11-16-1971

The Advocate

The Advocate, Fordham Law School

The Advocate

The Student Newspaper of Fordham University School of Law

Vol. IV - No. 3 | NEW YORK, N. Y. | November 16, 1971

Substantial Increase in Coming Year's Law Faculty; Most 2d, 3d Year Required Courses May Be Dropped

Fr. Walsh Stresses Wages and Hiring

President Michael P. Walsh, S.J., stated in a recent interview that increased faculty salaries, additional professors, and a greater amount of financial aid for needy students were the University administration's top priorities — in that order — for the Law School.

Fr. Walsh, a genial, softspoken man, also denied reports of huge profits made by the Law School, saying that before this year the surplus had usually run about $50,000 a year, and that it had never been greater than $100,000 in any year.

Four New Positions

Asked how many new faculty positions the Law School could expect next year, the president said that at that time he had not received a specific estimate from the Law School of its faculty needs.

Two weeks later, on November 5, Dean Joseph M. McLaughlin announced that four new faculty positions would be filled next year.

"I was troubled by the student-faculty ratio at the Law School even before the avalanche" this year of first-year students, he remarked.

Fr. Walsh noted that one full-time faculty position at the Law School had not been filled for the last two academic years, because the Law School had not hired anyone for the position.

Faculty salaries will be readjusted on the basis of negotiations with the Law School faculty, he said, adding that the faculty at other schools in the University realized the Law School faculty must be paid on a higher salary scale.

Fr. Walsh discussed at length the issue which most rankles the Law School — the financial arrangements with the Rose Hill administration, but he refused to release or make available budgetary figures for the Law School.

He stated that making budget

(Continued on Page 4)

Michael P. Walsh

Joseph M. McLaughlin

Legal Writing Program to Be Expanded

Dean Joseph M. McLaughlin announced in two recent talks to the students that the Law School will have four or five new faculty positions next year and that the faculty intends to eliminate most second and third-year required courses "over the next few years."

"The faculty is committed in principle to more electives," Dean McLaughlin stated. "Ideally, the curriculum would be fully elective after the first year" except for evidence, which may be made a one semester course.

Noting that he was still negotiating with the University administration, Dean McLaughlin said, "We are certain to get six and possibly seven new teachers next year." This includes new teachers to fill the two positions which associate professors will vacate this year.

Stating that the addition of new faculty is his "first priority," the Dean asserted that the Law School's faculty salaries must be made more competitive with other law schools. "We can't hire competent people with Fordham's current salaries," he commented.

The Dean also gave a similar talk last Friday to a group of about 100 night students. He pledged himself to reporting to the study body and getting their feelings in an open forum "on a regular basis — once or twice a year."

Dean McLaughlin strongly rejected proposals that the Law School change its grading system to "pass-fail" because of the increased problems of job placement Fordham graduates would face if that were done.

"A total pass-fail system would be a monumental error from which we would never be able to recover," he said, adding, however that he believes in pass-fail in

(Continued on Page 3)

Fordham Seeks O.E.O. Project

By ROBERT KELLEY

The National Employment Law Project tentatively plans to affiliate with the Law School, according to Professor Thomas M. Quinn.

The Project, an Office of Economic Opportunity funded program, which is currently affiliated with Columbia Law School's Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law, is interested in finding a new home in order to cut its operating costs.

Professor Quinn, who is the Law School's liaison with the program, stated last week that Dennis Yeager, the Project's director, had received a favorable response from the faculty when he met with them recently.

While final arrangements have not been made for the move, the University administration has given tentative approval to the proposed affiliation, Assistant Dean William J. Moore said.

Among the matters still undecided are where the office will be located, due to the lack of space on the campus, and how much of the Project's funds should be allocated to Fordham for its costs.

Mr. Yeager explained last week that the Project is a "back up" for all the OEO Legal Services offices located throughout the country on the subject of employment law.

The Project handles research, briefing and case preparation on problems that the local Legal Services offices are not equipped to handle. Its lawyers also advise on and interpret new laws and case decisions for these nationwide offices.

