UNITED STATES OF AMERICA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

REMARKS BY

THE HONORABLE CRIFFIN B. BELL

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

BEFORE THE

EIGHTH CIRCUIT JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

Brainerd, Minnesota August 21, 1978

Pages 1 thru 25

Hoover Reporting Co., Inc. 320 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 546-6666

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 1 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE 2 3 7 REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE GRIFFIN B. BELL ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES 10 11 12 BEFORE THE 13 EIGHTH CIRCUIT JUDICIAL CONFERENCE 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 MONDAY, AUGUST 21, 1978 22

MONDAY, AUGUST 21, 1978 12:00 P.M. BRAINERD, MINNESOTA

24

23

--

25

-

PROCEEDINGS

JUDGE GIBSON: This morning before breakfast, I had an opportunity to put on an old golf shirt and pair of slacks, and take a walk around the nice surroundings, look at the lake, and then I came into the main foyer here, of this facility, and I came across our able and distinguished United States Attorney Andy Danielson, and I saw that he was dressed quite nattily, in a full suit and white shirt, and tie and vest, very properly attired, and I thought that perhaps he knew something about the Conference that I didn't; I thought it would be an informal "here we are at the Lake" sort of thing.

And from there I went over and had breakfast at the facility to the north -- that used to be Rutgers -- and I sat down with another gentleman, and I introduced myself to him, and I looked at his nameplate, as we are wont to do. And he also was dressed in suit, white shirt, tie, vest -- and again I thought, rather formally for the occasion here at Madden.

And I looked at his nameplate and I discovered that he was United States Attorney from Iowa, and I said to him:

"There must be something that you and Danielson know about this conference that I don't." and he said:

"Yes, sir. The Boss is in town."

REPORTING CO., INC.
RECHUSEITS AVERUE, N.E.
Bton, D.C. 20002
46-6666

. 2 . 3

PREPORTING CO., INC. Machusetts Avenue, N.E. gron, D.C. 20002

The State of Minnesota, in this conference, is honored and pleased by the presence of the chief legal officer of our country. Griffin Bell was nominated as the 72nd Attorney General by President Carter, in December of 1976; he was sworn in on January 26th of 1977.

I would suppose everybody in this room knows and realizes that prior to his being sworn in in that position, he had served as a member of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Judicial Circuit, as a Judge of that Court, and with distinction, from 1961 until 1976.

I suppose also it would come as no surprise to any of us if I were to tell you that he's a native of the State of Georgia; I'm not quite sure that I can get the "Gawja" the way he's going to give you the "Gawja," but I'm told that he still maintains his legal residence in that State, as I'm sure do many others of our Executive Department in Washington, D. C. in these days.

It's kind of interesting; I saw our President, with his shorts and baseball cap, playing softball, on vacation, as I understand, and we're pleased that our distinguished visitor, instead of taking his vacation in his native State, has seen fit to vacation with us here in Minnesota.

Mr. Bell was admitted to the Georgia Bar in 1947; from 1941 to '46 he served with the United States Army and attained the rank of major.

2

3

5

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

He began his law practice in 1948 in Savannah, Georgia. He formed the firm of Maddox and Bell, and continued with that firm in Rome, Georgia. My former partner, Sid Gestason, might get a little kick out of the fact that he is also a member of the Order of the Coif. That was kind of a private Toke we had; when I practiced with Sid, Sid advised me that there were two members of the Order of the Coif over the years, that had come to New Ulm -- one of them turned into an alcoholic, and the other a Federal Judge.

Mr. Bell is married to the former Mary Ford Hull, and I'm sure he's pleased and honored himself to have a member of the Bar of Georgia -- Griffin, Junior.

I think the nicest thing that can be said about our distinguished quest, and a thing that impresses me -- and did impress me when I learned that he was appointed to this high office -- and that is that he is a friend of the bench and he's a friend of the bar, and in my opinion that's important to those of us -- the type that attend conferences such as these, and it's also important to the administration of justice.

Will you please welcome the Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Griffin B. Bell.

(General applause)

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Chief Judge Gibson, Judge Alsop, distinguished Judges and distinguished lawyers -- I

assume everyone here is distinguished, so I won't refer to anyone else -- thank you for the warm introduction.

