase Arrangements” was the subject assigned to Charles S. Lyon, of the New York Bar. “Purchase and Sale of Corporate Business” was the theme of the fourth session, under the chairmanship of William M. Emery, of McDermott, Will and Emery. Frederick R. Shearer, of Mayer, Meyer, Austrian and Platt, reviewed tax planning in buying or selling a corporation or its assets under the title “Taxable Transfers of Corporate Businesses.” An evaluation of alternative routes for effectuating tax-free transfers of corporate business, including mergers and consolidations, was the subject discussed by Robert F. Graham, of Gardner, Carton, Douglas, Roemer and Childgren. “The Acquisition of Loss Companies” was the subject of the paper by Thomas N. Tarleau, of Willkie, Owen, Farr, Gallagher and Walton (New York).

Harry B. Sutter, of Hopkins, Sutter, Halls, DeWolfe and Owen, was chairman of the session on “Estate Planning.” The practical considerations in utilizing the marital deduction was discussed by Roland K. Smith, of Isham, Lincoln and Beale. In “The Use of Powers in Estate Planning” Austin Fleming, of the Northern Trust Company, presented a comprehensive of tax and other factors in the providing for powers over principal and income either in inter vivos or testamentary dispositions. Mr. Fleming and Mr. Smith joined in a panel with Paul E. Ferrier, of the First National Bank of Chicago, and Professor William H. Pedrick of the Northwestern University law school.

A group of the participants of the Sixth Annual Federal Tax Conference are (left to right): Vance Kirby, Raymond Hoffman, Charles Davis, Roland K. Smith, William C. Childs, Paul Ferrier, and William Pedrick.
University School of Law on “Problems concerning the Marital Deduction and Powers.”

The conference concluded with a round-table discussion conducted by Walter J. Blum, William M. Emery, William N. Haddad, Paul Johnson, and Harry B. Sutter, with participation by members of the audience. The problems discussed were submitted in part by the registrants.

This sixth annual conference was the largest yet held, with a capacity audience present at every session. As in the past the entire proceedings of the conference is to be published in *Taxes* magazine.

### Dwight P. Green ’12, New Fund Chairman

The alumni have already received advance word from Dwight P. Green ’12, General Chairman of the 1953–54 University of Chicago Law School Fund. As this issue of the Record goes to press, we are happy to announce that the anticipatory gifts and pledges give this year’s Committee a running start on the coming drive.

Many of the chairmen in Chicago have already been appointed, and they are at work organizing their efforts for next spring. This year, in addition to the previous state organization throughout the country, greater emphasis will be placed on across-the-board class contributions, with alumni throughout the nation joining with their classmates in Chicago to build class totals.


Morry Feiwell is doubling also in an elder statesman role and as chairman of the classes of 1914 to 1922. Under his dynamic chairmanship last year, great progress was made in organizing the classes and telling the story of the School’s needs and opportunities to hundreds of alumni.

### The Law School Revisited

**John Jewkes**

An Englishman is not long in this country before he discovers that you in the United States are never more happy than when you are offering hospitality to a guest and never less happy than when that guest seeks to tender his thanks. I shall respect your feelings in these matters, but you must allow me to say that I am greatly obliged to you for asking me here today and for inviting me to speak.

When I first asked Dean Levi what I should talk about, he said, “Tell them what you are doing in The Law School.” Now I do not know whether the usage of language is, in these respects, exactly the same in our two countries. But in England this phrase “what are you doing in The Law School?” could have two quite distinct meanings. It might mean: “What tasks are you currently engaged upon?” I do not intend to speak about that, partly because I have already had an opportunity of discussing such matters with some of your number, partly because I fancy that the details might be of no great interest to most of you. But there is another possible meaning of this question. It might mean: “Why are you, a professor of economic organization in the University of Oxford, to be found at all in The Law School of the University of Chicago?”

There were in fact three reasons, each of them strong in itself, which taken jointly seemed to me to be irresistible. The first was the reputation of The Law School itself. If you do not already know it, you should be told what a high standing The Law School has wherever academics meet and talk together throughout the world. From the gossip of the common rooms I learned that your Law School had gathered together a group of lively scholars who pursued their studies with great enthusiasm and energy but also with that tinge of skepticism, not to say of conservatism, which adds the salt to all intellectual effort. I learned that the School takes a broad view of what is implied in the study of law and that it recognizes that legal studies lie very close to the heart of American culture, much closer than is the case in Great Britain. I gathered that, without any sacrifice of the idea that law is a good discipline in its own right, the School perceives that there are other subjects contiguous to the study of law, in which the thinking of lawyers has much to contribute and from which law itself has something to gain. And I further learned that the School is known to possess in its present Dean, if he will allow me to say so in his presence, a man who, having already established one reputation for legal scholarship, is busy creating in that most subtle and difficult field of administration, the art of holding together a group of academics, each of whom, in the nature of things, is likely to have a touch of the ballerina in his temperamental make-up. All these things I heard of your School. And because of them, any scholar would feel flattered by an invitation to join in the