1	ADDRESS
_ 2	OF
3	the honorable griffin B. Bell .
4	ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
5	•
6	BEFORE
7	
8	THE MICHIGAN STATE BAR ASSOCIATION
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1978
14	
15	9:20 p.m.
16	
17	Det roit Plaza Detroi t, Michigan
18	Decroit, Michigan
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Thank you, President Hartig, Carolyn. Thank you for the warm introduction. I hope if you do that again, you will tone down the drinking part.

Chief Justice Kavanaugh and other distinguished

State judges, Chief Judge and prospect, George Edwards -you know, he is going to be Chief Judge soon, other distinguished Federal judges, distinguished guests, fellow lawyers,
ladies and gentlemen: It's a pleasure to be here and I'm

sorry I will not be here tomorrow morning to witness the
debate between Sherry (Phonetic) of Sherry's Ranch and the
prosecutor from Nevada.

I have to congratulate whoever got the program up on having a very innovative approach to Bar programs. It reminds me a good deal of a speech I made last year in Richmond, Virginia, at a Bar luncheon and they introduced me and said, "This is the largest crowd we have had -- ever had except last month when Elizabeth Taylor was the speaker."

I missed Justice Ryan's remarks on the Chief Justice and what the Chief Justice had to say about trial lawyers.

I can testify that between the Chief Justice's remarks about trial lawyers and the President's speech that he made in Los Angeles, I have had a number of problems this year.

We seem to be getting over those two events. I'm not hearing as much about it as I did. I thought the Chief

_

6 CO., INC. Avenue, N.E.

IG CO., INC. Avenue, N.E. Justice's speech, when it provoked the studies and statistics, every Bar Association disputed his figures -- he said 50 percent of the trial lawyers were inadequate, Illinois Bar condemed him said it was not true only 20 percent who were inadequate, and all over the country. And finally, Maryland got down to 7 percent. That was the lowest figure I ever saw.

And it reminded me of this judge in Georgia when

I was a young lawyer who made a study of the prison population

and he found it on a projection that the prison population

was increasing faster than the general population of the State

And he announced at a meeting of the State Bar that in the

year 2014 everyone in Georgia would be in prison.

(Laughter.)

About the time the Chief Justice made this condemnation of the trial lawyers, such as it was, I was attending a dinner for Director Kelle when he was retiring as the head of the FBI, and his Congressman from Kansas City came to honor him and made a little talk. And he said that he was a used car dealer by profession, and he was very proud to be a used car dealer. He said that there were 26 lawyers mixed up in the Watergate and not one used car dealer.

(Laughter.)

I think it's a good time for me to say that I reaffirm my pride in being a lawyer and, having been a trial

. 2

_

_

6 CO., INC. Avenue, N.E. lawyer of sorts for some years, and my response to the Chief

Justice is not to criticize him but to create a trial advocacy

program in the Department of Justice, which will be one of

the best in the Nation and one that I hope the Bar Associations

over the country can copy.

Now the President's speech -- let me say a word about that -- that he made in Los Angeles. Many people have asked me "Did you read the speech in advance?" And my answer is "Yes, I read it. He sent it to me and I read it." He also invited me to go to Los Angeles with him and I was unable to go because I had another engagement.

But the President's speech was not that bad to anyone who has read it. It was an exhortation the lawyers would do better. And my information on the President now is that he is thinking more of lawyers after his experience at Camp David, where they negotiated long hours, and in fact he said something to me Sunday night over the White House -- I was priveledged to be there at the East Room -- when the three leaders came there and met and he said something to me about lawyers which was complimentary.

And I appreciated it very much because I've dealt with him a lot and he would have been a good lawyer, had he not gone wrong and become an engineer.

(Laughter.)

I want to say a few words to you tonight about the

.

CO., INC.

Department of Justice because I think you would like to get a report on it once in a while. And my remarks will be divided in what we call external matters and internal matters.

of importance for all of the American people, whether we have an adequate system of justice. And I have been working in this field for some years in the American Bar and the Pound

Conference. I was Chairman of the Pound

Conference Task Force to implement the things that were recommended at the Pound Conference, and it seemed to me that the court systems all over the country were in trouble.

And it reminded me of a story that I read in the New Yorker magazine many years ago about the last traffic jam on Manhattan Island. Some fellow had a dream that there was this huge traffic jam and finally every car stopped. And they had a meeting of the City Council to see what to do and they said we will just pave over, pave over and start again.

And the court system was in about that shape in many places in this country.

I can't help all the State courts, but I can help the Federal courts because the Justice Department has a big interest in the Federal courts. We're the chief litigants. We have more cases than anyone else.

So I knew that we would finally have a judgeship bill; we would get some more judges, but that is not the

i co., inc.

answer. One day the President asked me early on, when we were talking about the judgeships and we had to get about 150 more judges, and he said that everyone in the country is going to end up being a federal judge and is there something you can do to get matters out of court?

So I'm taking a sort of dual approach to the matter. We got the judgeship bill introduced and yesterday the Conference Committee got into an agreement and by early next week I hope that bill will get passed and we will begin to get these new judges. And that will be the first increase we have had in eight years.

and get matters out of court that really don't need to be in court would require something else. So we came up with a system of arbitration, let lawyers be arbitrators, and we are trying that now in three Districts: the Northern District of California; Eastern District of Pennsylvania; and the District of Connecticut. It's working well and I think we will have a base by early next year to ask Congress to go ahead and pass a law so that we can have informal arbitration in the Federal courts.

