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MOVIE!

Frank Copra's "It Happened One Night"
Starring Claudette Colbert and Clarke Gable

This extraordinary talents of a major director and two dynamic stars of the 1930's combine to make a superb comedy that 5 major Academy Awards, including Best Actress, Best Actor, and Best Picture!

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 17
7:00 p.m. ROOM 100 HH
9:15 p.m.

ADMISSION -- $1.00 Law students with law school identification * - free

*Please make an effort to bring the white law school fee receipt or some other positive identification of being a law student.

- Law School Film Society

CHANCERY DIVISION

WRIT OF NOTIFICATION

Chancery Division will hold its first substantive gathering in the Cook Room of the Law Quad (located in the N section) at 3:30 p.m., October 17 (today).

Ronald Trowbridge, member of the Ann Arbor City Council will be present for informal remarks and questioning and some liquid refreshment should be available.

Those who attended the William Buckley debate at Hill Auditorium last spring will remember Mr. Trowbridge's low-powered, lighthearted style as moderator that evening. He has promised us more of the same.

This meeting is open to all members of the Law School community wishing to attend. For further information, please see the "Bill in Equity" announcing the event which has been posted in Hutchins.

--

PHI ALPHA DELTA

Our speaker on Thursdays, October 23, will be Judge Tommasen. His topic will be taking traffic out of court. Please join us at noon in the Faculty Dining Room of the Lawyers Club. Coffee is provided.

PLEASE PASS THE FIDS

A Public Interest Law Society meeting will take place, as usual, Thursday at 12:30 in the luxurious ELS-PILS office, 112 Legal Research.

LATER

ETHNICS LECTURES

JUDGE HORACE GILMORE

MONDAY, NOV. 10
TIME: 7:30
TUESDAY, NOV. 11
ROOM: 150

Some states require the Law School to certify that the applicant for the bar has completed training in legal ethics. These lectures will satisfy the requirement. Information on the rules for each state bar is available from Mrs. Betts in 304 Hutchins Hall.

Code of Professional Responsibility and Code of Judicial Conduct will be available in Room 300 Hutchins Hall during the week of November 3rd.

--

RG, I'M SICK AND TIRED OF YOUR HALF-TRUTHS IN YOUR CRUMMY PAPER!

60% COULDN'T YOU PRINT SOME OF MY HALF-TRUTHS?
This Golden Oldie was originally published two years ago but is being re-run due to popular demand.

by Joe Fenech, editor emeritus, member of the Michigan bar.

Ex Libris

My first suspicion that the law library was not entirely what it seems occurred last summer. I had entered the library, for the first time, with Cohen’s Legal Research in a Nutshell (sequel to his great best seller, Legal Student in a Nuthouse) in hand, and asked a scholarly looking fellow where the "Shepards" were.

"Oh, about forty miles north of here, tending to their flocks."

"Hm, with a sharp wit like that he must be a law review man", I thought to myself.

I finally found the Shepards Citations.

The particular volume I needed was on the table interspersed with: You and Your Tibia, What the Hell are Eczema, Seborrhea, and Psoriasis?, Metatarsals and Proboscis, i.e. Toes and Nose, A Chemical Analysis of Hemoglobin in Hemophiliacs, Ophthalmology in Three Easy Lessons, Is Fecal Gas Flammable? --A Medical Dissertation by Brian Griffon Kennedy, and various undergraduate books: Humpty-Dumpty Examines Freud, Keynesian Economics in the Twelfth Century, Ronnie the Pooh, by J. Hensley, and Fly me to Boston, I Wanna Go Home-- A Travelogue, by Bruce Hallet.

"Strange books for a law library.", I thought.

I began "shepardizing" a statute when I heard someone scream:

"Your elbow is wiping out my cornea!"

In panic, thinking I had inadvertently incurred a Tort action, the loss of which would result in liens on my loans, I quickly retracted my elbow and turned toward the injured person ready to offer my aid.

There on the table was a three-foot diagram of the human eye.

The individual who had screamed came over and said:

"Pretty nice eye, huh?"

"I beg your pardon?"

"You had your elbow on my eye diagram." he said.

"Isn't that a strange thing for a law student to be studying?", I asked.

"Yes, but I'm an opthamology student."

"An opthamology student! Then what are you doing in the law library?", I queried.

"Oh me and my thirty-seven classmates here (he pointed around the table) always study around the "Shepards".

"Why is that?"

"Our calculations show that reading the small print in a Shepards results in a permanent loss of vision. Why already today, I've seen six law students with ocular-itis, two with glaucoma, and six with cataracts."

"Uh-huh!"

"Listen, I graduate in a month. Four of us are going to open up a practice back in the Federal Reporters. Come and see us if you have eye problems."

Reassuring him that I would do so if necessary, I decided to leave the shepardizing for a later date since the large "eye" was having a mesmerizing effect on me and I swore it blinked.

Turning to leave, I walked a few steps when I tripped over a four-foot high plastic model of a molar which had written on it: "PROPERTY OF U. OF M. DENTAL SCHOOL".

As I plummeted head first toward oblivion, I shouted: "darn dental students", whereupon the three hundred dental students in the law library pelted me with scores of empty toothpaste tubes!

Fortunately, I fell into the arms of an
undergraduate woman who, with the 6,087 other undergraduate women in the library at the time, asked me to marry her. I politely declined and slipped away.

One of the toothpaste tubes had cut my forehead and I was bleeding. Immediately the fifty-seven medical students, who had been occupying the entire west wing of the library with their coughing and hacking patients, rushed to my aid.

