QUESTION & ANSWER SESSION

OF

_

_

4

5

0

7.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE HONORABLE BENJAMIN R. CIVILETTI

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

AT THE

NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1980

WASHINGTON, D.C.

NOOVER REPORTING CO., INC. 320 Massachuserts Avenue, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666

The Attorney General Discussed the Following Topics:

ABSCAM	Page 2-8
Open Trials	9
Special Prosecuter for Miller Kextron Case	9-11
Prison Problems	12
Discrimination Against Gays	15
Leaks	16-20

VER REPORTING CO., INC. Massichusetts Avenue, N.E. Lington, D.C. 20002 346–6666

PROCEEDINGS

SPEAKER: The first one, if the combination of preindictment leaks and massive publicity of Operation ABSCAM has
undeniably damaged the reputations of presumably innocent men
without due process, what can, rather, what will the Justice
Department do to minimize the damage?

been in the Department of Justice has angered and frustrated me more than the revelations over the last two weeks, which have damaged and injured the reputation of individuals, of prominent public individuals and other public officials, who are entitled to at least the freedom from such damage to due process, and to their remaining rights of privacy.

I have already, as you know, begun an investigation into the leaks to determine whether or not any Government employees, be they lawyers or investigators or others, have been the cause of the leaks. I intend to beef up that investigation; I intend to pursue it with all the vigor within the Department of Justice, to get to the bottom of the leaks; and among other things, I have invited

Dick Blumenthal, the United States Attorney from Connecticut, to take charge of that investigation. He has had no association with the investigation of ABSCAM or any papers relating to it, and he is an outstanding lawyer. He is here with us today. Dick, could you stand up, please?

(Applause.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL CIVILETTI: I think in his career,
he also has a short stint as a reporter, so we may have some -(Laughter.)

-- extra background in the course of the investigation.

Dick will supervise the investigation out of the Office of Professional Responsibility, and I am interested not only in determining of course, the source of the leaks, but I am interested in determining the causes or motivations for the leaks, and to try to develop through that examination, not only punishment for those sources who have violated departmental policy, but remedies to prevent such repetitions in the future.

In addition to that step, or those steps, I am considering a number of other alternatives within the Department with regard to changes in the policy of the Department, with regard to a survey of our practices concerning the procedures and process of conducting investigations and maintaining the secrecy of investigations until the charging, public charging part, the indictment or presentment part of a case is timely.

I am interested in whether or not we are following the best and most careful need-to-know principles, or compartmentalization principles. I am also having examined the question of the communication, and our direction or policy with regard to communication, and whether or not, consistent with the Department's policy of openness with regard to its practices, to

NOVER REPORTING CO., INC. 20 Massachusens Avenue, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 its directions, and to the conduct of its affairs, consistent with those important principles we can somehow make more specific and more strong the prohibition against the revelation of any facts relating to the merits of a criminal investigation.

There is no excuse for an official of the Department of Justice be he a field agent, or be he a field or line attorney, to be sacrificing for his own interest, or regardless of the ploys that are practiced on him by people doing their duties to obtain information, which are independent and distinct from the Department's duties, to sacrifice the rights that he is charged with upholding and protecting.

SPEAKER: What is the timetable for the grand jury investigation of ABSCAM and the various individuals involved?

things in Washington, and one is not to give deadlines or time-tables when I don't have absolute control over the meeting of the timetable or deadline, so I can't give you a timetable or a deadline, except to say that with whatever energy we command within the Department, we are moving to develop the grand jury cases to the point where prosecutorial decisions can be made soundly on which cases to pursue and which, if any, cases do not merit pursuit under the compelling legal standards.

Phil Heymann estimated, in public statements to both the House and the Senate, that he hoped that within 90 to 120 days those decisions would be made.

OOVER REPORTING CO., INC. 28 Massachusers Avenue, N.E. Vahington, D.C. 20002 202) 346–6666

.

3

4

5

_

0

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

OVER REPORTING CO., INC.
Massachusers Avenue, N.E.
Shingron, D.C. 20002
02) 546-6666

SPEAKER: Without discussing the legal merits of ABSCAM, given the facts related by Senator Pressler, how could this be anything but entrapment?

