Leahy judges, case picked

Presiding as Chief Justice over this year's William E. Leahy Prize Argument will be Mr. Justice Byron R. White of the United States Supreme Court. Joining Justice White on the Leahy bench will be the Honorable Spottswood W. Robinson, III, of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and the Honorable John M. Ferren, Associate Judge, District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

The Leahy Prize Argument, to be held at the Law Center the evening of April 25, was established in 1967 in memory of William E. Leahy, a distinguished advocate and alumnus. The competition is open to all students who have successfully completed first year Legal Research & Writing. Participants submitting briefs deemed satisfactory by the faculty judges will receive one upperclass writing credit, and a cash prize will be awarded to each of the four finalists. In addition, the name of the winner of the Argument will be engraved on the Leahy Cup, which is stored permanently in the Law Center trophy case, and on the Roll of Best Advocates, a plaque soon to be installed in an appropriate location near the Main Court.


Faculty votes King tenure

The Law Faculty Tenure Committee has decided to recommend that Assistant Professor Patricia King be granted tenure by the University.

The decision was made Friday afternoon, January 19, at a meeting of the tenured faculty of the Law Center.

Tenure rules require that every member of the full-time faculty be considered for tenure by the end of his or her fifth year (this is King's fifth year at the Law Center). For the faculty member to remain at the Law Center, tenure must be granted.

Since tenure deliberations are confidential, it is not known whether the faculty was unanimous in its recommendation. The University Faculty & Tenure Committee, composed of tenured faculty from various departments of the University, has the next voice in the tenure process. University President Timothy S. Healy, S.J., makes the final decision. Although the decision is ultimately Healy's alone, the vote of the Law Center's tenured faculty substantially increases the likelihood of Professor King receiving tenure.

Tenure decisions are usually made by comparing the faculty member against a quad-objective standard having two major components: teaching performance and publication. Although, theoretically, each candidate is considered on his or her own merits, the political situation—a lack of minority representation on the tenured faculty at GULC, combined with the unpopular decision denying tenure to Jerrom B. Myers two years ago—may have assisted King in her application for tenure. The tenured faculty made no decisions individually, although a team format is used in the final argument. Each advocate is scored one-third on the brief and two-thirds on the oral argument at each round in the competition.

Inside: More on Prof. King's tenure recommendation. (See story on page two.)

G-Berger to disclose salaries to dean

Gordon Berger Enterprises, operators of the GULC Pub and snack bar, agreed last Friday to submit a letter of intent outlining their position on a mechanism for setting prices after a five-hour negotiating session with the SBA Food Service Committee, according to Assistant Dean Don Ransmeier, a member of the Committee.

"We're very happy that they'll come into agreement with our proposal," Ransmeier said. "There have been compromises on both sides."

The meeting last Friday was the first formal encounter between the parties since last July when Gordon-Berger requested a number of price increases. Lawyers for both sides were present.

Lack of agreement on a pricing mechanism was a key factor in the Food Service Committee's denial of price increases last fall. Problems arose when Gordon-Berger attempted to justify price increases with operating statements showing increases in salaries and wages. Since the salary line was not itemized in the operating statement, the Committee refused to grant an increase which might result in excessive profits for the operators.

SBA committee member Douglas MacBain said that "substantial progress" was made at the meeting, and that release of the agreement reached on pricing might occur as early as next week.

The Food Service Committee has tentatively scheduled its next meeting for Wednesday to consider the memorandum from Gordon-Berger. The committee expects to take action on the latest set of price increase requests then, according to Ransmeier.

Gordon-Berger gave the Committee a detailed list of price increases and wholesale costs ten days ago. Ransmeier said the price increases would be proportionate to the recent increases in wholesale costs, and are likely to cover a wide range of food items.

While the magnitude of the price increases to be approved is still in doubt, it is expected to be substantial. A number of prices have not risen since the fall of 1975 when Gordon-Berger began service at the Law Center.
Berne joins ministry staff

By KEN KINOSHITA

There's a new face among the staff of the Law Center Ministry. Dr. Patricia Berne, Jacquez of psychology, not theology, has joined the staff, temporarily replacing Sister Mary Himens.

Sister Himens will assume the position of Director of Campus Ministry for the spring semester, while Father Larry Madden, the present Director, takes a leave of absence.

Father James Malley, head of the Gulc ministry staff, was especially pleased that the appointment of Dr. Berne will keep a woman on the ministry staff.

