## ORIGINAL

1	OI HOH VIL
_ 2	
3	
4	
5	REMARKS
6	OF
7	THE HONORABLE GRIFFIN S. BELL
8	ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
9	BEFORE THE
10	
11	CONFERENCE OF ALL SPECIAL AGENTS IN CHARGE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	we have an agreement and supply grade had be
18	·
19	
20	WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 1979
21	9:00 A.M.
22	WASHINGTON, D.C.
23	
24	

REPORTING CO., INC. achusetts Avenue, N.E. en. D.C. 20002

## PROCEEDINGS

MR. WEBSTER: Good morning. I suppose you made good use of last night, and you are all ready to go again. We are very pleased to have the Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General with us this morning to talk about some areas that we have not covered, will not cover; and the Attorney General has indicated that there will be an opportunity for us to ask some questions and discuss things with him.

Judge Bell and Deputy Attorney General Civiletti have made a very strong team for the Department of Justice. I'm sure you know -- because I don't have the opportunity to introduce him -- I'm sure you know the background of Ben Civiletti, a former prosecutor, and then Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division, before becoming Deputy Attorney General. He probably brings more background and experience and understanding of the F.B.I. problems, than any Deputy Attorney General in history, that I can recall. We've had a good working relationship, and it's been a great pleasure for me to come on board with such a team.

Attorney General has done in support of the F.B.I. I'm sure you are aware of some of them. Some of them were mentioned in our session yesterday. The Federal Tort Claims Act has had his full and complete support, the amendment to that is derived, and he has given it every boost at every opportunity.

•

NER REPORTING CO., INC.

Massachusetts Avenue, N.E.

Massachusetts Avenue, N.E.

Magton, D.C. 20002

1 It
2 Att
3 our
4 his
5 cas
6 up
7 at
8 app
9 on1

It was because of the direct personal intervention of the Attorney General last summer, that we succeeded in extricating ourselves from the Civil Service Act. You know, of course, his participation and role in the Socialist Workers Party case. Some of you may not know, as our budget worked its way up in these very stringent times, that the F.B.I. budget was at the top of the Department of Justice's priority list of appeals. When we went through the F.C.I. budget, which not only goes through OMB but also through the Director of Central Intelligence, additional cuts in our personnel were proposed. The Attorney General went to see the President of the United States, and recovered 100 Special Agents for us.

Now, we've heard mention yesterday of the Attorney General's decision to protect the confidentiality of one of our informants, who had given information under a pledge of confidentiality, and whose safety was in real jeopardy in New Jersey. These are just some of the examples of specific, important contributions which the Attorney General, with the whole wide range of responsibilities to the Department of Justice, has found time to do for us on a personal basis. It has been a great pleasure working with him in the past year. We were friends beforehand; I think we're better friends now. I know the warmth and appreciation that he feels for this organization, and I just wanted to demonstrate in chapter and verse some of the major contributions that Judge Bell has

made in the last year.

Gentlemen, it is a pleasure to introduce the Attorney General of the United States.

(Applause.)

Webster, and gentlemen. I am going to speak about four or five minutes, and call on Mr. Civiletti to speak about ten minutes, and that will save us about 40 minutes for questions. I am a great believer in the proposition that you can communicate better with questions and answers, than you can through speeches and lectures, so we will test part of that out this morning.

Two things I want to mention, and both have to do
with ethics. You hear a lot about ethics today. We had
Howard Cosell speak to the employees across the street yesterday.
I didn't know what he was going to speak on. He's a friend
of mine, and I thought maybe we ought to have some outside
speakers on occasion; and he spoke on ethics in sports, and
it was a pretty gruesome picture that he painted about the
skullduggery going on and affecting sports in this country.
But I will leave that to someone else, and talk about our own
business.