ATTORNEY GENERAL CIVILETTI: That question is difficult to answer, given the qualifying predicate. essentially the question deals with whether or not there was impropriety or overreaching in the operation of the undercover operation, because a particular person did not transact business with the undercover operation. And the answer to that that in any undercover operation dealing in in part is a milieu of middlemen and con artists and underworld types of one kind or another in the middle of the undercover operation, whether it be in narcotics or whether it be in hijackings or whatever, from time to time misrepresentations will be made to the persons running the undercover operation: misrepresentations as to the possession of stolen goods, or misrepresentation as to the availability of stolen trucks or cars, or the ability to obtain a certain product or service at a price.

And of course to that extent, to the extent that there are persons around, peddlers of stolen goods or influence or whatever, who are misrepresenting about innocent public officials, then I think there is a collateral benefit to undercover operations to expose those individuals and to protect innocent public figures against such representations or conduct by such persons.

_ 2

Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 SPEAKER: F.B.I. Director Webster says the F.B.I. is probing 1200 cases of public corruption. How many Congressmen and Senators are involved?

(Laughter.)

Webster's statement, and I don't know what it relates to. I guess public corruption could include, in a broad sense, anything down to a public employee embezzling from public funds. I can say this, though, with regard to the latter part of the question, that I think the Department has stated that other than the unfortunate, regrettable, and inexcusable leaks that have endangered innocent persons by identifying them specifically, there are no other Senators or Congressmen, to my knowledge, in any way related to the ABSCAM investigation.

SPEAKER: On what basis could an F.B.I. agent involved in the ABSCAM operation refuse to testify in response to a House Ethics Committee subpoena regarding what the agent saw or heard?

instruction. The Department's regulations and rules provide that Federal employees in the Department of Justice, prosecutors and criminal investigators, can testify in proceedings _ -- involving investigations of the conduct of their business -- only with the authority of the Attorney General, as the head of the Department of Justice; and the technical answer there-

_ 2

fore is, at my direction, to preserve the integrity of the Department of Justice business, and particularly the integrity of its criminal investigations.

SPEAKER: One last question right now on ABSCAM:
Can you assure us that there was no entrapment used by the
F.B.I. in their ABSCAM operation?

many of the facts and details of the entire ABSCAM investigation. It was conducted by the F.B.I. in conjunction with prosecuting attorneys and supervised by sections within the Criminal Division, and reviewed by Deputy Assistant Attorney General Nathan, and periodically reviewed by Assistant Attorney General Heymann as to particulars during the 18-month course of the undercover operation.

And I was advised from time to time, generally, that the investigation was ongoing and of its direction, so I can not answer from my own knowledge with the kind of guarantee that I could provide if I was thoroughly familiar with all those facts. I have been advised by Mr. Heymann and by Director Webster that the close and careful and difficult questions that arise during any undercover operation, which involve principles of entrapment, unfair inducement, were thoroughly considered by the Bureau and by prosecutors, and measured decisions were made, and I believe that to be so.

On the other hand, issues of entrapment, as issues

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

hington, D.C. 20002

of unlawful search and seizure, issues of suppression, issues of confessions, are matters which are regularly battled out during the course of the criminal proceeding,

courts, or judges do not agree with the and the Government's conduct in every such instance, as we all know. And in this instance, I can't speculate as to, in one or more situations, whether or not some court may at some time, after full discussion of the facts and debate, in the application of the law, find that the line was crossed, not necessarily by the F.B.I. or by the prosecutors, by either some of the middlemen or by an informant who somehow participated with the Government, and for which in some judge's view, the Government can be found to be responsible.

I do think, from what I know, that those decisions were made carefully, crimes were not created by the F.B.I. at all; that the following of leads with regard to ABSCAM, as it moved from the investigation of stolen property and particularly Certificates of Deposit and art objects, and then into a casing franchise or licensing availabilities, and then into representations and purveyors of political services or influence, was followed based on a course of reasonable basis to believe that criminal acts were occurring, or criminal acts had occurred, of a nature similar to that which the operation was investigating.

To change the topic, regarding the open

trials, do you have any caveats or views concerning juvenile justice proceedings, which are usually closed?

an expert in juvenile justice proceedings, so I don't have any special wisdom to provide to you on that. The sensitivity and the delicacy of the tender ages of juveniles, frequently are the foundation for non-public-disclosure, but other than that I do not have any suggestions or advice.