"What a madhouse!" I said to myself trying to regain my composure.

Since I had to check some Wyoming statutes before leaving, I went over to the Wyoming section.

"HAAII--EEEE!!!"

Accompanying that horrendous sound was a flying side kick. Having studied Pukang-Tang-Soo-Do in years past I successfully parried the thrust, but the only other law student in the library, who happened to be standing at my side, was knocked clean through the A.L.R. shelf. While the medical students fought over his crumpled body, I discovered to my horror that we had intruded upon the Korean Olympic Karate Team which used the "Wyoming section" for its practice meets.

"A madhouse!" I said as I fled for protection into the "Michigan section".

There among the compiled statutes I sought refuge.

"Tweet! Tweet! Tweet-Tweet-Tweet!" There marching straight toward me was the two hundred forty piece University of Michigan Marching Band playing "Hail to the Victor"!

I got up and ran right out of the library, passing through a meeting of the Ann Arbor chapter of the National Organization of Women, and Evel Knievel who was reving up his bike near the reference desk.

Two days later I got up enough nerve to try again. There on the revolving doors was a sign:

"In as much as facilities and space are severely limited, we ask that law students refrain from using the library."

---

**Placement News**

The Washington Practitioner

Mr. John H. Pickering, JD'40, and partner in the firm of Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, Washington, D.C., will present a series of four seminars on The Washington Practitioner. All interested students and faculty are invited to attend these sessions. Two sessions will be held on each of the topics. They will be held in the Practice Courtroom (Room 232 Hutchins Hall) 11:00-12:15, and 2:00-3:15 on the following days:

- **Tues., Oct. 21** - The Washington Legal Scene - an Overview
- **Thursday, Oct. 30** - The Washington Practitioner and the Courts
- **Tuesday, Nov. 4** - The Washington Practitioner and the Executive Departments and Independent Agencies
- **Tuesday, Nov. 18** - The Washington Practitioner and the Congress

* * * * * * * * * * *

Group meeting for students interested in The Reginald Heber Smith Fellowship Program will be held on October 24th at 3:15p.m. Room will be announced at a later date.

If you have taken a job, please report it to the Placement Office. This information will help us in determining where we stand this year as compared with past years.
Dear Larry Halperin,

In so far as your letter of dump in the last issue attempted to point out the failings of free speech on network television and the weakness of the macho, neofascist National Rifle Association's arguments against gun control, I agree wholeheartedly. I must say that I was quite put off by your emotional, slanderous, and irrational approach, but such is generally typical of the "bleeding-heart" liberal position.

I am myself non-violent, or at least I have been so far. Generally, the Constitution aside, I agree that people should not be guaranteed the right to have guns or arms, though I hardly see how the mere access to guns has more to do with violence than the macho, possessive, and violence proneness of Americans conditioned by years of the glorification of killing (but not loving) on television, in movies, and by our "leaders". Still, I am generally more swayed by your views than I ever was by the NRA slogan, "If guns are outlawed, then only outlaws will have guns."

But there is another argument that may be far more important than the NRA's as to why we should have guns; that is, "If guns are illegal, then only the government will have guns." Given the recent deaths of millions by the Nazis in World War II, the killings of Black Panthers in Chicago, of students at Kent State and Jackson State, of prisoners at Attica and San Quentin, and of minorities and radicals everywhere in the country, maybe we should think twice about giving all the guns to the benevolent government. Are you so sure that John Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, and Martin Luther King (not to mention Malcolm X, George Jackson, and others) weren't picked out by CIA or other government conspiracies? The fact that "the government touches all aspects of our lives" does not make me feel any more comfortable and certainly does not to my mind justify further encroachment into my life. So even though I don't expect to ever shoot anybody, maybe the fact that a lot of people have guns is the one thing preventing a complete fascist takeover in this country.

Besides, if you are really concerned about violence in America why don't you look at the institutionalized violence perpetrated on us daily. Violent crime amounted to only about 20,000 deaths last year, but deaths due to inadequate medical care for the poor, pollution-caused cancer, inadequate diets, and dangerous automobile construction, led to over a million deaths in this country alone, not to mention the long-arm of American weapon sales and exploitation of foreign workers. So before we talk about making guns illegal for private citizens, we should really decide who is responsible for unnecessary deaths in this country; is it individuals or is most of this death due to corporate and government policies themselves?

Critically yours (though affectionately),

Jonathan Barry Forman

Dear RG:

(You may want to shoot me for saying this but ...)

By Rick Kamowski

I am not sure what Mr. Bourgeois's position is on gun control/hunting. It seems that for practical purposes he is opposed to the "absolute abolition of gun ownership by anyone for any purpose." While I agree that society does not appear to need protection from the hunters, I cannot see my way clear to a position where I can support this "sport." Outside of the case where the hunter goes out to hunt food, I find no positive objective served by the killing of the prey. I hope that Mr. Bourgeois or any person in the reading audience can explain the value of hunting "in the rational manner that is necessary."

Let me address some arguments that may be made in support of "The Guns of August." Some may point out the skill required in being able to hit a moving target. But isn't that what skeet shooting is all about? Others may talk of the tracking expertise that one must have to be able to find and flush out the animal. Sorry but that one doesn't wash either because that...
purpose is not furthered in my mind by the SUBSEQUENT killing of the hunted. How about the feeling of exhuberation of being out in the Great Outdoors? I am in favor of camping and the like. Again I am hard pressed to see the connection between this element and shooting animals. And the worst type of hunter is the one who is only looking for something to hang in the den.