Mr. Yeager also indicated that his office was currently handling

(Continued on Page 4)

Faculty Votes Bargaining Unit

Photos by Alan Michigan

UNION MEN: Professors of Law Martin Fogelman (left), Thomas Quinn (center), and Robert Kessler entering and leaving the faculty reading room where the Law School Bargaining Committee was okayed.

The Law School faculty voted, 16-0, Thursday to approve the Law School Bargaining Committee as their collective bargaining agent, according to Professor Joseph R. Crowley.

The Law faculty which the National Labor Relations Board ruled last September was entitled to a separate, identifiable bargaining unit, is currently the only group in the University with a union.

In the rest of the University the faculty voted 226-207 against being represented by the Fordham chapter of the American Association of University Professors. However, the results will not be official until challenges to 28 votes are resolved.

Professor Crowley said yesterday that regardless of the result in the rest of the University the bargaining committee would attempt to function in the same fashion as the faculty has functioned in its relations with the University administration for the past year.

"We are not looking for a traditional bargaining unit," he stated. "We want the University to sit down with the faculty and discuss the school and its problems."

Prosecutor Program Planned by Denzer

A prosecutors program for Fordham and other law school students interested in criminal prosecution is being planned for the 1972 summer, according to Professor Richard G. Denzer.

Federally funded, the program entails lectures by district attorneys and assistant D.A.'s coupled with a summer intern program in a local district attorney office. Professor Denzer cautioned that negotiations have not yet been finalized.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice will finance the institute. The New York State Office of Crime Control Planning is arranging a grant of money for a planning unit which would organize the summer school.

The school would acquaint law students with the intricacies of a prosecutor's practice. The program would be open to all first and second year law school students in New York City.

Professor Denzer indicated that Fordham Law School will be the site of the institute as well as its sponsor. The class will accommodate a maximum of 200 students.

Moot Court Team Wins

Fordham Law School won the New York Regional Championship of the National Moot Court competition in oral arguments held Wednesday and Thursday at the Bar Association of the City of New York in Manhattan.

The Fordham team consisted of Nick Liakas, Charlie O'Neill and Tom Markiewicz, who won the outstanding speaker award. Prof. Sweeney serves as the adviser to the team.

Nine schools presented oral arguments in a case very similar to the Calley fact pattern. Although they wrote their brief on behalf of the petitioner, the team argued both sides of the question.

In the first two rounds, the Law School team defeated Seton Hall and Brooklyn, and then outargued New York Law and NYU in the two final rounds. NYU was the runner-up and also gains a berth in the national finals held in New York on December 15-17.

This is the first time in seven years that a Fordham team has won the regionals.

The Advocate
The student newspaper of Fordham University School of Law

Mutuality of Obligations

Student newspapers are quick to point out the obligations that a law school administration, faculty, and student government owe the student body, and just as quick to indicate how the person or group in question has failed to live up to the students' expectations. There is a corollary to this area of concern — one which most students conveniently ignore.

The student also has obligations to fulfill, both to the law school and his fellow classmates. At Fordham currently most students seem to ignore their responsibilities. Students who expect interested and concerned faculty members, should also walk into a classroom prepared to discuss the day's cases and material. Let a student imagine for a moment himself as a Fordham law professor, preparing for a class when he knows that most of the students in his class have not prepared themselves for doing anything more than copying down a verbatim resume of the material of that day's lecture — not to absorb, analyze and discuss on the basis of previous preparation the pertinent points of the lecture. This is especially true in seminars. When students ask for smaller classes, they place upon themselves the added burden of going to class, and being fully prepared each week. By definition, a seminar is not a lecture, but a give-and-take between teacher and students, and students and students. For any seminar to be successful the students must make it so, not the professor.

