

PRESENTATION OF ATTORNEY GENERAL RENO BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL Thursday, May 1, 1997 University of Chicago Law School Auditorium Chicago, Illinois In 1789 the first Congress MR. BAIRD: mandated that there be appointed, quote, a meet person learned in the law to act as an attorney general for the United States. Since that time, the holders of this office have preserved the rule of law and established a long and worthy tradition of integrity and independence in the Department of Justice. At the University of Chicago, we can

1 2

take special pride in the role that our graduates have played, especially Edward Levy and his solicitor general, Robert Bork.

Janet Reno continues this tradition. It is therefore a special honor to have her with us on Law Day. It is my great privilege to introduce her to you, a meet person learned in law and our Attorney General.

MS. RENO: Thank you, Dean, very much, and good afternoon to you all.

I am very, very honored to be here at one of the great law schools of the country. I have had the opportunity to sit across the room in my conference room, and once his conference room, with Edward Levy who represents to me what

an attorney general should indeed be all about. And it is a real wonderful opportunity for me to be here today with you.

I love the law and I love lawyers. But I don't like greedy, indifferent lawyers who are selfish and don't care about others. This law school has produced so many wonderful people who have made such giving contributions to the profession, to the nation, to their community, and to society generally; and I know that you will carry on.

Do not become known for the dollars you make or the house you live in or for the name of the law firm that you join, but become known for how you use the law; how you use the law to help others; how you use the law to solve your clients' problems rather than making them; how you use the law to achieve equal justice for all; and how you use the law to contribute to your community and to your nation. You are the lawyers that will shape the next century of one of the most complex, challenging, and clearly most successful legal systems in human history.

I would like to discuss with you today two challenges that we face and that you will

1 2

face as you shape the 21st century; challenges that will test our nation, our economy, our civil life, and particularly our legal system.

The first challenge I would like to discuss with you is the challenge of the information age; how we use technology to open new worlds of learning, of commerce, of communication; new opportunities that stagger the imagination and convert vanity to prayer; how we control that technology and ensure that it does not control us or threaten us; how we reach across borders and around the world to know people we have never known before without sacrificing our right -- our precious right to privacy and to be left alone.

Let me begin with a description of the challenge. Let's look a few years into the future, for as we speak, science fiction is fast becoming science fact.

Not too many years from now an attorney will wake up one morning in Chicago. Let's call her Janet. She won't go to her door to pick up the newspaper. She'll sit down at her computer, and she will be able to flip through the Chicago papers as well as newspapers and outlets from

London and Tokyo and beyond.

If she drives to work through a toll booth, she won't have to stop because her car will send an electronic signal that will automatically deduct the toll from her bank account. From her car she might be able to listen to an Australian radio program beamed to her by satellite and call the station back to try to become the ninth caller and win the prize.

At work, assuming she still has to go to the office, Janet could log on to the computer and do some research. She could type her brief by dictating into a microphone. Then she could encode the document and send it to New York.

At lunch she could log on to the Internet, check her finances, and sell a few shares of stock or transfer some funds from her bank account to pay her electric bill. Then

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

1

3

4

5

6 7

8

- Janet could fill her doctor's prescription by calling in to the pharmacy's computer and ordering a month's dosage of medicine.
- 22 At home she might surf the Internet 23 later to buy an anniversary gift with electronic 24 cash. Then from her living room she and her
- 25 husband could choose from a list of over 10,000

movies by pressing a few more buttons, and maybe their children would be playing games on the Internet.

Much of that future is already here. The rest of it is not far behind. In fact, it all sounds a little ordinary. But this technology that she has used in this little slice of life poses a number of novel legal issues that lawyers are already grappling with and that you will be called upon to help resolve.

The fact is, anything that presents new opportunities for Americans also presents opportunities for the criminals and challenges to the lawyers who must join with others to help to stop them.

Just as money can be used to tithe or to bribe, just as cars can deliver bread or bombs, so too can computers be used to make our lives better or to threaten our basic security, our privacy, and leave law enforcement a step behind.