We continue to have leaks in cases. When I first came here, the leaking was so bad that they embarrassed the Attorney General. We were operating in a most unprofessional

R REPORTING CO., INC.
Seachusetts Avenue, N.E.
Seon, D.C. 20002
36-6666

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

manner. We got in very serious trouble in the F.B.I., breaking cases in New York, and part of it came through leaks that came out of the group of lawyers who had been working on a case before I came. Judge Duffy became quite exercised, and I took affidavits from everyone that had anything to do with the case, and found out just who the person was that had talked to this reporter, Seymour Hersch of the New York Times. And the person is no longer working in the Government. Judge Duffy seriously considered bringing him there and putting him in contempt; finally decided not to do it.

In Atlanta now, in the Lance case, we are in something of the same situation, and Lance's lawyers have filed suit against me and others on the grounds that we have leaked information, grand jury information. They are just trying to get the case thrown out, on that basis or other relief, such as contempt, that sort of thing. It is just pro forma against me, because I am disqualified in the Lance case, on account of having owned stock in his bank, the Bank of Georgia. But the serious thing, it points up again that if we are really, truly professional, we don't leak out information that will -- out of an investigation, whether it's in the grand jury, out of the grand jury, or where. No one has accused the Bureau of doing the leaking; it's generally thought to be the lower level of the lawyers, as best we can tell. It may not be there; it may be through another Government agency that has been working

REPORTING CO., INC. nichusetts Avenue, N.E. non, D.C. 20002 6-6666 \_ 2

1

4

3

5

7

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

two or three other agencies. One of them -- it may be another agency, because one of the reporters has seemed to get some of the news that covers another department of the Government, not the Justice Department.

with the Justice Department lawyers and the F.B.I. There are

At any rate, however it is happening, it is unprofessional, unethical, and something we ought to be on guard against.

The second thing, a matter of ethics I want to mention, is a thing called the Ethics in Government law, which takes effect July 1. This bill is the -- the law is the finest hour for the interest groups, and the greatest accomplishment in their history was in this bill. -- if the bill stays as it is, the bill gets momentum, it will effectively eliminate any short-term worker from ever coming into Government: the "dollar-a-year man" that became famous in World War I and World War II, will be a thing of the past, and no one will be able to come in for a short time in any kind of a responsible job, because of the penalty you have to pay to leave, would be not only a -- for one year you couldn't go back to an agency, before an agency, but for two years you couldn't have anything to do with any matter that fell within your official responsibility.

In my case, that would mean every matter within the Justice Department, in the F.B.I., in the U.S. Attorneys

•

REPORTING CO., INC. achusetts Avenue, N.E. ton. D.C. 20002 6-6666 Offices, in the country, whether I'd ever heard of it or not.

So, that would effectively -- for two years, I might -- I

would just make arrangements to go teach somewhere, maybe go

into the banking business, or --

(Laughter.)

This is aimed at lawyers. I told the President that they had shot -- misfired, and hit doctors and scientists harder than they did lawyers. I gave an example, of a doctor who dedicates his life to cancer research, works out at the National Institutes of Health, on a very narrow -- in a narrow area. At some point it is necessary for him to leave there, and go to Sloane-Kettering in New York to continue that same research. He would be a -- possibly charged with a felony, if he comes back and deals with the same people he was working with at the National Institutes of Health.

Some engineer at the Defense Department, working on a missile system, submarines, let's say, some complicated thing -- left to go work on the other end of the project, he couldn't -- he may have helped get them some technical information for a change order, and he might be charged with something. This is an overkill. This takes us back to the time of ancient Greece, when Solon came in and had to rewrite all the laws, because every time their legislature would meet they would raise penalties, until they finally had nearly every minor crime carrying a death penalty. Solon came in and

rewrote all the laws, which seems to be in the process in this country, of overkill of that sort.

I'm hoping that we are going to get some changes made. We are proposing some changes that will narrow this field, and will relieve the doctors and scientists, and to some extent the lawyers, of the problem of at least a chance to make a living without being charged with a felony. These are what we call the "technical amendments". I don't know if they will pass or not, but if Congress is going to pass them, they'll have to pass them in a hurry, or the people will be gone, because they -- these scientists and doctors are -- they react like sheep following a shepherd. They went out and got lawyers of their own to find out what the law meant, and when they found out, they said they were leaving; and I don't blame them. I would leave myself.