Students at Fordham Law School also have the habit of offering criticism at the slightest provocation, but when asked to join together to change that which disturbs them, they disappear. The shoddy performances in the past by many freshmen in the Freshman Moot Court program, the relatively small number of participants in the voluntary moot court competitions, and the writing sample competition for a position on the *Journal of Urban Law*, are indicative of programs that were organized to meet student demands and needs, which may someday be forced to fold due to the lack of effort by Fordham law students.

In response to the editorial in the last issue of *The Advocate* on the grading system, Professor Constantine N. Katsoris took the time to reply and express his views. No student has bothered to show any similar concern in this or any other area.

If the student body wants change, wants new programs, and wants respect from the faculty, students had better review their own status first.

Yes, Virginia, There Is An SBA

Dean Joseph M. McLaughlin should be commended for his two recent talks with students. The Law School cannot run effectively and intelligently without student participation in and knowledge of its governance. The faculty also ought to make greater attempts to communicate with all segments of the Law School community.

One thing the Dean said, however, was very disturbing. In response to a question, he called the Student Bar Association "cooperative and informative" as well as "helpful." While Dean McLaughlin may be in frequent communication with the SBA Excutive Committee, the student body and the SBA Board of Governors (comprised of the class officers and representatives of campus organizations) have no idea what the four SBA officers are telling the Dean, the faculty and the Rose Hill administration.

Last month the four officers dined on SBA funds with President Michael P. Walsh to discuss the Law School's problems. Following that meeting the officers refused to reveal the substance of their conversations with Father Walsh. This information has been withheld not only from most students, but also from the SBA Board of Governors.

We question the legitimacy of an organization which so totally ignores its constituency. Students at the Law School are concerned about a great many important matters, but they have no contact with the cliquish SBA leaders. Therefore, despite the work the Executive Committee is doing, students are justified in thinking the SBA is doing nothing. Unless the Executive Committee begins to communicate with the Board of Governors and the student body — concerning both what it is doing and what students want it to do — the SBA will continue to be a totally unrepresentative organization.

Viewpoint:

Grading Defended

By CONSTANTINE N. KATSORIS
Professor of Law at Fordham

I read, wth great interest *The Advocate's* recent editorial (Oct. 19, 1971) entitled "Grade School," which discussed the merit of a three-tier (high pass, pass, and fail) grading system over the present practice of numerical grading.

I feel constrained, however, not only to rebut many of the arguments developed therein, but more particularly, to object to the completely one-sided coverage given the issue.

At the very outset, *The Advocate* condemned the present system because grades "are the principal tool used by employers in evaluating a student's 'capabilities' and the sole criterion for entering the *Law Review* competition." One can hardly blame an employer or the *Law Review* for attempting to pick the best applicants available. If they did any less they would be derelict in their duty. I am sure that *The Advocate*, also, in electing its board, attempts to choose the best candidates available.

How else can applicants be selected other than by objective criteria such as grades, extra curricular activities, past experience, proper motivation, etc.? To suggest it could seriously be done in any other way is a cruel hoax upon the student body. *The Advocate's* contention thta such offers or invitations should instead hereafter be meted out mainly on the basis of "interest" and a "desire and ability to work hard" is meaningless rhetoric, for how do the selectors measure such qualities at the outset? In addition, *The Advocate's* criteria ignore the simple reality that all law students are not of equal ability. On the other hand, grades generally reflect some degree of both ability and dedication.

Furthermore, although grades are admittedly most important in receiving the initial invitation to join the *Law Review*, they by no means insure continued good standing thereon. Once the invitation is granted, "membership" in the *Review* must thereafter be paid for by endless hours of hard work and proven writing ability. The annals of the *Law Review* are filled with "high grade" students who, once invited, were later dropped because thereafter they wished to "sit" on their grades.

The Advocate further implied that to "rate" an 85.3 student ahead of an 85.2 student is unjust. Such minuscule difference is apparent on its face, and I suggest you are overreacting, for no hiring partner would automatically choose the former over the latter solely on that difference.

