ORIGINAL

UNITED	STATE	s o	F AMI	ERICA
DEPAR	TMENT	OF	JUSI	ICE

-

REPORTING CO., INC.

achusetts Avenue, N.E. Ston, D.C. 20002 6-6666 AN ADDRESS BY

THE HONORABLE GRIFFIN B. BELL ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

•

CONFERENCE OF CHIEF JUSTICES

BEFORE THE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1979

12:00 NOON

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

2

_

3

5

6

•

-

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

er reporting co.. Inc. Essachusetts Avenue, N.E. Egton, D.C., 20002

PROCEEDINGS

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Chief Justice Nichols, other Chief Justices, Judges, Justices, friends:

Nothing would warm a lawyer's heart more than to be introduced by his own Chief Justice. I am reminded of the days when I was on the Fifth Circuit, in the '60s, and it was not too popular at that time to be a Federal Judge in the South. If we were invited to speak, we always found another Federal Judge to do the introducing -- the only safe way to proceed.

Chief Justice Nichols and I have a warm friend,

Judge Lewis Morgan, who was on the District Court and then
on the Fifth Circuit, and I remember when he was going to be
nominated by President Kennedy in 1961 to be a District

Judge. His mother was living then, and she was from Montgomery, Alabama. And she called her sister in Montgomery
and said;

"A great thing has happened to Lewis." -Lewis Morgan.

"We are all so proud of him. He is going to be appointed a Federal District Judge."

And his aunt in Montgomery said:

"Proud? We think he's bringing disgrace on our family!"

(General laughter)

_

REPORTING CO., INC.
Stachusetts Avenue, N.E.
Ston, D.C. 20002

I want to talk to you briefly about some ideas I have by way of an overview of the justice system today. And before I get into that, I want to have a word or two to say about money. I know that you all are interested in money for new systems, and studies and what not.

I was over in the House of Delegates this morning, and they told me yesterday that they were going to bring up something called, let's see, they always have some new thing that costs money. This is called the Center for Defense Services, and it has to do with appointing lawyers in criminal cases.

So, I told them that I thought that was wonderful if the States would pay for it. The States have money; they get \$3 billion a year just in revenue sharing. Every State has a surplus. The Federal debt now is over \$800 billion, and it won't be very long, at the rate we're going -- unless we balance the budget -- before it'll hit a trillion dollars. I would hate to be President when it hits a trillion dollars. I would hate for it to be said of me, that I was President when the national debt hit a trillion dollars.

So, I made a fine offer, I thought, to the House of Delegates this morning. I told them that the Federal Government is really expert in running things; that we have demonstrated that over the years, and if the States would get up the money, I'll see if I can't get the Federal Government

1 .

to run this new Center for them.

2

3

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(General laughter)

And I made one other observation: If it turned out the Justice Department could not manage it for the States, we could get the Post Office to manage it.

(General laughter)

By the way, I was out in Salt Lake City recently. It took me 13 hours to get there, because of the storms in the Midwest, and I was over the next morning speaking to the Utah Bar and meeting with my employees, U.S. Attorney and all the other people from the Justice Department in that area. We were in the Post Office building, and it struck me that I might use in my speech at lunch that day the motto of the Post Office:

"Neither rain, nor sleet, nor dark of night, will stop the courier on his duly appointed rounds" whatever it is; I'd forgotten. I had one of my assistants call the Post Office to get the motto. They didn't know what Made seven phone calls; never could find out the motto.

(General laughter)

So I said:

"Make one more; ask them to look in the Manual Surely they have a Manual that would have the motto in it."

chusetts Avenue, N.E. gron, D.C. 20002

They said:

"We have taken the motto out of the Manual."

So, I'm afraid that's the shape a lot of things are in this country now. We've gotten away from our old ways, and we're casting about trying to find new ways of doing things.

Even in your group, I was talking to Chief Justice Cameron up here about one of the programs he's interested in, and I have some responsibility with LEAA; and I find we're just sending money out in all directions. You've got something called the National Center for State Courts, which is a fine organization; get many grants from the LEAA, largely financed by the LEAA. You have the Appellate Judges Conference of the A.B.A., who are running seminars, and recently I had someone write me a letter complaining because I was holding up the grants for that seminar program.