I found nothing but a cooperative attitude on the Hill, amongst the leadership, when we went up and asked for these changes, and the President agreed to change it right off the — these are things that were put in the bill, after the bill got up to the Hill. This is a good example of what the staff in the Congress can do as to legislation; they carry great power now. The staff, working with interest groups, will do us in; and we've just about been done in by this. There's nobody in the country that's not in favor of ethics in Government. Take a high-sounding title like that,

REPORTING CO., INC. Schusetts Avenue, N.E. 100, D.C. 20002

and add all these restrictions to it, you're going to end up with a situation that's very much against the public interest, in my judgment. We'll talk more about that later, in the question and answer period; but you can ask me anything that comes to mind, once I get a chance to get back up.

Now, I would like to present my Deputy Attorney General, a man in whom I take great satisfaction, Ben Civiletti.

(Applause.)

MR. CIVILETTI: Thank you, Judge Webster and Judge Bell. Good morning, gentlemen.

I know a good many of you from speaking engagements or trips around the country in the last two and a half years, but it gave me a thrill to walk into the room this morning, behind Judge Bell and Judge Webster, and see you assembled together, the quality of men and the outstanding careers of performance that you stand for in the country. It's a little bit like — some of the best ceremonies that I have been to in the Nation's Capital have been those ceremonies which start with the presentation of the colors, and the Marine Band. You're going to have to have a hard heart or a black soul not to be thrilled when that occurs.

I would like to address, from a couple of different aspects, the achievements and progress as we look at it, or as perhaps a different perspective, the lawyers' side in the

\_ 2

1

3

5

6

•

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

last two and a half or two years. One, progress is measured by some improvements, assistance. It is also measured by resistance to attack or to deterioration, and it is also measured or can be judged by advances in product. And I would like to address that progress from the point of view of the last year or year and a half or so, short-term, near-term prospects, and then a few directions that I see in the future which are good signs and high hopes.

First, in the administrative field, it seems to me that the ADP system, management knowledge at the SAC level has proven out more this year than any other year; Director Kelley, and other improvements built on by Judge Webster, have enhanced the capacity of decision-making and knowledge here, aided in the budget presentations. You know, it's very difficult -- as you all know, you've been through it many, many times -- it's very difficult to communicate, it is to me, to communicate with OMF and then again to try and communicate with OMB, because they speak a different language. They speak in terms of numbers, and I think we now are beginning to, at least on our side, the Bureau has been able to do it better consistently for a long, long time. We now have better ammunition, better language to speak, in order to obtain the kind of resources necessary here.

Administratively, minority employment, strides have been made there, with your hard work, with a reach-out program,

and with Judge Webster's leadership. The priority system,

I think has improved the capacity and flexibility and strength
of the Bureau substantially.

Short-term, near-term, further administrative type of strengths, I think message-switching, arguments, and symbolism and nonsense, is going to be ended very shortly; and positively, I think through an election process, we've had some luck, and I think finally some understanding --

(Laughter.)

MR. CIVILETTI: -- I think finally some understanding of some principles. They are not very difficult, but they are apparently very hard to understand, even in good faith, which has not always been present, I think, on this issue. I think we will bury that issue very shortly.

FOIA, I think the Congress, there, and others in the public, do not want 16 percent, 20 percent of the work of the Bureau, in the issuing, releasing information from its files, to be released to criminals, to convicted criminals, or their aides; so that I think that at least we will be able to achieve, in the near term, some redressing of the abuses that are now present under the Freedom of Information Act.