Indeed, I suggest that a "three-tier" grading system could cause a more grievous injustice, in that the minor difference between a student who "just" makes the high pass category and the one who "just" misses it is grossly distorted by describing the former as a high pass, and the latter merely as a pass.

In the last analysis, employers and the *Law Review* editors will easily adjust to your suggested grading change by thereafter making their selections from the upper reaches of the newly created "elite," high pass category. Moreover, the contention that grades should be discontinued because they create a class distinction among students would lead to the equally absurd conclusion that all other differences, such as of beauty or wealth, should also be eliminated for the same reasons.

It would appear that the cornerstone of your attack on the present grading system is that it inspires competition. Like it or not, Fordham competes with other law schools to place its graduates. The *Fordham Law Review* competes with other Law Reviews for excellence, inspiration, and originality of thought.

It took Fordham many years and much effort to raise its head among the ranks of the better national law schools. It achieved and maintains this position not through overwhelming budgets, or an entrenched position of influence and power, but through honest hard work and dedication, with the result that its students enter the legal profession able to compete with anyone.

Make no mistake about it, the legal profession is by its very nature founded in competition and advocacy. If one finds competition abhorrent, therefore, not only has he perhaps found the wrong law school, but more importantly he has chosen the wrong profession.

I agree with *The Advocate's* comments that law students "are, for the most part, mature and motivated enough to study the material necessary to become effective lawyers." On the other hand, law students are human, just as everyone else, and once in a while need reminding and prodding — not necessarily for the sake of having one student complete against another for competition's sake, but more importantly to spur each student to his attainable capability.

I will cite a recent example of law students no less mature or dedicated than the present student body. Several years ago this faculty, in its sincere desire to help prepare the non-*Law Review* student for the practice of law, instituted a writing program on the much heralded pass-fail basis. Under this program, each faculty member was assigned between ten to fifteen students (during their second year) and entrusted with the responsibility of tutoring each student assigned him in the research and preparation of a legal paper, on a topic mutually agreed upon.

This was done earnestly and quietly, and without the fanfare of classifying the program by a "go-go" description, such as "clinical" — although in fact that is what it was. Indeed, the faculty devoted a great deal of its time to insure the success of this program. I might add, much to my disappointment, that after a few years of laxed sanctions, student apathy became so apparent, and their work product so poor, that the program was abandoned.

Nor can I agree with *The Advocate's* inference that the present system should be eliminated, because in "an enlightened environment students should shed such anti-intellectual, cutthroat habits as stealing notebooks and cramming Universal outlines." If a "relatively unimportant" thing in life such as grades causes a student to steal from his colleagues, much less anyone else, I suggest he is unfit to enter the profession, and hardly falls within the description of the mature and motivated law student.

I guess I can go on and on — as indeed you must already think I have. I would however, like to point out that my thoughts on this subject are offered in the sincere belief that the present grading system, imperfect as it is, still is necessary to bring out the best effort in each student. This benefits himself, as well as Fordham. Also, bear in mind that my beliefs are not rooted in any desire to "cop-out." Indeed, they come at a high cost, for they result in literally hundreds of extra hours of thankless marking drugery annually which would be eliminated if, instead of "grading.... performance, we merely had to "categorize" it as good, adequate, or inadequate.

Professional Responsibility

By MICHAEL A. SCHWARTZ

There are a number of words, and concepts which they denote, which have become somewhat obsolete over the past decade.

Patriotism, once a word which connoted the most noble of virtues, has become so debased that it has been relegated, in the minds of most people, to the world of the politically deranged. **Honesty** and **integrity** have been replaced by **expediency** in dealings between people and business interests. **Responsibility** also has suffered to the extent that it is fast becoming an anachronism. On an individual level, "passing the buck" has become a substitute for accountability. On the collective plane, there has been a general unwillingness on the part of major groups of society to act in accordance with that which is right, for the sake of righteousness.

* * *

The members of the legal profession are the guardians of society, and as such must necessarily be a positive moral and ethical force if they are to maintain themselves in that most sacred position of public trust with which they have been endowed by society.