You're in great luck today, because the Chief

Judge has already told me I've got to stop speaking at 12:15,

so in about eleven minutes from now --

Chief Judge Gibson's from Kansas City; so is Tom

Dacey, and they have a Congressman there whose name I just

can't remember, but I heard him speak in Washington one night

at Clarence Kelley's retirement dinner. He said his profession

was that of a used car dealer. He was very proud of it.

He said there are 27 lawyers mixed up in the Watergate, and not one used car dealer.

(General laughter)

I bring you greetings from Washington; also some good news. It's a rare thing for any newspaper to carry anything humorous since the Watergate; everything's sad, bad, and they're saving the country. We'd go down, were it not for the media.

This morning they carried something humorous in the Washington Star, and in the Atlanta Constitution. Hopefully, the Washington Post and the New York Times will soon join, and follow suit. This was the story they carried; this was on the front page in the Washington Star this afternoon, and in the Atlanta Constitution.

About two months ago, there was some article about

me in Newsweek. It said that I was an expert on something called "rooster pepper sausage." That's a rare kind of sausage we have in Georgia, and they've been trying to get the recipe since then, a number of people.

So this story broke today. Somebody phoned this in; it's supposed to be the truth -- and I think it is. The headline says:

"Sausage Gate, peppered with White House links.

The AG is hanging tough again. He is involved in a new controversy -- Sausage Gate, a scandal with a White House link. It involves a conspiracy by the Attorney General, an Atlanta lawyer -- Charles Kirbo..." -- one of my former law partners --

"...to corner the market on rooster pepper sausage, a Georgia delicacy.

The AG provoked interest in this subject by delaying his business on his way to a White House press press conference, by stopping to talk with a reporter who asked about rooster pepper sausage.

The AG replied, quote: 'Now you're talking about something important.' Close quote.

Since this first public mention of the subject, letters have been mounting at the Justice Department, asking for the recipe for rooster pepper sausage. More letters than the Marston affair generated.

PREPORTING CO., INC. searchusetts Avenue, N.E. gton, D.C. 20002

Despite his professed policy to reduce secrecy in Government, the AG has steadfastly refused to respond in any way to these inquiries. It is reported that he and Mr. Kirbo -- are exploring legal means of obtaining patent or copyrights on the sausage.

Georgia State officials have not shed any
light on the matter, other than to indicate that they
know of no Georgia sausage which is made out of rooster."

I think you can see from that that things are picking up in Washington. We've got a little humor being restored.

It's good to be in Minnesota; I often talk about
Minnesota with the Vice President. We've had two Vice
Presidents from Minnesota, and you have a Chief Justice; we
also have an Associate Justice, and until the Georgia group
came in, you had more public officials than any other State.

We've got a different view about it, though, those of us from Georgia. They now ask us: who's left in Georgia? We always respond: "The smart ones."

I was interested that the State bird is the loon.

I'd never known that before; it's useful information we all need.

We had a Governor once in Georgia who was something of an expert on birds, and he found one called the "joree."

The joree twitters, twirps a lot, pecks around, and he had

3

Δ

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

had a lot of trouble with the news media, and he finally named the news reporters jorees; he always referred to a bunch of --"...bunch of jorees here this morning."

But that is not our State bird. The robin, I think, is our State bird.

Somebody -- Judge Devitt referred to great political parties in Minnesota; got new names for them: Farm Labor, Democrats, and Independent Republicans. I've learned that what Will Rogers said was true, since I've been in Washington and I think the President would probably agree with it.

Will Rogers said he didn't belong to an organized political party; he was a Democrat. That's the shape I'm in.

I'm glad to be on the program with Senator

De Concini and Congressman Volkmer -- I do a lot of business with the two Judiciary Committees. I think we're operating a good team; at least I'm trying to, and they've been very helpful to me, both Committees. I'm going to speak in a minute about some of the things that I think are very important, that are going on in those two Committees.

I had a press conference at 10:00 o'clock, and I was asked about the Eighth Circuit, what I thought about it, what I thought the greatest problem facing the Eighth Circuit was, and I told them that I considered the Eighth Circuit to be a model Circuit.

They handle their business with dispatch, they have

/

R REPORTING CO., INC. teachusetts Avenue, N.E. tgton, D.C. 20002 46-6666 the fastest disposition -- shortest disposition record in the nation amongst the eleven Circuits. I don't think there's but one vacancy on any Court -- there's one in Iowa, and I don't know of any others, because there are two nominees that have not been confirmed yet, but at least their names are over in the Senate.

