Political Scientists, Barristers Split on Supreme Court Reform

**LAWYERS CHARGE ROOSEVELT WILL ‘PACK’ TRIBUNAL**

Political Scientists Defend Measure, Say Proposal Necessary to Make Court ‘Convenient’; Will Make Efficient Judiciary.

Favorable reaction and strong opposition were both expressed by law college and political science faculty members of the University when interviewed by a newspaperman on the subject of President Roosevelt’s startling new program for federal courts reform.

“A most unfortunate and dangerous proposition,” said Dean R. R. Foster of the law college.

“Do not let anyone misunderstand reference to the Federal judiciary,” said Mr. Roosevelt, whose real purpose is to allow the Federal Ex- change Court to carry out the policies of such administrations as that of the New Deal, its real purpose is to make the Supreme Court an instrument of the program of the administration.

Two changes of fundamental impor- tance in our governmental structure are involved: (1) the retention of the federal judiciary in the states so that it is to be changed by the enormous enlargement of federal powers; (2) the relation of the judicial department to the other departments of the federal govern- ment is to be changed by making the judiciary subordinate to the political department of the government.

Direct Method Better.

“The direct method of constitutional amendment, a method that gives the people of the United States through the legislatures of their several states or through constitutional conventions called for that purpose a chance to pass on such measures, seems better for making fundamental changes than the indirect method of whittling away constitutional provisions by court interpretation,” said Mr. Roosevelt.

In a similar vein were the methods controlling the personnel of the court.

If our government is to con-