I ask you to squarely face the issue. Why does the animal have to be killed if there is no purpose served by it? I suggest that a purpose is evident and it includes the feeling of accomplishment and pleasure associated with being able to stop a living thing.

I must admit that I cannot rely on surveys or even personal experience. Hunting has never appealed to me and my analysis may be completely wrong. In one sense it would be very comforting to have any errors pointed out to me. Maybe others don't see the correlation between respect for life and respect for human life that I do.

Mr. Bourgeois does make one other statement that interests me. "There is hope for gun control, and in the near future." That's good news but I remain skeptical. The near-nothingness accomplished after the "63 and "68 assassinations have left me with the notion that only seeing is believing in this area. And the two attempts on President Ford's life have hardly stirred the public into a call for gun control. We've become passe' on this issue. Or so I thought.

I must apologize to those who believe that emotions should be left out of this discussion. I don't see how it can be done. And after listening to some of the opponents of gun control I must reluctantly conclude that all they understand is a warm gun.

---

Dear Professor Kamisar:

Well, we have both taken our share of public condemnation in the past few weeks. Now that the issue presumably has had its day, let me express to you my appreciation for your public apology. I felt that the student body deserved such an apology, and obviously, from your letter in RG, you felt similarly. We all have our own opinions concerning the rights and wrongs of our individual approaches in this matter, but regardless of all that, I am satisfied. A simple "I'm sorry" goes a long way with me to remedy any "misbehavior" I may have conceived of as having occurred.

In the same voice, I wish now to apologize to you. I admit my letter was harsh, but it was meant to be harsh on a practice, i.e., turning in grades late, and a lack of established policy to prevent such a practice. It was not meant as a personal "character assassination." I consider both of our actions with respect to our public "positions" fair game for comment and criticism, and that was the spirit in which I wrote condemning you in your capacity as a professor whose action of turning in grades late inconvenienced and created "personal problems" for the students and staff at this school.

In light of your promise not to turn in your grades late for the "next twenty years," I hope that we can count on you as a voice on the faculty advocating a policy of disciplinary incentives for procrastinating professors and even more important, a system whereby professors who have personal problems preventing them from getting their grades in on time can get help in grading exams from other professors or graduate student assistants or someone. There must be a way for the faculty to help one another when illness or other personal problems causes them to be unable to carry out their professorial functions. If such a system had been in effect, maybe you could have received the aid you needed and none of this would have had to happen.

Again, thank you for your apology. 

Sincerely,

Pamela S. Hyde

---

WHEN THE RG WAS ROTTEN

Producer: Harry Zeliff
Director: Larry Elder
Stage Manager: Mary Busby
Script Girl: Ken Frantz

CAST
Robin Hood: Howie Bernstein
Maid Marian: Larry Halperin
Little John: G. Burgess Allison
Friar Tuck: R. Richard Livorine

---

CONT P7
Dear Peter Isme, G. Burgess Allison, Nancy, et. al.,

Since my letters seem to generate more heat than light (and I'll admit intending to needle the professional needlers), I promise the readers of Res Gestae to refrain from comment for at least one month. But not before one more bonfire! Swimming in all of last week's ad hominem, I think I detect an issue - a real, arguable issue! And since Peter Isme asked me to respond - well, how could I possible be rude and refuse?

I am not certain, Peter, that my ideal law school differs as radically from yours as you may think. I would hate to attend a law school in which professors were smugly self-satisfied, intellectually stagnant, and aloof and unresponsive to students and to the local community. I would want a variety of skills, personalities, and backgrounds on my faculty. I would not refuse a place on it to a particularly capable teacher who preferred to devote most of his time to clinic, preparation of lectures, community involvement, and counseling students, even if he proved less than prolific in publication. My father is such a professor, though his field is Political Science, not law. I would weigh very heavily the cultural and social perspective a Black professor, a Chicano professor, a Native American professor, or a Woman professor could lend to our understanding of the law and would adjust my other criteria for selection accordingly. However - and here we clearly differ - I would reserve a place with honor for the professor willing to spend the hours of grueling research, painstaking thought, writing, analyzing, rewriting which Yale Kamisar undoubtedly pours into the intellectually superlative legal comment he regularly publishes. And I would be quite willing to put up with considerable weakness in teaching to keep him on my faculty.

Perhaps you do not realize it, Peter, but judges who are shaping the future of American society weigh quite heavily the comment Yale Kamisar and his colleagues produce. I suggest, Peter, that a law school does not exist solely to make its students efficient legal technicians and to wipe the noses of the poor and oppressed within the local community. As I see it, a great law school should also bring together great legal minds, provide them with a great collection of legal materials, and encourage them to examine critically the foundation of legal doctrine and explore with daring her outermost reaches, saying honestly, clearly, and forcefully what they see so that the entire legal community can share their insights. Such scholarship requires time - time which must be taken from other professional duties. I am surprised that Yale Kamisar, of all people, should be under attack from the radical community here. It is at least possible that he has already helped more "victims of the system" (your terminology) obtain procedural due process than all of the law school clinics in the country put together. Because we are exposed to him and to others like him, the National legal community - lawyers, judges, law schools - have greater confidence in our training which, justly or unjustly, helps each of us considerably in a tight job market.