In order to abide by its obligation to society, it is incumbent upon the profession to accept responsibility for the policing of its own ranks. Specifically, there are certain lawyers who have breached their duties with respect to legal ethics, and who are not deserving of society's confidence.

Those lawyers who are employed by corporations as specialists in the art of tax-dodging, or in the avoidance of agreements which, though not legally binding, are ethically and morally obligatory, are engaged in improper activity. These men are neither a

(Continued on Page 3)

Calamari Appointed To Endowed Chair

Professor John D. Calamari has been awarded The Agnes and Ignatius M. Wilkinson Chair of Law, Fordham's President Michael Walsh, S.J., announced at the University Convocation of the Faculty last month. The chair includes a special endowment to further legal research.

The chair was created by the will of the late Dean Ignatius M. Wilkinson. It was instituted in 1961 at the dedication of the Law School building.

Professor Calamari has been a member of the faculty since 1952 and is recognized as a leading expert in contract law. An alumnus of Fordham College, he graduated from Fordham Law school in 1947. Professor Calamari also has a LL.M. degree from New York University.

Co-author with Professor Joseph M. Perillo of a hornbook on contract law, Calamari served in the Army's Judge Advocate Corp before joining Fordham's Faculty.

The Wilkinson endowed chair was formally held by former Dean William Hughes Mulligan who was recently appointed to the Federal Court of Appeals for the 2d circuit.

McLaughlin Meets Students

(Continued from Page 1)

certain electives such as trial advocacy.

The Dean also said that he "would take to the faculty" a student proposal that all third-year courses be made pass-fail.

Next semester, Dean McLaughlin announced, the elective offerings will include trial advocacy, two sections of "Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights," and a repeat of Professor Richard G. Denzer's seminar on criminal law, which was first offered this semester.

Sol Schreiber, a federal magistrate, will teach the advocacy course, which will be offered in the evening. Joseph D. Garon, a partner in the firm of Brubaugh, Graves, Donohue and Raymond, will teach the day and evening sections of the course on Patents.

The only new elective which will definitely be offered next year, the Dean said, is a course in Law and Medicine, but he indicated that other new courses would also be given.

One new teacher's "sole responsibility will be teaching legal writing," Dean McLaughlin stated. He said that the current writing program would be expanded and changed, but that he would leave the structure to the new professor — someone he already has "in mind."

The Dean drew applause from the night students when he commented, "Legal writing is an area where I'm totally convinced we've blown it."

Dean McLaughlin remarked that he did not know the allocation of Law School funds to University overhead because the Rose Hill administration has circumvented the request by claiming the figures cannot be broken down for the various schools of the University.

The Dean stated that he did not believe that all of the Law School's tuition should be spent by the Law School, but that a greater percentage should come back to the Law School.

Asked what a law student received for that part of his tuition that did not come back to the law school, the Dean replied, "A Fordham image." He added, however, that he thought ten percent of the school's tuition income would be a more "acceptable" amount to be taken from law students to subsidize such departments as classics and physics.

At this time, he commented that he thought that Rose Hill was taking a significantly greater percentage than ten percent.

He called the University's recent decision to allow the Law School to conduct its own fund raising drives — "the condition under which I accepted the deanship" — "a major victory."

Dean McLaughlin indicated that a separate Law School fund raising drive would begin in about two weeks.

The Dean stated that several clinical legal education programs are being established at Fordham, including one in civil law in conjunction with the Legal Aid Society, a summer program with the District Attorney's Office, a labor-management program, and an environmental law internship.

He also mentioned that a joint program with the Fordham Graduate School of Business is "close to fruition." The program calls for three years of law school and a year and a summer of business school to earn J.D. and M.B.A. degrees.

Discussing the placement office which has been the center of controversy this year, Dean McLaughlin said the Law School was negotiating with the University to get more staff in the office.

"We must change the focus of the effort on the bottom three quarters of the class," he said, referring to the fact that much of the placement office's efforts are for the top-ranked students.