. 2

EPORTING CO., INC. hisetis Avenue, N.E. a. D.C. 20002 With regard to the Federal Tort Claims Act, Judge Webster and Judge Bell have probably fought more skirmishes without yet winning the war, in that field, as any other --

fought -- I won't detail all of them, but fought the ABA and fought the congressional committees, fought over in the review process of approval for legislation, fought the Civil Division, and now fighting, of course, with the Federal Tort Claims Act introduced by Senator Kennedy, with a very substantial statement in support of it, and it's now pending before Senator Bayh's subcommittee. And it is one of those bills that just attracts cumbersome collateral problems to it; and the problem which it is now interrelated with, should not be -- it doesn't have anything to do with it -- is the intelligence charter.

There have been lots of setbacks in the course of the two-year struggle with the Tort Claim Act amendments. We are not set back in this instance; it is simply a delay, but we are determined -- I am

\_ 2

1

3

•

6

7

\_

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

R REPORTING CO., INC.
bischusetts Avenue, N.E.
biscon, D.C. 20002
146-6666

determined, and I know Judge Webster and Judge Bell are, from their performance -- are determined to continue the skirmishes and overcome them, and to get the legislation enacted.

With regard to training, I think training has been continued at the pace it's always been, and it has been one of the prides, I think, of the public and the F.B.I., and why the public has the rightful impression that the F.B.I. has been, is, and will continue to be the finest investigative force the world has ever had, civilization has ever seen. Quantico -- performance at Quantico, the number and capacity and ability of the training program there, continues at an outstanding level. Additional training, though, added -- inservice, in part, and in other ways joint training with prosecutors and investigators in special areas, I think has made some advances over the last year and a half, two years or so. The white-collar crime unit training that Joe has been so heavily participating in, has been very worthwhile. I anticipate in the short run, and perhaps even in the long run, that financial investigation training, integrated training between not only prosecutors and agents, but between specialists in other areas looking to the F.B.I. for guidance and direction and support, will increase. And I think as we do the really hardest work, as we are now doing and have been doing for a long time, but the emphasis continues to be at the very hardest work, the other side of that prioritization

23

24

25

is going to be an increase -- and it will be a difficult area -- is increased dependence on the Bureau to not only support, as we do, but to specially train the executives, the management, the Captains and Majors, of State and local police authorities, in the manner and method of not only administration, but technique, performance, incentives, and all of the rest. I say it's a tough area, because -- although we've done it well, and done it for years and years -the quantity of doing it, I think, is likely to increase, and that poses a budgetary problem. And there is a strong feeling that the mood of the country now, and in the years in the future, will be toward balanced budgets and looking to the States to provide their own resources and revenue expenditures. But I think that's inevitable, that we will be asked to assume even more and more of a role, as we try to -- with flexibility and good sense -- move from less onerous duties into more onerous duties.

With regards to techniques, we have, I think, protected well the techniques which are most useful to us. We have even, I think, to some extent, perfected some of those techniques; and in other areas we are continuing to learn, beginning with informants, undercover operations, Title 3s, grand jury performances, investigations, immunities, and record access -- a little bit of a balancing, with regard to record access, troublesome, but it's far better than the kind

1

3

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

n, D.C. 20002

of stone wall that was put up with an Act such as the 1976 Tax Reform Act.

And the SWP case is, as you have heard in detail, I'm sure, a victory for the principles which are so important to effective law enforcement. The undercover operations which are now under way, are, I guess, at the highest level in terms of numbers and sophistication and difficulty and achievement, that has ever existed outside of -- in the criminal field, outside of the counterintelligence area -- that have ever existed in the entire history of the Bureau. Sure, there are problems. They are very difficult. And there are civil exposures, and there are, of course, the individual exposures to danger and to risk and serious bodily injury, which has tested the Bureau. But the Bureau has not only met the test, but it has met it superbly, and the men and women in the F.B.I. have proved again that the confidence that the public and the laws impose in them, in this new area -- which again, in the short term and in directions, will become, I think, a larger and larger part of the role that the Bureau plays, without restricting or subverting or damaging to any extent, the informant systems and networks and their importance.

