

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION  
COMMITTEE ON THE PROVISIONS FOR THE DELIVERY OF LEGAL SERVICES

THE WESTIN HOTEL  
RENAISSANCE CENTER  
KENT ROOM  
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48243

FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 1985  
9:00 A.M.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

PRESENT:

- Basile J. Uddo
- Pepe J. Mendez
- Thomas F. Smegal
- Leanne Bernstein
- Robert A. Valois
- W. Clark Durant III
- Lorain Miller
- Hortencia Benavidez
- Claude G. Swafford

1 MR. VALOIS: Good morning. This is a  
2 meeting of the Committee for the Provisions of the Delivery  
3 of Legal Services, and it's 9:05 and we have a quorum, Mr.  
4 Uddo and Mr. Durant are present and I'm Robert Valois.  
5 We're going to begin and hopefully get some preliminary  
6 matters out of the way.

7 First thing is approval of the  
8 agenda. Do I have a --

9 MR. UDDO: I move the agenda be  
10 approved.

11 MR. DURANT: Second.

12 MR. VALOIS: All those in favor say  
13 aye.

14 The agenda is approved.

15 The second item on the agenda, the  
16 approval of the minutes of the last meeting, that of  
17 December 19, 1984. The committee members have had an  
18 opportunity to look at them. May I have a motion?

19 MR. UDDO: I move the minutes be  
20 approved.

21 MR. DURANT: Second.

22 MR. VALOIS: All in favor?

23 The minutes of December 19, 1985 are  
24 approved.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

The third item on the agenda is a report from the office of Field Services on Attorney Training and Recruitment.

I'm going to call on Dan Rathbun to lead this report.

MR. RATHBUN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce myself. I'm Dan Rathbun Staff Coordinator for this committee. With me today is Mr. Dean Reuter from the Central Office of Field Services who worked on the analysis contained in your committee book and Mr. Charles Moses Delivery Research Coordinator for the program development who will be dealing with the major part of this morning's presentation on new initiatives in the area of attorney recruitment.

This presentation and the attendant materials in the committee book are intended for the information of the committee and will not be presented as a recommendation for action by the Provisions Committee.

In a response to a request made by the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation, the Office of Field Services has compiled a report of LSC'S attorney training and recruitment efforts. This report includes historical and present methods of recruitment and training as well as an analysis of possible methods for the

future. That report is contained in the committee book and can be referred to accordingly.

One method of attorney recruitment used in the past was the Reginald Heber Smith Community Lawyer Fellowship Program. The Reggie Program began in 1967 as a program of the OEO, and was originally administered by the University of Pennsylvania. In 1969, the administration of the Reggie Program was taken over by Howard University. In 1975, LSC became the funding source of the Reggie Program, which continued to be administered by Howard University until 1984, December of 1984 when the Program was brought in-house. The 85-86, 86-87 Reggie cycle was zero-funded by LSC's Board of Directors, and a retrospective analysis of the Program and an analysis of other recruitment methods was requested. To that end, OFS presents the report contained in the committee book.

The report is an attempt to analyze LSC's recruitment efforts today and in particular the Reginald Heber Smith Fellowship Program. Specifically considered are the benefits of the program weighed against the cost of operating the program.

The report concludes that the disproportionate administrative and operational expenses of the Reggie Program outweigh the benefits. This conclusion

1 is strengthened by three major considerations. First, the  
2 Legal Services Corporation is currently developing and  
3 implementing other very promising methods of recruitment on  
4 the national level, i.e. the Law School Civil Clinical  
5 Project and the clinic component of the Elderlaw Project.  
6 Second, the Reggie Program, when examined closely, does not  
7 prove to be cost effective. Third, LSC statistics reveal  
8 that local programs are quite capable of attorney  
9 recruitment.

10 It should be noted as it is in the  
11 Committee Book that the report contained in the Committee  
12 Book makes no attempt to objectify certain intangible  
13 benefits of the Reggie Program, namely, the prestige of the  
14 Program the historical importance of Reggie Fellows employed  
15 by legal services programs for periods beyond the duration  
16 of their fellowship. Certainly maintained employment is a  
17 benefit of the Reggie Program, and data on the number of  
18 former Reggies currently employed by legal services programs  
19 is contained in the report. However, information on the  
20 number of Reggies who have, over the past ten years, stayed  
21 with legal services, and the duration of their employment,  
22 is not available if they are no longer with legal services  
23 programs.

24 In 1976 through 1984 the Legal

1 Services Corporation had expensed over 43 million dollars  
 2 for the Reginald Heber Smith fellowship program with 5.2  
 3 million dollars allocated for fiscal year 1985. The cost  
 4 efficiency data on the Reggie Program is very interesting.

5 Analysis of the costs of the Reggie  
 6 Program raises questions as to the efficient use of funds  
 7 for recruitment purposes by Legal Services Corporation. For  
 8 example, in 1983-84 first-year Reggies were paid \$16,000;  
 9 second-year Reggies received \$17,000. Now these amounts are  
 10 reasonable and are not being criticized in our report.  
 11 However, examining the most recent period for which complete  
 12 data is available, mainly '83-'84 funding cycle reveals that  
 13 the actual cost per Reggie recruitee is over \$23,000 which  
 14 leaves about \$7,000 per Reggie fellow funded in  
 15 administrative costs. The total amount of funding necessary  
 16 for the 203 Reggie spots for that cycle was \$4,717,000.

17 Now with FY '85 funding you can draw  
 18 an analogy to the impact on the field, the FY '85 funding is  
 19 \$5.2 million. Had that funding been allocated to the field  
 20 programs for example each of the, approximately 330 direct  
 21 recipients of legal services funds would have had nearly  
 22 enough to employ their own first year Reggie for  
 23 approximately \$16,000 each which would have provided 330 new  
 24 attorneys in the field as opposed to the 203, approximately

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

203 fellow that will be placed for the expenditure of those funds.

In fact the data on accumulated costs of the Reggie Program since '76 reveals the same expenditure trends as discussed earlier. LSC records indicate that since '76 stated earlier over \$42 million have been allocated for the Reggie Program. To put this in real terms in relation to the field, the money expended by the Reggie Program since '76 resulted in, approximately in relation to the field could have resulted in the expenditure of \$130,000 each LSC recipient programs since 1977.

The relation to these costs are poor attempts to objectify the recruitment benefits of the Reggie Program by review and survey of the retention of fellows and LSC's programs beyond the duration of the fellowship. To that end the office of field services analyzed two surveys which are contained in the Committee Book.

