

86  
ARLEN SPECTER

January 29, 1982

Riding back from his talk to Steel workers at Shoreham Hotel.

*sen to have that it change*  
14  
03  
"There have been several articles wirtten about the low profile I've maintained here. That was by deliberate design. As a body, the Senate <sup>his forte before</sup> hates aggressiveness. People here say there are two things you can legitimately talk about--matters affecting your home state and issues on which you are an expert. When I was district attorney I adopted an aggressive, high level profile. I thought that as a Republican officeholder in a Democracy, I had to do that. As one of a hundred Senators, I'm in a different situation. But even then, I think I could have been a little less intensive than I was. One group I didn't get along with as well as I should have were the judges. Oh, on a matter of rapes or corruption or a major grand jury investigation a high profile was all right. But on other matters, I need not have faulted the judges to the degree that I d-d. I haven't wanted a high profile here. You've seen the Wall Street Journal article on the freshman class, blasting away. Or the Washington Post article, blasting away at so many of them. People here are just waiting for you to make some mistake. But it's so hard to get anything passed. That's the trouble Heinz is having--he hasn't gotten anything passed. I think that's why the people in the Justice Department are opposing the bill. They don't want me to get the credit for it. People like Baker and Dole, who are established figures. They don't care if someone else gets the credit. But not everybody is that way."

*intensity my charge - not persistence however*  
Later he said "The evolution of intensity and drive is a fascinating subject. If you compare what I did today with what I would have done when I was first elected District Attorney, it's the difference between night and day. Woodrow and Willcox told me I'm easier to live with this year than last."

I think the intensity can be toned down a bit without having people think you're not interested. Compared to my DA days, I'd say I'm limp."

We talked about his work across the aisle. "I've done a lot more than most Republicans. The Byrd case on mine safety is just one example. I work with Dan Riegle on the NE-MW Coalition. I work with Edgar on the Coalition. I get calls from Cranston. He invites me to Peace Through Law meetings. And I go. I've joined the Military Reform Caucus with Sam Nunn and Gary Hart. I'm not comfortable with those two; but Bill Whitehurst is in the group. I'm comfortable with him. On the Judiciary Committee, Mathias is with the Democrats all the time. I'm very selective about going with him. He may say to me, we'd like you to take the lead on such and such. I'll say no, I want to think about it. I may vote with you, but I won't take the lead. I'll tell you what I've done a lot of--voting but not speaking. The guys at the White House get livid when you speak out against them. If you vote against them and they win they forget it. If they lose, and it isn't by one vote, they don't care. They don't want you to make yourself the focus. They understand why you have to vote, but they don't understand if you become a cheerleader. Again, it's the feeling against self-aggrandizement."

"We are right on track with Pennsylvania. 11 trips to Pittsburgh, 2 trips to Erie and having them come here, 8 to Harrisburg. We're right on track and going according to plan on the visits. I think a visit in the first year is worth 5 visits in your last year."

He's a little confused I think. Still keeping a low profile; yet "groping" for something that will make a big smash.

All the preceding was said on ride back from Shoreham. On the way out, we talked more about 1688. When I fell in with him leaving his office, he

said he saw me in the audience yesterday and was reminded of how he had cancelled me out earlier, and thought this would give us a half hour if I rode with him to the Steelworkers speech.

He said "yesterday's hearings were awful because we didn't cut back to fit the reduced time available." He may have said something like, "We've got to avoid mistakes like that." But I can't recall.

Gordon came with us and he said to Arlen "Bill Longhery hasn't showed up and no one knows where he is. We don't have your speech. I just came along. I don't have any papers with me."

Arlen said "We need the papers telling what we've done for the steel workers, this year. I've got a million dollar budget and I can't get a few papers when I need them... Was it OSHA or MENSHA? Was it the miners or the steel workers? What was the outcome? Does anybody know? Oh, well, it's just 300,000 votes and the most important industry in the state. (I said "It sounds like the campaign!) No it isn't. During the campaign, I didn't rely on my staff. I did it myself. And I knew what I didn't know. I didn't have this million dollar staff." He was upset; but he contained it well.

Then he changed the subject. "I'm groping to find a major, substantial issue that could become the subject of an investigation. I want to find something that would command attention. I'm under no illusion that I can have a Kefauver or a McClellan type investigation. My subcommittee doesn't have a very broad jurisdiction. There isn't too much I can do without the approval of others. But I'm trying to find something that will have a substantial impact. (Can you build on 1688?) The problem of sentencing might be an issue."

How is 1688 coming? "I think we're back on track as a result of a meeting we had at the Justice Department yesterday."

"I'll tell you confidentially what has happened, because I don't want to get people mad at me and have to go over the same ground again."