I think we will, in techniques, I think that equipment, use, development, and improvements in equipment, will -- in the near term, perhaps not, but certainly in a three or four-year period -- will prove to be of extreme

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPORTING CO., INC. Sachusetts Avenue, N.E. Ston, D.C. 20002 importance and help to us. Equipment of all kinds, not only communications equipment, detection equipment, and laboratory equipment, electronic equipment, but in protective equipment, in security equipment, too.

Most importantly, though, in terms of achievements and measures, I think are what I would loosely refer to as "action achievements" in every area, in every single area of importance, or of emphasized importance. We do a tremendous number of things, and you do, that are important, which are not emphasized or are not priorities. That doesn't mean that they're not important; they are all extremely important. in these emphasized areas: espionage, terrorism, corruption, economic crime, Government crime, organized crime -- the performance in the last two and a half years, or the last year, year and a half, has been absolutely astounding. cases that have been brought in every major city, in smaller cities, the scope of the cases, the intensity of those cases, -- and you can tick off 15 cases in every one of these fields -- the rapid response time has been sensational. And they've been high-visibility, they've demonstrated to the public and reconfirmed the value and the performance of the Bureau in its everyday operations, day in and day out, week in and week out, year in and year out. And I think that that has enhanced the honor and respect in which the public holds the F.B.I. and its people, and Judge Webster's --

\_ 2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPORTING CO., INC.
achusetts Avenue, N.E.
ton, D.C. 20002

(End of side one.)

(Laughter.)

MR. CIVILETTI: Essentially, there is a legal argument now that the statutory language for the payment of AUO can be read to require that the overtime -- subject to call for overtime -- must be continuously or regularly such that it could not possibly be adminstratively managed as double-time, or time-and-a-half, or other overtime provisions are managed; and that therefore, if someone is in a removed position -what we would call, say, a management position or an administrative position -- who is not directly in the line of law enforcement and investigations, subject to being called out and working this, that, and the other thing, that the statutory language compels that whenever an administrator or manager or unit is able to assign the work on a regular basis, or control overtime on a regular basis, or a fairly regular basis, that it must do so not with AUO, but in some other payment basis. And that applies to the position, as well as its -- the regularity of the individual occupying the position, or individuals.

What we want to do is to slightly change the language, to eliminate that argument entirely, so that the AUO system that we now have that works so well for us, regularly, and we are all, I think, fairly -- even those in administrative positions -- you know that you may be, you

\_ 2 \_ 3

REPORTING CO., INC., chusetts Avenue, N.E., Dr.C., 20002

know, for a month -- somebody may be 9 to 5 -- we are all on call. We can not control the responsiveness that we must make, sometimes hourly or daily or weekly, and sometimes for a long period of time, to the duties that we have; and therefore, by a slight change in the statutory language, we can eliminate the perennial argument that somehow, some positions in the Bureau -- either in the field, or particularly at headquarters -- can or should be removed from the AUO status. And it seems to me career development is such, that we -- it's essential not to penalize people coming in here to headquarters. In fact, it seems to me they ought to get hazardous pay --

(Laughter.)

MR. CIVILETTI: That's essentially it.

law firm that's opening an office in Washington, and they are going to pay their people assigned here 15 percent more than they get in the headquarters city, because they find that the cost of housing is so terrible in Washington. It really is a big handicap. The first year or two you've been assigned to Washington, I think you ought to get paid something extra.

MR. CIVILETTI: Aggravation pay.

(Laughter.)

SPEAKER: Recently there was correspondence from the Bureau with an attachment from the Department, on the

\_ 2

REPORTING CO., INC., Machusetts Avenue, N.E., Bron, D.C., 20002

possibility of modifying the Department of Justice guidelines on Dyer Act prosecutions. Two questions, really: One, is that a contemplated change in the near future? Two, I think they suggested that they might put the -- make the Dyer Act one of the legs of the RICO statute, add that to the RICO statute. Is there any current change on --

Attorney General will have to answer the -- I want to say, in my experience as a Federal Judge, that it was the finest thing John Mitchell ever did -- and he probably did some other fine things -- the finest thing he ever did was to take the Bureau and the U.S. Attorneys' Offices out of these minor Dyer Act cases. When I was first appointed as a Federal Judge, that's about all that it seemed to me the Bureau and the U.S. Attorneys were doing, in the South, other than -- the U.S. Attorneys' Offices were handling bootleg cases, but the --

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Be thankful the Bureau never had to get into that.