Now for my other critics. Nancy, you urge me to have faith in the judgment of students who have witnessed "apparent injustice" in faculty behavior and to temper my enthusiasm for this law school accordingly. I see at least two flaws in your reasoning. First, isn't it unjust to deny the faculty a presumption of innocence, particularly in view of the esteem they enjoy in the larger legal community? I'm still waiting for solid evidence of insensitivity, immateriality, elitism, etc. So far the only candidate is that of the Great Kamisar Controversy, and Professor Kamisar's response seemed totally human to me. Second and third year students whose judgment I trust tell me that the allegations against the faculty are largely unfounded. Richard Livorine's column lends considerable credibility to their comment.

Secondly, I believe that second and third year students are in very little better position to judge the ultimate value of their experience here than you are or I am. On that score, I have more confidence in the judgment of the man who talked me into coming here that I do in the collective wisdom of this entire student body. My friend is putting the final touches on the most comprehensive study of legal education in the past 20 years. In his judgment, one cannot receive a finer legal education anywhere in the country than right here at Michigan. We have our faculty and administration to thank for that, he suggests - a faculty and administration which is, if anything, stronger than ever. My friend, incidentally, took his law degree from Columbia. He has finally consented to become assistant Dean at another law school.
after spending several years working beside some of the finest judges, lawyers, and legal scholars in the country at the Supreme Court of the United States. He is in no way prejudiced in favor of Michigan.

For those who suggest that I would like to stifle criticism of this law school: I'm sorry I gave you that impression. I'm all for criticism - honest, accurate, telling criticism which explores clearly, cogently, and respectfully (1) the shortcomings we see in this school, and (2) how we would overcome them. Mary, I agree with you wholeheartedly, and I have offered criticism and recommendations myself. Ask Dean Martindale or Dr. Pooley. I object, however, to "mindless criticism" - criticism which assumes what it ought to demonstrate, which never squarely faces the real issue but settles for dismantling a caricature and stereotype of the opposing position, criticism which is in essence a temper tantrum. Were I to respond in kind (and I note that my few barbs have been felt), I could say something like this:

I have little use for smug, self-righteous, intellectually-stagnant, fuzzy-minded, sophomoric student radicals and I would rather see them spanked soundly, sent home from school, and forced to earn the bread they eat by the sweat of their scraggly brow than to see them cooed and coddled by administrators and professors who so often return for rhetoric and respect for ridicule, firm in the faith that beneath all that intellectual acne there is something worth saving.

That, Mr. Allison, is a diatribe, replete with unfair caricature, oversimplification, and mindless ridicule. It doesn't become me and (though your intent is humor) it does not always become you.

I suppose, Richard, that my motives are somewhat suspect among those who do not know me personally. I can only say, in my own defense, that I have spent most of my 25 years in the home of a marvelously professor and educational administrator - my father. I know how far toward making it all worthwhile a few kindly, appreciative words (like yours) would carry him. I also know how deeply the personal, poisoned barbs of thoughtless students wound him, even when cast in jest. Yet he smiles and says nothing.

I'm sorry, critics, but I really do like my first year professors, however incredible that may seem to you. Don't you, Nancy? It hurts me, personally, to see them unappreciated and unfairly criticized, and I am moved to protest. Perhaps too forcefully. If my protest makes me a toady and a brown noser - well, the good Lord loves us all despite our personal shortcomings. Perhaps I will be forgiven even for mine.

Yours truly,
Greg Hill

COLLEGE:
Tennessee(23 4/5) at Alabama
Oklahoma at Kansas St.(25 3/5)
Wisconsin(28 2/5) at Ohio St.
Texas at Arkansas(7 1/4)
Nebraska at Oklahoma St.(10 3/5)
Texas A&M at TCU(28 1/2)
Florida St.(28 2/5) at Florida
Northwestern(27 2/5) at Michigan
Penn State at Syracuse(18 3/5)
Oregon(32 2/5) at USC
Missouri(8 1/5) at Colorado
Texas Tech(9 1/2) at Arizona
Michigan St. at Minnesota(16 1/2)
Auburn(5 1/4) at Georgia Tech
Notre Dame at Air Force(1 6/1)
Maryland at Wake Forest(11 1/2)
Pittsburgh at Army(10 3/5)
Stanford at Washington(7 3/5)
UCLA at Washington St.(7 1/2)
Tulane(11 3/5) at West Virginia
Kansas(3 1/2) at Iowa St.
California at Oregon St.(10 3/5)
Navy at Boston College(3)
Purdue(5 1/2) at Illinois
Iowa at Indiana(1 1/5)
North Carolina(7 1/2) at NC State
Kentucky at LSU(2 2/5)

PROS:
Chicago(26 1/2) at Pittsburgh
Oakland(5 1/4) at Cincinnati
Washington at Houston(3)
Cleveland(15 1/4) at Denver
Miami at NY Jets(2 1/3)
Atlanta(10 1/2) at Los Angeles
Baltimore at New England(4 1/4)
Kansas City at San Diego(1 1/2)
Detroit(11 3/4) at Minnesota
Green Bay(13 1/2) at Dallas
Philadelphia(4 1/3) at St. Louis
New Orleans(7 1/4) at San Francisco
NY Giants(1 9/10) at Buffalo
The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. in the Faculty Dining Room. Members present were: Pam Hyde, Bertie Butts, George Vinyard, Barbara Harris, Sharon Williams, Valorie Anderson, Jon Karp, Maryel Norris, Paul Ruschmann, Otila Saenz, and Phyllis Rozof.

Pam Hyde moved to correct the minutes of the meeting of September 25, 1975 to state that she was present at the meeting. The minutes of the last meeting (October 2, 1975) were approved.

