ORIGINAL

1	
_ 2	
3	
4	
5	REMARKS
6	
7	OF
8	
9	THE HONORABLE GRIFFIN B. BELL
10	ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATE:
11	
12	BEFORE
13	THE
14	
15	FIFTH CIRCUIT JUDICIAL CONFERENCE
16	
17	WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 1979
18	ATLANTA, GEORGIA
19	MARRIOTT MOTEL
20	·
21	
22	
23	
24	
	II

TER REPORTING CO., INC.

Massachuserts Avenue, N.E.

Ingron, D.C. 20002

146-6666

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PROCEEDINGS

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Thank you.

Chief Justice Burger, Chief Judge Brown, Judge Morgan, Judges, distinguished lawyers, ladies and gentlemen:

It's good to be with you. I won't try to respond to Judge Morgan's introduction, because I know he'll fall into my net one of these days.

(Laughter.)

I told you Monday, when I introduced Senator Kennedy, about the woman asking me if I was a salesman from Ohio. You are pressed for time, but I want to tell you something else that happened to me recently. It seems like every trip I go on, some unusual thing happens.

I was at Boca Raton, at the American College of Trial Lawyers, and I was walking through the lobby of the hotel going to speak, and a man introduced himself to me, said he recognized my accent. He said he was from Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and his name was Glenn Bell. Said he wanted to thank me for the limousine he got at the airport the day before.

(Laughter.)

I said, "I didn't have a limousine. I ride with the F.B.I."

(Laughter.)

He said, "But they had one there waiting on you,

OVER REPORTING CO., INC. Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. mington, D.C. 20002 D) 546-6666

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

VER REPORTING CO., INC.

Massachusetts Avenue, N.E.

hington, D.C. 20002

346-6666

and they were paging Mr. G. Bell."

He said, "I answered the page, and they said, 'Your limousine's ready.'" I said to my wife, "Let's go."

(Laughter.)

So they got in the car, and they had gone about 20 miles, and the driver said, "You sure don't have a Southern accent."

(Laughter.)

He said, "Should I?" He said, "My name's Glenn Bell You were paging Mr. G. Bell."

He said, "I was paging the Attorney General."
(Laughter.)

That was a true story.

A lot of people ask me what it's like to be in Washington, and I have lately been telling the story of the response that the Territorial Governor of Nevada sent back to Washington, when they asked him about how he was doing out there. And he said, "This is no place for a Christian."

(Laughter.)

"And I did not remain one long."

(Laughter.)

I want to talk to you about a -- I want to mention four things to you this morning. The Chief Justice is going to speak, and I don't want to take any of his time. First I want to give you a report on the judge selection process, not

the process, but the progress we have made to date. You can take as a figure of the number of vacancies, about 170, because there are always some retirements or deaths above and beyond the 152 omnibus judgeships.

If we take 170 as a figure, there are 102 selections

in process. When I say, "in process," that means the President has signed off on 102. I have eight accumulated now, and I hope to see him tomorrow with eight additional ones. That will put it up to 110, so that means there are 60 judgeships that have not gotten out of my office, most of which have not reached my office. There are some there, about whom there are some problems.

In the Fifth Circuit, we are working on all of the -- virtually all of the judgeships except those in Alabama. We have not heard anything out of Alabama, on the District Court level, but we are working on all of the judges except one place in Georgia. The same is true, I think, in Florida, Louisiana, and tomorrow I will get the vacancy in Mississippi signed -- I will get the President to sign off on that, and Texas has got one place yet to go, I believe. So, if we had the Alabama group in, we would pretty well have the Fifth Circuit under way.

Now, on the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, there are six judgeships pending in the -- six judges' nominations pending in the Senate, and then there will be one other sent

over there in the next two or three days. So that will be seven. I believe one of those probably is to fill a vacancy caused by retirement, and six will be of the new judges.

In the Senate, as of yesterday, there were 28 nominees. Some, according to my record, some were voted out of the Judiciary Committee on April 25, three -- three judges. I don't know why the full Senate has not voted on them yet. Apparently some were voted out of the Senate Judiciary Committee yesterday. I heard that this morning, including five judges from Texas. But there are 28 in the Senate awaiting confirmation at this time.

There are six at the White House, en route to the Senate, and there will be two more today, which will be eight. So you can see from that that we are making some progress.

Now, the process in the Senate is somewhat slower than it has been, because Senator Kennedy put in a new system. They do some investigating over and above what we do. Well, you can't -- you can hardly have too much investigation, when you are appointing someone to a full time -- to a job, a lifetime appointment, where you have as much power as judges have. So, we have the F.B.I. make an investigation. I have the American Bar screening committee give me a recommendation on ability. And in addition to that, I refer the names to the National Bar Association, which is the black, predominantly black bar association, just to get them to give us any indi-

a women's coalition for the same purpose. So there is a lot of checking going on.

cation of bias, and lately we have begun to give the names to

But -- and I don't find anything wrong with that -the Senate Democrats and the Senate Republicans have an investigator, and they are -- we let them go through the F.B.I.
files, and perhaps most of the time they are satisfied with
that, but sometimes they want to go out and check up on something, get some more information. That's good, but that's
the system, and it takes a little longer than it used to
take.