"You know about our meeting of <sup>November</sup> December 9th with the President, where he said at the end 'Let's go with it. I'll leave it to you to work out.' The Attorney General said he was for it; Ed Meese was for it. And they told me to work it out with OMB. I had a long battle with Ed Harper, the number two man behind Stockman at OMB. They don't want to spend one extra nickel. He kept asking me, what will it cost in 1985. And I kept saying that I didn't know what it would cost in 1985 but that prosecutors can exercise discretion and prosecutions can be controlled. I said they should go with it now, that it will be a show case for the administration in a very important area. We had a long wrangle and at 6:30 he finally said OK and signed off on it. "Then I thought everything was all set; but I got a call from the Justice Department saying that they could not testify in favor because it had been held up at the White House. I said the President and the Attorney General and Ed Meese had agreed to it and I didn't understand how there could be any problem. But I traced it down in the White House to Martin Anderson the Domestic Policy Adviser (he rolls his eyes!) He said it was the first he had heard of it and that he had not had a chance to study it. He turned the problem over to his deputy--whose name you can get from Michel. Yesterday we had a meeting with the Justice Department and Anderson's subordinate--or, I think think he's a subordinate. We get strong support from Lowell Jensen. I think Anderson will support it now. And I think OMB is still agreed. Isn't that fascinating? These meetings with the bureaucrats may be more important than the meeting of <sup>November 13</sup> December 9th with the President, the Attorney General and Ed Meese and Max Friedendorf."

"I've got a problem over in the House. They are not likely to be impressed with the administration's endorsement. I started to make contact

over there after the December 9 meeting, when I thought I had the go ahead. We're going to have a meeting in Williamsburg tonight of the two Judiciary Committees and I'll get a chance to talk to Rodino and Hughes and those people on an informal basis."

Then he says to Gordon--"Will you get me a list of all the House members who will be there, with their pictures and their biographies, so I can study them on the way down."

I asked how important this bill was to him. "If we get it through, it will be really big. It will be a really big piece of legislation. It's not just a matter of what it will do for Arlen Specter. It will revolutionize criminal prosecutions in this country. State judges will impose heavier sentences and if defense lawyers complain, they can threaten to send the case to the federal courts. In the state courts, lawyers can dance around from one docket to another. Once the case gets to a federal court, they'll have to face one judge and there won't be anymore dancing around."

Later, on the ride back, I kiddingly said I had an interest in his bill so I could write it up, he said. "We're going to get it. We'll get it."

The steelworker officer introduced Arlen by saying it was his "maiden voyage" before the group. He also said that Arlen had "spent the better part of his first year learning how he can be most effective in the Senate". "He has not been too much of a public figure in PA and that has been by design... I think he's been doing his homework so that he can be an effective Senator according to his point of view... On the mine safety bill, he was accessible to us when we needed him and we're here to commend him for his assistance."

I asked Arlen afterward if that was a fair description of his 1st year and he said "No. Jim is not exactly a booster."

Coming out of the meeting, he said "The steelworkers are a tough bunch. They were solidly for Flaherty and against me in the election--roughly and rudely so. That guy Jim is a dyed in the wool Democrat."

He said in his speech "It may be my maiden speech in Washington, but I've spoken to steel workers many times and I have some familiarity with these matters."

He spoke on mine safety and said "cuts in mine safety cannot be tolerated." This got him the only applause of his speech.

He talked of his and Bob Byrd's effort (then included Heinz as an after-thought) to get mine inspections done by Menshen at time of continuing resolution and how they lost.

"It's tough in this Congress to carry forward the inspection business. There is an attitude unfavorable to regulation. But that is an unwarranted attitude when it comes to safety. It's going to take greater intensity of effort, a lot of spadework and digging in."

Steel: No. 1 industry - threatening to slip back; Jap. imports. His answer is to give courts jurisdiction over trigger price mechanism and he has a bill to that effect.

He talks about how marathon and US Steel proposed merger was handled by courts and he wants injunctive power to be given to courts re trigger prices.

He attacks administrative (ITC & Commerce) inaction and "dallying."

"It's unfair to the steel industry and to foreign policy...and to make the steel industry take it on the chin... If the Steel Workers Union can go to court to enforce the trigger price mechanism, you can take care of yourselves. But you can't fight the bureaucracy."

"We aren't applying enough toughness and muscle in our negotiations" with Japanese.

He says he "pleads guilty to doing homework."



86  
Camm  
Says he's made 11 trips to Pittsburgh, went to conference on steel and visited Aliquippa plant and has "travelled extensively" in the area.

Said he followed TR "Speak softly and acquire the relationship and the background to get measures adopted. Legislation by press conference is not a good idea... I'm willing to cross the aisle and work with Democrats." Tells how he met Byrd at the Joint Session across the aisle. "Bob Byrd said to me, 'We'll have to go back to work on mine safety.' I agreed."

Talked of MW-NE coalition and how he worked with Riegle, the other Co Chair to get bigger share for NE.

"There's a lot of independence on the Republican side of the aisle in these matters, as you can tell from our votes. We are working to get a bigger share for Penn."

Polite applause at the end. He walks out alone. Some guys talk to him at the back; a couple want his autograph. We leave. Gordon asks him if he saw the speech Bob Loughery left for him on his desk at the office. He said No. He says they'll have to do better at these things in the future and he asks Tom, Gordon and Sylvia to meet with him immediately to go over procedures. "We'll have to play better for these things in the future."

Asked Gordon to make a note to get him to see I.W. Abel when he went to Pittsburgh. Hasn't ever met him.