ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

AN ADDRESS BY

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

BEFORE THE

PRESS AT THE MISSOURI BAR ASSOCIATION

St. Louis, Missouri September 22, 1978

Pages 1 thru 13

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

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
_ 2	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	AN ADDRESS BY
9	
10	THE HONORABLE GRIFFIN B. BELL ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
11	THE CALLED STATES
12	
13	BEFORE THE
14	PRESS AT THE MISSOURI BAR ASSOCIATION
15	
16	·
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1978 11:00 AM
23	ST. LOUIS SHERATON HOTEL ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI
24	
25	

R REPORTING CO., INC. 48 houseurs Avenue, N.E. 19-oat D.C. 20002 146-6666

The Attorney General discussed the following topics:	"
Use of Television Cameras in the Courtroom	2
Attorney General's Tenure	3-4
FBI Records and FOIA	4-5
Intelligence Surveillance Act	6
Truong-Humphrey Case	7
Relationship Between FBI and DOJ	7-8
Vesco Extradition	8
Carter's Los Angeles Bar Speech	9-10
Burger's Remarks on Lawyers	10-11 -
Plea Bargaining	11-12

iti

Ł

3

;t

3

-

R REPORTING CO., INC.
assachusetts Avenue, N.E.
ngton, D.C. 20002

PROCEEDINGS

I don't have a prepared statement; I'm here to speak at the Missouri Bar Association, as you know. I left Atlanta yesterday -- I mean, Washington, at 12:00 o'clock, and spoke

ATTORNEY GENRAL BELL: Everybody in? All ready?

last night at the Michigan Bar annual meeting in Detroit, and

then flew down here this morning.

I don't know of any fast-breaking news, so I'll be glad to answer questions.

QUESTION: One of the things that's going to be discussed at the Missouri Bar Association Meeting is allowing television cameras and microphones in courtrooms.

Your feelings on that, sir?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Well, I've said a number of times that I don't object to have television cameras in appellate courts. I have not made a final decision in my own mind about trial courts. I know there are some experiments taking place now in the trial courts, and it may well be that we'll end up finding that we can have cameras in the trial courts.

It may be that it would help the courts to have cameras, but we don't know that until we try it out. But it's no problem at all in the appellate courts. As a matter of fact, the Georgia Supreme Court was the first one to let the cameras in, and they say it's working well. They've been doing it for about a year.

Yes, sir?

QUESTION: Do you intend to resign before Mr. Carter finishes his first term, and if so, do you have any idea when?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Sir, I'm going to stand on the statement I've made, which is that I'll not be in Washington in 1980. That's the election year, and I have said consistently that I don't think it would be good for the President, or the Justice Department, for me to be the Attorney General during the election year.

washington has not yet recovered from the Watergate episode, and there's a great feeling of suspicion and distrust of all public officials. There seems — that seems to be on the wane, but it's still there, and because I'm from Georgia, people would think that whatever I ruled — and you have to make a lot of close rulings, or controversial rulings — that I might be doing something because of politics.

I think so much of the Justice Department, I've dedicated so many hard and long days to the Justice Department, trying to restore the confidence of the public image in the Department of Justice, that I don't want to be a party to seeing any retrogression in how people feel about the Department, so I think it would be better for me not to be there during the election year.

QUESTION: Have you made any decision or tentative decision about when?

____25

R REPORTING CO., INC. issuchusetts Avenue, N.E. issuchusetts Avenue, N.E. issuchusetts Acende (N.E. 1970), D.C. 20002

3

4

6

8

10

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: No, I have not. I have not, and I hasten to say that the President does not agree with my position. He takes a rather dim view of my logic.

QUESTION: Mr. Bell, FBI Head Webster wants records of investigation -- certain records -- to be kept under wraps for a period of time -- maybe even years.

Would you go along with that?

attorney General Bell: I think it would be a very good thing. We're having a great problem living with the Freedom of Information Act; I don't think anyone perceived the problem we would have by putting in a Freedom of Information Act and making it retroactive. We did not have a data retrieval system in the Government to complement the Freedom of Information Act.

We have hundreds of people digging around in warehouses and old records, trying to find things, and sometimes
we say we don't have something, and three months later somebody
comes up on a box of records somewhere.

We just weren't equipped to have a retroactive Freedom of Information Act.