Counseling students will be Dr. Berne's primary function at the Law Center. She is very interested in the psychological effects of law school on students, for the stress under which law students operate creates many problems, both academic and personal. She would also like to talk with faculty members about the relationship of students to faculty.

Dr. Berne brings a wealth of different experiences to her position on the ministry staff. She has worked previously with community mental health centers and has counseled children with learning disabilities. The fact that she is a lay person may encourage those who are uncomfortable around "theological" people to seek her advice. Married, with three children, she will help Sister Himens in her marriage counseling program at Gulc.

Father Malley was especially pleased to have Dr. Berne join the staff because of his concern that female students have the option of conferring with a woman. Interested in women's issues, Dr. Berne fills the gap caused by Sister Himens' relocation to the Main Campus. Both Father Malley and Dr. Berne stressed that she is here for all students. Malley indicated that men sometimes need a woman's perspective and that Dr. Berne could provide that.

Sister Mary Himens was appointed as Acting Director of Campus Ministry in January; she will return to full-time work at the Law Center in July when Father Madden returns from his leave. Her prior administrative experience made her the obvious choice as Acting Director; she had previously helped Father Madden in that field. As Director of Campus Ministry, she will be a Vice-President in the University structure. She plans to keep in contact with her Gulc friends, returning Tuesday afternoon office hours at the Law Center.

Georgetown to go solar

The world's largest solar-electric building is to be built at Georgetown University during the next couple of years. The $27-million intercultural center, targeted to be completed in 1981, will produce 480-400 kilowatts of electricity through a 400-foot long roof steeply constructed to catch the rays of the sun. With the efficiency of solar photovoltaic technology improving rapidly, the building is expected to provide more of the power to heat and light both the six-story building and a 400-seat cultural theater to be built beside it. The center is called a "national exemplar project" to demonstrate a "solar viable system."

The center, however, will not be visible from the surrounding town even though it is "an aesthetic and architectural solution... a handsome building in an historic district," according to university architect Dean Price.

The new intercultural building will house the University's offices on its north side and will resemble the Dales Internation Airport terminal building. It will house Georgetown's School of Foreign Service, School of Languages and Linguistics, and Graduate School.

This will be the third major campus structure at GU designed to help make the school self-sufficient in energy. The major goal of all new construction since 1973 and the Arab oil boycott has been to reduce energy costs. This building will come into the university's electrical system and eventually could provide electricity to surrounding Georgetown in the event of an arcwide power failure.

Funds for the solar building are expected to come from the U.S. Department of Energy, since the building will serve as a demonstration of advanced use of solar energy technology in large structures. The project, which the 95th Congress recommended for federal funding, was officially submitted to the DOE last week.

Georgetown is now finishing construction of two other energy-saving buildings and is considering putting new solar roofs on many existing campus buildings. A unique energy supply plan. This spring, officials expect to dedicate a new $14-million heating plant and a $7.4 million underground sports center, which will need to air conditioning and little heating since the earth around it maintains a constant temperature of 62 degrees.

The steam heating plant will be the nation's largest commercial application of a new atmospheric fluidized bed high sulfur coal process, burning high-sulfur coal without visible coal piles, smokestacks or air pollution. The coal plant is a "co-generation" plant since it can produce steam for heating as well as for conversion to electricity.

The GU intercultural center is designed to be an all-electric building, but will be connected to the campus steam heating system and plugged into the general electrical grid. Under the energy master plan, the campus may well become all-electric in the long run, perhaps with most of its buildings refitted with solar electric roofs. The coal-burning heating plant, which replaces the present natural gas and fuel oil plant, will some day itself become only a back-up system.

Chess

By K.R. FISHER

White to play and draw.

Student committee backed Prof. King's tenure

In recommending tenure for Prof. Pat King, the faculty committee followed the recommendations of the NAD Advisory Committee on Faculty Affairs.

In a report handed to the faculty committee Friday before the vote on King's tenure, the student committee said, "A clear majority of the Committee believes that Professor King has a great deal to contribute to the Law Center." The student vote was 7-2.

The committee noted that some students, particularly those that had King for first-year Torts, were critical of her lack of structure in the course and her lack of control of the class.

However, students in King's seminars gave her "very good reviews." Student comments in large upper class courses were more mixed in the report said.

The committee's report went beyond class performance and praised King as an active member of the Law Center community.

