

PAUL MICHEL

July 30, 1982

He checked off the Judiciary Committee list for me. Then he was interested in what he had produced. It was like he had not done this before. He said Arlen was "excited" about my book and had talked about it this morning at staff meeting and afterward. I apparently jogged him some, because he and Paul talked about the 1688 situation after the staff meeting. Had they ever done a head count till I asked them?

"You might want to check with Bruce and Kevin. They have had more contact with the staffs of the Senators than I have. My judgments were all made on the basis of what I knew about the Senators generally. I haven't spoken to them or their staffs...And I don't want to." Would be interesting to compare Arlen who has talked to Sens, (Bruce and) Kevin who have talked to staffs and Paul who has talked to neither and their guess is Arlen's was more detailed than Paul's certainly. His personal relations made him more optimistic. I think I made AS focus on 1688 in a way that he hadn't.

"Arlen is a person of very great energy, willfulness and force. When he was District Attorney of Philadelphia, he could dominate almost any situation by virtue of those qualities. But those same qualities count for very little in the Senate. That infuriates me. But Arlen reacts just the opposite. He denies what I see as the reality of the situation. He thinks we are going to get the bill out of the committee, and pass it on the floor. He thinks the only possible problem is on the House side. I am much more pessimistic. Arlen thinks he can persuade the others in committee. There is so much wheelspinning here.

"I told Arlen yesterday that our main problem now is getting a quorum. I'm very pessimistic about that. I don't think we'll get a quorum. I don't

think we'll get a quorum. I don't think Thurmond will try hard enough to get one. It isn't that he's against any particular bills; it's just that he has no strong incentive to call one. They tried hard to get one and couldn't. It's the Republicans that will have to do it, because the Democrats won't come to any meetings. They don't want anything to come out of that committee. Baucus and Heflin may come. They are free spirits. I told Arlen I think the only way we will get a quorum to the administration to call Strom Thurmond and say 'We want this bill. You must get a quorum.' The person we would ordinarily turn to would be Ed Meese. He and Arlen get along well and respect each other. We met with Meese before; he liked our bill; crime is clearly within his bailiwick; and he understands the bill because of his background as a Los Angeles County prosecutor. He's our ace in the hole. But his son was killed in an automobile crash last week. That may take him out of the picture. And there is no second choice. I'm afraid we're stuck. I don't think he will move any further.. Our only chance is for Arlen to wait a week and call Meese to see if "if he's back at work."

He ran through the other possibilities and rejected them. "The only other person who could get Strom Thurmond to act would be Jim Baker. But he is so busy with so many important, big, national problems that he wouldn't be able to focus on or care about a little item like this. Meese would help move our bill, even though it is not important, because it's a more of a hobby with him. He likes the bill."

*Have
allied*

We talked about Hughes, Rodino and the House. Ron Wyden was the one who introduced it there. "He stole it from us. They were very open about it. We told them we'd rather they didn't introduce it. They said they were going to do it anyway. They said it's a free country. We said 'we could

never ask you not to introduce it; but if you asked us we'd say we'd rather you didn't.' We have enough problems without getting Hughes upset over this."

They had talked to Parker, counsel for Judiciary committee and told him they'd like it to go to Hughes subcommittee. They were told that it was a delicate problem between Hughes and Congress ^{you} and couldn't say how it would go. But it went right.

*3/20/82
Arlen Specter
re: new ideas
4/26/82*

"Hughes has the belief that any crime bill that passes, other than his LEAA bill will detract from the chances of that bill. And he also has a very strong but illogical feeling about gun control. He's a nice guy. But he believes so strongly in gun control legislation that he thinks that somehow or other our bill will harm gun control. I tell him that there are 60 million guns out there in society, we can't call them in, that the gun control problem is beyond us now. It's not even an issue. He doesn't believe me. I think our bill is the only realistic way to have gun control--take it away from people who use it to commit crimes. So on the merits he doesn't much like our bill. Maybe it's a tribute to our efforts with him that he hasn't come out against it. We had lunch with him and Arlen agreed to co-sponsor some bills of his. Arlen did not mention 1688. As he said, I don't believe in doing business that way, I don't think it works and, besides, I agreed with him on all his bills anyway. But Hughes does not want to get on the bad side of Specter. These things are even more complicated. Hughes' New Jersey district is in the Philadelphia media market. His constituents watch Philadelphia TV. Arlen Specter is a hero in that area from his days as DA. Specter could be of help to Hughes, in getting on TV. In fact, they have even talked about some joint appearances. That's another reason to stay on the good side of Specter. So even though he's opposed to

the bill, we hope these things will keep him from blocking it. If he kicks it out of his subcommittee, Rodino will handle it in full committee. He worries us too. I don't think he likes the bill too much either. He also thinks it's an anti gun control bill."

He talked again about the fact that the bill is a new kind of bill and it falls in a new category. "You've got to come to it with a completely fresh mind. It's not like other bills you're used to seeing. The first reaction of most people is to be against it. But if you walk it through with them, they usually think it's a good idea. The Attorney General of Philadelphia was opposed to it when he first heard about it. After talking about it for an hour, he completely switched. And he had been a prosecutor. I had the same experience with the DA's Association and the Bar Association. They were initially opposed to it but I turned both of them around. Unfortunately they were both overruled by a higher authority. You have to walk people through the bill. It's subtle. And it's different from anything most people are used to. That's particularly true of staff. I spend an hour talking to Sen. Kennedy's staff person the other day--a 26 year old woman who worked in the Justice Department. She is typical of the staff people we have to deal with--young, bright, law clerk type, never tried a case, never practiced law, never prosecuted a criminal and doesn't understand the prosecutorial experience. I'm afraid that these Senators will be captured by their staffs. At the least, some Senators will be convinced it is controversial. Arlen is relying on his ability to answer their questions and satisfy them on the spot in committee. But it may not be the Senators themselves who matter. It may be the staffs. So 1688 will have trouble going through even if we do have a quorum. It isn't a non-controversial bill. We have a much steeper climb even than I had thought."

Submit
12/10
proceed

"You spend so much time and have so little influence on any that happens here.

This is the specific case we are using to help us learn the obstacles and the pitfalls of the legislative process. But it's much worse when you are trying to break into a new field like nuclear weapons. People don't even know you are around. No one regards when you put something in the record. Where are the people who work on these things. Where are the windows or doors that will let you into those areas. That's a lesson we have not learned." (I told him to get on the right committee, laughed and left.