



# MDP No Rx for Success

I want to thank Dan McAuliffe for his very well-reasoned, well-written article opposing modification of the Rules of Professional Conduct to allow so-called multidisciplinary practice (*Arizona Attorney*, October 2001).

For all of the reasons stated in the article, I want to add my name to the list of those who oppose this unnecessary and dangerous move to allow lawyers to practice and share fees with nonlawyers. I believe that such a measure would, as Dan states, degrade the core values of our profession and move the practice of law one more step, if not the final step, down the path toward becoming just another business peddling a product to consumers.



Having witnessed the negative effect of lawyer advertising on the public’s perception of our profession, I shudder at the thought of entrepreneurial practitioners rushing to establish “Wal-Mart”-type practices.

We, as lawyers, need to do whatever we can to preserve and nurture the dignity of our profession, not devalue it in response to an imagined client demand for “one-stop shopping.”

— E. Hardy Smith  
Chandler, Tullar, Udall &  
Redhair, LLP

I agree entirely with the opinions of Daniel J. McAuliffe expressed in his article “Degrading the Core Values of the Profession.” There are only two comments that I would like to add to his article regarding the degradation of the profession that would follow from multidisciplinary practice. The first is that we seem to have learned nothing from the medical profession.

It seems to me so obvious, and has been so extensively reported in the media, that physicians believe that the care of their patients has been jeopardized by managed care companies who refuse to preauthorize medically necessary tests and procedures for reasons of profit. When nonprofessionals can affect, limit or con-

trol professional decision making for reasons of profit or for any other reason, as has been the experience of the medical profession, the exercise of independent professional judgment is severely jeopardized and the delivery of ethically appropriate services is compromised.

My second comment is that I also cannot believe that private practice lawyers who favor multidisciplinary practice want to have a rainmaking accountant partner telling a lawyer associate what is or is not the lawyer’s ethical responsibility to the multidisciplinary firm’s client and to the tribunal, e.g., the required disclosure of perjury.

— *Stephen W. Myers*  
*Myers & Jenkins, PC*

**Arizona Attorney is proud to provide a forum for members to voice their opinions. Please limit letters to 250 words. We reserve the right to edit for length, grammar, punctuation and clarity. All letters should be signed and sent to**

**Arizona Attorney**  
111 W. Monroe, Suite 1800  
Phoenix, AZ 85003  
or by e-mail to  
Tim.Eigo@staff.azbar.org.