MR. REUTER: It begins on Page 25.

MR. RATHBURN: The most important single statistic in that is the existing recruitment benefits resultant from the expenditure of over \$43 million in legal services funds by the Reggie Program in 1976 through 1984 is the retention presently 355 former Reggie Fellows by LSC grantees. This accounts for only 7.8 percent

1 of all attorneys employed by Legal Services organizations or  
2 355 of the over 4500.

3 Presently our survey shows, of the  
4 two surveys conducted, to determine the retention of the  
5 Reggies in the field, the total was 355 former Reggie  
6 fellows which is about 7.8 percent.

7 MR. DURANT: Are there any  
8 differences when you add the two numbers together, the  
9 survey and the house appointment, is there overlap in that?

10 MR. RATHBURN: There is some overlap.

11  
12 MR. DURANT: In other words you don't  
13 have those by names?

14 MR. RATHBURN: There was an overlap  
15 because we weren't sure of the programs that did not respond  
16 to Mr. Cook's survey.

17 MR. VALOIS: Yours is a complete  
18 survey?

19 MR. RATHBURN: That's correct, it  
20 accounts for 7.8 percent of attorneys whereas I stated 355  
21 of the 4,452. With that I'd like to move to present Mr.  
22 Moses who is going to speak to the new initiatives in the  
23 corporation presently. We have provided the analysis of the  
24 Reggie Program and recruitment for the record for this

1 Committee and I'd like to introduce Mr. Moses who will be  
2 dealing with another method of attorney recruitment at the  
3 national level, namely a nationwide computerized job bank  
4 consisting primarily of the resumes of recent law school  
5 graduates.

6 MR. UDDO: Before you do that could I  
7 get you to go over the chart on Page 9 for me and then the  
8 chart on Page 10, just to make sure I understand what they  
9 all mean?

10 MR. REUTER: I think I can answer the  
11 questions. Do you have specific questions?

12 MR. UDDO: Well, I might have  
13 something, but I'd like for you to explain to me what Chart  
14 1 represents.

15 MR. REUTER: Well, columns 1, 2 and 3  
16 on Chart 1 is data on former Reggies that are currently  
17 employed by local legal services programs. Chart 1 -- or  
18 column 1 rather is data accumulated from the LSC in-house  
19 survey. Column 2 is data from Mr. Cook's survey. Column 3  
20 are the data combined. The number of 355, the total number  
21 of former Reggies currently employed by legal services  
22 programs is the third item down in column 3.

23 MR. UDDO: Now, your second row there  
24 showing the programs employing former Reggies, why is there

1 such a difference between Mr. Cook's survey and your survey?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. REUTER: Well, explain Mr. Cook's survey by mail, all legal services programs. To that survey 209 programs responded, of the 209 147 had employed former Reggies. We surveyed every legal services program except those 147 which responded positively to Mr. Cook's survey.

MR. UDDO: You found an additional 58?

MR. REUTER: Right, an additional 58 programs.

MR. UDDO: That's the same thing with the former Reggies employed, you only --

MR. REUTER: Found an additional 103.

MR. UDDO: You found an additional 103 from the programs that didn't respond to Mr. Cook's survey?

MR. REUTER: That's correct.

MR. UDDO: With a total of 355 former Reggies employed?

MR. REUTER: That's correct.

MR. UDDO: So you've accepted Mr. Cook's survey and you've added to your survey so --

MR. REUTER: Mr. Cook's survey is the

1 basis and we made efforts to complete it.

2 MR. UDDO: All right. Before  
3 Mr. Rathburn said you couldn't tell how many former Reggies  
4 were still employed if they -- once they have left LSC.  
5 None of the surveys attempted to determine if there were  
6 records to indicate how long some of those employees may  
7 have stayed with legal services even though they might be  
8 gone now?

9 MR. REUTER: That's correct. None of  
10 the surveys attempted to do that, former fellows who are  
11 presently retained.

12 MR. UDDO: So if there were Reggie  
13 fellows who had stayed with LSC for three or four or five  
14 years but were gone at the time of the survey, we wouldn't  
15 know about that?

16 MR. REUTER: That's correct.

17 MR. UDDO: On chart 2, why don't you  
18 explain chart 2?

19 MR. REUTER: Column 1 of Chart 2  
20 simply represents the total number of legal services  
21 attorneys. That information is gathered from the LSC fact  
22 book. It is broken down in minority.

23 Column 3 represents the total number  
24 of attorneys employed by Legal Services Programs discounting

1 the number of former Reggies. So the interesting statistics  
2 here is under subtotals comparing Columns 1 and Columns 3,  
3 we see that in Column 1 Legal Services Programs employ 26%  
4 minorities.

5 In Column 3 we see without the  
6 influence of former Reggies Legal Services Programs still  
7 employ 22.2%, so we're talking an expenditure, an annual  
8 expenditure of approximately \$5 million, \$43 million over  
9 the past several years.

10 MR. VALOIS: So what you're saying  
11 the Reggie program has increased theoretically the  
12 employment of minorities by the difference between 26% and  
13 22.4 percent.

14 MR. REUTER: That's correct. That's  
15 based on the survey.

16 MR. VALOIS: Based on the survey.

17 MR. REUTER: Right.

18 MR. MOSES: What I plan to do first  
19 is to give you a little background on what the corporation  
20 is doing with law school clinics and then talk about the  
21 resume bank. As you're probably familiar the corporation  
22 currently has two major projects involved with law school  
23 clinics at this time.

24 The first is a research project which

1 began approximately nine months ago. That now has 14  
2 separate schools which are funded under the research  
3 project. On the map those 14 schools are indicated by  
4 orange dots.

5 That particular project is based on  
6 an eighteen-month cycle. Currently the cost for one year of  
7 that project is a little over \$700,000. We're expecting in  
8 that one year between four and 500 students to participate  
9 with approximate service to between three and 4,000 clients.  
10 This year the corporation has just instituted an Elderlaw  
11 project. These are law school clinics designed to promote  
12 services specifically to elderly clients.

13 I'm sure you're familiar this is the  
14 money congress appropriates specifically for elderly issues  
15 this year. Out of that money we have been able to fund a  
16 total of twenty additional law school clinics. Those  
17 clinics are on the map in the dark dots.