You're having some environmental problems; I noticed you're having trouble with the wolf. They say the wolf is an endangered species. I don't know much about that, because I'm an expert on the snail darter.

(General laughter)

But I do sympathize with you. I lost the snail darter case, and it was one of the great losses I've ever suffered.

I want to mention just a few things to you about the Justice Department. The first are external matters, and the last two things that I'll mention we'll call "internal" matters. External matters all have to do with legislation.

The first one is the Omnibus Judgeship bill. We badly need judges; I don't know if we'll get them. I'm not as optimistic as the two -- as the Senator and the Congressman about that. They seem to think that it's not important to divide the Fifth Circuit; I disagree. I don't think, as Attorney General, that I'd be anything other than reckless

.

R REPORTING CO., INC.

assachusetts Avenue, N.E.

agron, D.C. 20002

346-6666

if I would stand by and assist the creation -- in the creation of a Court of Appeals with 26 Judges on it. I think the same thing might be said of the Ninth Circuit; they've agreed not to divide the Ninth Circuit, but to give them 23 Judges.

I was on a Court that had 15 Judges on it, and you ought to have the experience of sitting in an en banc case, sometimes with 16 senior judges on a case; you ought to sit in a Court like that some time. That's the-- exactly the same as sitting in the legislature, and can you imagine 26 Judges sitting there trying to make a decision -- 23?

I think it's reckless in the extreme. Therefore,

I think they'll have to do something about dividing the Fifth

Circuit, and they really ought to divide the Ninth, or they

ought to take all the Judges out for the Fifth and Ninth and

give the Judges to the rest of the country.

If the Congress wants to deny 40 percent of the people in America adequate justice, then give the other -- don't punish the other 60 percent, just take those out until Congress can finally make the decision to do something about it.

That's my position about the matter.

Now, there are several things they could do short of that, but they have not agreed to any of them. You could have an en banc court consisting of less than all of the

1

-

3

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

-25 Judges. That doesn't suit anyone -- well, it suits some and not others, I'll put it.

Senator DeConcini has got up a compromise which would be something on that order; that has not yet been considered. Hopefully they'll come to some agreement on that. That would be not to divide the Fifth Circuit into separate Circuits, but almost separate Circuits, by calling the two parts "divisions."

There is another way it can be resolved, and that would be for the Congress to turn the matter over to the Judicial Conference of the United States, so that we can run efficient courts in this country. When a circuit needs realigning or dividing, somebody is there to do it, without making a great political issue out of it.

That would be a way that I'd greatly favor.

There's another way to do it, and that would be for the Supreme Court of the United States to say that they have inherent power over the alignments of the circuits. We've got a lot of districts in the country that are out of balance, and everything is so political that it's almost impossible to get anything done about it.

But division and realignment of districts, and all that aside, we do need these Judges, and I favor -- if all else fails, giving the 60 percent of the nation their Judges and let the other part of the nation suffer until we can

a political issue.

The second thing is, our foreign intelligence

finally resolve what really is not a big issue. But it's

The second thing is, our foreign intelligence system is suffering; it's been suffering since the Church Committee hearings, and we have a very fine foreign intelligence system, but the American people think -- a lot of people -- think there's something wrong with it, the way we run it.

So we've introduced the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act -- we've really re-introduced and modified something that President Ford and Attorney General Levi introduced. It's passed the Senate, hopefully it will pass the House, and for the first time, we'll be able to go to a Federal Court and get an order on various kinds of surveillance of activities we carry on in foreign intelligence. This will, for the first time, bring the Judiciary -- the third branch of Government -- into the operation.

I'm very hopeful that that will be voted on the first week after Congress returns, after Labor Day. This is something very badly needed.

The Criminal Code has passed the Senate; it's in the House. I don't know just what's going to happen to it. It's something that's badly needed, but it's really a test of the Congress, whether or not they can handle anything as complex as a recodification of the criminal law.

_ 2

I would have thought that after Congress was able to master that giant law called "OSHA," that they could have faced up to the Criminal Code. So far, we have not been able to see that.