(Laughter.)

MR. CIVILETTI: The basic principle, I don't think, has changed, but there is concern and there is recognition in the -- some of that correspondence reflects it, that as sometimes happens with a good idea, with a good purpose and a good direction, you go beyond that which you intend, or the consequences go beyond that which is intended; and you have to

\_ 2

•

REPORTING CO., INC.
adhusetts Avenue, N.E.
an, D.C. 20002

be extremely careful with that, and here we have a growing problem involved in commercial -- you know, utilizing the opportunity that we are less, have less coverage in the area, and less emphasis in stolen motor vehicles, to develop and blossom into the "chop shops" and the rings. And they are difficult to prosecute and -- I mean, difficult to investigate, and difficult to penetrate, when you are not running the underlying operation in an intensive way, of Dyer Act cases. So the issue is being thought about; it is serious; it is of concern. But I don't think the solutions will be a major change in Dyer Act policy, although I do know, as you point out, that there is some sentiment to bringing in the enterprise concept in the Dyer Act under RICO, because of the availability of the punishments and the system.

\_

REPORTING CO., INC.
Schusetts Avenue, N.E.
Ston, D.C. 20002

all of you a copy of the opinion in the Socialist Workers case in New York. That trial, that was the first time, in modern times, that a court has ever said anything in behalf of the law enforcement apparatus, the Attorney General, or what not, and a very fine opinion. I have had a high regard for the courts, but it certainly improved after that --

(Laughter.)

SPEAKER: Judge Bell, would you comment on the intelligence charter status?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Yes, I'll be glad to comment.

I am not keen on a charter

REPORTING CO., INC. chusetts Avenue, N.E. pn, D.C. 20002

for the F.B.I. on the domestic side or the intelligence side, for different reasons.

On the domestic side, we're getting along mighty well, now. We've learned to live on the guidelines; we have systems in where people sign for -- to assume responsibility; written records are made; and once we get over in the Congress, I don't know what will happen to us. So I've never agreed to the charter, the domestic charter. Ben and Judge Webster agreed to it, because we had to send something over there. But my position is that I would just as soon not have it, so if some Senator or Congressman wants to add something to it that is restrictive, too restrictive, then I am going and say, "Well, I'm against it. Let's just drop it, just forget it."

The same way with the intelligence charter. They have got a charter they drafted and sent, which I'm very much opposed to, frankly. It's called S. 2525, I think it's called. We have got enough of a charter of our own, which applies the Fourth Amendment to procedures. It keeps it within the bounds of the Fourth Amendment. Ours is a very simple -- and in my short experience with Washington, I find you can't get anything done if it's simple. You have to complicate it.

And so I doubt ours will go anywhere, so I expect my position is going to be, that we would be just as well off just to leave everything alone. And what I said -- yesterday, some

Senators or staff people said they would be glad to introduce

REPORTING CO., INC.
Schusetts Avenue, N.E.
2000, D.C. 20002

one charter or the other -- I don't know which one it was -at my request. Well, I'm not requesting it. At one time, I
thought we needed a charter, particularly a domestic charter,
and perhaps an intelligence charter; but we have learned to
live without it, and I'm afraid we'll be done in if we aren't
careful, as the process continues. I think what we ought to
do is be cautious. We'll see how it goes. I guess the idea
that they would be holding up the amendment, in the Senate
Select Committee on Intelligence, to try to get a better
intelligence charter -- that doesn't set well with me, either.
I understand "blackmail," "graymail," "whitemail" -- --

(Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: I know what that means.