18 With the Elderlaw clinic again on a  
19 one-year cycle, we would be spending approximately \$818,000.  
20 According to estimates contained in the project the totals  
21 themselves between five and 600 students per year will  
22 participate in these elder law clinics.

23 Now, that is not really the focus of  
24 what we're here to talk about today. But I wanted you to

1 have that background. In affect, what this means is, as you  
 2 can see from the map, we currently have a presence, analysis  
 3 presence of funding clinics at a total of 33 separate law  
 4 schools. That's in 23 separate states. This is important  
 5 just to show that we actually have presence of wide  
 6 diversity of the areas.

7 What we're here to talk about today  
 8 though is an addition to that whole system, the addition of  
 9 recruitment. What we would like to do, and in fact what we  
 10 have begun to implement this year based on field  
 11 recommendations in fact is system for attorney recruitment  
 12 from those students who have actually participated in these  
 13 law school clinics.

14 Preliminary results have indicated,  
 15 and I must stress these are very preliminary results.  
 16 They're coming from the first six months reporting period of  
 17 the law school project. That within the first six months a  
 18 total of approximately 140 to 150 different students have  
 19 all indicated a desire at the conclusion of their clinic  
 20 experience to potentially consider a career in legal  
 21 services. The significant thing about this is we were  
 22 asking not only which would you consider it at the end of  
 23 your clinic experience, but did you consider it before your  
 24 clinic experience. There was a 48.9 percent increase in

1 those students who said that after their clinic experience  
2 they would consider a career in legal services. So obviously  
3 we're talking about a large group of people that potentially  
4 might want to start to consider legal services as a career.

5 What we're trying to do now is  
6 facilitate putting those people who are interested in legal  
7 services with the jobs in legal services at the local level.  
8 So that's why we're attempting to design a nation-wide  
9 resume now. The whole purpose of this resume is to  
10 facilitate local recruitment of attorneys. What we will do,  
11 and as you can see, the process of this thing is simplified  
12 on the chart, I'll label Chart B.

13 MR. VALOIS: Let the record reflect  
14 that there are two charts in the room and you will submit a  
15 miniature of those for the record so that the record  
16 accurately reflects what the chart looks like.

17 MR. MOSES: The first box on Chart B  
18 is the solicitation of actual resumes. Here what we're  
19 trying to do is get the resumes, the students who are  
20 interested in legal services through the clinical records so  
21 that the resumes would be submitted to the corporation  
22 headquarters from the actual clinic records themselves.

23 Once these resumes come into the  
24 corporation we have designed the capability to sort those

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

resumes so that we can find out not only what geographic area we're talking about as far as job consideration, but what areas of specialization they've been working with in their clinic experience in the past.

Once those resumes are sorted we're going to have the capability to actually help the field in their local recruiting efforts because at that time then we can funnel the resumes to the specific areas that jobs opening. We can follow the resumes to the specific job needs of the local areas so that the field programs will be getting assistance in making their local hiring decisions.

Now I must stress here that the entire focus of this program is to assist local recruiting. We would not of course be doing any hiring. We would not be doing recommending. All we would be doing is facilitating the actual local recruitment. Any hiring decisions would be made at the local level by the local program attorneys following their normal process. But we want to make these particular resumes and student resumes available to them to enhance that decision. Once the resume goes to the local program of course it's out of our hands. That's why we have on the charts the job availability with the dotted line because that is something we do not control.

In actuality what we can get from

1 this type of program we have identified four major benefits  
2 and I think that any one of the four alone, much less in  
3 combination would justify an effort in this regard. The  
4 first benefit would be that we are assisting the field  
5 program in recruiting of trained attorneys. These would be  
6 attorneys who already have gone through the clinic  
7 experience so they already know to a large degree what  
8 they're dealing with. Not only that because they've gone  
9 through the clinic experience, they know that this is the  
10 type of career, the type of law that they're interested in.  
11 It's not like it's an attorney who would change their mind  
12 after four or five months because they've already been  
13 through it and I think that can't be stressed too much.

14 Another major benefit of this is that  
15 they're going to help improve access to rural area programs  
16 through this particular project. What we envision is, of  
17 course we have a wide variety of rural programs. We do not  
18 have ready access to law school. With this process we will  
19 enable them to have ready access to students who are  
20 interested in coming to the area or who are originally from  
21 the area and are planning to go to law school simply because  
22 they might go to law school doesn't mean every student came  
23 from San Antonio and there might be possibly students from  
24 areas from Colorado or Wyoming that are interested in going

1 home when they leave. We can help facilitate that access to  
 2 those rural areas, and I think that that's very important  
 3 considering many rural programs people have expressed  
 4 concern that we have to find a way for law student clinics  
 5 to benefit them.

6 A third major advantage of this  
 7 project, and I think this is probably the paramount in my  
 8 view, they were actually deciding something to compliment  
 9 what we're already working with. We're taking the programs,  
 10 the Elderlaw program and the research program and we're  
 11 designing at minimal cost an entire structure to compliment  
 12 and actually use the students that we are putting money in  
 13 to train. We're trying to get the most benefit from what  
 14 we're putting in these one time projects.

15 Finally, and this can't be stressed  
 16 too much, we can do it all at minimal expense. We have  
 17 always designed the program to do this resume with existing  
 18 computer capability ratio. We're using sole existing  
 19 personnel. There is no need for additional interstructural  
 20 so it can be done on a very minimal expense, no more than --  
 21 well, even if you were to count the administrative time  
 22 which is a fair measure, not more than two to four thousand  
 23 dollars.

24 Such a minimal expense for such a

1 great potential benefit that that's why I personally am very  
2 excited about it. In affect what you're going to end up  
3 doing is creating with this resume bank the final land of an  
4 interacting complimentary system. I think the excellent  
5 resources we will be providing not only actual client case  
6 service at the local level but would also be providing the  
7 training to the specific term. Attorneys might be willing to  
8 provide services in the future and with this last leg we  
9 will be providing a major recruitment effort to funnel those  
10 attorneys into the legal services program as if they're  
11 interested in legal services as a career. I think it's a  
12 coordinated effort that will work well.

13 MR. VALOIS: When is the program  
14 you're describing going to be operational?

15 MR. MOSES: In fact we have already  
16 begun solicitation of resumes. What we are planning to do  
17 is to start with our law school clinical research project  
18 schools initially because those have been going the longest.  
19 The past month we had a conference at which we discussed  
20 this with representatives from each of the 14 schools.