Prof. King's race and sex were also considered by this committee, which reported that it felt King had to surmount additional burdens in the classroom on account of her race and sex. The report said some "committee votes took into consideration the symbolic aspects of Professor King's tenure candidacy," an apparent referral to the controversy surrounding the denial of tenure for Prof. Jerome Shuman in 1977.

King is the first black woman faculty member to be considered for tenure and the first black since Shuman.

In its summary, the committee rated King as "a good or great teacher" who had made substantial contributions to the Law Center. Those voting against tenure said King's high marks in her seminars did not outweigh her difficulties in her lecture courses, particularly Torts.

Committee Counsel to speak at GULC

Attorney Barbara C. Washington, Chief Counsel for the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and a member of the New York Bar, will be BALSA's guest speaker on Wednesday, January 24, in Room 1B-19 at 4:00 pm. The title of the talk will be: "Getting A Job On Capitol Hill."

Ms. Washington has a bachelor's degree from Douglass College, and a law degree from Rutgers University (73), where she was very active in BALSA activities. After law school, she worked as an attorney in the general litigation division and in the tort division in the office of New York City's Corporation Counsel. She later worked as an attorney for C. Corporation System of New York City (a private agency for the service of process), and as an attorney in the Broadcast Service department of NBC.

Ms. Washington came to Capitol Hill in 1974 and this is the first black woman to hold the pointed Chief Counsel of a House Committee.
13. Parking:
I have used the lot:
1) very often 57
2) often 32
3) seldom 30
4) almost never 18
5) never 18

Its strong points are as follows:
Price 49
Location underground (security) 33
Convenience 26
Staff 14
Car pools 11
Well-run 11
Regiment, the attendant 5
Improvement over 1977 5
Hours available 2
Color coding 2
Ticket system 1

Its weak points are as follows:
Too small, overcrowded (especially for night students) 92
Closed on the weekends (Saturday mornings) 12
Too expensive 9
Ineffective car pool system 8
Too many "reserved" spaces 6
Closing entrance when spaces are available 5
Designed for small cars 5
No covered parking for bikes 5
Staff 4
Inconvenient system for paying 4
Lack of space for car pools 1
Too much red tape when using borrowed car 1
Too cheap; it should pay for itself and compete with other lots 1

Improvements for Parking:
Build more facilities 23
Use of additional lots in area 17
Open weekends (Saturday mornings) 12
Better parking for bikes 7
Reduce "reserved" spots 6
Encourage public transportation 4
Car pools for three 2

GUTS
Eliminate "white"; replace with "blue" 2
Stamp I.D. cards with parking permit symbol 1
Allocate spaces for evening students 1
Separate machine for evening tickets 1
Use both sides as exits during peak hours 1
Charge by the hour 1
More green spaces 1
Automatic check machines 1
Encourage carpooling 1
Open earlier 1
Sell books of tickets 1
Too many green spaces 1
More blue and white spaces 1
Have maps available 1

14. Student Activities Office
I attend approximately (... student activities annually:
0 1
1 - 5 59
6 - 10 103
11 - 15 20
16 - 20 6
21 - 30 4
31 - 40 0
over 40 1
80% 1

I am a member of the following student organizations:
Law Journal 16
James Brown Scott Society 9
Law & Policy in International Business 8

16.) Student-Alumni/ae Relations
What do you perceive as the role of alumni/ae in Law Center affairs?
Financial Contributions 59
Placement 41
Input into the Law Center’s affairs 30
Counseling 22
To carry on Law Center reputation 8
Listen to the real world 1
GRIP 1
What programs involving alumni/ae would you like to see instituted in:
1) the academic area? 1

Seminars, lectures (for evening students) 45
Continuing education for the alumni/ae 11
Counseling 11
Help for Law Clubs 9
Involvement in Meet Court 5
Tutoring (legal writing) 4
Evaluation of courses 4
Internships/careers 3
Board to judge faculty 3
Use of library 2
Symposium on "the Law Center and the law" 1
Funding - building, professors, etc. 1
Recruiting faculty 1
b.) the placement area?
Actual placement 32
Career counselors 18
Reporting of openings 11
Expand GRIP 7
Newsletter 5
Out of D.C. referrals 4
Internships 2
Practice interviews 2
c.) the social area?
Parties 23
Alumni Clubs 6
Class newsletters 3
Finance lounge areas 1
Fund-raising drive 1
Small, intimate functions 1
Open Houses 1
Temporary housing 1
Class Reunions 1
Annual Banquet 1
Sports 1
Invite them to all
Law Center affairs 1

PERSOINAL DATA
This was judged by a good number of the students to mean their year of law school graduation.
It is provided here as it is because it does give some foundation with which to work.