The fact is, criminals are also preparing for the 21st century, and the computerization of America has become a double-edged sword. Computer crime cost our

society an estimated \$10 million a year. A recent survey showed that 42 percent of security specialists in Fortune 500 companies reported unauthorized use of their computer systems just last year.

Let's return to Janet in the 21st century. She started her day with those on-line newspapers. What if, unknown to her and every

other reader, somebody had hacked into the newspapers' web site and changed some of the stories so that now John Jones was arrested for rape, not John Smith? Maybe they even inserted a photo of Jones instead. Can Jones sue? Who would he sue? And will the police or the FBI ever be able to track down the hacker.

On her way to work, Janet tried calling that radio station to win a prize, but unknown to her, someone rigged the computerized phone system so that they could be the ninth caller. Sound farfetched? That's exactly what happened a few years ago in Los Angeles when a couple of hackers won two Porsches and \$30,000 in cash before they were caught. They went to jail. Don't try this at home.

Remember that brief Janet sent to her

partners in New York? Turns out an unscrupulous competitor intercepted it to get a leg up in court. But there is good news in this case. The message was encrypted, and the hacker couldn't break the code.

At lunch, when Janet seeks to transfer funds from her bank account, she realizes her account is empty. Someone has robbed her bank account with a modem instead of a ransom note and a sack.

Just last year a gang of computer hackers sat in a kitchen in Russia and broke into Citibank's financial system. They tried to steal more than \$10 million by transferring the funds to accounts in at least seven different countries. Working together with law enforcement around the globe, we arrested the gang of hackers. Unfortunately, to this day, \$400,000 remains unrecovered; stolen from a Russian kitchen table.

But Janet's day is not over. When she goes to fill her prescription, she finds out that someone has broken into the pharmacy's computer and stolen its files. They are threatening to make the files public, damage the reputation of

the customers, and bankrupt the pharmacy if it does not pay ransom. Once again, science fiction is already science fact.

Hackers from Germany recently captured the credit card files a Miami company kept on its customers. The hackers then threatened to distribute all the credit card numbers unless they were paid ransom. When one of the hackers tried to pick up the money, German authorities arrested him. If the hackers had chosen to use the numbers instead of trying extortion, law enforcement may not have been able to stop them.

Now 21st-century Janet is driving home from work. She's tired, and there's more bad news on the radio. It seems that a group of cyber terrorists have hacked into the air traffic controller system and disrupted the entire system, and flights are delayed around the Law enforcement knew that they were up to something because they had been sending frequent messages to their headquarters overseas. police had even obtained a court order to access the E-mails. But because the conversations were all coded with encryption products that did not allow for data recovery and the police could not

break the code, all they saw was a garbled message. So they could not stop the crime in advance.

Janet gets home and finds the perfect anniversary gift for sale on the Internet. She buys it, but it never arrives and her money is gone. Telemarketing fraud used to be labor intensive requiring thousands of calls to people over several weeks. Now scam artists can reach millions on the Internet in seconds. Can law enforcement, using wire fraud laws, keep up?

At that point Janet's 10-year-old tells her about something he saw on the Internet that afternoon. Looks like a pedophile at work, a nice stranger inviting her son to meet him in the

16 park.

17 18

19

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

2.2

23

24

25

These are not just the problems of tomorrow; many of them are the problems of today. They sound daunting, even frightening.

20 Can the law keep up?

In many cases we are already at work.

For example, President Clinton established a
commission to determine how best to protect the
nation's critical infrastructure from computer
assault so that attacks on systems like our air

11

traffic control network will remain science fiction. But this presents extraordinary challenges to lawyers.

Lawyers have to understand the technology. But more importantly, lawyers have to remember everything they've learned about the Constitution; and we have got to make sure that as we attempt to control the technology, we control it according to the traditions of our Constitution, and that we make sure that that document, which has been such a living document, continues to live without abatement and that lawyers are capable of dealing with the technology.

The Justice Department has set up a special section that deals with computer crimes, and every U.S. Attorney's office has designated lawyers to deal with high tech crime and provided them with special training. The FBI has established three high tech squads. But this is not a problem for law enforcement alone. These are challenges for every attorney and for every American.