21 MR. VALOIS: Give me a date when it's  
22 going to be.

23 MR. MOSES: I anticipate by the fall  
24 we should have 40 or 50 resumes. Currently they're

1 beginning to straggle in.

2 MR. VALOIS: How many do you think  
3 you'll have say one year from this fall?

4 MR. MOSES: Giving these statistics  
5 of interest I got from the student surveys on a three-month  
6 period I would anticipate within a year would have as many  
7 as 300 or more.

8 MR. VALOIS: Let me ask you a  
9 specific question. Last night at the cocktail party that  
10 the Michigan Bar threw for us I had a conversation with Eric  
11 Dulstrum who expressed some concern about inability to  
12 recruit native American attorneys. Will there be on your  
13 resumes and keyed into your computer, are you going to have  
14 ethnicity and race and all that sort of thing keyed so if  
15 Eric calls me up and says send me all the resumes you've got  
16 on native Americans, are you going to be able to do that?

17 MR. MOSES: That can certainly be  
18 keyed in with no problem.

19 MR. VALOIS: Well, I think it should  
20 be if it's going to serve that need.

21 MR. MOSES: An interesting statistic  
22 is we have done ethnicity statistics on current students in  
23 the research project and we do have that statistic for all  
24 students who are participating in the research project at

1 this point, approximately .65 percent of all students

2 MR. VALOIS: I'll ask you the same  
3 question with respect to the other programs that we want to  
4 use your information to fulfill what they deem to be their  
5 affirmative action requirements. Is somebody in my area  
6 North Carolina going to be able to call you up and say send  
7 me resumes of all the women attorneys who want to practice  
8 in North Carolina?

9 MR. MOSES: Certainly, that should be  
10 no problem at all.

11 MR. REUTER: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moses  
12 has completed his presentation the committee was providing  
13 in our draft report. The final report has been concluded as  
14 of yesterday and it is available for the committee.

15 MR. VALOIS: You're talking about the  
16 report which begins on Page 89 of the board book which is  
17 available to the public? At least I know it was available  
18 yesterday.

19 I'd ask that you put the original in  
20 the record, send a copy of the original to each of the board  
21 members and any member of the public that asks for one. You  
22 only have one copy today?

23 MR. REUTER: That's correct.

24 MR. VALOIS: All right.

1 MR. REUTER: Next item Mr. Chairman  
2 is a panel discussion.

3 MR. VALOIS: Is there anybody who  
4 wants to comment on the recruitment program?

5 Mr. Cook, we have as usual a very  
6 heavy agenda and if you will try to be as concise, go ahead.

7 MR. COOK: Thank you Mr. Chairman.  
8 It's rather difficult to be concise but I'll try my best.

9 Something like this is extremely  
10 important. First a few general observations. First of all  
11 I'd like to say it doesn't speak very well for this  
12 corporation to make a decision on a program like the Reggie  
13 Program that's been in existence since 1967 without having  
14 the kind of detailed study that you have that you have done  
15 with a number of the other areas and just things that come  
16 to mind, things like --

17 MR. VALOIS: I know you were here  
18 yesterday and you had a copy of the board book and you saw  
19 the study that was just summarized. Are you satisfied that  
20 it was a complete study?

21 MR. COOK: No. Let me finish my  
22 point. My point is that this study that's in the board book  
23 today has absolutely nothing to do obviously with the  
24 decision that the Board made. This study as I understand it

1 Mr. Rathbun can correct me, was done sometime in June of  
2 this year, but as their telephone in-house study the  
3 decision of this board to zero out the Reggie Program for  
4 1986 was done sometime early in the spring. My point is the  
5 study that's in the book has no connection at all with the  
6 decision that the board made to defund the Reggie Program  
7 and I think it further points out my own view that the  
8 Reggie program has been targeted by the LSC staff  
9 from the very beginning. I think the retrospective study  
10 really doesn't have anything at all to do with the decision  
11 to defund the Reggie Program. I think that's basically  
12 dishonest.

13 MR. VALOIS: Let's not debate that,  
14 Mr. Cook.

15 Let me just say that I'm personally  
16 aware that the corporation and its employees were not  
17 without knowledge about the Reggie Program when the board  
18 made its decision. I personally recall your testifying on  
19 several occasions concerning the Reggie Program so it's not  
20 a matter of acting without knowledge. Let's talk about the  
21 recruitment program we've got now.

22 MR. COOK: I have to make my  
23 presentation based on my views. I'm giving my views. I  
24 just got this book yesterday so I haven't had an opportunity

1 to thoroughly go over the material they put in here but  
2 there are some things that need to be pointed out about the  
3 study that LSC did.

4 First of all, as I understand it,  
5 what they did was a telephone survey in June of 1985 dealing  
6 with the situation that existed in June of 1985. They  
7 compared, for comparison purposes, they used employment  
8 figures for 1983. Now, I don't know whether or not there  
9 are significant differences for instance between the figures  
10 of a number of attorneys, minority attorneys in 1983 as  
11 opposed to 1985. So, when you start talking about the  
12 composite that you have on Page 6 of our book, Page 6 of the  
13 public book, the deal with the composite figures. You know,  
14 I think you may very well be comparing apples and oranges.  
15 Now, I don't know whether that's great or not, but my point  
16 is that a survey was made in June of 1985 in terms of the  
17 present conditions existing in programs with former and  
18 present Reggies but the results, the employment figures that  
19 they used are for 1983.

20 Now, as I said, I don't know Legal  
21 Services why -- how the employment situation has changed,  
22 that is a number of attorneys and also the number of  
23 minority attorneys, women attorneys in '83 and close to '85,  
24 but I would imagine there would be at least some change. I

1 know in my own program there have been significant changes  
2 in the employment numbers from 1983 to 1985. So, when you  
3 start comparing the percentage of minority Reggies,  
4 percentage of women Reggies in 1985 and using 1983  
5 statistics, you may definitely get some different numbers.

6 Another point that's made, and I'd  
7 like to just -- there's so many problems with this report.  
8 I'd just like to point to Page 23 in our book, the public  
9 book. Evidently there are two board books.

10 MR. VALOIS: What's the number at the  
11 top of your page?

12 MR. COOK: At the top of my page is  
13 page 3 and at the bottom of my page is page 23. The point  
14 that is made on that page, for purposes of making their  
15 point, is that when you compare the administrative cost of  
16 the Reggie Program for I think it's the 1985 class, their  
17 point is that roughly \$3,349,000 was spent on direct salary  
18 payments to the Reggies and the remaining balance,  
19 \$1,367,000 is what they call administrative costs. Of  
20 course you can do what you want with statistics, and I think  
21 it just isn't very honest for them to be presenting figures  
22 like this and here's what I'm talking about.