I have been -- I have talked lately to the officials in Australia, New Zealand, Canada and England, and they are all thinking about a Freedom of Information Act, but there's no one that would think of making it retroactive. Prospective, fine: we would put in a data retrieval system, and would have

been able to get the records out in a hurry.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPORTING CO., INC. ssachuseurs Avenue, N.E. igica, D.C. 20002 45-6666

Now, what Judge Webster is talking about is something a little different than that, and that is that we have to be very careful about giving out the names of people who are, say, informers.

If you waited 30 years, as you do now with war secrets, like we're now just giving out the -- some records from World War II, there'd be no danger in someone being harmed or compromised, and that's the sort of thing he had in mind. That's just a narrow part of the Freedom of Information Act; it's not a wide-ranging thing at all.

But we're learning a lot about the Freedom of Information Act, and I don't know if we're making any progress, but we're doing the best we can.

And you always have the possible conflict with the right of privacy, and you might give out somebody's name accidentally, or information that would lead to someone's name, and would utterly destroy their privacy. And this country was founded on the idea that the privacy of the individual means a lot.

The Bill of Rights is directed to the individual; it's not directed to any groups, or any corporations, or such, and so you have to be very careful about people's privacy. That's one of the great rights, and I appreciate that probably more than anyone, because I lost all of my privacy when I went to Washington.

QUESTION: Could you spell out for us just to what extent the Federal Government should have the power to conduct surveillance, wiretapping individuals, speaking of individual privacy?

What sort of limits? To what extent should the Government be limited?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Well, the Government is limited by law. In the -- in criminal law, we have to go by what we call Title III of the Crime Control Act of 1968, I believe it is, and a Supreme Court decision called Keith.

So we're limited by the statute and by what the Supreme Court said in law enforcement surveillance -- electronic surveillance.

In foreign intelligence, we're limited by the President's power under the Constitution. Just in recent days we've been able to get a law passed by the Congress called the "Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act," which gives us a statutory base for foreign intelligence surveillance. That's a matter now pending in the Conference Committee between the Senate and the House, and when that's finally adopted -- as I expect it to be before Congress adjourns, we will have a statutory system, and statutory limits so all electronic surveillance then will be done within the statutory bounds.

QUESTION: In the case of David Truong, you feel that

REPORTING CO., INC. sachusetts Avenue, N.E. gton, D.C. 20002

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

R REPORTING CO., INC. Stanuseus Avenue, N.E. Agron, U.C. 20002 146 -- 6666

all of the evidence that was gathered against him was conducted legally?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Do I feel that way?

Well, I actually feel that way; I'm the person that authorized the wiretaps on David Truong, and I'm also the person who prosecuted him. And the Courts upheld my -- everything I've contended, so far.

The case is on appeal, and I don't like to get into the merits of the case -- I can't do that.

QUESTION: Sir, since Judge Webster became Director of the FBI, have relationships between the Bureau and the rest of the Department changed?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Has it changed?

QUESTION: Yes, sir.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Not that I know of. I hope it hasn't changed.

The FBI is in the Department of Justice, and as far as I know it's just -- there's been no question since I've been Attorney General.

I hear about those things, but -- the FBI is a part of the Department of Justice, and Judge Webster is doing a good job -- he's doing a fine job, and I feel very fortunate as an American citizen, as well as the Attorney General, that we were able to convince him that he should leave the bench and take the job as Director of the FBI, a job that I consider

one of the most important in the nation.

QUESTION: Has the role of the Bureau changed at all?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: What was that?

QUESTION: Has the role of the Bureau changed?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: It hasn't changed at all; no. It's doing what it's supposed to do, and doing a good job at it, and I don't know what you're driving at, but if you've got something more specific you want to ask me, you can do that.

The FBI is in good shape. They have over 20,000 people, 8,000 agents, and I would daresay that if you picked out some group in St. Louis with 20,000 people, that they would have a problem every now and then, even in as fine a place as St. Louis.

I don't think that we have any more than our normal share of problems in the FBI. And, as I say, I think Judge Webster is doing a fine job, and I think the morale of the FBI is picking up.

QUESTION: What is the status of extradition proceedings against Robert Vesco?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Well, you're just sort of like Jack Anderson; you want me to tell you everything that's in my files!