Environmental Law Group Formed

By KENNETH F. McCALLION

The Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. (NRDC) is a national organization of lawyers, scientists and concerned citizens who seek to protect the natural environment from encroachment and destruction.

According to John Adams, director of the New York office, the Council's first priority is the choice of cases that will change the law.

Among the suits initiated by NRDC have been an attempt to switch the burden of proof from conservationists to the defendant industrial polluters; the representation of citizens' groups seeking standing to sue; and an effort to get judicial review of the "environment - impact" statements that federal agencies are required to file under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

The Fordham Environmental —Law Council is currently working in conjunction with NRDC, doing research on the problems of ocean dumping and highway expansion.

The idea for the Council grew out of the landmark victory in the Storm King Mountain power plant case by the Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference. Three lawyers who had been active in the case — Whitney North Seymour Jr., Stephen P. Duggan, and David Sive — were concerned with the amount of money spent on that particular case and concluded that only a full-time staff of environmental lawyers could fill the growing need.

The new organization, which was organized at a March, 1970 conference in Princeton, modeled itself after the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. NRDC is a non-profit New York corporation and is licensed to practice law by the New York Appellate Division.

The Council's first major battle, however, was not with polluters, but with the Internal Revenue Service over the group's tax-exempt status which was threatened because of NRDC's litigation activities. After considerable publicity and a Congressional inquiry, IRS relented.

The Council functions as an environmental legal corporation, the first of its kind, out of a New York office at 36 West 44th St. staffed by eight lawyers and a Washington office with a four-man staff. NRDC has received a large grant from the Ford Foundation and smaller grants from other foundations.

Another attempt by the Council to change the law is its suit against Tennessee Valley Authority for failure to file an "environmental-impact" statement concerning the extensive strip mining it has permitted in Tennessee and Kentucky.

Not all of the cases, however, that NRDS has initiated are attempts to influence the law. "If there is a significant threat to the environment and no one is doing anything about it, we'll take the case," Mr. Adams, the director, stated.

This stop-gap approach was applied when the Council received word that a manufacturer intended to dump two hundred tons of arsenic into the ocean off the New Jersey coast. The manufacturer made a voluntary agreement not to dump the arsenic after the group sought an injunction in New Jersey District Court.

In addition to its litigation activities, NRDC represents environmental interests in federal rule-making procedures relating to major federal administrative actions affecting the environment. This work is handled primarily by the Washington office and brings the Council into contact and frequent conflict with such agencies as the AEC, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Forest Service.

With the advice of The Scientists' Institute for Public Information, NRDC is sponsoring "Project on Clean Air," a long-term national effort to monitor federal and state implementation of the 1970 Amendments to the Clean Air Act. NRDC has entered into federal rulemaking proceedings under this Act and is national coordinator of local efforts to influence the state standard-setting proceeding mandated by the Act.

NRDC has also established a national program of cooperating attorneys. It provides information and, when appropriate, legal assistance at trial or on appeal to lawyers representing environmental interests around the country.

NRDC maintains regular contact with cooperating attorneys through a quarterly newsletter. Each issue focuses on an important environmental legal question, with the aim of supplying basic legal information to lawyers engaged in environmental litigation.

NRDC employs a small number of student interns for summer work on selected environmental problems.

Professional Responsibility

(Continued from Page 2)

credit to themselves nor to the profession which they degrade and depreciate.

An even more deleterious influence has been generated by lawyers who consider themselves "radical activists." These men, who are being glamorized currently by a sensationalist news media, make their living by subverting the system of justice which they have pledged to defend. Such men do the legal profession a disservice. One cannot properly defend clients in a court of law if one does not uphold the law. It is the function of a good lawyer to serve the law, for by serving the law well, he will serve his client well.

By their actions, the radical lawyers have sought to destroy an atmosphere which is conducive to fair and impartial hearings by creating circus-like demonstrations in the courtrooms and by the intimidation of judges. They have been deliberate in their attempts to create chaos where order is required to provide a climate of cool dispassion which is a requisite for true justice.