Years of College Graduation
1977 17
1976 18
1975 28
1974 28
1973 42
1972 14
1971 6
1970 13
1969 9
1968 7
1967 8
1966 3
1965 1
1964 1
1963 1
1962 1
1961 1
1960 1
1959 1
1958 1
1957 1
1956 1
1955 1
1951 1
1945 1

If you have been out of school for a period of time before becoming a law student, what have you been doing?
Work 116
Graduate School 36
Military 1
Travel 7
Freelance writing 1
Marriage/children 3
Peace Corps 2
Conscientious objector 1
with Selective Service 1

Wanted: Full time and part time positions available at Alexandrian Luxury Hotel front desk. Flexible hours and good working conditions. Call Diana at 370-9600.

Lerner Law Books
The one place to stop for everything you need for law school.
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PR tries to balance supply

By KEVIN HANDLY

Does the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission have the power to insure that consumers enjoy a continuing supply of the old, price-regulated natural gas, and that new, deregulated natural gas, is developed prior to price deregulation? If the Commission is found to have such power, is its "prudent operator" standard an appropriate exercise of it? These are the questions addressed in the brief filed in the United States Supreme Court after last May's decision by the Institute for Public Representation attorney Charles Hill.


The conflict arises from a regulation issued by the Federal Power Commission in 1974. The F.P.C. regulation, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, F.E.R.C., on July 30, 1976. Acting in response to the gas shortage which developed after the formation of O.P.E.C. in 1973, the Commission issued Order No. 539. B. This order was the Commission's first attempt to define the delivery obligations of gas producers under the sections 4(d) and (b) of the Natural Gas Act of 1938. In essence, Order No. 539-B would require "certification" of gas producers to supply gas to interstate commerce.

Order No. 539-B would require natural gas producers to show compliance with the "prudent operator" standard whenever they desired to abandon or curtail natural gas production from the existing field already "dedicated" to interstate commerce. With the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 increasing the prices available for natural gas, but only for natural gas not already dedicated to interstate commerce, the natural gas producers, Shell Oil included, have tremendous incentive to shift their investment dollars from "dedicated" gas fields to "new" gas fields to obtain a greater return on their investment. The natural gas consumers, on the other hand, are the ones who are going to have to foot the bill. To the extent that the producers are permitted to abandon their "old," dedicated fields in favor of "new" gas fields for the purpose of supplying interstate commerce, the natural gas consumer is going to be paying higher utility bills. The quantity of gas involved is immense - Shell, according to J. P. R.'s brief, or "nearly nine times the amount of gas delivered from [dedicated] reserves during the preceding year."

The difference in price is also substantial. The maximum price for "new natural gas" under the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 is established by a $1.75 base price [per million BTUs] for April 1977, and increasing it by both a fluctuating inflation component and an annual escalator of 3.5 or 4 percent. . . . However, gas dedicated to interstate commerce before the date of enactment did not start at a lower "base rate" for April 1977 (i.e., generally the base rate is the "just and reasonable" rate previously set for gas by the Commission), but also is in

There is an old saw that "you can't win your case as oral argument, but you can sure lose it." The continued vitality of this principle will perhaps be demonstrated by the Supreme Court's opinion in Federal Energy Regulatory Commission v. Shell Oil Co. Everything was going smoothly until Justice Stevens threw this hypothetical oral argument last Monday afternoon. First, the F.E.R.C.'s Solicitor, Mr. Howard E. Shapiro, presented the Commission's case in the usual style, but not particularly inspiring terms. (The Gallery was intrigued by Mr. Shapiro's practice of sitting on a rock chair in the Chamber.) Mr. J.P.R.'s lawyer, Mr. Shapiro then relayed Mr. J.P.R.'s position to the Court who had appeared so animadverted in litigation before them.