The first challenge is to educate

Americans. For example, now that crimes can be

12

committed by bright children from a computer in their bedroom, it is more important than ever to reach out to them and teach them what is right and wrong. Children walking down the street past a candy store that is closed know that it is not

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

5

14

15

16 17

6 right to find ways to break inside. That same 7 thinking should apply when they are on the 8 computer as well.

But how do we do that? It's mostly your age that are computer literate, not my age. The teachers who are teaching our children today are not literate on the computer.

I was in Birmingham recently, and I asked some young people in a weed-and-seed neighborhood, If you were the Attorney General, what would you do to deal with the problem of youth violence? And they looked at me and they said, We've got the violence under control here. Let me just talk to you about -- we need computers, and then we need somebody to come down to teach our teachers how to teach us how to use the computers.

We have got to focus on how we teach the values that we have held dear in all this nation's history to our children in the context

13

of technology, but we must also educate adults in 1

2 other ways; for example, like every crime,

Internet fraud can be reduced by educating 3

4 consumers. Those who shop over the computer must

use the same common sense in the cyber market

6 that they do in the supermarket. If they

7 understand that a web site can be created at

8 relatively little cost, then they'll realize it

9 could look completely reputable even if it's

10 That is why everyone must invest the time

11 to investigate the people with whom they

12 interact. Caveat emptor means as much in the

computer age as it did in ancient Rome. 13

> Our second challenge is to get businesses to understand that their effort to stop computer crime can only be as successful as their partnership with law enforcement. often businesses simply don't tell law

18 enforcement because -- that they've been 19

20 victimized by hackers fearing that their

customers will lose confidence if they admit that 21

their systems are vulnerable. But if your 22

23 neighbors don't tell the police that their houses

- have been broken into recently, you're never
- 25 going to know to install that extra lock to

protect your house.

1 2

Our third challenge is to enact 21st-century laws to keep up with 21st-century crime. In many cases we can use traditional tools to prosecute fraud or harassment over the Internet. And we worked with Congress last year to strengthen computer crime laws, but the Internet poses novel change to the law every day.

If the electronic transaction gone bad involved an overseas vendor, there's suddenly an international law enforcement problem. Will that country's laws protect Janet here in the United States? The world is becoming a world without boundaries when we deal with cyber crime.

In the next few weeks, the Supreme Court will pass judgment on laws designed to keep indecent materials away from children on computers. Regardless of the decision, there is hard work ahead to protect our children from the equivalent of a wide open door into an on-line adult bookstore.

Our fourth challenge is to encourage cooperation between local, state, federal, and even international law enforcement; how will we

The other day I saw a picture in the "Washington Post" of a vacant lot littered with busted parking meters. As somebody pointed out, in five years you'll probably never see that, or ten years, because you'll have a card by which you pay your parking meter, and it will all be done on computer. And police will be having to investigate and understand a computer theft from the parking meter authority rather than trying to figure out who it was that busted the parking meter and threw it into the vacant lot. Police do not have that ability and that expertise, nor

do they have the equipment at this time.

2.

4 5

We face a challenge in making sure that they not only have the guns and the fingerprint technology and the DNA technology, but that they have the computer forensic capability of investigating cyber crime in the future.

At the international level we are working with our foreign counterparts to harmonize computer crime laws and eliminate the procedural obstacles which prevent police officers from rapidly seizing evidence located in cyberspace.

Several separate efforts are under way to tackle these difficult issues, including multilateral efforts with the Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development, the P8 and the Council of Europe.

Our fifth challenge is to find a way for law enforcement to keep pace with changing technology such as encryption.

Everyone should recognize that if global information infrastructure is to fulfill its promise, it is so critical for people to have access to strong encryption. Our support for robust encryption stems from our commitment to protecting privacy and commerce. But at the same time, citizens rely on government to protect the public safety and national security against the threats posed by terrorists and organized crime. That is why we are gravely concerned with the proliferation of unbreakable encryption which would seriously undermine our ability to perform this critical mission. For if unbreakable encryption proliferates, we could be faced with an electronic superhighway marred by bands of

1 computer files will be rendered useless.