SPEAKER: The Financial

Privacy Act of '78 has cut off a lot of our informal access to information on various types of business, and we recently had a ruling out of the Department that we could not use grand jury suppoenas unless the case was being heard by the grand jury; particularly in fugitive-type cases, we're just about without any tools. Is there any consideration on the part of the Department, how we might be able to obtain and protect the sources of these documents?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: I think there is a court decision that says you can't use a grand jury supoena, unless the grand jury is considering the matter, or expects to con-

- 2

•

.12

-

REPORTING CO., INC., schusetts Avenue, N.E., con, D.C. 20002

sider it. Ben, do you know anything about that?

Ben keeps up with the privacy laws. You know, the bankers have got this started, the Bankers Association, so its not -- you can't say that everyone is interested in law enforcement. That's why I don't get too excited when the bankers call on me about helping with bank robberies. I think that they should have thought about that when they sponsored this privacy legislation --

(Laughter and Applause.)

MR. CIVILETTI: As you may know, when we got into the Financial Privacy Act, and by "we" I mean the Department, it was over in the Finance Committees -- it wasn't in our Judiciary Committee, it hadn't come up that way. It was proposed, as the Judge said, by the bankers and by some Privacy Commission, and it was from a prior Administration, but came out of this Administration; and there is sentiment among the public, generally, or, I guess, an Orwellian kind of fear -- it's not fear of law enforcement. It's fear of Government, generally, and people poking around in your business and my business, who have got no business doing it.

When we got into that, it was really severe. It was just heading right down the same railroad track as the 1976 Tax Reform Act, and that Act, the Department took the position that we opposed it absolutely, entirely, and we lost the game and the war and everything else. And we have the

REPORTING CO., INC.
Schusetts Avenue, N.E.
1000. D.C. 20002

result, problems with trying to get access, quick and ready access and communication with the Internal Revenue Service, even on the same operations, of thieves, crooks, and the rest.

So here, we tried to carve out and accommodate and balance the interests, and did a fairly decent job. We got grand jury out of it, we got the counterintelligence out of it, we got the security aspects of Secret Service excepted entirely from the Act; we preserved the right of informal access, in effect, and truly it is a prelude to, or the first step to getting the civil demand, the Bureau obtaining in effect the supcena power under a different name. It is the first step, because it provides for a written request, and unless there are certain objections taken and the rest, it protects the bank from disclosure, and provides for -- notice has to be given, and the rest, but it provides for disclosure by the bank, free of some of their old arguments about liability for wrongful disclosure and the rest.

I think that we are in a shake-down period. The Act is brand new -- went into effect, what? -- March 1st or 15th or something. I think everyone's antsy about it, and apprehensive. I think you've got more shutdowns now, or closeoffs, than you will have when we become more comfortable with it and have worked with it -- "we", I mean the community generally, private and public -- and there will be less difficulty. At the same time, I think the charter, wisely --

-

this isn't an immediate answer to your problem -- the charter wisely takes the next step and provides to the Bureau, the civil investigative demand or supoena power, or administrative ability to obtain records, which is the next logical step, even if it is under a system of restraint or potential court process.

SPEAKER: It is quite apparent that there are 20 scores, or hundreds of organizations we have investigated in the past, eagerly awaiting the outcome of this SWP civil suit. Yesterday we heard that the SWP is willing to settle this suit for \$5 million.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: It was in the paper.

SPEAKER: Pardon?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: It was in the paper, last week. And we refused to do that.

SPEAKER: My questions are, what is the prognosis of that case, and if we do settle or lose that case, will there be scores or hundreds of other civil suits filed, and keep us tied up for the next 15 years?

attorney General Bell: Well, of course, the statute of limitations is running on some of them, but they are -- this has been a difficult problem. You know, I have spent more time on F.B.I. problems, I suppose, than anything else, since I've been Attorney General. When I came in, I reviewed a lot of these suits, and I said we'll admit liability

\_ 2

...

REPORTING CO., INC.
Sechusetts Avenue, N.E.
Ston, D.C. 20002

and go to trial on damages, jury trial on damages; and the damages would be very slight, in my opinion. That's, to some extent, the way I used to defend an antitrust case.