These notorious activists have made it their business to encourage the population to withdraw its support of and confidence in their legally elected authorities, by reckless, irresponsible and slanderous labelling of these government officials as racists and reactionary oppressors of the people.

The rhetoric of the activists is vicious; their intent is sinister. For, these men are attempting to destroy the judicial system which guarantees all Americans their freedom.

It is the responsibility of the legal profession to condemn these radical activists as menaces to the law, and to ostracize them professionally. The profession must make it plain that it will no longer tolerate within its ranks those who will take any steps in the furtherance of their clients' interests, regardless of ethical and moral considerations.

As the guardians of society, the members of the legal profession must act as models of rectitude, probity, and honor.

They must be in the vanguard of a movement where courage to do that which is right and proper has a greater emphasis than the doing of that which is currently in vogue.

In Memoriam

Andrew M. Stillman, 2E, died last Wednesday of an unknown illness at the age of 23.

Althouh he was at the Law School for a short time only, he distinguished himself with a superior academic record and by his performance on the Journal of Urban Law.

The students, faculty and administration extend their sincere condolences to his family and friends.

More Faculty Promised

(Continued from Page 1)

breakdowns for the various schools and departments would cause "dissension." The president discounted the argument that the failure to make the figures public created even greater dissension at the Law School. Reports of the Law School surplus often run to a figure many times that stated by Father Walsh.

At the present time Fordham releases figures for such categories as "instruction" only on a University-wide basis.

Stating that he had not yet seen budget figures for the Law School for the current year, Fr. Walsh said, "If it were not for the extra students, I doubt the Law School would have been able to balance its budget this year."

With the one hundred additional first-year students, Father Walsh indicated that a higher surplus than had occurred in the past might be expected at the Law School, which he noted was not the only division of the University with a customary budget surplus.

He observed that the Law School budget does not include the principal and interest on the cost of the Law School building.

After disclosing that he had been instrumental in getting certain contributions for the Law School, the president pointed out that "two years ago the Law School was given the special privilege" of being able to conduct its own fund raising drive.

However, "there was not much movement last year" with the change in the deanship, he commented.

Discussing the genesis of some of the Law School's current problems, Fr. Walsh mentioned the University's financial crisis several years ago, the transition of deans and the "extra avalanche of students."

He was also noncommital about the possibility of new programs at the Law School, though he did mention that he had spoken to the faculty about becoming involved in poverty programs — something about which "they were reluctant before," but on which "they are now working very hard."

One thing the president stated very strongly was his opinion that the Law School needs more students from minority groups.

"A strong effort was made last year," he said, and "we must get the money and ability to find minority students" in the future.

Asked about his dinner meeting last month with the Student Bar Association's four officers, Fr. Walsh stated, "I can't give them any answers. It will demoralize the structure as it exists."

Fr. Walsh said that the University, which is building a major new dormitory complex at Rose Hill, allows law students to live in University housing. However, he explained that law students have low priority compared to students from other divisions in obtaining housing in the current tight housing situation.

Employment Project

(Continued from Page 1)

problems in five major employment areas: discrimination, unemployment insurance, health and safety, manpower training programs, compulsory work litigation and civil service.

Professor Quinn called the Project an excellent opportunity for research and development in the law.

Currently at Columbia, there is a staff of four attorneys including Mr. Yeager, three secretaries and four law students who work part-time.

The students actively engage in critical research and are paid for their fifteen hours of work per week. During the summer, they can work forty hours per week for pay.

Although students do not receive credit for their work at present, Mr. Yeager expressed a willingness to have a credit program initiated.

He said that the Project was beneficial to the student because it exposes them to a "lawyer-like experience," and that students were good for the Project because of their enthusiasm and stimulation.

The Project is completely funded by the government with no cost to the school other than those which are later reimbursed.

Congressman Koch: "1984 Is Here!!"