**President's Report**

Pam Hyde read a letter from Brian Kennedy. She also reported that William Kunstler had agreed to speak at the Law School during the Ann Arbor Teach-in.

**Dean Pierce**

Dean Pierce filled in Senate members on the progress of the proposed addition to Legal Research. A modernistic design had been proposed because it was felt that a good building in sharp contrast to the rest of the quad would be preferable to a poor imitation-Gothic. Efforts have been expended to raise the funds necessary for this addition, but so far they have not been tremendously successful. At the present time, the Building Committee is awaiting determination of the amount of money which will be available for the new building before proceeding further with any plans. The LSSS will be appointing several students to work with this Faculty committee, and interested students should contact Pam Hyde or Jon Karp.

**Lawyer's Club**

Art Mack, Director of the Lawyer's Club, presented the final Guest Policy. See Appendix A. He also gave to the Senate a copy of a memo explaining the reasons for instituting the picture-i.d. card system for checking off people with meal contracts.

Sherry Clifton, Dietician, asked that the Senate allocate $5 to pay for prizes for a candy-corn guessing contest to be held at the Lawyers' Club. A motion to that effect passed with no opposition.

**Resolution - Student Governance**

Bob Stephens presented several copies of The Report of the Commission to Study Student Governance and The Supplement to the Report of the Commission to Study Student Governance. A resolution supporting the recommendations of the Report and requesting that the Regents of the University of Michigan support the concept of a representative central student government and the inclusion of students in academic decision making was also presented to the Senate for adoption. Because the Report was approximately 50 pages long and Senate members had not been given the opportunity to familiarize themselves with it, it was decided that support could not be given to its recommendations. George Vinyard suggested that the Senate adopt the remainder of the proposed resolution, as follows:

RESOLVED,

Because we firmly believe in the necessity of effective and representative student government; we, the elected representatives of the Law School acknowledge that the governing board of each school and college is the agent to decide the nature and extent of student participation, and we request that the Board of Regents:

(1) support the concept of an effective, responsive, and representative central student government;

(2) remove any impediment in their Bylaws that precludes effective student participation in the decision making processes within the University's Schools, Colleges, and Departments;

(3) encourage, at the discretion of the governing boards of the Schools and Colleges, the integration of students into the academic decision making processes in their units; reserving the right to pass judgment on the Report and Supplement of the CSSG at a later time.

The motion passed with one member opposed.

**PIRGIM Fee Collection Tactics**

Richard Scheidt, representing a group of students who advocate that PIRGIM give students equal opportunities to either pay or rescind the PIRGIM fee, asked that the LSSS pass a resolution censuring the manner
in which PIRGIM fees were assessed thisall and calling upon the Regents of the
University to devise an equitable system
for the paying or rescinding of the fee.
Allan Barak spoke in opposition to this and
recommended that students form a committee
to study the CRISP system and the effects
of alternative fee collection methods on
PIRGIM revenue before acting.

The following resolution was offered by
Sharon Williams and adopted unanimously:

Whereas, the Law School Student Senate
supports PIRGIM's existence as an organi-
ization but finds that the present fee
collection system is abhorrent, the LSSS
therefore recommends to the Regents of
the University of Michigan that the PIRGIM
Refund Card be mailed to each student with
his or her first tuition bill and that a
check-off and return of this card be suf-
cient to remove the PIRGIM assessment
from the student's account.

Committee Appointments

The Senate voted to appoint the students
to committees as listed in Appendix B as
recommended by Pam Hyde, George Vinyard
and Otilla Saenz. It was decided also to
change the "Policy of the Speakers Commit-
tee" to provide for an "appropriate number"
of members rather than "eight" in order to
accommodate the appointment of 11 people to
this committee.

Respectfully submitted,

APPENDIX A

Guest Policy

1. Brown Bag Card is automatically issued
to guests staying in upstairs guest-
rooms when they register.

2. The Professor-for-lunch program is re-
instated.

3. Guest Policy: Residents with guests
both sign in at the main desk and re-
ceive a Brown Bag Card. The guest will
surrender the Card at the door and then
may have coffee, tea, or bug juice.
cleration, and Cleveland Cliffs knows it. The Mack bill would ban lawsuits 30 days after the completion of the permit process—long before the need for reclamation arises.

A vote-trading campaign of legendary cynicism enabled Mack to get his bill out of Senate committee without a single public hearing and past the floor by a 21-13 vote. One senator was quoted as calling it, "the worst bill I ever voted for."

As the House began considering SB 1003, Mack's strategy became even more elaborate. On August 6 he circulated a letter among legislators indicating that SB 1003 had the "full support" of Attorney General Kelley, an influential supporter of EPA, and implying the backing of the powerful United Auto Workers union. Environmentalists panicked, and some began suggesting a compromise with Mack.

It soon became clear that Frank Kelley and the UAW did not support SB 1003; there must have been some misunderstanding. Fortunately, the "misunderstanding" was cleared up before the floor vote, and passage was thwarted by a 69-28 vote—-to the surprise of both sides.

The bill was not killed outright, however. A motion to reconsider placed it at the top of the legislative calendar when the House returns.

The causes of Mack's setback are not clear. It is possible that Mack's tactics had shocked even the most hardened representative.

But if the Michigan House of Representatives acted out of conscience, for some members it may have been the same type that prompted H.L. Mencken's definition earlier in this century: "Conscience is the inner voice that warns us somebody may be looking."