(General laughter)

in REPORTING CO., INC. assachusetts Avenue, N.E. ngton, D.C. 20002 346-6666

3

4

5

7

•

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

-25

25

I'd say that it's a matter that's being handled by the Department of Justice, that has my personal attention, and that's all I care to say about it.

Now, you can go and print that I didn't tell you everything.

QUESTION: Judge, when President Carter spoke to the Bar in Los Angeles, he came down pretty hard on lawyers, and reports were that you had a lot of input into that speech.

One of the comments that he made was that -- blaming lawyers for a lot of the delays in the justice system.

Do you agree with that position?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Well, you've asked me two or three -- you made some comments I'll have to address first.

I did see the speech before the President delivered it. He wrote the speech himself, most of it. I made two or three changes, just to correct some things in it, and that's all really that I had to do with the speech.

He invited me to go with him, and I was not able to go, because I had another engagement. But he was having a good deal to say about the delays, and lawyers have to take some responsibilities for that. It was not laymen who wrote the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; it was lawyers and law professors — a little heavy on the side of the professors, I think. Sometimes I think they were written by people who had not been to court.

5

6 , **7**

9

8

11

10

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

I think lawyers have to take a lot of the blame, and I think what the President was saying -- his message was: do better. Things are not good; it's too expensive to go to court. It takes too long.

And I think lawyers ought to address themselves to that. That's what he was saying, among other things. the lawyers are addressing themselves to it. There's more work going on now, in the last two or three years, to do something about that, than there ever has been in my memory. we're doing a lot at the Justice Department

And it's been said that the President was critical of me, critical of the Department of Justice, in what he said. Well, he had to be. He was talking to all lawyers

We're doing a lot now, and I'm going to have something to say this morning, when I speak on some of the things we are doing, some of the things we have not yet been able to get done, but which we will get done in the next year or so.

So I don't think -- that's like Chief Justice Burger's remarks; I think all this has helped the legal profession; in the end it will help. You know, it all wasn't too pleasant at first, but things don't hurt forever.

QUESTION: Was Chief Justice Burger's assessment accurate of the legal profession?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: I thought his figures were a little high. But you know, the lowest figure I've heard

from any Bar association is over 7 percent. He had 50 percent.

And some of the others have said it was 20 percent.

I never have used the figures; my idea is that if there is one incompetent trial lawyer, there's one too many, and we ought to see that that situation does not continue.

QUESTION: What about on plea-bargaining, which the President also was very critical of, saying that lawyers and prosecutors often used it to save themselves time.

You're a prosecutor --

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Well, plea-bargaining is a very necessary part of the criminal justice process, for several reasons.

One is that in the urban areas the system would break down if you didn't have plea-bargaining, probably. I think it would break down.

But the real reason for plea-bargaining is the fact that a lot of people are guilty, and they want to plead guilty -- most people who do something wrong will eventually want to admit it, and so they have a lawyer and the lawyer goes to the prosecutor and says:

"My client wants to plead guilty. What sentence do you have in mind?"

and naturally the lawyer, he'd like to find out what the prosecutor intends to do, and in some jurisdictions you can even
go see the Judge and find out.

IR REPORTING CO., INC. Assarbuserts Avenue, N.E. Agro., D.C. 20002 146–6666

Now, there's a lot of misunderstanding about pleabargaining. There are many judges that I know of that would not think of talking to lawyers about what sentence was going to be imposed, so when you use the term "plea-bargain," you have to sort of define what type plea-bargain you have in mind. This is sort of a complex matter, actually, to discuss in a general way.

But there's nothing wrong with plea bargaining of the kind I envision; that is, the kind where the judge does not get into it. I can't see how anybody can complain about that, where you just go into the courtroom and recommend to the -- the prosecutor says:

"I've talked with Mr. Gates, and the client wants to plead guilty, and we've talked about it and we think he ought to receive a sentence of three years."

The Judge says:

"I don't know about that; I'll have to look at
the probation report."

and he gives three years. There couldn't be anything wrong
with that.

Now, there are some other ways where you're letting people plea-bargain for misdemeanor when they ought to receive a felony sentence and that sort of thing, just to clear the dockets of the court. Then we're getting into deep water and really dangerous situations.

Anything else? Thank you.

REPORTING CO., INC., Sachusetts Avenue, N.E., aton, D.C., 20002 tr-5666