Speaking at an October 22 Law Forum lecture on "Privacy and Government Surveillance," Rep. Edward Koch (D-N.Y.) called for enactment of a bill curbing government surveillance of private citizens.

Throughout the "three levels of government," Rep. Koch stated that there were some 180 million "files in existence." Access to these files is virtually unlimited. The one person denied the privilege to see these files, Koch said, is the subject on file.

To ameliorate the injustice of such a policy, Rep. Koch drafted H.R. 854 — the Koch Bill — to remove the cover of secrecy from government surveillance actvities. Under this bill, unless a person is involved in a pending criminal prosecution or deemed an active threat to national security, the federal government would be required to notify the subject of the files existence and allow the subject to examine the file, add, clarify and strike out irrelevant materials, and refuse access to anyone who is not authorized by law to examine the file.

Photo by Alan Michigan
Edward Koch

Agencies will be denied the privilege of compiling files unless information is required to further the agency's jurisdiction.

Rep. Koch is also concerned with surveillance on the local level. He has urged Councilman Sadowsky to introduce a bill which would force the New York Police Department to disclose the "approximately one million names on file" with its "Red Squad," as well as any pertinent information concerning these people.

On the "Red Squad" list is "almost everyone" who is known to have participated in peace demonstrations or who has signed a petition in support of such a rally, Koch said. Also included, he continued, are suspected Black militants and others deemed "undesirable."

UN Intervention Urged by IRA

By MARK BARRETT

Frank Durkan, defense counsel for Irish Republican Army leader Joe Cahill during his deportation hearings this summer, called for United Nations intervention in the current crisis in Northern Ireland. Mr. Durkan spoke last Wednesday with attorney Cormac O'Malley, at the first of a series of lectures here on the Ulster problem sponsored by the Law Forum.

Most Americans, Mr. Durkan maintained, are misled by the "British reputation for fair play and good laws." It is "therefore difficult" for them to believe that London would maintain a provincial government that has "overtly discriminated" against Roman Catholics for fifty years.

The denial of basic civil rights, Mr. Durkan continued, can best be seen in the recent "internment" of suspected IRA members without charges or trial. He charged that British officials were practicing imprisonment and torture of innocent citizens including "a blind man, a 74-year-old cripple, and a British soldier home on leave."

The spokesman for the American Committee for Ulster Justice charged that the British government's Information Service had attempted to obscure the findings of the "Cameron Report." The study, initiated by the British Parliament, documented and substantiated charges of bias alleged by the Irish civil rights movement.

Citing the failures of the nonviolent element of the Irish civil rights movement to alleviate the Ulster situation, Mr. Durkan demanded United Nations intervention and re-unification of Ireland as the only way of making Ulster "into a state where a man's religion is irrelevant."

International lawyer Cormac of Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt and Mosle — tated that the United Nations has three bases for in-Nationals has three bases for intervening in Ulster. Mentioning the U.N.'s role in the similar crisis in Cyprus, Mr. O'Malley suggested following that precedent.

Mr. O'Malley also stated that since Ireland did not recognize the partition of Ulster, the Irish government could bring the problem before the international body and could charge the London government with violation of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights.

Frosh Elections

The first-year sections elected their class officers Thursday. Class officers serve as members of the Student Bar Association Board of Governors.

In Section 1A Joseph Riemer was elected president; William Savino, vice president; and Thomas Greble, secretary-treasurer.

Section 1B elected Robert Kelley president; Betty Santangelo, vice president; and Joseph Kaestner, secretary-treasurer.

In Section 1E Robert Loergan was elected president; Matthew Coffeey, vice president; and John Lawless, secretary-treasurer.

The election in 1B was marked by statements of dissatisfaction with the current policies and leadership of the SBA, particularly with its president Anthony Siano. Heated debate occurred after Siano ruled one nominee ineligible under the SBA constitution because he had not paid his dues.

THE ADVOCATE
Fordham Law School
140 West 62nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10023
(address correction requested)

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
New York, N.Y.
Permit No. 7608