The Court then asked Mr. J.P.R. what the problem was and Mr. J.P.R. said that the problem was that the Court had imposed such an impossible standard that the natural gas company was being forced to sell its gas at a price below its cost. The Court then asked Mr. J.P.R. what the<br>Oral Argument, or how not to answer a hypothetical question

By GAIL GROSSMAN

Paige Sound Gillisters, Association, you say? No, it's not a new disco. Or even an up and coming rock group. The Noise Elimination Association, however, the petitioners in a case which Professor William H. Rodgers, Jr., will be arguing in the Supreme Court during the week of February 25, 1979.

Rodgers, who teaches Environmental Law, Legislation, and Toxics at the Law Center, is one of three groups of people interested in environmental issues.

The first lawsuit in which Professor Rodgers is involved, to be argued in the Supreme Court next month, is entitled United States v. Washington. Rodgers represents an Indian tribe known as the Puyallup Indians, located in the northwest part of the state of Washington. The suit involved a dispute between Indian treaty fishermen and non-Indian fishermen in the state.

In an exchange for relinquishment to the United States government of large Indian lands, the United States agreed, by treaty, to allow various Indian tribes to continue to fish off the reservation and to be able to fish in common with non-treaty fishermen. However, over the years, with an increase in non-treaty fishermen, the State of Washington adopted several measures which favored non-Indian fishermen in violation of the treaties, to the great detriment of the Indian tribes.

As a result of the actions of the state of Washington, a suit was filed in behalf of the Indian tribes to try to retain their rights which were granted to them by the treaties.

The case will involve the direct conflict of state vs. federal court in the state of Washington. The U.S. District Court granted an injunction to stop the unauthorized taking of fish by the non-treaty fishermen, in violation of the treaty. However, commercial fishing groups, such as the National Association of Commercial Fishermen, found their relief in the State Supreme Court of Washington which refused to enjoin the decision of the federal courts enforcing the treaty provisions. The Supreme Court will make a determination whether the treaties guarantee these rights to the Indians and whether the rights will be protected.

The case in which Professor Rodgers is involved (in the Western District of Washington) is a side issue of the Supreme Court case. The case, also captioned United States v. Washington, involves the issue whether there is a federal treaty right providing any environmental protection whatsoever for the fisheries resources that are the subject of the treaty, i.e., whether the complete eradication of anadromous fish, (salmon), which are the subject of the treaty, will be allowed to occur through environmental offensives.

In this case the Indian tribes were granted by treaty, a right to take and harvest anadromous fish, off the reservation. In an effort to develop the Indians' supply of fish, the State of Washington took such measures as giving over generous allocations to the non-treaty fishermen; by approval of grossly destructive harvesting methods; by mild state regulation and revenue licensing measures; and even refusal to arrest and physical violence to the Indians.

The legal issue presented is whether the State of Washington's actions constitute a "taking" of fish without just compensation.

A second issue in the case involves the gravest concern to the resource as a result. This right is a reserved, high valued, government and held for the Indian resources granted by the treaty the State of Washington is violating a government to hold these resources. Any violation of the treaty would be a duty to protect the resource from degradation or eroded.

In a third case involving environmental Rodgers is representing the Natural Environment for Environmental Improvement before the Environmental Protection Agency in many deals with pollutant discharge from the Blue Plains Sewage Treatment Plant brought by the coalition because the that were committed by the plant. The Blue Plains Sewage Treatment Plant outside of Washington, D.C., says Potomac River with low dissolved Oxygen of the Federal Water Pollution result. Fecal bacitracin and other river, creating hazardous health and water use.

In all of the cases he has litigated, Rodgers continues to work pro bono for the members of the tribes, including the Super Professor Rodgers also announced that he will be leaving the Law Center for a different law practice.
Of administrative justice

Consumer interests in the national energy regulatory process, represented by Georgetown's Institute for Public Representation (I.P.R.), C.E.C.A. supports the Commission's assertion of regulatory jurisdiction over the supply of natural gas to interstate commerce, noting that without such jurisdiction the power of the Commission under the Act to pass upon reductions or abolishments of gas supply would be illusory. But C.E.C.A. focuses its primary attention on the inadequacies of the standard adopted by the F.E.R.C.