23 First of all, LSC knows that it isn't  
24 just the salary of 16,000 and \$17,000 that's paid to the

1 Reggies, they know that in addition to that salary LSC also  
2 includes as a part of that grant 12 percent for fringe  
3 benefits. That's a substantial amount of money so that that  
4 administrative cost there is simply not accurate and it isn't  
5 honest.

6 In addition the other figure that  
7 should come out of the administrative cost is the cost of  
8 training, that is paid for both this year and in prior years  
9 by the Reggie program. So, instead of coming up with a  
10 figure that sounds like 30 percent for administrative costs  
11 and 70 percent for salary cost. One, it's inaccurate and  
12 it's dishonest because they know that -- they're the ones  
13 who have been giving the grants to Howard University. They  
14 know that in addition to the \$16,000 salary for first year  
15 Reggies and a \$17,000 to second year Reggies, they also  
16 include 12 percent for fringe benefits. I don't think  
17 that's an accidental oversight.

18 MR. VALOIS: Regardless of the --  
19 why don't you just tell us --

20 MR. COOK: I have to give my  
21 testimony from my perspective.

22 MR. VALOIS: I want to give you an  
23 opportunity to give your testimony. Frankly I want to give  
24 you an opportunity to submit an analysis of that compared to

1 --whatever you want to present in writing, but I frankly am  
2 a little bit more interested right now in the present  
3 initiative on recruitment.

4 MR. COOK: I simply wanted to point  
5 that out because somebody reading this book would get the  
6 wrong impression that 30 percent is used for administrative  
7 costs when indeed that simply isn't the case.

8 Now, dealing some more with some of  
9 these numbers that are in this report. I really find it  
10 amazing that some of the language used, for instance on page  
11 6 when they're talking about the results -- page 6 of my  
12 book, the results here, they use words like only 49 percent  
13 of the total are minority. Only 43 percent of the total are  
14 women. Well, I don't know what they mean by that, does that  
15 mean that's not a good score card? Are they suggesting that  
16 perhaps a 60 percent figure would be better? I would think  
17 that 49 percent minority in the first year Reggie plan,  
18 second year Reggie plan is an admirable percentage. The  
19 impression given by the kind of language used is that the 49  
20 percent minority, 43 percent women is not a very good figure  
21 for the Reggie program.

22 The other thing that we need to keep  
23 in mind too --

24 MR. UDDO: Mr. Cook, the Reggie

1 program is primarily going to be supported because it  
 2 recruits minorities. I think that is a significant figure.  
 3 It's not primarily recruiting minorities if it's less than  
 4 50 percent.

5 MR. COOK: Keep in mind, Mr. Uddo,  
 6 the notion that the Reggie Program is "primarily" a minority  
 7 recruiting program isn't one that I have made since I've  
 8 been talking about the Reggie Program. What I have  
 9 acknowledged is that the Reggie Program is indeed and has  
 10 been since 1967 a significant program that has involved  
 11 women minorities et cetera in legal services in numbers that  
 12 cannot be matched by any other program and yet legal  
 13 services percentagewise.

14 I think it is a primary goal and a  
 15 primary responsibility.

16 MR. VALOIS: Would you agree that  
 17 that goal can be served in some other way or do you think  
 18 it's the only way it can be served?

19 MR. COOK: There are lots of  
 20 different ways, Mr. Valois, that a lot of goals can be  
 21 served. What I'm talking about here is, what we're trying  
 22 to deal with here are affective indicies or indicies of  
 23 affectiveness or relative affectiveness in terms of doing  
 24 recruitment, minority recruitment, women recruitment one way

1           versus the other. So I'm not saying that there is no other  
2           way to recruit minorities or no other way to recruit women.  
3           What we're talking about here is dealing with the most  
4           affective means by which you get this, by which you get this  
5           job done. And further dealing with their statistics, flawed  
6           though they may be, just take a look at what LSC says about  
7           the Reggie recruitment of figures as they did them sometime  
8           in June.

9                           They concluded for instance that 12.6  
10           percent of all legal services are either Reggies or former  
11           Reggies. Now, the way in which that's presented is that  
12           that's a negative. Let's examine that. Even if you accept  
13           their figures and keep in mind I think they are not dealing  
14           with current figures. But let's just take their  
15           percentages. If you say that 12.6 percent of all legal  
16           services attorneys are either Reggies or former Reggies, you  
17           have to look at that as being, in my view, a very important  
18           statistic.

19                           The reason I say that is, why don't  
20           we take a look at the percentage that the Reggie budget is  
21           of the total legal services budget or the total basic field  
22           budget and see how that compares.

23                           MR. VALOIS: I think what we're  
24           talking about is whether or not the amount expended on the

1 Reggie Program is adequate in terms of performance as  
2 compared to, and I know you're not advocating this minority  
3 recruitment program, in terms of what the affectiveness of  
4 other methods employment into legal services. I think  
5 that's what we need to compare.

6 You're not suggesting that all of the  
7 legal services are expended toward recruitment programs.  
8 You can't compare the Reggie program against the total  
9 budget of the legal service grants.

10 MR. COOK: I most certainly can in  
11 this instance because they use the entire population for  
12 this particular point. What they said was that 12 percent  
13 of all legal services attorneys are either Reggies or former  
14 Reggies. So to the extent that you use that total  
15 population for that particular statistic, it is valid to  
16 deal with that total population when you start talking about  
17 money.

18 My whole point is that I don't think  
19 you should make light of the fact that 12.6 percent of all  
20 legal services attorneys were former Reggies or present  
21 Reggies. I think that that's significant and my point, in  
22 dealing with the dollar figure here is that when you -- one  
23 way to deal with affectiveness I think would be to see how  
24 much bang for the buck you get from a program like the

1 Reggie Program.

2 I haven't dealt with percentages yet,  
3 but whatever that percentage of the total say field budget  
4 is that comes from the Reggie Program, what that percentage  
5 is and compare that with the total number of present and  
6 former Reggies in the legal services, that's another way to  
7 look at cost benefit, that's my whole point. There are  
8 other ways to measure cost benefits.

9 The other thing they say in that same  
10 paragraph is that 23 percent of the minority attorneys in  
11 legal services are Reggies or former Reggies. You know, for  
12 a program that has such a small percentage of legal services  
13 budget and to produce 23 percent of the present minority  
14 attorneys in legal services I think is a very very  
15 significant point.