This will be an inexpensive method of dispute resolution, but it will not deprive anyone of any right because if you're dissatisfied with the result, you can go back and take your regular place on the docket. You will not

G CO.. INC. Venue, N.E. lose anything except a little time and very minimal expense in arbitrating.

But where it has been tried in some State courts, notably Ohio -- in Cincinnati and Cleveland -- has worked well.

The other thing that we decided to do is to increase the power of the Federal magistrates so that they could try some of the cases that now are being handled by Federal judges and under a simplified set of procedures —— not the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or Criminal Procedure —— the magistrates' bill was introduced, passed the Senate and now is in the House. This week it came up on the Speaker's calendar and the normal parlance. That means it is going to be voted on soon and we will get that bill.

And I went to the Judicial Conference this morning over at Spring Court and the Chief Justice announced that the committee that he had appointed to formulate a set of magistrates' rules is almost ready to report. So we will get the magistrates and the new set of rules about the same time.

We are not doing well on diversity. The Justice

Department has taken the position that a citizen of the State

ought to go to the State courts rather than the Federal courts.

It enhances the Federal courts. In the first Congress the

diversity jurisdiction was for the non resident and not the

resident. It was later changed.

The House passed a bill removing all diversity jurisdiction. Our bill is in the Senate Judiciary Committee. They were going to vote on it vesterday and one of the Senators -- as he had a right to do -- moved to set it over a week because he is opposed to it. Congress is nearly at the end. and I don't know how this will come out.

I've been a Bar Association person all my legal career, and I'm usually on the side of the Bar, but I've had a hard time with the Bar Associations of the country, particularly with the American Bar, with this bill. I think that the public interest requires that we readjust our court systems at least this much so that the State courts can take these cases and relieve the Federal courts and the National Association of State Chief Justices favors that. They favor the same position I'm taking.

Congress has just passed something called the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which will strengthen our foreign intelligence apparatus a great deal because we will be able to go to the Federal courts to get court orders in the foreign intelligence field. A Conference Committee has been created to settle the differences between the Senate and the House, but this will be some additional work for the Federal courts.

I regret to say that the Federal Criminal Code will

2

1

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

.

16 CO., INC. Avenue, N.E. not be passed this year. It passed the Senate. It has never come out of the Subcommittee in the House. I wish I could recall and regain all of the days on end that I put on this piece of legislation, but this is the second Congress where it has failed, and I don't know what the future holds for it.

There is a very good part of it that should be non-controversial and that is the sentencing procedures which is part of the whole bill.

Now going to the internal matters, I suppose there are many things that I could say about the Department of Justice, but I think in a general way what I have tried to bring there, to teach there as an outsider is that we ought to be ethical and that we ought to be professional, and that we ought to conduct ourselves as government lawyers under the same standards and meet the same obligations as a private bar. I think that we are doing that.

I have worried some times about whether or not the Justice Department was sufficiently independent. The President asked me to be the Attorney General. He said that I have said publicly that I would like to make the Attorney General independent of the President and "I wish you would study that Well, I did and I find that you can't do that because the Constitution charges only the President with the duty to faithfully execute the laws.

But I did decide that the Justice Department could be

_ 2

NG CO., INC.

converted into a neutral zone; that in our country the law must operate on neutral principles and certainly the Department of Justice, which represents all people, must be a neutral zone.

It's like the foreign intelligence business and also much like foreign diplomacy. It is non-partisan. And I have now just two weeks ago announced to the lawyers of the Department a new method of insuring independence to the Department from any interference by the White House -- anyone in the White House or the Congress or anyone else. And that has been published; there has been a good deal written about it.

And I patterned what we have done after what they
do in England in the Attorney General's office where the
government fell in 1924 when the Attorney General was accused
of having been influenced by another Cabinet officer about
a prosecution.

And since that time, whenever a public figure is involved, the career person who is called the Director of Prosecutions handles those cases. He tells the Attorney General about them, but the Attorney General makes no decisions on them.

I put a little different version of that in. In oursethey tell me about it and they tell the Associate Attorney

General and the Deputy Attorney General, and if we change the

_ 2

NE CO., INC. Avenue, N.E. decision, we'll say, of the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division -- if we change it, we have to make public the fact that we changed it and why we changed it.

This is, I think, a sufficient safeguard, and it is exactly what I did when I overruled the Antitrust Division and allowed the merger of LTV and Lykes that you read about in the paper not so long ago. I made public the fact that I did overrule them and I gave my reasons for overruling them.

And then if we do that, if we put things on the table, then the American people can judge whether you have done right or wrong.

So I'm proud of that. And in closing I'll say that
I have been through a great deal of travail as Attorney

General. I started out, it seems to me, on an attack and a

lot of people say, "How do you like it? How have you liked the

job since you've had it?" I'd say the pay is very poor and

the hours are long, but there is some good and some bad.

I was recently cited for contempt and I had been on an airplane one day and a woman came up to me on the plane and said she had been to see one of my predecessors who was in prison, and I told her I thought it was a fine thing that she did. And as she walked away, she said, "I certainly hope you will never have to go to prison."

And so when I was cited for contempt and finally my

-

Avenue, N.E.

status was stayed by the Court of Appeals, I called my wife to tell her and she started weeping. And she said, "I never let you know, but I thought the woman who spoke to you on the airplane was a prophet."

Well, it's not that bad. It's exciting and it's exhibitant exhibitant and you survive because you think you're accomplishing something. If I didn't think I was making some progress, I would have left before now, but I'm holding on and I think we are making progress.

And I think we do have now a Department of Justice that you can be proud of. Thank you.

(Applause.)