The "prudent operator" standard, argues C.E.C.A., was developed by state courts to define the gas producer-lessee's obligations to the landowner-lessee. The lessee is interested in continued production from the field because of the royalties that production brings, and not because of any interest in continued production per se. In certain instances it is to the lessor's benefit to discontinue or withhold production from a particular well, and thereby reap the rewards of a higher market later on—a tactic analogous to O.P.E.C.'s withdrawal of oil from the market in December 1973. In such circumstances, the interests of the lessor, which the "prudent operator" standard was designed to protect, come into direct conflict with the policy of the Natural Gas Act to assure a steady supply of natural gas at reasonable prices to the consumer. Rather than the "prudent operator" standard, C.E.C.A. urges the Commission to adopt a standard tailored to the consumer interest in continued service that the Act was intended to protect.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission rejects C.E.C.A.'s arguments, stating that "this regulation is better than none at all" and attacking the consumers' failure to suggest specific alternative standards. If the consumers and the Commission are upholding on the jurisdictional front (in light of the F.E.R.C. decision), I.P.R. contemplates offering such specific suggestions.

Adendum

1. T. V. Johnson, counsel for Tennessee & Pennzoil, wrote a letter to Supreme Court judge Michael Rodak on Tuesday, January 16, requesting that the court review their brief in this case "independently of the oral argument." (This is an extraordinary request, extremely rare in Supreme Court practice, will be disregarded by the Court.)

"We knew that the Indians supplied us, with no degradation exploitation. We took the salmon, we took the fish, we took the huckleberries, without the slightest interference from the Federal authorities for the Indians. The salmon runs have never been diminished, the fishery has never been interfered with in any way, and the Indian tribes have never been interfered with in any way by the Federal Government for the Indians. The salmon run has never been interfered with in any way by the Federal Government for the Indians. The salmon run has never been interfered with in any way by the Federal Government for the Indians. The salmon run has never been interfered with in any way by the Federal Government for the Indians. The salmon run has never been interfered with in any way by the Federal Government for the Indians. The salmon run has never been interfered with in any way by the Federal Government for the Indians. The salmon run has never been interfered with in any way by the Federal Government for the Indians. The salmon run has never been interfered with in any way by the Federal Government for the Indians. The salmon run has never been interfered with in any way by the Federal Government for the Indians. The salmon run has never been interfered with in any way by the Federal Government for the Indians. The salmon run has never been interfered with in any way by the Federal Government for the Indians.

Professor Rogers has written a book on the environment, entitled "Corporate Country". This book took a hard look at the way corporations manipulate their way into the most advantageous financial positions, often to the great detriment of the environment and society.

Professor Rogers has been a great asset to the Law Center faculty, staff, and students. He will be sorely missed.
Whither humanity?

Humanity as a concept is something often neglected in the pressure-packed law school environment. The thirst for knowledge (read: "the grumbing for grades") can sometimes cause us, in our haste, to perform acts which no self-respecting human being would consciously choose to do. The accompanying cartoon is an appropriate example.

Certainly first year students have no monopoly on immoral practices such as cutting out cases from the Federal Reporters or cheating onto Law Journal. But the extreme pressure visited on first year students from the moment they walk into their first class causes some of them to lose their perspective on life, law, and reality.

Reshelfling library books is another example. Common courtesy would dictate that a person reshelve library books when one is finished with them, so that the other students who need those very books can find them without too much effort. With the onset of the infamous spring brief, the number of books not reshelved is again on the increase. The inconvenience to other students (for example, those in the same law club who are researching the exact same problem) is outrageous when compared to the small investment of time required to reshelve one's own books.

The point is that the law school experience is not meant to be a complete denial of everything that occurred before law school. Although it may be important to learn how to think like a lawyer, it is even more important to remember how to think like a human being. Cutting out cases from reporters and forgetting to reshelve books is only a symptom of the real problem. Concern for the rights and feelings of others demands that we all reevaluate our commitment to each other from time to time. Charity begins at home.
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Guest Opinion

Equal Justice needs help

The phrase "equal justice" should be redundant, but unfortunately, it isn't. For that reason 30 people from various law schools met at the Law Center on January 6 and 7 to work on establishing an Equal Justice Foundation.

In academic year 1977-78, the initial organizing year of the EJF, over 150 third-year law students pledged a minimum of 1% of their incomes to provide funds to promote greater access to justice in the United States. Those funds will be coming in at the end of this month, and the transition council met to solidify developments and to confer on this year's organizing campaign.