SPEAKER: A questioner asks, why did you lend yourself to partisan political purposes by going to Baltimore with
President Carter shortly after you became Attorney General, on
what was essentially a campaign trip?

ATTORNEY GENERAL CIVILETTI: I can't say. I guess it is in the eye of the beholder. I thought it was essentially a trip home to Baltimore --

(Laughter.)

-- and a trip to visit with an Italian-American organization that had invited me many months before, and the campaign had not started. I have not campaigned in the campaign. I don't intend to. I have not been asked to. So I didn't consider it to be political at all. I thought it was rather natural, in my home town.

SPEAKER: Will you reconsider naming a special prosecutor for the Miller/Textron case, and also, please answer Senator Proxmire's charge that you have a conflict of interest

OVER REPORTING CO.. INC.
Masschusetts Avenue, N.E.
shington, D.C. 20002

-

_ 2

There are three essential requirements of a special

in this matter. And also, detail as specifically as you can, how far the Justice Department investigation has gone in investigating possible perjury and obstruction of justice.

attorney General Civiletti: Taking them in reverse order, the investigation that the Justice Department has conducted had been going on , in various stages, before Secretary Miller's confirmation hearing, and resulted in part in the prosecution of Bell Helicopter for criminal violations, and proceeded or continued thereafter \ to review and analyze and investigate any and all allegations relating to individuals who might have been knowledgeable or involved in Bell Helicopter's payment activities.

Added to that investigation were requests by Senator Proxmire after the confirmation hearings, which related to, as I recall, the failure to produce records, the potential destruction of records and its relationship to the obstruction of justice, and misstatements by witnesses at the confirmation hearing. All of those things have been pursued now, before and after the confirmation hearing. In response to Senator Wiecker's question to me at the appropriation hearing, I merely said that all of that investigation, nothing which I had been alerted to or seen in either the S.E.C. consent papers or anywhere else had indicated the predicate for a special inquiry under the Special Prosecutor Act.

Massichuserts Avenue, N.E. shington, D.C. 20002 02)-546-6666 inquiry under that Act: One, you have to be a covered employee two, you have to have a specific factual allegation of wrong-doing; and third, it has to fit within the probability of the application of a particular criminal statute or violation. And in this instance, in the Department, I am alerted to the initiation of a special prosecutor inquiry by the Criminal Division, its Public Integrity Section, through Assistant Attorney General Heymann, and I — had not and have not received any such alert, nor have I independently seen the predicate — for the consideration, even, of a Special Prosecutor, or the triggering of a special prosecutor inquiry.

And I simply answered to that effect, which somehow got translated around to the point of view that I had considered the matter thoroughly and carefully, and decided not to appoint a special prosecutor. The matter has never reached that level at any time. If the conditions or predicates for the triggering of the Special Prosecutor Act develop in some manner, shape or form, specifically, I have not shown any hesitancy, nor has the Department of Justice, to have special prosecutor inquiries or to meet the standards applied by the Special Prosecutor Act. I don't have any conflict of interest of any kind or nature. I don't know exactly what Senator Proxmire means. Conflict of interest ideas can, I guess, be about as elastic as rubber bands and can be stretched to fit almost any package.

OVER REPORTING CO., INC.
Massachuserts Avenue, N.E.
Shington, D.C. 20002

(Laughter.)

I think I have answered the three questions.

Federal court order to reduce prison populations. In view of

There are many States currently under

the recent rioting in New Mexico's prisons and the Attica riots

of a few years ago, is there anything the Justice Department

can do to assist States or local governments in this matter?

ATTORNEY GENERAL CIVILETTI: Yeah, there are about

four things. The first thing we are doing is immediate

10

relief, of course, to New Mexico. We have offered and have

11

taken in about 400, I think, of their prisoners, in order to

12

provide facilities and to alleviate their emergency situation

13

that they have.

14

But on a general basis, one, we have about finished

15

the development of Department of Justice Federal prison stan-

16

dards, which should serve as a guideline to all institutions,

17

Federal, State, local, county, and jails, and will provide a

18

basis for the development of -- particularly for new con-

19

struction or renovation, -- safe, humane, and secure institu-

20

tions.