In all likelihood, legislators who had voted with Mack on every preliminary vote finally realized from the sudden deluge of newspaper editorials that the stench of Senate Bill 1003 had reached the folks back home.

The trouble is, however, that in Lansing some people think the "folks back home" have very short memories. Senator Mack and Cleveland Cliffs are hoping that maybe, just maybe, the stench of SB 1003 won't be quite so overpowering to the home folks when the legislature reconvenes.

A coalition of environmental groups, including PIRGIM, will continue to lobby against SB 1003. You can help. Letters to your home town newspaper editor, your own representative, and House Speaker Bobby Crim would certainly reinforce their "consciences."

SPEAKERS WANTED

The Speakers Committee of the Law School Student Senate is now planning its programs for the year. The Committee seeks maximum student input before making invitations and committing its resources (derived from law school fees).

If there someone you would particularly like to hear speak and answer questions before a law school audience? In particular, do you have personal contacts with anyone who might be of interest to the law school community? If so, please fill out and detach the suggestion slip below. Place it in the Speakers Committee box on the table in front of Room 100 (Friday only) or in the Committee's mailbox at the Lawyers Club office.

I would like to suggest the following speakers for consideration by the Speakers Committee:

1. ________________
2. ________________

Please include your name and phone number if you have any personal contact with, or information about, a suggested speaker. The Committee will contact you.

Name: ________________
Phone: ________________
APPENDIX B

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND INCENTIVES
Professor Gray
Tom Friel -- 1234 White St., Ann Arbor, MI 48105 -- 663-3251

Sherri Toennes -- Law Club, M-31 -- 764-9062
James Widland -- Law Club, A-21 -- 764-8966

ADMINISTRATIVE -- Dean Rivera (ex officio)
Ken Cobb -- Law Club, L-23 -- 764-8994

ADMISSIONS POLICY -- Professor Carrington
Santiago Peregrino -- 915 Sybil, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 -- 764-2722
Robert Aicher -- 2723 Braeburn Circle, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 -- 971-7535
William Leavitt -- 503 Elm, Apt. 2, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 -- 995-3856

CURRICULUM -- Professor Cooper
Liz Hilder -- 717 Arbor, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 995-5913

Mary Margaret Bolda -- 7018 Mayburn, Dearborn Heights, MI -- 274-7139

Terrance Carlson -- 1240 Astor, A2024, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 -- 995-4693

PLACEMENT -- Nancy Krieger
John Leisner -- 1693 Broadway #103, Ann Arbor, MI 48105 -- 995-4694
Luthus Tate -- 2551 Stone, Ann Arbor, MI 48105 -- 995-2551

Gregory Hill -- 914 Hill, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 -- 995-1686
Kenn Cobb -- Law Club, L-23 -- 764-8994

STUDENT PERSONNEL -- Professor Kamisar
(Chairperson of Faculty committee)
Peter Winkler -- Law Club, D-42 -- 764-9079

Florence Sprague -- 923 Greenwood #1, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 -- 662-9834

Curtis L. Christianson -- Law Club, J-35 764-9050
Robert J. Deloria -- 502 E. Madison #20, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 -- 995-2751

STUDENT SENATE COMMITTEES

FILM COMMITTEE -- John Vestal -- 764-8929
Steve Okragleski -- 994-5150
Arthur Block -- 764-9005
Joel Ressler -- 764-8973
Rick Durden -- 995-4484
Kent Woods -- 764-9004
Chuck Watkins -- 995-1429
Carol Sulkes -- 764-8952
Sharon Stack -- 761-4645
Randolph Perry -- 665-8762
David Levinson -- 764-8912
Rachel Goodstein -- 761-2083
Kit Friedemann -- 994-5150
Richard G. Watson -- 761-0543
John Nuances -- 763-1617

SPORTS COMMITTEE -- Howie Bernstein 764-8904
Bob Stewart -- 341 E. Jefferson
Jack Helms -- 995-5310
Mark Fuhrmann -- 761-4413
Don Parman -- 761-0957

SOCIAL COMMITTEE -- Bruce Hiller -- 764-9075
Dave Dawson -- 764-3789

Wes Coulson -- 764-8976
Rick Lipschultz -- 995-3557
Donn Randall -- 761-6717
Terry Carlson -- 995-4693
Tom Friel -- 663-3251
Kit Friedemann -- 994-5150
Steve Okragleski -- 994-5150
Barb McLeod -- 668-7606
Marilyn Madorsky -- 994-3959
Abigail O'Vess -- 764-8950
Mary Vaviano -- 668-6767
Richard Watson -- 761-0543

SPEAKERS COMMITTEE
Howard Ulan -- Law Club -- 764-8988
Luthus Tate -- 2551 Stone -- 995-2551
David Fredrickson -- 211 1/2 N. Main 665-3856
Harold Rennett -- Law Club, O-21 -- 764-9004
Greg Hill -- 914 Hill -- 995-1686
Mike Payne -- 314 Catherine -- 995-3506
Ross Eisenberg -- 1012 E. University 668-8743
Paul Centolella -- 662-4058
Diane Dusseau -- 437 S. Fourth St. 665-8290
Maggie Woodcock -- 2414 Bishop #1 -- 994-0022
Mike Nicholson -- 1531 Packard -- 668-7170
In a fashion similar to Joe Falls' column (shaft?) in a major Detroit newspaper (that's like saying, "a major midwestern law school") (well, not quite), the Personal Foul will this week take a look (query: is that under $100?) at some Quite Quick Quips:

Sincerest congratulations go out to Allen Smith (a likely name) who is actually offering a property property course next semester. That's right folks, a real honest to god property course dealing with property property!