16 There are other things that LSC  
17 didn't bother to look at and as you say -- I think people  
18 leave out what they want to leave out and they improve those  
19 things that they want to improve. One of the things that's  
20 been important about the Reggie Program is not yes the  
21 present employment of particular Reggies, but one of the  
22 points is how is this going to affect this program, that is  
23 this national program over a period of time? And Mr. Uddo  
24 on one point I think it's extremely important and somebody

1 needs to take a look at that, and that is since 1967 this  
2 program has been -- we do have a history here.

3 Over some period of time there have  
4 been a number of -- a qualifiable number of people going  
5 into the Reggie program. We shared as some statistic or  
6 some notion of how many of those people have been retained  
7 by Legal Services, say one, two, three, four, five, whatever  
8 number of years after they completed their two-year Reggie  
9 stint, because I think that that's an extremely important  
10 statistic to have because it would give this board and this  
11 community some notion about the kind of people, kind of  
12 contribution and the kind of impact that the Reggie program  
13 has had over the years in terms of other legal services  
14 programs nationally.

15 MR. UDDO: Mr. Cook, let me ask you a  
16 question. One of the reasons I asked that question is  
17 because back in, whenever it was we debated this last time,  
18 I guess it was December, I asked you if you could help me  
19 get those statistics and you asked that question in the  
20 letter you sent out and I was kind of hoping that by now you  
21 would have helped me get ahold of those statistics.

22 MR. COOK: Keep in mind, Mr. Uddo,  
23 that one of the things the February 20th letter that I sent  
24 to Mr. Mendez and distributed to the other members of the

1 board was an attempt to respond to a number of quick  
2 questions that you and other board members had made to me in  
3 terms of "impact" of former Reggies. You have to also keep  
4 in mind if you know, what I was trying to do as a single  
5 individual was to give the board some quick notion of how  
6 this program has impacted the national program. Now, in the  
7 letter that I sent to the field I was -- in fact I even said  
8 on February 20th when I testified that there probably are a  
9 lot of other questions, relevant questions that should be  
10 asked in trying to ascertain the impact of the Reggie  
11 Program. What I had suggested to the -- in fact Mr. Mendez  
12 even said to the staff, well, if he can come up with this  
13 and he's just one person, why can't this whole staff come up  
14 with a comprehensive survey and study of the Reggie Program.

15 So, I agree. I didn't ask every  
16 question. What I'm trying to do --

17 MR. UDDO: I thought I asked you  
18 specifically to try to get that information for me because  
19 it was a statistic I was interested in. But that's not  
20 important now. Let me ask you this, do you think records  
21 are available from which that information could be gleaned  
22 or is it an impossible question to answer?

23 MR. COOK: I think, Mr. Uddo, the  
24 further you go back like toward 1967 because the program at

1 the University of Pennsylvania then through 1969 you may  
2 have more difficulty the further you go back, but the  
3 program was at Howard University from 1969 until last year  
4 and I don't know what their records would show, but what I  
5 think ought to be done is some attempt ought to be made to  
6 use the information that LSC presumably already has and  
7 supplement that by information that can be gotten from the  
8 field in terms of getting that prior information about the  
9 retention of Reggie staff.

10 MR. UDDO: Mr. Rathbun, do you think  
11 that information is available?

12 MR. RATHBUN: I don't know that it is  
13 available.

14 MR. UDDO: Has anybody attempted to  
15 contact Howard University to find out if they kept any data  
16 like that?

17 MR. RATHBUN: Not to my knowledge.

18 MR. UDDO: Would we be able to make  
19 an effort to get that information?

20 MR. RATHBUN: Yes, sir, we will.

21 MR. UDDO: What I'd like to see is  
22 how many Reggie -- how long Reggie fellows stayed in legal  
23 services work, which necessarily isn't covered by the  
24 information we have before us because as you said and Mr.

1 Cook's question asked we're really only dealing with those  
 2 presently employed. If you can get that information I'd  
 3 like to see it compared to how long the average legal  
 4 services lawyer stays in legal services work.

5 MR. MENDEZ: Mr. Chairman, I'd like  
 6 to follow that up and ask Mr. Uddo, when you're computing  
 7 that, are you saying the overall from the time the Reggie  
 8 starts or from the time that the staff takes it over?

9 MR. UDDO: The time he becomes a  
 10 staff attorney, someone who got into the legal services  
 11 first as a Reggie fellow. It doesn't matter, I guess you  
 12 can include his two years as a Reggie fellow, just include  
 13 it as a separate figure. If he stayed in legal services  
 14 work for four years, two of them as a Reggie fellow that  
 15 would be relevant information in affect you only retained  
 16 him for two years.

17 MR. VALOIS: It seems to me that  
 18 certain information is available, it's a simple enough thing  
 19 to do. If for instance somewhere there is a list of every  
 20 Reggie fellow since the program inception and if somewhere  
 21 else there is by year a list of every person who worked in  
 22 legal services, you can --

23 MR. MENDEZ: Before we assign them  
 24 this task I would hope that they would find out if it's

1 going to be an impossible task.

2 MR. VALOIS: I agree with that. You  
3 know, that's my question. Local grantees may keep those  
4 records.

5 MR. MENDEZ: My recollection was when  
6 I asked them to do that they indicated it was virtually an  
impossible task to do.

7 MR. VALOIS: We've interrupted Mr.  
8 Cook and I really want him to get to -- we really don't have  
9 much time left.

10 MR. COOK: I just wanted to make one  
11 other point in terms of impact and it is not just the number  
12 of people who are former Reggies who are presently in legal  
13 services programs. In the survey that I did back in  
14 February, I thought that something that was extremely  
15 significant is for instance, the 127 programs that indicated  
16 to me that they had present Reggies on their staff, I also  
17 asked them in which capacities these former Reggies were  
18 serviced. I think it's significant that of the 127 programs  
19 that said they had former Reggies, that 39 of those programs  
20 are now run by former Reggies. Thirty-nine of those people  
21 are also managing attorneys in those legal services  
22 programs. Fourteen of those people are litigation  
23 directors, 45 of those people are senior attorneys and the  
24 remainder 135 are staff attorneys.

1                   So, we're talking too as the Reggie  
2 program has always looked for is leadership potential in a  
3 program like that.