Now, some people say you're just trying

terrorists and other criminals. Traditional

tools like court-ordered wiretaps and searches of

3 to expand your authority. Right now, law

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 2.2

23

24

25

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21 enforcement, if it wants to get a court-ordered wiretap, develops probable cause to believe that a crime is being committed using wires, and the information can be obtained if an intercept is effected. A court order is obtained, and the telephone company puts a tap on the wire.

If we put the tap on the wire and it's encrypted and we can't break that encryption, we are going to be much further behind, whether it be in drug trafficking, in the theft of intellectual property, in so many other areas. But right now, if I get a search warrant for a drug dealer's home, I oftentimes bring out records; a search warrant done pursuant to clear constitutional standards. I bring out the records; the DEA analyst pores through the records, determines evidence that will result in a significant prosecution.

If instead of being on paper those records are on computer disk and those computer disks are encrypted and we can't break the encryption, the search warrants obtained by law

18

enforcement will mean very little. And to the company that thinks, Well, it's not the drug dealer that I'm worried about, it's others; if a competitor or a former employee steals the information from the company and encrypts it on their own disk and we can't break that encryption, the person that resisted our efforts to develop key escrow will be up a creek without a paddle. None of this will matter if the intercepted communications are just unintelligible jumbles of noises or symbols. Finally, we need the best and the brightest lawyers in the fight against high tech

Maybe some of you will consider this crime. challenge.

One of the more extraordinary opportunities I've had is to sit over a brown bag lunch with the lawyers in our computer section to hear the debate, to listen to the search and seizure questions. It is one of the most fascinating areas of the law around now. And

- what you might say is, Why should I get into public service? I saw you yesterday sitting for six hours before a Senate committee.
- 25 And I will tell you that after some 34

years, most of it in public service, yes, you do get cussed at, fussed at, and figuratively beat around the head. But I have found no work in the private sector as rewarding as trying to make the law work for people, trying to enforce the law the right way according to principles of due process and fair play. It doesn't mean you should stay in public service all your life. It's really good to have a variety and to understand the law from different perspectives. But if any of you are technologically literate and sophisticated and interested in this area of the law, the computer section of the Department of Justice is a fascinating place to be right now.

The second challenge that I would like to talk to you about seems somewhat distant, but they are interrelated and both are absolutely critical to this nation's future. What can we do now, and as you assume the leadership of the bar in the next century, to make sure that our legal system, our government structures, and our community processes are created, developed, and maintained in such a way that give to every child in America the opportunity to grow in a strong

and positive way, an opportunity to be educated so that they develop the skills that will make them a player in this next century of cyber challenge. How do we create communities that are safe for our young people in the light of rising youth violence; how do we keep our children from dropping out of school; how do we give them the healthcare that will enable them to grow in a strong and positive way.

You might say what is the Attorney
General of the United States talking about

children for. Because as a prosecutor for 15 years, I picked up presentence investigations and looked at youngsters that we had prosecuted and convicted for an armed robbery at 17 and seen three or four points along the way where we could have intervened in that child's life.

As an Attorney General worried about our ability to compete in the next century in terms of technology, I want all our workforce to have the opportunity to have the skills that will make them competitive.

Unless we make an investment in children, we are going to bring our healthcare institutions to their knees because of failure to

provide for preventive medical care. We will never be able to build enough prisons 18 years from now unless we make an investment in our children now.

How do we design a legal system that makes sure that our children have appropriate medical care? That's yours and my challenge. It can be done. What, 30 years ago, the senior citizens of this country said, We're going to have proper medical care. Let us make sure we do the same for our children. Let us make sure that our children have the education needed to do the job.

As I figured what to do about the 17-year-old charged with armed robbery, I went back and developed dropout prevention programs with the schools, but soon learned that that was too late; the child had already fallen grade levels behind, and it was time to look earlier in the child's life for focus. And at that point the crack epidemic hit Miami in 1985, and the doctors took me to our public hospital to try to figure out what to do about crack-involved infants and their mothers. And they taught me that the first three years of life were the most formative in

any human being's life, the time the child learns

1 2

 the concept of reward and punishment and develops a conscious.