This Judge who wrote me happened to be a friend, and said he understood I was holding it up because they'd been having meetings in resort areas. I wrote him back and told him that was true; I did that myself. I didn't think that we could keep giving out Federal money for seminars which were being held in places like Miami Beach, and other fine resort areas. And he then told me they didn't think they'd get anybody to go unless they went to a resort area.

Well, I can't stand up under that. You know,

1 2

-

_ .

REPORTING CO., INC.
Schusetts Avenue, N.E.
Ston, D.C. 20002

ER REPORTING CO., INC. Lassachusetts Avenue, N.E. Ington, D.C. 20002 346-6666 Congress will call me over there and ask me about it, and I'm the one that's going to catch it, so we just have to stop some of those things.

Well, it turned out they hadn't been to a resort area in two or three years, and the programs they run are very good. I used to participate in them myself.

There are many other needs for money, but I think that the State Court systems need to get into one operation: go through the National Center, would be better, but if you're going to have something else, we're going to have to cut down on the number of avenues through which we'll be sending money.

The LEAA's budget has been cut to about \$500 million in the upcoming budget. The number of employees, since I've been there, have been reduced from about 900 to 600, and they're going down another hundred in the new budget. But I think that there'll be about as much money available on the firing line as there has ever been, given the fact that we no longer are going to spend any money on hardware. I think the programs you're interested in will still be financed, and that you'll be satisfied.

There is some feeling in the Congress that the amount of money ought to be increased. Senator Kennedy, I notice, has had some rather strong statements to make about our budget. I was in the Appropriations Committee last week; there wasn't no one there said anything to me about increasing,

but I wouldn't say it won't be increased.

I think that you'll be, as I say, satisfied.

Now, in an overview of the justice system today, from where I stand we are making some progress. A great deal more can be made. From my standpoint, I've been very pleased at the attitude of the State Prosecutors and the State Court Systems, to the extent they've been cooperating in our effort to reallocate responsibility. We had gotten the Federal Courts filled with cases that should have been in the State Courts, and I instructed all the -- first I met with all the State Attorneys General, discussed the matter with them; then I instructed all the U.S. Attorneys to start meeting with local prosecutors to see who could best try various types of cases, who should have the responsibility. And I can report that that program is working very well.

We have had some complaints, not from the Courts, but, say, from the banks because we have stopped the FBI from handling all the bank robberies. A lot of bank robberies are just like robbing a grocery store or something. The people are caught in the next few hours, sometimes coming out of the bank, but we had gotten in the habit where we had FBI agents standing by all over the country just to handle what is really a local crime.

At the same time, we have a lot of these white-

REPORTING CO.. INC.
Chusetts Avenue, N.E.
Coron, D.C. 20002

. 2

PER REPORTING CO., INC.

Sesschuserts Avenue, N.E.

Mington, D.C. 20002

546-6666

collar crime cases, computer frauds, or very complex cases where we need the FBI agents working, and where we need to have our prosecutors working. They are interstate in nature, and it's in the public interest to have people assigned to those cases who are really skilled, and we are trying to furnish that to society, to the American people.

And all that's working out very well, and I know that this has put some stress on the State Court systems and on the State prosecutorial forces; and it would be fair and just, I think, to see if we couldn't compensate for that to the extent we are able to do so, because it has increased the expenses of the States.

But the States -- I haven't had many complaints about that, and it's well known that the States -- most States are in good shape financially, and they can put up more money themselves, and will. I've talked to our Governor here, Mr. Chief Justice, and as you know he has a very good attitude about these things, and is one of the Governors -- probably 25 or more in the country -- who recognize that perhaps the Federal Government has been doing more than it needed to, and that the States can do more.

Now, the other thing that we have done is try to come up with some alternative means of handling matters in courts. As you know, we're making a lot of progress with the Neighborhood Justice Centers. They'll have to be taken

_--

R REPORTING CO., INC. Seachusetts Avenue, N.E. Ston, D.C. 20002 over, once they reach beyond the experimental stage, by the States or by the counties, cities, as the case may be. We've started three. The most successful one is the one here in Atlanta, because they get over half the cases from the Court system. The cases get in Court, and the Courts refer the cases back out to the Neighborhood Justice Center, where they're disposed of by mediation with no lawyers in the process, whatsoever, not even working in the centers. They've trained people from the neighborhood to come in and solve these disputes between the people.