Now, I think probably in the next three or four months we will begin to see how long it's going to take names of nominees to be confirmed in the Senate. I would guess, right now, it's running about 90 days. Some of these five that were voted out of the Senate yesterday -- I'm looking at my list here -- that's not out of the Senate Judiciary Committee, were sent over there on February 13. Well, I think that's not a fair assessment of the length of time, because they had to get organized, and they are organized there in the Senate now. So, I don't know how long it's going to take, but they are doing a -- they are trying to do a thorough job, and it's in the national interest that they do, just as we try to do a thorough job.

Our affirmative action program that we are running,

MER REPORTING CO., INC.
Massachusetts Avenue, N.E.
Mington, D.C. 20002

_

is subjected sometimes to some criticism, but I am keeping up with the A.B.A. ratings, and the affirmative action group's ratings are about the same, running on about the same average as the other -- as the people who were not in the affirmative action program. So that's working out.

We have found -- we have selected, I think, some very good people. We are making every effort to carry out an affirmative action program, and at the same time, do it on a basis of excellence. I am now working on a statement -- I don't know when I'll have it ready -- on affirmative action, and when -- at what point does affirmative action end and we go back -- then, we resume the system of just putting everybody in the pot and selecting the best person. That's what I'm asked frequently, and I am thinking that out right now.

Now, the next thing I want to mention, just much more briefly, I just want to report that the Chief Justice is just about ready to launch the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. He has selected some judges from over the country to serve on that court. It is service in addition to your regular duties. You come to Washington and sit as a judge there for a period of time, and when you are needed to handle foreign intelligence orders, you will be called on by the Attorney General to do that. And there is also three judges designated as a court of appeals for that court. These are duties in addition to your regular service as judges.

3

2

4

5

ь

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FER REPORTING CO., INC.
Massachusetts Avenue, N.E.

This is going to bring in the third branch of the Government, the Judiciary, into the foreign intelligence process for the first time in the history of the republic. This may be a sign of where we are heading in charters for the C.I.A. and for the counterintelligence division of the FBI. that the public will have a great deal more confidence in the system if the courts are involved in the process. We can't do too much to safequard the rights of an American citizen, and I am glad that we have someone above the Attorney General, to sign. I am glad for two reasons. One is, I am glad to have my own judgment checked, and my judgment is based on what Director Webster recommends to me, or the head of National Security, the Secretary of State; but then someone else to check my judgment is good, and also, I am hoping that it gives me some form of immunity.

Since judges have absolute immunity, I want to get under that umbrella some way. I report to you that I have been sued over 300 times since I have been Attorney General.

Now, the next thing I want to mention, and this will take a little more time, and this is from a Law Day address I gave at the University of Georgia, Saturday a week ago, just a little -- one part of that. And that has to do with the principle of Rule 11, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which states, "The signature of an attorney constitutes a certificate by him, that he has read the pleading"

. 2

MER REPORTING CO., INC.
Massachusetts Avenue, N.E.
Mington, D.C. 20002

-- this is important -- "that to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief, there is good ground to support it"
-- to support the pleading, what is said in the pleading -"that it is not interposed for delay."

In citing this rule to you, I take note, first, of the tremendous power exercised each day by lawyers, over the affairs of their clients. Whether the client is the Government or a private individual or entity, the client must depend upon the lawyer to file such papers as he or she deems necessary and appropriate.

My concern is that in the interests of advocacy,
Rule 11 is frequently ignored. How often does a lawyer stop
to reflect on the presence or absence of good grounds for the
filing? How many motions and discovery proceedings are commenced, not in the aid of truth-seeking, but merely to put
off the ultimate day of reckoning in court.

Under another situation, how many appeals are taken by lawyers, who know that there is an absence of good grounds for appeal, or that the appeal is interposed for delay. Abusive filings clog the courts, and enhance the public misimpression that lawyers foster unnecessary litigation for their own interests. They divert judicial resources from consideration of truly meritorious filings, and they increase the cost of dispute resolutions.

It is important to note that there is not even a

_ 2

ER REPORTING CO., INC. Issachusetts Avenue, N.E. ington, D.C. 20002 J46-6666 Rule 11 under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, or in the Federal rules on appeals, not even a mention of a Rule 11. There is a requirement in the A.B.A. Code of Professional Responsibility, that a public prosecutor or a Government lawyer shall not institute or cause to be instituted criminal charges, where he or she knows, or it is obvious, that the charges are not supported by probable cause.