A major criminal law professor at a major midwestern law school whose last name is the same as a major midwestern country was recently overheard asking, "Yale who?"

First-year "property" courses have been recently held to be within the scope of the Michigan sodomy laws (People v. Cunningham, 19 Mi 69, 22 So2d Skidoo). Look it up.

It's hockey season again (that's right, this Saturday night at 9 on 9, watch NHL Hockey Night in Canada with Brian McFarland and, if we're lucky, Howie Meeker!). The Penalty Box (last year's favorite column in the RG, according to an end-of-year informal RG survey), however, is still in jail on an assault and battery conviction.

Did you know that they won't let you take Real Estate Law in the Business School because we supposedly learned everything in that course when we took our first-year "property" course.

(What the hell is a vacation of an alley?)

(Yes, I know, Manila & Joe Frazier)

Professor Greenhooe (with apologies to the bathroom wall) has filed for bankruptcy in the court for the eastern district of the southern circuit of the State of Michigan.

Professor Ree Boringer queried, "Who's he?"

Professor Kahn asked, "What for?"

Professor F. Allen asked, "Yale who?"

and Professor Stein quipped, "Before we start, does anyone else want to apologize for anything?"

MARY HAD A LITTLE LAMB....

Professor Dean Saint (I forget the rest of the title) immediately disconnected all the phones.

There is absolutely no truth to the rumor that Chuck Borgsdorf has got all those television cameras trained in on anything at all.

Did anyone see ex-President Pixon at (I didn't say that! It must have been a linebacker or a hitchiker ... or the typewriter)

Did anyone see Richie (don't call me Dick) Nixon (Phillies fans unite!) at the Jimmy Hoffa Memorial Golf Tournament signing autographs, "smiling" (I guess "jowling" would be more accurate) (hey! let's lay off the cheap shots for a while. Don't you think he's suffered enough?"

Don't
next
year
already?), and pretending to be human?

A conversation recently overheard at a minor beach in a major, western state of a major western hemisphere nation fronting on the northern part of a major, well-known ocean:

"Pat. You know what this means don't you? Its ... the comeback trail."
"Oh Dick."
"Call me Richie!"
"Pardon me, I forgot."
"... I hate you Pat."
"Yessir, your highness."
"You say that again and I'll take you down to the trash compacter at the Red Shield Inn!"
"On that leg?"
"Oh Pat, you're so cruel!"
"Oh Dick, you're such a tool."
... sounds of whispering ...
"Yale who?"

About 3% of this student population are "broads". They are the persons who are usually about 6 feet tall and have shoulders about 3 feet across (often ex-football types) and are the only one's who are legitimately called "broads".

Some, though not many that I know of, are "chicks". I, am one of those, but am unusual because most are not willing to admit their cowardice.

(Or animal ancestors)

There are no girls in this law school!

If you don't believe me, ask any female type person (or certain as yet unspecified male type persons) in one of your classes. If she says I'm wrong (or if you are a female type person who thinks I'm wrong) the correct answer can be affirmed by almost anyone who is in room 132 at 9 AM on Monday and Tuesday mornings. Helen, you can ask Rhonda.

(It's OK. She's on the same floor as you.)

Last Weeks Ethics Question:
Hypo: you're at sentencing (not your own), representing an indignant client whose record, he or she has informed you, is about as long as the proverbial arm of the law. The judge is reading from a probation report which you know incorrectly lists your client's prior record as "none" (you know this because you got a copy of the same report beforehand). The judge says, "I see your client's record is clean. Is that right M. Hot-Shot Lawyer (which is your nick-name).

What do you answer?
Remember, if you say anything but of course your honor, he/she's gonna figger somethin's up and delay this sentencing 'til she checks everything out.

This Weeks Ethics Question:
What if you don't know what the report says "cause you don't get to see it beforehand?

Next Weeks Ethics Questions:
(choose one question)
A: How do you fix a broken face, and is it difficult to extricate one's flashy new brief case with gold embossing on the side from having been delicately crammed down one's throat sideways?
B: Is it easy for a dis-barred ex-lawyer to find a job as a Chicago bus driver, Dean of a law school, or mayor of New York even if she/he's been in the slammer for the last trillion years?
And finally:

DOGSUCKER!

"Boy, that RG will print anything!"
- Yale Kamiczar

"Yale who?"
- Vince Blasi
- G. Burgess Allison

Half of 1974's New Lawyers Enter Private Practice

FIFTY-ONE per cent of 1974's graduating classes of new lawyers entered private law practice, according to a survey of law schools made by George Fee Associates, a Chicago firm specializing in consulting to the legal profession. Some major law schools had higher percentages entering private practice—for instance, Harvard and Vanderbilt, 65 per cent; Cornell, 62; Michigan, 61; Duke, 55.

Seventeen per cent of the new lawyers found employment in federal, state, or local government. George Washington University led this category with one third of its graduates going into government practice.

Corporate law departments, according to the survey, seem to be moving in the direction of recruiting new graduates, and 6 per cent of the 1974 lawyers went to corporate law departments.

Four of each one hundred graduates chose to continue academic work either in law or other fields or to accept teaching positions. Most of these positions will be temporary, the survey states, probably not more than one or two years in duration.

Judicial clerkships accounted for 10 per cent of the 1974 graduates. In this category Yale Law School had the highest percentage, 21, with George-town (20) second, while Harvard and Stanford each had 16 per cent.