Senator DeConcini spoke to you about the Magistrates Bill; the whole design of the Magistrates Act is to separate what we knew as -- I knew as a young lawyer: a Federal case from non-Federal cases. We tend in the Federal Courts to make every case into a big case, and that's because of the discovery rules, and we've got to have some way of -- and hopefully the Judicial Conference of the United States will not apply the same rules to Magistrates' cases as they do now to all other cases.

I've asked the Judicial Conference, at least a year ago, to start promulgating Magistrates' rules. I don't think there's any work going on right now on that; I see people here from the Court Administrative Office, and I hope some day soon that you'll address that question, because it will do little good to give Magistrates new powers if they are going to be under these same rules. We'll still have -- every case will be a big case.

Arbitration is the most exciting thing that we're trying. We're already experimenting in three Districts -- the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Northern District of California, and the District of Connecticut. We've copied

. 2

B

R REPORTING CO., INC.
assochusetts Avenue, N.E.
ngton, D.C. 20002
346-6666

the Ohio arbitration system; they pioneered it there by the Cleveland bar and the Cincinnati bar, and really brought forth by Chief Justice O'Neill, and incidentally, I saw in the morning paper that he died from a heart attack, and he was a great former Governor and Lieutenant Governor, and a real judicial innovator.

You'll be able to take your place on the docket, go back to court if you don't like the award; you'll have to arbitrate. Lawyers will do it as an adjunct of the Court; it will be a great public service to be rendered by lawyers. If you're dissatisfied, you go back to the Court and take your place on the docket, your same -- your rightful place.

But in Ohio, they have about a 95 percent finality rate on these arbitrations.

Diversity -- the status of diversity is that hopefully we'll get -- we'll remove diversity jurisdiction from Federal Courts for the resident only. That's as far as I favor going. The House removed all diversity jurisdiction; it's tied up in the Senate, in Subcommittee, on a 2-2 vote, so I don't know just how that's going to come out. But I think it would be in the interests of the State Courts for the bar to help out some on taking this one step in diversity jurisdiction.

After all, this is what the Founding Fathers did in the beginning about diversity jurisdiction.

.

Supreme Court jurisdiction; we lose sight of the Supreme Court. They have so many cases they can hardly handle them, and that's one institution that should not tamper with, so we introduced a bill, over in Professor Meador's operation at Justice Department, to remove all mandatory appellate jurisdiction; everything would be by certiorari, and we were going great guns on that non-controversial matter until somebody offered an amendment to take jurisdiction of the Supreme Court away completely on any matter involving school prayer.

So that's -- and by logic, that's a way to address that question, I suppose, is on Supreme Court jurisdiction, so that's a -- that may be the end of that bill. I hope not.

Bankruptcy judges are being compromised by the two Committees. I don't favor either approach; I don't think we need bankruptcy judges. I never thought we needed bankruptcy judges as a judge. We had referees, and they were judicial officers that the court appointed.

If the case is large enough to have a judge, then a District Judge ought to handle it, and -- otherwise, the clerk or the District Judge can appoint somebody to handle these '13's and those sort of things. But the House -- they tell me over there that they never wanted to make bankruptcy judges Article III judges; what they're trying to do was make the bankruptcy courts better, and if that was the purpose,

_

then the Senate bill, with the 12-year term and that sort of thing, will do that.

So maybe it'll come out all right. I think, if
we're going to have a real reorganization, if we don't
have a bankruptcy judge handling that, we have a District
Judge handling it. There are a lot of major bankruptcy
matters that the District Judges would handle, and if we need
more District Judges, then do that. I don't think it's a
good idea to be creating these "specialist" judges, specialist type judges.

One important bill -- and this is the last bill I'll mention -- is the Federal Tort Claims Act Amendment. I'm sued a lot, Judge Webster is sued a lot; the FBI agents are sued every day, and someone has to furnish them with lawyers. If there are multiple defendants, and there usually are in these suits that they bring when they find out things that happened years ago, under the Freedom of Information Act -- they use that to get this information, then sue us -- we have a conflict of interest and we have to go out and hire private lawyers, sometimes, to defend some of the defendants.

Congress balks about paying these lawyers, and I discovered, shortly after I became Attorney General, when we decided the nation needed the swine flu serum, they couldn't get anybody to make the serum because they thought they'd be sued, because in the law, they provide that the United States

ıd

REPORTING CO., INC.
stachuserts Avenue, N.E.
8ton, D.C. 20002

46-6666

will be substituted as a party defendant, and will defend the suits.