Why worry about access to justice? Presently, money can buy access to a judicial decision. But major stumbling blocks lie in the path of the average citizen who needs legal protection or representation. Procedural, representational, and organizational barriers preclude citizen participation in legal processes and foreclose access to legal remedies. Public interest representation groups do exist, and legal service organizations provide help for poor people with problems. But such organizations are usable to go to the root of the problem; changing the structure of the legal mechanism. Much of their work is limited to putting out fires, and little can be directed to fire prevention. Advocates of increased access to justice realize that any impact in important areas—consumer protection, discrimination, health care, energy, the environment, poverty, corporate abuse—depends upon citizen and public interest group access to the institutions that make critical decisions.

There is a need for central organization in reforming the legal system. Different pieces of legislation presently pending before Congress address federal consumer class actions, standing to sue and intervene for reimbursement. The Communications Act of 1934 is being completely rewritten. While special public interest groups keep an eye on such matters individually, no organization yet serves to coordinate information and to channel activity toward a fundamental revision of the legal mechanism.

The work of the Equal Justice Foundation will include legislative drafting, lobbying, litigation, education, and research, all aimed at the broad goal of increasing access to the American legal and governmental systems. Existing restrictions on class action litigation, citizen standing to sue, attorneys fees for successful public interest litigants, and public participation in judicial selection processes are but a few areas needing work.

The drive to solicit both financial pledges and commitments to work in the local Washington chapter of the EJF will begin during the next two weeks. Those interested in helping to set up this membership campaign are urged to contact Michael Palmer at 256-7076, or to leave a note with name, address, and telephone number at the Women's Rights Collective/National Lawyers Guild office.

Michael Paul Palmer

Free money available

The deadline for applications for Law School Services Fund grants is February 1; applications must be postmarked on or before that date. The LSSEF program seeks to encourage the development of law-related projects by law school students through grants ranging from $100 to $1,000. For application forms and further information, contact your Law Student Division representative, your student bar association president, or your dean, or call the Chicago ABA/LSSEF office.

EXAM TAKING HANDBOOK: DO'S + DON'TS

43. WHEN IN DOUBT, MAKE AN EDUCATED GUESS.

51. COMMERCIAL LAW EXAM.

I DIDN'T KNOW THE ANSWER TO THE QUESTION ON IMPLIED WARRANTIES, SO I PUT DOWN MY SEAT NUMBER.

SIGH!

(cliff and save)

©1979 Pamphlet

A word about street parking ...

One of the security guards has informed the Law Weekly that students who park on the streets around the Law Center are especially vulnerable to towing by the D.C. Police crane trucks. One of the city's impoundment areas is on the unopened segment of Interstate 395 near the Law Center. The guard told the Law Weekly that several student's cars were towed on Friday, towing a car results in a $25 ticket and a $50 towing charge.

"O.K., let's move along here!" KROKOMOKE

Letters

Keep it open, please

To the Editor:

Some of us live in the real world—that is, we work and we are not students. It is therefore hard on us when the GUCLC doesn't keep the hours it promises to keep. Case in point: the course material "distribution center" says that it will be open until 8 p.m. It closes at 6:15 p.m.—or at least this particular night student made three stops there between 6:15 p.m. and 6:45 p.m. and no one was there. Not a big deal, admittedly, but galling nonetheless.

Name withheld on request

Helping us keep fit

To the Editor:

Many law students complain that they don't get enough exercise while they are in law school. Anyone who attempted to use the library last term during exam-time, however, did not encounter this problem. Thanks to students who didn't reshelve their books, much time was spent walking around the third floor looking for books left on tables. Those who successfully completed their term papers using the Georgetown library can probably qualify for any upcoming walking marathons.

We would sincerely like to thank those students who, out of sheer altruism for the physical well-being of the fellow students, did not reshelve their books. In an effort to keep us all in shape, these students managed to ignore any pleas from their fellow students to reshelve the books, any feelings of guilt about leaving stacks of unshelved books on tables, any reasonable person's (1) sense that the library staff could not possibly reshelve books as quickly as they were used, as well as any common courtesy or habit such as "if you use a book, put it away."
From the Registrar

Exam conflicts
Deadline for filing exam conflicts is January 31, 1979. See page 11 of the Spring course schedule for details. Forms are available at the Registrar’s office.

Credit/ No credit
The deadline for upperclass 3D students to file K/NK elections for any course which begins in the Spring Semester is February 21st. Forms available at Registrar’s Office. Receipts will be issued when you submit your election.

Add/Drop period
Add/drop slips will be accepted through January 24th. Courses may not be added to or dropped from a student’s schedule after this date. Watch Bulletin Boards for notices of time and place of add/drop.