Six per cent took positions with labor unions, accounting firms, associations, investment firms, or other business organizations. Five per cent went into work with community legal organizations.

The survey concludes that a large majority of those persons now in clerkships, government, community legal organizations, teaching, or graduate work ultimately will enter private practice, so that normally 80 per cent of a graduating class on the average will be in private practice or in a corporate law department three years after graduation.

In a recent survey of chief legal officers in the five hundred largest publicly-held industrial corporations in the United States, Harvard's law school alumni occupied 20 per cent of the positions.

The study, conducted by George Fee Associates, Inc., a Chicago-based consulting firm to the legal profession, showed that the University of Michigan Law School's graduates were in second place with 9 per cent of the senior legal spots.

Closely following Michigan was Columbia University School of Law with 8 per cent of the most responsible in-house corporate legal positions. In fourth place was Yale Law School with 6 per cent.

New York University's and Northwestern University's law schools were tied at 4 per cent apiece, while Fordham, Minnesota, Pennsylvania and Virginia each accounted for 3 per cent of the total positions.

The law schools of the University of Pittsburgh, Cornell University, George Washington University, George-town University, University of Chicago, University of Texas and the University of Illinois each controlled 2 per cent of the top legal posts.

The survey demonstrated that the majority of the large corporations depend heavily on only a few law schools for their top legal talent. Fifty-one per cent of the positions were filled by graduates of only six law schools (Harvard, Michigan, Columbia, Yale, NYU and Northwestern); 63 per cent by alumni of 10 schools; and 77 per cent by 17 law schools.

The remaining 23 per cent of the positions were held by graduates of 47 other law schools.

Another aspect of the study revealed that Harvard Law School graduates also were in more chief executive officer positions than the graduates of any other law school. Harvard represented 27 per cent of the top management positions held by lawyers, while Columbia's law school controlled 12 per cent and Yales' law school, 8 per cent. The other 53 per cent was widely dispersed among 24 other law schools.
FOOTBALL POLL

The RG P OLL is here in its customary spot. The BC Betto r was severely gored was we ek by his college spreads as they were full of holes. Luckily he was hot in setting pro spreads, which brought the overall percentage down to .555. I'll get you all back this week. Last week's winner was Bob Jerry, with a record of 31-9, including an unheard of 12-1 on the pro games. I hurt! He can collect at B-15 of the Lawyers Club. Circle the winners and cross out the losers. Here I go again:

COLLEGE:
Tennessee (23½) at Alabama
Oklahoma at Kansas St. (25½)
Wisconsin (28½) at Ohio St.
Texas at Arkansas (7½)
Nebraska at Oklahoma St. (10½)
Texas A&M at TCU (28½)
Florida St. (28½) at Florida
Northwestern (27½) at Michigan
Penn State at Syracuse (18½)
Oregon (32½) at USC
Missouri (18½) at Colorado
Texas Tech (9½) at Arizona
Michigan St. at Minnesota (16½)
Auburn (5½) at Georgia Tech
Notre Dame at Air Force (1 6½)
Maryland at Wake Forest (11½)
Pittsburgh at Army (19½)
Stanford at Washington (7½)
UCLA at Washington St. (7½)
Tulane (11½) at West Virginia
Kansas (7½) at Iowa St.
California at Oregon St. (10½)
Navy at Boston College (2½)
Purdue (5½) at Illinois
Iowa at Indiana (1½)
North Carolina (7½) at NC State
Kentucky at LSU (2½)

PROS:
Chicago (26½) at Pittsburgh
Oakland (5½) at Cincinnati
Washington at Houston (4½)
Cleveland (15½) at Denver
Miami at NY Jets (2½)
Atlanta (10½) at Los Angeles
Baltimore at New England (4½)
Kansas City at San Diego (4½)
Detroit (11½) at Minnesota
Green Bay (18½) at Dallas
Philadelphia (4½) at St. Louis
New Orleans (7½) at San Francisco
NY Giants (1 9½) at Buffalo

NAME: ____________________________

TIEBREAKER: How many passes will Michigan throw this week?

RG RANKINGS

Again this week the number 1 spot goes down to the wire.

1. Ohio State(5) ............... 155
2. Oklahoma(5) ............... 154
3. Nebraska : 37
4. Texas A&M 128
5. Texas : 122
6. USC : 119
7. Michigan : 113
8. Penn State 108
9. Alabama 102
10. Colorado : 82
11. Missouri : 75
12. Florida : 71
13. Arkansas : 60
15. Arizona State : 48
16. Notre Dame 36½
17. Oklahoma State : 35
18. Michigan State 22½
19. Tennessee 2½
20. Pitt : 17

OTHERS RECEIVING VOTES: Georgia Tech (9), UCLA (5½), Miami (4), Vermont Virginia (4), Maryland (3), San Diego St. (3), Cal. (3), Kan., Ill. (1), S. Car (1). Here is the record of the pollsters:

Wittenberg Wonder: 23-17 106-54 .663
Princeton Prog.: 26-14 99-61 .519
Golden Dome: 24-16 73-47 .508
Oberlin Oracle: 22-18 97-63 .606
Vassar Flash: 24-16 93-67 .581
Stillwater Cow.: 0-0 66-54 .556
Buckeye Blas.: 20-20 87-63 .544

It should be pointed out that the Buckeye Blasphem er did not turn in a poll in time to be included in the rankings, so there are only 8 voters this week.

Howie Bernstein, the BC Betto r