4                   MR. MENDEZ: Mr. Cook, may I ask you  
5 a question? Are you telling us that the recruitment program  
6 that the LSC, the corporation has set up is not going to  
7 recruit individuals?

8                   MR. COOK: I'm telling you what I  
9 just told you. I didn't make any reference at all to -- we  
10 don't know what LSC's -- one, we don't know what their  
11 recruitment scheme is really going to be, how effective it's  
12 going to be because part of it's just started. Some is just  
13 in the planning stages, as I understand. So, I really don't  
14 know what the LSC experience is going to be ten years down  
15 the road.

16                   What I'm saying is that with the  
17 Reggie program at least we have some quantifiable figures and  
18 statistics about the performance of that program, the impact  
19 that program has had on this national program. So, we do  
20 have from the Reggie program a --

21                   MR. MENDEZ: The thing I'm interested  
22 in is whether or not the present projection recruitment  
23 effort is going to accomplish the same thing and so far I  
24 haven't heard anything from you to indicate that it will not

1 accomplish the same thing.

2 MR. COOK: Again, Mr. Mendez, I don't  
3 even know all of the parts of the LSC recruitment program.  
4 I don't know what they consider a total recruitment program.  
5 I've just heard a gentleman here on the panel explain some  
6 things that they have in the network and things that they  
7 plan to implement later on. I'm not sure what that's going  
8 to do. I can't comment effectively on the impact of a  
9 program in the future as effectively as I can comment on one  
10 that I have personally been involved in for 16 years. So,  
11 the answer is I just don't know.

12 Now, if you want me to speculate  
13 about what I think the relative merits of the two programs  
14 are, I can do that. I think you might guess what my  
15 speculations would be.

16 MR. MENDEZ: Do you have any basis of  
17 fact?

18 MR. COOK: We can't really deal with  
19 basis of fact unless you are going to try -- unless you give  
20 them some kind of track record versus the track record of  
21 the Reggie program. So when you talk about basis of fact, I  
22 don't know how we can deal with basis of fact.

23 MR. UDDO: Mr. Cook, Mr. Valois asked  
24 me to take over as chairman for a few minutes. You don't

1 have much time left.

2 I'd like to know if you want to make  
3 any comment on some of the other material in the Board book,  
4 material that I found very distressing and that was some of  
5 the mismanagement of the Reggie program and some of the  
6 indiscretions and possible illegal activity by Mr. Davis. I  
7 think that has reflected very poorly on the Reggie program  
8 and I think it's hurt us in cause to the corporation if you  
9 don't really have to take it in-house to try to purjure  
10 these problems.

11 MR. COOK: Without prejudicing  
12 anything that Mr. Davis wishes to do in terms of that  
13 report, that draft report, there are a number of things that  
14 you and other members of the Board should understand, Mr.  
15 Uddo, and this is what infuriates me about this entire  
16 process. First of all, in dealing with that point we need  
17 to get other people who have been involved in that process,  
18 including Mr. Davis, going back to the spring of 1984. This  
19 is why I'm so infuriated.

20 I think that the staff targeted the  
21 Reggie program for extinction a long time ago. The board --  
22 your predecessors, I think in November of -- I can't think  
23 of what year, 1983 I think it was, specifically directed the  
24 staff to do certain things in terms of the Reggie program

1 contract. The LSC staff consciously waited until almost the  
2 end of the contract year in --

3 MR. UDDO: Mr. Cook, that's not  
4 responsive to my question. Even if that's true, and I don't  
5 have any independent knowledge of it at this point.

6 MR. COOK: I'm getting to your  
7 question.

8 MR. UDDO: You're not going to say  
9 that those things forced Mr. Davis to do some of the things  
10 that are suggested he did?

11 MR. COOK: I'm getting to your point.  
12 There are two points about that, first of all, there was a  
13 preliminary evaluation of the Reggie program by the LSC  
14 staff and that preliminary investigation didn't do what Mr.  
15 Potak wanted done with the Reggie program so he ordered a  
16 second investigation because the initial monitoring did not  
17 turn up the kind of negative thing that Mr. Potak was  
18 looking for. So, they went out specifically on the second  
19 go around, because I was interviewed on the first go around.  
20 They went out specifically on the second go around with  
21 marching orders, as it were, we think for Mr. Potak to find  
22 the kind of thing that they thought would be sufficiently  
23 damaging to deal with the Reggie Program.

24 Now, to Mr. Davis' point are the

1 things mentioned in that report concerned Mr. Davis? I  
2 haven't read the draft in a number of months. He can answer  
3 for himself because I think what we have basically  
4 allegations from LSC, but one thing that's important to be  
5 kept in mind about some of the so-called damaging points on  
6 the Davis thing. The LSC contract requires the director of  
7 the Reggie program to be a faculty member of Howard  
8 University Law School. It is a very well-known fact if  
9 anybody seeks to take a look at it, that professors at  
10 Howard University Law School, including Mr. Davis was a  
11 member of that faculty are indeed allowed and required --  
12 not required, but are allowed to carry on a private  
13 practice. It's not unusual of a part-time private practice.  
14 It's not unusual for law professors to have that kind of  
15 flexibility in dealing with outside cases.

16 MR. MENDEZ: You're talking to the  
17 wrong person about what law professors can do and can't do.

18 MR. COOK: I didn't say --

19 MR. MENDEZ: I think Howard  
20 University's policy is that same as most places policies are  
21 and that is for anything that's major some of the things  
22 that are suggested here it would require special approval  
23 from the president of the university and it's my  
24 understanding he didn't have that, but even aside from that

1 he had restraints and constraints placed on him by LSC. So,  
2 he was in a somewhat different position than someone that's  
3 just working for Howard University.

4 MR. COOK: My whole point, Mr. Uddo,  
5 is that in terms of that report on John Davis and what he  
6 did or did not do, and I'm not expressing an opinion about  
7 what he did because I don't know what he did or how much  
8 time he spent or what cases he handled, my point is that I  
9 think Mr. Davis has to deal with that.

10 MR. MENDEZ: Mr. Cook, during that  
11 period of time weren't you the executive director of the --  
12 or the chairman of the board, the advisory board of the  
13 Reggie --

14 MR. COOK: That's right.

15 MR. MENDEZ: Wasn't he responsible to  
16 you?

17 MR. COOK: No, he was not. Since you  
18 asked that question, let me respond to it. There may be  
19 something here that you don't know.