From the SBA
SBA meeting
The SBA will meet Thursday, Jan. 25, 8 p.m. in 1B-17 to approve budget requests for student organizations.

Student Activities
A.C.E. sponsors luncheon
The new Alternative Career Emphasis organization invites all students to attend the first of a series of informal and informative luncheons dealing with alternative career opportunities. Our guest will be Charles Hapner, director of the Institute for Public Interest Representation who will provide an overview of the public interest law community. This “brown-bag” affair is scheduled for Monday, January 22nd at 12:15 p.m. in 1B-33.

Letters
(continued from page 7)

If last term is any indication, many of GULC’s students will be just as fervent about the health-crazed this term. Those of us using the library should wear sweatshirts, gym shorts, and sneakers. Perhaps the health-faddists could sit in inaccessible cars, and really increase our exercise?

I wanna bike it!

To the Editor:

The parking authorities have decided to discontinue permitting bicyclists to use the underground parking lot. For physical plant, the decision was as simple as black and red: the bikes were not paying for themselves. I think physical plant should reconsider.

Bike racks were placed on two spaces in the parking lot at the beginning of last term. Bikers could use them by buying a 50 cent decal (compared with $1 for a car) and paying 15 cents a day (compared with 90 cents for a car).

Thirty-five bikers bought decals, but, on the average, only one or two used the bike racks each day. Physical plant did some arithmetic during the winter break. If only one biker (15 cents) used the parking space that a car (90 cents) would have used, the space lost an alarming 75 cents a day. This amounts to $3.75 a week, or $60 a term (which, by the way, is less than three percent of that one biker’s tuition for that term).

Sixty dollars in the red was too much for Physical Plant, but it should not have been. For one thing, some of the loss was compensated for by the $17.50 in decals the bikers purchased.

It is true that the facility was experimental, and that bikers were warned that it would be discontinued were not enough use made. But the little use can be explained by the harsh winter, and the fact that the idea was new. There is no reason why use would not pick up in the spring.

And there are some good reasons for continuing the underground bike racks on one car space. After all, as many students benefit from them as from an extra car space. Moreover, I think it’s worthwhile for GULC to encourage students to bike to school.

Carol Josien
Maria Tapper

A.C.E. Panel Discussion
We will be sponsoring a panel discussion for students and graduates who are interested in starting their own law practice. Panel is scheduled for Wednesday, January 31 at 4:00 p.m. in Hall 6.

Wine tasting
This week, we will be tasting Ports. All those who did not contribute money last week are welcome, if they bring cheese (Stilton is traditional with Port) and bread or crackers. Thursday night, 8 p.m., 1B-42.

BALSA sponsors job discussion
The entire law school community is invited to a talk by Arty. Barbara C. Washington, Minority (Representative Chief Counsel, House Committee on the District of Columbia, Wednesday, January 24, 1979, Room 1B-19 at 4:30 p.m. Title: Getting A Job on Capitol Hill.

Variety in store
The Co-Curricular Activities Committee is pleased to announce the second coming of the Section 3 Variety Show. Get your set together and put your names or ideas in the co-curricular box in student activities office. Open to faculty, students and staff.

Gilbert & Sullivan
Any and all persons interested in doing production or stage work for this year’s production of “Rudolph” please contact Shaun MacMurray at 243-3629.

Table tennis singles
Entries for the Georgetown University Table Tennis Singles Tournament will be today through Wednesday, Jan. 24, at the GULC Student Activities office. Entry fee is 50 cents per person. The tournament is for men and women in the GU community.

Squash
Entries for the Georgetown University Squash Tournament will be through Wednesday, Jan. 24, at the GULC Student Activities office. Entry fee is 50 cents per person. The tournament is for men and women in the GU community.

Et alia
Recycle those IPLB’s
Due to subscriber demand for last week’s Administrative Survey, Law and Policy will pay two dollars (U.S.) for the first 33 copies of Volume 10, Issue 1 turned into our office. Contact Sean K. Johnson in LP1B.

Student insurance
Ms. Gwen Wilson, the G.U. Student Health Insurance Plan representative, will be available for late enrollment by students into the Plan Outside the Health Office on Jan. 22 and 23 from 9 to 1. Anyone with insurance questions is welcome to drop in and chat.

Goodbye Patrice
The Placement Office is a glorious place since Patrice Weighlin left to join the Office of University Development on the main campus. See asks old friends to stop by and see her anytime.