As stated in the applicable ethical consideration to this rule, the responsibility of a public prosecutor differs from that of a usual advocate. His duty is to seek justice, not merely to convict. And in one of my first meetings as Attorney General, in the Great Hall where I spoke to the lawyers, I read to them from Justice Southerland's admonition in Berger vs. United States, and I am going to read it to you.

I am going into this because I need help. I am going to -- I have announced a new policy at the Department of Justice, that there is a Rule II applicable, the concept, in everything that we do as Government lawyers, whether we say something orally, whether we file a pleading, whether it is in a civil case, whether it is in a criminal case, whether it is on appeal. And I hope that you will watch my lawyers, and watch me, but I also hope you'll hold the private bar to the same standard that we have put in for Government lawyers.

This is what the -- but this, what I'm reading to you now from Justice Southerland's opinion, applies only to a

prosecutor:

"The United States Attorney is the representative, not of an ordinary party to a controversy, but of a sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern at all, and whose interest, therefore, in a criminal prosecution, is not that it shall win a case, but that justice shall be done. As such, he is in a peculiar and very definite sense, the servant of the law, the twofold aim of which is that guilt shall not escape or innocence suffer."

Now, we are putting out this new policy. It's not a rule; it's not an order in the Justice Department; but it's a policy, that there has to be good grounds for anything said, written or oral, in court. In addition to that, I put -- I am putting out a new policy on prosecutions, that there has to be more than probable cause to indict. There has to be a probable, winnable, case. I have found that most all of the U.S. Attorneys were doing that already, and there is no point in putting the power of the Government against someone just because you have probable cause, and it's rather obvious that you are not going in there with a case, even though you have probable cause.

Now, the last thing -- not the last thing -- right here, I want to thank all of you judges who have been asked to come to the Justice Department to work in our Trial Advocacy Institute. It is going in great style now; since

VER REPORTING CO., INC. Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. lington, D.C. 20002

ER REPORTING CO., INC.

Suschuserts Avenue, N.E.

Suschuserts Avenue, N.E.

Suschuserts Avenue, N.E.

Suschuserts Avenue, N.E.

March, we have been giving a three week course. We give two weeks in one sitting, and then bring the lawyers back after six months for the third week. I think we have the best Trial Advocacy Institute going in the country today. Many State bar groups are coming there to observe it, and many law schools are observing it. It was my answer to the Chief Justice, who was worried about trial advocacy last year, probably still is worried about it, but we will be training 600 lawyers a year there; and as you know, many of them will be leaving the Government later on, and they will join the private sector, where they'll be able to hopefully help some in the private sector.

Now, the last thing I want to say is about the Chief Justice. He is the greatest leader in the administration of the law that this country has seen, perhaps ever; certainly there have not been more than one or two that were his equals. He has a wide-ranging interest in law, Federal and State, and law reform, and even in prisons, probation, and parole.

I have learned that you can't do everything in a short time in Washington, and I've been there for 27 months, and I've never even gotten around to studying prisons, for example. I regret very much that I haven't gotten into that. I have so many things to try to learn, that I just haven't got to that, but I have been talking some with the Chief about it, and I was telling him the other day that I have come to the firm belief

-

Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. that the Parole Board ought to be transferred to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. As part of the Watergate fever that raged in Washington, and still rages to some degree, the Parole Board was taken out from under the Attorney General, and they are under no one now. They are just there. And they have a very great deal to do with the liberty. They can, in a parole hearing, go into what something — other crimes a person may have committed, and there is no trial to those other crimes, but it has a great deal to do with whether you are going to get released, because it depends on the gravity of the offense. You have to serve time, before you can be paroled, based on the gravity of the offense, that is assigned to the offense. That is the only thing. It needs to be where the court system can have some influence over it.

I have been thinking maybe the prison system ought to be transferred to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, but I haven't decided that, and I wouldn't want to -- I hope you are not about to faint, Chief, about that, that I even had such a thought.

(Laughter.)

But I am certain that the Parole Board ought to be moved to the courts. You have the probation service already, so you ought to have the parole system.

Now, if we are able to pass the recodification of the criminal law, and the new sentencing procedures that we

NER REPORTING CO., INC. Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. Mington, D.C. 20002 3 346–6666 are advocating, there won't be a whole lot for the Parole
Board to do, although I have an idea that other things will
be thought of, other service for them to render. But right
now, they badly need to be somewhere, and they are nowhere.
They are just on their own. Their budget -- I have to submit
their budget to the Congress, but I am not allowed to change
it, even. And I would like for them to be transferred to the
Administrative Office of the Courts. I have already told the
Chairman of the Parole Board of my views about that, and I
expect we will be hearing some noise before it's over.

But, having said that, I think I had best sit down and let the Chief Justice respond to that, and to say whatever else he may have on his mind.

(Applause.)