What good are all the prisons going to be 18 years from now if the child does not have a conscious and does not appreciate punishment? And I became convinced that whether you be a prosecutor, an attorney general, a corporate president, a school teacher, a doctor serving middle-class patients and having no concern about children at risk, all of us are in this together; and together we have to design a system that will make sure that our children have proper health care, that our children have proper supervision as parents work, that our children are properly educated, that they have the opportunity to learn work skills, and that they have the opportunity to be safe.

We as lawyers have a challenge of how we build the structures of government, how we come together to design a legal system that can provide protection for our children in the juvenile courts as they are abused or neglected or as they are delinquent. We have not met that

challenge in the legal profession yet. We have much to do, and it is a challenge that I think all of us must undertake no matter what profession we pursue. This has been an extraordinary four years and a splendid opportunity to use the law to try to serve the American people.

This past Monday I was in Philadelphia for the conference on volunteerism. I wandered through the various meetings. I have never seen such energy, such commitment, such hope, such optimism. The whole atmosphere was electric, of people doing things in their communities as volunteers. Whether we be lawyers or just people providing community service, every one of us can make a difference to this nation. But as we do it, as we reach out to others, let us never forget those that are closest to us.

I think raising children is the hardest

- thing I know to do. About 12 years ago a friend
- 21 died, leaving me as the legal guardian of her
- 22 15-year-old twins, a boy and a girl; and the
- 23 girl was in love. I've learned an awful lot
- 24 about raising -- I've learned an awful lot about
- raising children in the last 12 years, and I've

- 1 learned it takes love, hard work, intelligence,
- 2 and an awful lot of luck; but that it is the most
- 3 rewarding experience that you can have. When I
- 4 put that 15-year-old, then 17, on the plane to
- 5 send her off to college, and when I went to see
- 6 her graduate cum laude in three years, and on
- 7 both occasions she threw her arms around my neck
- 8 and said, "Thank you. I couldn't have done it
- 9 without you."

10 As you pursue your legal career,

- 11 remember there is nothing as rewarding as making
- 12 sure that you do right by the people you love.
- 13 And so as you strike out from here either this
- June or in the years to come, go to that law
- 15 firm, go to that government agency and say, What
- do you do about family leave? What do you do
- about child care opportunities? What do you do
- 18 about flextime? What do you do about
- 19 telecommuting? How much are you putting children
- 20 and families first in this law firm or in this
- 21 government agency? And if you start coming out
- of law school asking those questions, you're
- 23 going to help change the culture of America so
- that we put children first and so that we develop
- 25 a generation 20 years from now that can cope with

25

- 1 any competitor in the world in terms of computers
- 2 and address these critical issues that we have
- discussed today and others that we don't even
- 4 begin to dream of.
- 5 There is a strength in this nation. I
- have seen it in communities; I have seen it among
- 7 the young people. I believe -- never before have 8 I believed so strongly in this nation's future,
- 9 in this nation's ability to cope with its

```
10
      problems. I believe that working together
11
      addressing issues with hope, with vision, with
      common sense, and without a lot of
12
13
      partisan rhetoric, we can make a
14
      difference.
15
                Thank you.
16
                         (Proceedings were had
                         which were not
17
18
                         stenographically recorded.)
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                                                        26
1
      STATE OF ILLINOIS )
 2
                        )
                            SS:
 3
      COUNTY OF K A N E )
 4
                KIMBERLY WINKLER CHRISTOPHER, being
 5
      first duly sworn on oath, says that she is a
6
      Certified Shorthand Reporter; that she reported
7
      in shorthand the proceedings given at the taking
      of said presentation; and that the foregoing is a
8
      true and correct transcript of her shorthand
9
      notes so taken as aforesaid and contains all the
10
11
      proceedings given at said presentation.
12
13
14
15
16
                          Certified Shorthand Reporter
                          License No. 084-002752
17
18
19
      Subscribed and sworn to
20
      before me this ____ day
      of _____ 1997.
21
22
23
              Notary Public
24
25
```