21

22

23

Secondly, under our I guess it is stationing, or prisoner use services of the United States Marshal, when we house Federal prisoners in State institutions, local or county, we can provide certain reimbursements or certain payments under certain strict conditions, for upgrading

or improvements over the period of the contract for the provision of these housing facilities, for the benefit of the Federal prisoners involved, and of course inuring to the benefit of all the prisoners in the particular institution.

And, thirdly, through LEAA there has been room, and there have been grants issued for the improvement and study of prison problems and facility problems, although there is not a program, and I think it would be inappropriate to have a program within LEAA or the Department of Justice, where the Federal Government was paying for essentially State proprietary institutions.

SPEAKER: Attorney General Bell set up a system after the Marston affair, to warn the President about Congressmen under investigation. Is that plan still operative?

Wasn't as indicated in the question. The purpose was to give quick notice to the senior people within the Department, of the first developments of an investigation of public figures, in order to avoid misstatements by the senior officials in the Department, or embarrassment by appearances at public functions or sessions with such individuals, which might occur naturally, and, thirdly, which is the point of the question, in those instances where it was either necessary or desirable or there was a particular purpose to be served, of the Attorney General notifying the President concerning such an investigation.

OVER REPORTING CO., INC.

Massachusetts Avenue, N.E.
ashington, D.C., 20002

7 346-6666

•

U

_

PVER REPORTING CO., INC. Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. Shington, D.C. 20002 93, 346-6666 The follow-up question to that would be, well, why didn't you, then, according to that system, advise the President? And the reason was that the triggering mechanism for such advice and needed advice is ordinarily when the President is likely to be either meeting or inadvertently on the road with such persons, and when the investigation has proceeded to a stage of some ripeness concerning charges rather than simply allegations. And under these circumstances, although the disclosures occurred over the weekend, at that point I saw no purpose to be served, on Friday or Thursday when we learned that they were likely -- or when I learned that there were likely to be disclosures, I think it was principally Friday, no purpose to be served, no function to be fulfilled by, at that point, advising the President.

SPEAKER: What, if anything, does the Justice Department intend to do relative to the ripoffs of the American public on gasoline and heating oil prices?

ATTORNEY GENERAL CIVILETTI: I will have to duck that question. My expert, John Shenefield , is here. We have, I know, at least a half a dozen investigations within the Antitrust Division, and at least a half a dozen or more investigations within the Criminal Division and the United States Attorneys' offices, which relate to potential abuses of, one form of the antitrust law, or of the criminal law in one way or the other, dealing with exhorbitant or excess prices, distri-

_ 2

__

bution costs, add-ons, false sales, or whatever, concerning both gasoline and , fuel oil products. Other than that, I don't have a detailed answer.

SPEAKER: What steps will you take to bring the F.B.I.

in line with the Justice Department policy barring employment

discrimination against gays? Currently even low-level F.B.I.

clerks are fired solely on sexual orientation grounds, while

attorneys at Justice have privacy protection. And, do you

accept Mr. Webster's contention that it will take years to

review the problem.

cussed that with me, and I understand that he is reviewing it.

It is not an easy problem. I think neither Judge Webster nor

I believe that sexual preference ought to be an absolute bar

and automatic bar to Federal employment, but when you are discussing various kinds of Federal employment, I think you have

to determine the criteria and needs of the particular position,

and evaluate it on a fair, case-by-case basis.

SPEAKER: What is your Department's position on the pending telecommunications bill that threatens to moot the Department's pending antitrust case against AT&T?

ATTORNEY GENERAL CIVILETTI: I support the

Administration position with regard to competition in communications.

We do not think, after

the Antitrust Division's examination of at least the pro-

3

_

6

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 -

23

Massachuserts Avenue, N.E. hington, D.C. 20002

posals which we have seen, that it in any way threatens or will thwart the AT&T case.

SPEAKER: You were critical of the leaks of your undercover operations. Are you also critical of the news media for reporting information about the investigations?

