



Department of Justice

ADDRESS
OF
THE HONORABLE GRIFFIN B. BELL
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
BEFORE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE EMPLOYEES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1978
11:00 A.M.
THE GREAT HALL
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Some 400 years ago a writer observed that the world seems to be "out of square." Inflation gives us that impression today.

The subject of my talk this morning is the effect of the President's anti-inflation program upon the Department of Justice. As you are aware, the President has stated his intention to reduce the level of federal spending as a major element in his overall anti-inflation program. Further, the administration is under Congressional mandate, as expressed in the Leach Amendment to the Civil Service Reform Act, to reduce federal employment to levels existing at the end of Fiscal Year 1977. In order to meet these two goals, reduced government spending and reduced federal employment, the administration is now in the process of limiting Fiscal Year 1979 spending under the appropriations recently enacted by the Congress and restricting the size of its Fiscal Year 1980 request to the Congress.

This will not be an easy task. The goals of government are many and varied; they call upon federal funding constant and increasing. However, the President believes--and I concur--that reduction in Federal spending and employment is critical to the successful reduction of inflation in the United States. I, therefore, must tell you that I have committed the Department of Justice to supporting vigorously the President's programs in this area.

What does that commitment mean? It does not mean that we, as a Department, will simply acquiesce in all decisions made with regard to our current and future funding by OMB. Indeed, we are, at this very moment, in the process of negotiating adjustments in some of the recommendations that have already been made. Nor does it mean that we will cease supporting and fostering the vital programs of the Department--both criminal and civil--which fall to our stewardship. The activities of this Department, in its role as primary enforcer of the Federal criminal law and as the chief civil litigator for the United States, are central to the success of this or any other government. We must not and will not lose sight of them. It does mean, however, that we must look within ourselves and find ways to reduce spending and employment while maintaining the level of quality and service the Department has come to stand for. It does mean that we must make the extra effort and confront the hard decisions among our various priorities to ensure that we do our part to support the President's program.

Let us turn now to some of the specifics relating to the Justice Department's future funding. The Congressionally-enacted budget for the Department of Justice for Fiscal Year 1979, the fiscal year we have just begun, provided total funds of \$2,473,086,000 which would allow for an end-of-year employment of 55,144 people. The administration is asking that we reduce these levels in significant ways, in both FY 1979 and FY 1980. These reductions are to

be accomplished in staged intervals over the next 22 months.

This may seem to be a significant burden for a major department of government, many of whose components already considered themselves underfunded. On the other hand, it does not begin to compare with the substantial funding increases this Department has had over the last decade. It may be useful, to put our present situation in perspective, to look at the Department's funding history over the last 10 years. From 1969 to 1978, the Department's total funding increased from \$545,497,000 to \$2,300,619,000--a total increase of 321%. Even discounting the funds added for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, whose funding programs have substantially added to the Department's total budget, our funding has increased by 240%. Total staffing, as expressed in available positions, increased by 52%, from 35,779 in 1969 to 54,528 in 1978. This rate of growth has made the Department one of the three fastest growing cabinet-level Departments of government, ahead of the Department of Defense, ahead of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and ahead of the Treasury.

It should be noted that within the total increases granted to the Department over the last decade, there have been variations in the success rates of the component organizations that make up the Department. Funding of the legal activities, including United

States Attorneys, has tripled over the last decade, while staffing has increased by 177%, more than three times the Department average. Another notable area of success has been the Drug Enforcement Administration, where funding has increased by a factor of 8 and staffing by almost 250% over the last decade. At the same time, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has lagged behind the Department's increases over the last decade, with total funding increases of 141% and total staffing increases of 19%. In fact, the Bureau's staffing has actually dropped by a percentage point over the last five years. Further, LEAA, which had dramatic increases in funding and staffing earlier in the decade, has seen a reduction in funding of 26% over the last 5 years and a reduction in staffing of 23% from 1978 to 1979.

The difficulties of these two agencies point up a general problem within our overall funding picture over the last decade. While we have had substantial success over the decade, much of it came in the first 5 years, from 1969 to 1974. Funding and staffing increases from 1974 to 1978 have slowed substantially from those earlier years, to approximately 1/5 of the rate of increase experienced from 1969-1973. Many of our component agencies have not felt the impact of this slowing process because it has been directed primarily to our larger organizations. The time is fast approaching when we will no longer be able to avoid impact to other organizations.

Further, many in the Department would argue that the increases we have obtained, large as they are, are still insufficient in light of the growth of our responsibilities as a Department. Nor would I entirely disagree with that. There are always new programs to be undertaken, and old activities to be revitalized. There always have been and there always will be. I cite these figures only to demonstrate that we have had a period of substantial growth in the past which may act as a hedge against the reductions we must now undertake.

With this picture of our recent funding successes as background, let us now move to explore our current situation once again. As noted, we face the requirement to reduce funding and staffing between now and the end of Fiscal Year 1980.

The organizations primarily affected will be the following:

- . The Office of Management and Finance will lose staffing in its central management function.
- . The legal divisions, which had substantial increases in FY 1979, will not lose those increases, but their implementation will be slowed and will take place through FY 1979 and FY 1980. There will be no further increase for FY 1980.
- . The U.S. Attorneys will, as they have in most recent years, enjoy an increase in staffing, due to the new Judgeship bill.

- . The U.S. Marshals Service will lose substantially in administrative overhead staffing and pick up some additional staffing for Judgeships. On balance, its staffing will be reduced.
- . The Community Relations Service is now the subject of continuing negotiations between the Department and OMB. We are not certain, at this time, of the outcome of those discussions.
- . The FBI will suffer minor staff reductions, but there will be no impact upon the number of agents. Further, the level of funding for Foreign Counter-intelligence activities remains at issue.
- . The Drug Enforcement Administration will lose **research and** development funding and suffer some cuts in administrative overhead.
- . The Immigration and Naturalization Service will not lose staffing from its present level, but will have no growth.
- . The Bureau of Prisons will suffer cuts in administrative overhead.
- . The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration will suffer cuts in administrative staffing.

I have not provided you with precise figures regarding organization funding levels because in many instances the final figures are still under final consideration by the Director of OMB and the President.

We have a difficult task ahead of us. While the reductions mandated by the administration will not cripple the Department, they will require sober contemplation and careful implementation in order to minimize disruption of our activities. I am counting on the leadership and staff of this Department to implement these reductions with care and precision and to accept the importance of this undertaking.

Moreover, I have directed the Deputy Attorney General, the Associate Attorney General, and the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, OMF, to begin an immediate search for fat in our activities. I have noticed an inclination in government never to stop a program, whether or not there is a continuing need for it. We must bring the Department into "square" based on a standard of genuine federal-level need.

Thank you.