25
REPORTING CO., INC.
Schusetts Avenue, N.E.
Ron, D.C. 20002

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: We're not paying that, and we're not -- also not paying any more lawyers for discovering documents. We're going to let the jury -- the judge, in the future, set the amount of money that we pay lawyers for getting these documents up, under the Freedom of Information Act. I've never been so shocked, as I read in the paper one morning that we paid these lawyers for these Rosenberg sons, in New York, \$194,000 for looking up records, for their efforts they made in getting records of the Rosenberg trial. And I told the Civil Division not to pay anything else without me approving it personally, and I'm not approving any large sums of money for anything like that. Some judge is going to have to set that, in the future.

SPEAKER: Judge, one question we get is, in connection with all of these civil suits -- and you mention the Chicago case, the ACLU suit -- they have attorneys on their side, and volunteer attorneys, all these law students, and for six years, like in the SWP, it's been in a discovery stage -- the Government has, at best, one attorney, sometimes

19 20 21

22

23

24

25

REPORTING CO., INC., whusers Avenue, N.E., on, D.C., 20002

the Department doesn't even have an attorney assigned to it. And we always seem to stand up there taking their best shot, and all we do is respond to their discovery; and our people in the field, our legal advisors, seem to think that we never engage in filing interrogatories. We don't have the time, because we have such a limited civil staff, out of the Department or in the United States Attorneys' Offices. Their question is, can we do more like was done recently in the Dellenger case, where some of these activists, immediately upon being served an interrogatory, they dropped the suit. They won't respond to these, most of the activists. They don't want to go into publicly what they have done, and so the question is, when you are getting funds for additional attorneys, is there ever going to be an opportunity to fund the Civil Division and some of the United States Attorneys Offices to take an aggressive approach in these civil suits? We've got 300 pending against Bureau Agents right now, and it is not an aggressive defense, in many of them.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Yeah. Well, I don't want you to think that I don't have a mutual interest in this.

I have been sued more than 300 times, myself.

(Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: But we are -- I don't think that -- the problem, that we've given the specialized attention to these cases that we should have. After I was cited in

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

contempt, of course we got a lot of lawyers and -(Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: -- somehow, they responded to that.

(Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: In a hurry. But if
we win that case, it might be the part of wisdom to set up
a special unit of lawyers to see what we can do about these
cases. We need to get rid of these cases. It's just like
something that's carried over from the '60s, some of the
other problems we have. We just need to get somebody on the
cases.

That's a good idea, Jim. I'll see if we can't get special operations going on this type case.

This is probably the last time I'll have a chance to speak to this group. I know a lot of you, from traveling around the country. I want to thank you for your help in the past, and for your friendship.

Senator Eastland was Chairman of the Senate Judiciary
Committee, and a man of few words. And we were over in the
Rose Garden one day, launching the bill to create the Foreign
Intelligence Surveillance Court. The President asked
Senator Eastland if he had anything that he would like to say.
And he said, "Yes, I'd just like to say that I'm for the F.B.I."

(Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: That's all he said, just -- (Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: So, we had a going-away party for Senator Eastland over in the Conference Room at the Justice Department, and everybody had had a drink or two, and he was feeling emotional. And I'd said some nice things about him, and I asked him if he would like to say anything in response. And he said, "Yes, I'd just like to say I'm for the F.B.I."

(Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: That's all he says.

Not long ago, we were arguing something about the Budget Director, but I've forgotten what it was. I was in the dining room over at the Justice Department, and I told somebody to go and get that straightened out. I said, "I want it known that I'm for the F.B.I."

(Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL BELL: Just like Senator Eastland.

They all said in unison, "We know that already."

(Laughter and Applause.)

MR. WEBSTER: Judge Bell and Ben Civiletti, I think that the response speaks for all of us. Thank you, and Godspeed to you, wherever you may serve your country.

10

11

12

-13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPORTING CO., INC., ichusetts Avenue, N.E., on, D.C., 20002