ATTORNEY GENERAL CIVILETTI: Generally, no. the duties and responsibilities of the Department and its employees as separate and distinct from the functions and duties of the press and the media and reporters; and the only reservation that I have with regard to that subject, is it does seem to me somewhat bizarre that at the same time as reporters are using every legitimate device and means to obtain the news, which is their job -- and even involving endangering, the threats -- I mean, the risks of and exposure of, and violation of the rights of privacy of innocent persons, which arise not from the exposure but from the release of informa-· that is being blared on the front page, and tion on the back page the editorial writers are criticising this terrible danger to the -- which it is -- danger to the system of due process. I think that that is a little difficult to separate out completely, since I think that there is a certain responsibility on the part of editors -- which I believe that they exercise -- to judge what they print, and that responsibility can not be totally transferred to others under the proper suggestion that it is your ability to -- I mean, it is

your duty to retain the information, and our duty to pry it out of you.

3

SPEAKER: This questioner wants to know what your views are on whether the C.I.A. should be exempt from the Freedom of Information Act?

ATTORNEY GENERAL CIVILETTI: I don't have a detailed

7

view. have in the Department a task force report undergoing analysis in the Associate Attorney General's office,

and the recommendations will be coming to me very shortly, not

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

only with regard to the C.I.A. but with regard to the F.B.I. and to other parts of Justice. I think it likely that a total exemption for the C.I.A. would not seem to me to make common sense. They may have particular problems which have to be addressed, and there may be a legitimate need for significant amendments, but without

the basic benefit of that review and close analysis, it does

reaching exemption would be appropriate to the dangers caused

not seem to me that a total exemption or even a very wide-

SPEAKER: Thank you.

by the present law.

Before asking you a final question, I would like to present you with the National Press Club's Certificate of Appreciation, and also a Press Club tie.

> ATTORNEY GENERAL CIVILETTI: Thank you.

SPEAKER: For the final question, speaking of leaks,

tts Avenue, N.E.

•

OVER REPORTING CO., INC.
Massichusetts Avenue, N.E.
Mahington, D.C. 20002

aren't there good and bad leaks? For example, if there were no leaks, you might not have uncovered Watergate. Will your investigation tend to kill off good leaks, too?

ATTORNEY GENERAL CIVILETTI: From the Department's point of view, from my own point of view, and from the point of view of employees who take an oath of duty, both as lawyers or investigators independently within the Department, there are no good leaks which disclose facts on the merits, or relating to the merits of pending criminal investigation. We have every opportunity to present those facts to the courts and to have any difficulties with regard to the facts debated and publicly available for criticism or not.

On the other hand, with regard to conflicts within the Department, or with regard to allegations of wrongdoing by Departmental people within the scope of their duties, then it seems to me that there are compulsions, there are rationales which would support the disclosure in the appropriate manner, and I seldom think that the appropriate manner is to have a disgorging to The Washington Post, or The New York
Times, or The Star, or NBC, or CBS, but rather to the Office of Professional Responsibility, to the superior or one above the superior involved, in order to see that action is taken.

But I can see rationales and justification, be they patriotism, or be they idealism, or be they self-promotion --

REPORTING CO., UNC. ichuseus Avenue, N.E. ton, D.C. 20002 which is less justifiable -- or the resolution of conflict in your favor, all of which I am sure are common, motivations for leaks, and many others. I can see that as to process, as to internal proceedings, as to suspicion of wrongdoing, that that might well be, within the Justice Department or the Government, a rationalization and not a bad one for some public disclosure in violation of duty, but the individual has to make his choice, and be prepared and realize that it is not all one way; that if he does that, he does violate a very important duty, and should be willing to admit to the violation and suffer whatever the consequences are.

Where there is a need for such disclosure, I am sure the consequences would not be severe, nor be allowed to be severe, but there is no excuse for violating the rights of innocent persons outside the Department, who are entitled to due process, who are entitled to their day in court, and who are entitled to be presumed innocent, and particularly when it involves public officials whose reputations are their life's blood. And anyone in public office assumes a certain amount of criticism and questioning, and rightly so. We ought to be pursued and questioned and criticized without end; that is what the American system is all about, and particularly what the press is all about. But at the same time, for a Department employee to deliberately and intentionally violate those inno-

cent rights of third parties, which are so fragile, in some misguided belief that he is doing a public service, seems to me to be inexcusable and tragic.

Thank you.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

(Applause.)

* * :

DOVER REPORTING CO., INC. 30 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. ahington, D.C. 20002