Now, that is a -- the same thing can be done, I think, for any Government official who is sued in a civil suit. There's -- that has nothing to do with prosecuting a public official, or referring him for administrative discipline, but it does -- it will afford a way to protect these people, or otherwise they're going to finally get to the point where they're so apprehensive about being destroyed by paying their own expenses in legal proceedings that they may not want to do their full duty.

So we're trying to get that through. We are making some progress, although I'm not too encouraged. I think we've got a chance on that.

Now, internally, two matters, and I'll stop.

One is that we are developing a very large trial advocacy program in the Department of Justice. They had one there; it was just for Assistant U. S. Attorneys, and it was about a three-day school.

We've now -- we have it up to a week, and we're planning on making it three weeks. We're going to model it after the National Institute of Trial Advocacy program at Boulder. We have already expanded it to all of the lawyers in the Justice Department, whether in the U. S. Attorney's Office or in main Justice; if they go to court, they have to

take this program.

That is our answer to the complaints about the trial lawyers of America. We're trying to make our Government trial lawyers more adequate, and I think that we can do it.

The other matter I wanted to mention to you is that when I was -- when I agreed to be the Attorney General, the President said he wanted to make the Department of Justice as independent as possible.

Under the Constitution the President is charged with faithfully executing the law. There's no mention of an Attorney General in the Constitution, so you can't completely -- you can't make the Attorney General completely independent under the Constitution, but you can do certain things to make the Justice Department into a neutral zone, and I have tried to do that, and it's taken a lot of thinking about how to finally articulate this.

And we are approaching the day when we'll be able to set out certain customs in writing, about what happens when people contact the Justice Department about matters, whether they be within the White House or the Congress, how those sort of things will be handled. A lot of things will be done by putting in writing customs that should be followed; we've been studying the British system.

In 1923 the British Government fell because they thought the Attorney General was interfering with the prosecu-

_

REPORTING CO., INC. Bachusetts Avenue, N.E. Bron, D.C. 20002

3

5

6

7

9

8

10

12

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

-25

23

tion of a public official, and they never did prove that he interfered, but the government fell. That's how serious it was, and not since then has a British Attorney General ever mentioned to the head of the -- they call him -- he's the Chief Prosecutor, but that's not his exact title.

He tells the Attorney General:

"We're getting ready to prosecute a member of Parliament."

and the Attorney General says: "Thank you." He never gets into it; all he knows is that that's going on.

That happened about three weeks ago when they indicted Thorpe, the head of the Liberal Party in England.

So since 1923, they've had a custom that when a high political official is under investigation or being prosecuted, the Attorney General has nothing to do with it.

I think that we probably need to move in the direction of making the Head of the Criminal Division in the Department of Justice a career person, and then we'll take these same offices that are in all these "special prosecutor" bills, and draw up a Justice Department order that those type matters would be handled in the Criminal Division, and go no higher than the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division, who would be a career person, a career appointment.

I think that that would be the answer to all these

special prosecutor bills. I can see -- the Special Prosecutor bill, incidentally, has not passed, but under the temporary -- there's more support for it than there is for the permanent, the temporary prosecutor -- I can see where you would just have a multitude of those floating around Washington, and there would be nobody in charge of them.

I would appoint them, after a waiting period -- I wouldn't appoint them; I think I'd tell the Court and the Court would appoint them, under most of the bills, but nobody then would have any control over them.

so it may be we need to follow the British model, and there is some merit in that. But at any rate, I want to assure you I'm working on that. I've given a lot of thought to that, how to make the Department of Justice into a neutral zone, because the law has to be neutral.

And foreign intelligence has to be neutral. That's two things that we do at the Justice Department that we ought to keep the political process out of, and I'm going to do my best to have that done by the time I leave.

Thank you very much.

(General applause)

VOICE: We're indeed grateful to the Attorney General for being with us, and for that address. I'd hoped to introduce to you Mrs. Mondale; she is scheduled to be in here -- so if somebody wants to ask some questions, or to make a

25
R REPORTING CO.. INC.
Assachusetts Avenue, N.E.
Regon, D.C. 20002

346-6666

- 3

speech or talk, I would like to have you stay to meet Mrs.

Mondale, so we can acknowledge her presence here.