The one in Kansas City is doing pretty well. The one in Los Angeles has not done well, but is being reorganized and will be doing more. Just starting these three has had the effect of causing 15 or 20 more to be started by States and local government over the country. So, it's a movement that seems to me to be taking off, and it's essentially a substitute of what we used to know as the Justice of the Peace system in the rural areas. You have somewhere you can go to solve a small dispute, without getting into the Court system where everything seems to be complex. We seem to have lost our ability to handle anything in a simple way; particularly the Federal Courts have lost that ability.

We are, in the Federal Courts, trying to expand the power of the Magistrates so that they can handle small cases, and we're even getting up a different set of Rules for the

•

R REPORTING CO., INC.
assachusetts Avenue, N.E.
agron, D.C. 20002
346-6666

Magistrate Courts, once we get this legislation passed. That is not an alternative means, except -- well, I guess it is to some extent, in the Federal Courts.

The thing that I've been working on that has the most promise, besides the Neighborhood Justice Centers, that has real promise in substantial cases, is arbitration. We have copied the Ohio system, that the Supreme Court of Ohio devised, set up by Rule of Court; we've got that going now, trying it in three District Courts: Philadelphia area, which is Eastern District of Pennsylvania; District of Connecticut; Northern District of California. And we are taking types of cases, referring them out to lawyers who are selected from a list — lawyers are selected at random.

Three lawyers take a case, and they have an informal disposition. That means that lawyers are adjunct Judges, and one lawyer's office is a Courtroom, adjunct Courtroom. And they make a disposition, and if the litigants are happy, they quit; if not, they can come back and take their rightful place on the docket.

In Ohio, where they tried this -- in two cities, actually, Cincinnati and Cleveland -- they were getting a finality rate of above 90 percent. I'm told that our finality rate in these experiments is running almost that high. That means that the case is filed, at a point when I think the answer is filed, the case is automatically sent

REPORTING CO., INC.
Sachusetts Avenue, N.E.
ton, D.C. 20002

out to these lawyers for arbitration. This has the potential, I think, of being a very great thing. It'll cut down the expense of litigating, it'll speed up disposition, and the public will be well served. We hope to have a law passed promptly, allowing the Federal Courts to do this. We're doing it now by local rule, and probably could get by doing it by local rule, but it's a far-reaching procedure and I think it would be better to have a statute passed.

Now, the last -- that's reallocation, that was between the State and Federal Courts -- alternative means, and the third thing I want to mention to you is what to do about the large number of frivolous cases that are in court.

There's one story about General Lee that I think of often, in the time we're living in. It is said that after the Civil War, a woman walked up to General Lee with a small child in her arms and said:

"General, what can I do to make my son great?"

And he said:

"Teach him to deny himself."

We're living in a time when no one is denied, and certainly not anyone is denied a chance to go to court, no matter how frivolous a case may be; and this is nowhere more true than in the Appellate Courts. I would estimate, based on my experiences as a Federal Judge in the Fifth Circuit, that there may have been as many as 20, and maybe as high as

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

tts Avenue, N.E.

30 percent of the cases, the appeals were frivolous. I think you'd find this to be true in many places. It's particularly true -- I guess it's caused by the fact that the only way you can do anything about it, is to do something to the lawyers. You can't stop the litigant from appealing.

In the old days, a lawyer wouldn't dare take a frivolous appeal. Now, in these appointed criminal cases, if the lawyer does not appeal -- everybody gets a free appeal -if the lawyer does not appeal, he is apt to be sued. least he will have a grievance filed against him, in the Bar Association, so the safe thing for a lawyer to do is Now it seems to me to disparage, or denigrate the judicial process, for anyone my age, who was born to have great respect for the Courts -- I've been taught that all my life -- to think that you could go into Court and file a frivolous appeal.

There is a Rule, in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 11, where you certify -- the lawyer has to sign, certifying that whatever is said in a pleading is based on probable cause. Now, if we had something like that on appeals, we could cut down on appeals. And this is not a small thing; this takes a substantial amount of Appellate Court time in America today. And that's one area where we have not -- it's a place where we can reap a rich harvest. It's a field that we have not moved into, to the extent we

3

7

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ER REPORTING CO., INC. n, D.C. 20002

So I give you that as something to think about. should. That's the third thing we can do to make the Courts more efficient, make it possible to accommodate the case load of meritorious cases. I've not met anyone who knows exactly what to do about that, but I know in our country, if we think about things, if we put our minds to problems, we always come up with a solution; so that's one that we ought to be thinking about.