20 When LSC negotiated that contract  
21 long before the -- I mean the prior board, one of the things  
22 that was talked about was whether or not the Reggie program  
23 was required to have a normal board of directors as per  
24 local programs or not. That was a big contingent between

1 Howard and LSC. The compromise was because Howard  
 2 absolutely refused to have a separate board of directors  
 3 superimposed on their board of trustees and in the contract  
 4 itself, the Reggie contract had expired and in fact the ones  
 5 that were made between LSC I think from 1976 on or '78 on,  
 6 it was very explicitly stated what the role of the advisory  
 7 committee was. We did not have the same kind of authority,  
 8 a fiduciary duty, all regular board of directors, because  
 9 Howard explicitly refused to go along with that. So, you  
 10 know, as the advisory board chairman, I did not have, nor  
 11 did any members of the advisory committee have the kind of  
 12 oversight nor authority in dealing with the Reggie program  
 13 because Howard refused that and that was a compromise  
 14 between LSC and Howard.

15 MR. UDDO: Did Mr. Davis ask for  
 16 permission or did he inform that board that he was engaging  
 17 in private practice?

18 MR. COOK: No..

19 MR. MENDEZ: Did he advise you that  
 20 he was engaging in private practice?

21 MR. UDDO: Answer my question.

22 MR. COOK: I can only answer one  
 23 question at a time.

24 The answer to your question is no, in

1 terms of -- your question was the advisory board. Now, in  
2 terms of your answer, I knew that Mr. Davis from time to  
3 time handled Title 7 cases because keep in mind he ran the  
4 EEO clinic at Howard, that was what he did as a professor,  
5 but in terms of what he did in that clinic in terms of Title  
6 7 work I don't know. I was not privy to what he was doing  
7 or the extent of his --

8 MR. MENDEZ: How often did you meet  
9 with Mr. Davis? How often was the advisory board called  
10 into session?

11 MR. COOK: My advisory met on the  
12 average of between two and three times a year.

13 MR. MENDEZ: How often did you  
14 personally meet with Mr. Davis?

15 MR. COOK: I can't say. It depended  
16 upon the situation. If we were having -- it depended  
17 particularly on the situation with the LSC board, depending  
18 on what was going on vis-a-vis the Reggie program with the  
19 LSC board, that was pretty much determined, the frequency of  
20 the meetings I was having with Mr. Davis.

21 MR. UDDO: Mr. Chairman, I just have  
22 one more question. Mr. Cook, if the allegations of this  
23 report were substantially correct, would you agree that that  
24 alone would be a basis for the corporation to be concerned

1 about the management of the Reggie program and having to do  
2 something specific to make sure that these kinds of problems  
3 didn't occur again?

4 MR. COOK: First of all, Mr. Uddo, I  
5 can't accept your premise because, one, I don't know what  
6 John Davis did or did not --

7 MR. UDDO: I'm saying assuming the  
8 allegations are substantially correct.

9 MR. COOK: It would depend upon. You  
10 know, I'm thinking only your view about what Howard, Mr.  
11 Davis' employer decided that he as a faculty member can do.  
12 I mean that's extremely important. Because if Howard  
13 University took the position that they allowed Mr. Davis to  
14 do what he's alleged to have done, I think that that's  
15 important.

16 MR. UDDO: Howard couldn't give him  
17 permission to use Reggie program stationery to transmit  
18 political contributions giving the impression that it had  
19 some connection with the Reggie program. I don't think that  
20 they could give him permission to use secretaries paid by  
21 LSC to do his personal correspondence, and I don't think  
22 that they could give him permission to use the supplies of  
23 the Reggie program paid for by LSC to do personal work.  
24 There may be some things they can approve of, but there's

1 definitely some things that they could not approve of.

2 MR. COOK: Mr. Uddo, one of the  
3 things that you've got to keep in mind is I have also had  
4 some experience with LSC investigators. What appears at  
5 first blush with LSC investigations, you know, there's very  
6 often a disparity between what appears at first blush and  
7 what in fact --

8 MR. UDDO: Some of these things there  
9 are copies of. The campaign contribution letter on Reggie  
10 stationery is the real thing. There's copies of that, so  
11 there's not just suggestions. You don't want to answer my  
12 question.

13 MR. COOK: It's not that I don't want  
14 to answer your question.

15 MR. UDDO: Assuming these are  
16 substantially true, shouldn't we be pretty concerned about  
17 the way the Reggie program has been administered over the  
18 past several years and do something to make sure that these  
19 things don't happen again?

20 MR. COOK: I have two answers for  
21 that. First of all, I can't assume that they are true. And  
22 the other thing is they have to be taken in the context of  
23 how he was operating at Howard University with the Law  
24 School.

1 MR. UDDO: Let me tell you our  
 2 problem with that. Five minutes ago you told us exactly  
 3 what Gene Protak's intent was when he redid the survey. You  
 4 told us exactly what it was he was looking for. You told us  
 5 exactly what his motivation was, all negative; and as far as  
 6 I know, that's just your assumption. Now, talk about Mr.  
 7 Davis where there's a fairly concrete record here, you're  
 8 not willing to assume anything.

9 MR. COOK: I simply gave you my  
 10 opinion about what happened at LSC vis-a-vis the Reggie  
 11 program and I'm giving you my opinion.

12 MR. UDDO: Is it your opinion that  
 13 these thing did happen?

14 MR. COOK: I don't know that those  
 15 things did happen.

16 MR. MENDEZ: Shouldn't we explore  
 17 this more thoroughly?

18 MR. COOK: Sure.

19 MR. MENDEZ: How should we go about  
 20 exploring this more fully?

21 MR. COOK: I don't know how you can  
 22 go about it, Mr. Mendez?

23 MR. MENDEZ: As the advisor for the  
 24 Reggie program and as the chairman, how would you suggest

1 that we more fully explore this to insure allegations made  
2 here are either true or false?

3 MR. COOK: I don't know how you  
4 should go forward in doing that.

5 MR. MENDEZ: But you do think we  
6 should go forward and do that?

7 MR. COOK: I didn't say -- I think  
8 what you should do is have investigations as they should be  
9 should be balanced, that is, Mr. Davis and LSC needs to be  
10 heard from on those issues, and Howard University.

11 MR. VALDIS: I'm sure this is all  
12 very important, gentlemen, but we don't want to eat into the  
13 time of the other important questions on the agenda.

14 Mr. Cook, I thank you very much. Go  
15 back to your offices and give us a written response to this  
16 response. We'd appreciate it very much.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24