Does anyone have any gems of wisdom that they'd like to give to the assembled group here? What we need is some comedian-type that can take up time and relay some jokes. I see John Shepard coming; he's the Chairman of the House of Delegates. I think you ought to be a prime person to give us some wisdom, John.

CHAIRMAN SHEPARD: Well, Judge, I'm extremely happy to be here at a meeting that you're in charge of; you always do it with such dispatch and skill, and with the help that you received from the other members of this Committee, I have no message that would be adequatly homorous nor educational to give.

JUDGE GIBSON: Well, John, I think probably your words are very kind, but we handled this meeting with a little too much dispatch.

We're indeed grateful for all of you attending here. This is a wonderful area to hold a conference of this type. I think the weather is accommodating, to confine the thunderstorms until the small morning hours, and at least today the sun is shining brightly, and we hope it will continue.

I might recognize Judge Haney at this time. Judge, do you have any further information on the arrangements pro-

gram or the social program?

JUDGE HANEY: I guess I really don't have any new information; it's all in your brochures. After this program finishes, you'll go back to your respective resorts and have lunch, and then the afternoon recreational program, or the golf and the bridge and the tennis will begin.

We're having a cookout this evening, and those of you who were in Lutsen, we are going to repeat the planked lake trout out by the shore of the lake, and I'm sure you'll all enjoy that, and I see that Joan Mondale is here now, and we're certainly happy to have her.

(General applause)

Minnesota have known Joan for many, many years as a warm and gracious lady. She has been a leader in the cultural affairs of our State, particularly in the arts. She has campaigned for Fritz, and I guess every other Democratic candidate over the years, and in addition to that, she has done, as another great lady of Minnesota -- Muriel Humphrey -- has done, she has raised a very delightful and accomplished family, and Joan, I would like to have you meet our guests of the Conference, and to thank you for coming to speak with the women and for being here.

MRS. MONDALE: Thank you, Jerry.

I'm going to talk to your wives, and I thought it

.

teporting co., inc., chusetts Avenue, N.E., on, D.C. 20002
-6666

was only fair that I subject you to my charms.

2

(General applause)

3

MRS. MONDALE: The other night I read a story about me in the newspaper, and it's a very nice story, and the headline said:

5

"Joan of Art."

7

So I rushed over to show it to Fritz, and he read it, and he said:

8

"Well, that's a nice story, but remember how she ended up?"

The Office of Management and Budget struck out the

10

I see an ally of mine in your audience. Our Attorney General, Griffin Bell, and I want to tell you why he's an ally.

appropriations for oil portraits by artists of departing

Cabinet officers. I was very upset; I read about it in the

Denver Post when I was in Denver, flying home to Washington.

And so I thought: what can you do? This is an insult to the

12

13

he's an ally.

14

15

16

17

18

19

visual arts.

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I asked if there could be an appropriation for a photographer to take the Cabinet portraits, and it was agreed. So I went to Marvin Sadik, who's the Director of the National Portrait Gallery in Washington, and said:

"Give me ten art photographers, photographers who are really good, and who have been selected, who have

R REPORTING CO., INC.
Meachuserts Avenue, N.E.
1800n, D.C. 20002
146-6666

_ 2

been exhibited, and who are recognized as outstanding in the field of photography."

which is an incredibly booming industry now.

And so he did. And so I've taken these Cabinet portfolios around to each member of the Cabinet, and have asked him or her to choose a photographer to take their portrait.

What we're going to do is have an exhibition at the National Portrait Gallery of these Cabinet portfolios. We're going to be in for a good time, because Brock Adams has to have his done, and Joe Califano has to have his, and Harold Brown, and they love this; they just adore this.

Griffin, have you had yours taken yet? Griffin!

So you'll be surprised when you meet the photographer, because he or she is not only a photographer; they're an artist, and you'll have a real experience. I'm looking forward to this exhibition.

Now, what can you as lawyers and judges do to help the arts? Well, you're going to have to figure that one out yourselves, but do a good job.

Thank you.

(General applause)

JUDGE GIBSON: Thank you, Mrs. Mondale, for being with us.

This concludes today's program; see you at 9:00

```
o'clock in the morning.
1
                  Meeting adjourned.
                  (Whereupon the meeting was adjourned.)
3
5
7
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

IER REPORTING CO., INC. Viassachusetts Avenue, N.E. Vingcon, D.C., 20002