It's a pleasure to be with you. I told Judge Cameron I would save five to ten minutes to answer questions. I know some of you will have questions; and the mere fact that I said something about money, doesn't mean that you can't ask questions about money. It's just -- I just wanted to sort of alert you in advance that there's not a lot of money floating around Washington these days, but there is It's good to be with you. some.

SPEAKER: Thank you, Attorney General Griffin Bell, and you're always welcome at any of our meetings. Do you have any questions? That includes the press as well, if you wish to ask any questions.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: I had a press conference, and they asked a good many there, this morning. Yes, sir?

> SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Yes, we have a rule like that now, but it is seldom enforced, in the Federal Courts.

_

ER REPORTING CO., INC. Essachusetts Avenue, N.E. Ington, D.C. 20002 You can tax double cost, for taking a frivolous appeal, and I think, at least in the Second Circuit, they think that you can be imposed with Attorney fees. We have rules, but I fear that we don't enforce the Rules we have.

Now, in the British system, they had one other thing in criminal cases which is worth considering. You know you can hardly get bail on appeal in Great Britain. I don't know about Scotland, but in England and Wales, we'll say. If you take a frivolous appeal and you're out on -- I don't understand exactly how it works, but you lose the time, the days -- oh, well, you don't get credit for the days you were in jail while you were taking your appeal. They dock you for those days you were there. You don't get credit for it on your sentence. That's a very real penalty there. But I think there's no way that we're going to do that in this country, so --

SPEAKER: Is the system still in existence, that the Appellate Court could increase the punishment, or --

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Well, that's just one way they increase it. That's the way I'm talking about, about giving you credit for those days; but here nearly everyone in our country is out on bail during appeal, so you don't have that. That would be tilting with a windmill, to get off into that. There's got to be something better than that thought of; but it is a problem. Yes, sir?

Q

er REPORTING CO., INC.
Essachusetts Avenue, N.E.
Egton, D.C. 20002
146-6666

SPEAKER: Mr. Attorney General, you mentioned the fact that the States have money, and they are receiving money in the way of revenue sharing. Would you consider assisting the Court systems, so that the Court systems would have a definite share monies that go down in the way of revenue sharing?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Well, I know that at one time the LEAA had a system like that. You got an amendment to the LEAA where you were supposed to get a certain percentage. Everyone was getting money earmarked. I don't know that I'd be in favor of doing that. It seems to me that is an intrusion on the State governments, for the Federal Government to give money to the States and then say you must give a certain percentage to the courts.

I know that would help you; and I don't say that
I wouldn't be in favor of that. I would have to think about
it. My view of Federalism may be a little too set, but I do
look at the States as being separate units of government, and
I hate to see the Federal Government tell them exactly what
to do with the money once they get it. I know that goes on,
but I'd have to think about that. I don't want to say I
wouldn't do it, but I'm not prepared to commit to it.

SPEAKER: Attorney General, what do you think the future of LEAA is, at the present time?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: I think it's going -- we're

J

•

RREPORTING CO., INC.

Lassachusetts Avenue, N.E.

Logion, D.C. 20002

going to pass LEAA, a reorganization bill, where we have a Research and Development Division; a Bureau of Statistics, which is badly needed in this country. I don't think we have reliable statistics on hardly any subject in the justice system. And I think we're going to have the grant program just going on like it is. There are going to be the regular grants, and then we'll have some earmarked for juvenile justice.

Juvenile justice has got a life of its own in the Congress; everyone wants to spend money on juvenile justice, and we had -- I believe we have \$60 million now that we've never been able to spend for juvenile justice. We had a -- I think we had \$100 million allocated, and we just were not able to find places to spend it. And so we've cut -- some of the reduction this year in the budget was there. We cut from \$100 million to \$50 million on juvenile justice.

But I can say this: Once we get it organized -reorganized, and the public get the idea that the money's
being well-spent, that it's not all going to study bizarre
questions and buying up all sort of equipment that somebody
can think of -- some new equipment somebody can think up -once the public gets confidence in the LEAA, that we'll get
all the money we want. I'm not worried about getting the
money; I'm more worried about getting a structure in place,
where you can be certain that the money's well-spent. And I

1
_ 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

think we have that design now, and just as soon as we can get it enacted into law, I think we'll be in good shape. SPEAKER: Any other question? Again, Mr. Attorney General, thank you very much. And you're welcome again. (Applause)