

1341 would expand these efforts through Federal-State partnerships. Local agencies, nonprofits and community groups currently provide family caregivers with training, counseling, referrals and crucial respite care. H.R. 1341 would reward outstanding, innovative programs and identify those of national significance.

1999 is the International Year of Older Persons. In recognition of this important milestone, I encourage my colleagues to demonstrate their commitment to securing the dignity and health of older Americans and their families by cosponsoring H.R. 1434, "The National Family Caregiver Support Act of 1999."

IN RECOGNITION OF CHILDREN'S
MEMORIAL DAY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a House Resolution supporting the establishment of the fourth Friday in April as "Children's Memorial Day."

We are all saddened by the tragic shootings at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado. Unfortunately, violent acts against children are occurring with increasing frequency—destroying innocent lives and devastating families and communities. In the United States each day, five infants and children die from abuse and neglect, and seven teens are murdered. In fact, more children lose their lives to criminal violence in the United States than in any of the 26 industrialized nations of the world. This is unacceptable.

In Alameda County, California, which I represent, the County Board with the hard work and strong dedication of Alameda County Supervisor Gail Steele, adopted in 1996 the Children's Memorial Flag Project and established a National Children's Memorial Day on the fourth Friday in the month of April to remember all of the children who have died by violence in our country. The Child Welfare League of America has adopted Alameda County's Children's Memorial Flag and promotes it nationally. This year we anticipate 20 State Capitol Buildings will fly the flag at half-mast, with 13 others memorializing these children by other means this Friday, April 23rd.

We have lost far too many children in violent, preventable deaths, through gun violence, fire, automobile accidents, suicide, and physical abuse and neglect. From this moment forward, let us approach our work in Congress with renewed resolve. It is our responsibility and the responsibility of adults everywhere to protect children and to ensure that they have a full opportunity to become healthy and productive adults. Even one child lost is one child too many.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution and to honor the memory of children lost to violence in this country. Let us condemn acts of violence committed against the children of our communities and pledge to safeguard the welfare of the children in our nation.

AGENTS WHO SERVED AMERICA
SHOULD HAVE THEIR DAY IN
COURT

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1999

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to mandate the establishment of a special federal judicial panel to determine whether cases involving breach of contract disputes between the U.S. Government and U.S. intelligence operatives should go to trial. The bill is identical to legislation I introduced in the last Congress.

The legislation directs the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court to assign three federal circuit court judges, senior federal judges, or retired justices to a division of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia for the purpose of determining whether an action brought by a person, including a foreign national, in an appropriate U.S. court for compensation for services performed for the U.S. pursuant to a secret government contract may be tried in court. The bill provides that the panel may not determine that the case cannot be heard solely on the basis of the nature of the services provided under the contract.

Currently, the Totten doctrine bars these types of cases from even going to trial. The Totten doctrine is based on the 1876 Supreme Court case of *Totten versus United States*. The case involved the estate of an individual who performed secret services for President Lincoln during the Civil War. The court dismissed the plaintiff's postwar suit for breach of contract, stating, in part:

The service stipulated by the contract was a secret service; the information sought was to be obtained clandestinely, and was to be communicated privately; the employment and the service were to be equally concealed. Bathe employer and agent must have understood that the lips of the other were to be forever sealed respecting the relation of either to the matter . . . It may be stated as a general principle, that public policy forbids the maintenance of any suit in a court of justice, the trial of which would inevitably lead to the disclosure of matters which the law itself regards as confidential, and respecting which it will not allow the confidence to be violated.

Other court rulings over the past 120 years have affirmed the Totten doctrine as it applies to breach of contract disputes arising from espionage services performed pursuant to a secret contract. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of policy, the Totten doctrine is unfair, unjust and un-American.

For the most part, U.S. intelligence agencies do a good job of fulfilling commitments made to U.S. intelligence operatives. However, there have been some disturbing lapses.

During the Vietnam War the Pentagon and the CIA jointly ran an operation over a seven-year period in which some 450 South Vietnamese commandos were sent into North Vietnam on various espionage and spy missions. The CIA promised each commando that, in the event they were captured, they would be rescued and their families would receive lifetime stipends. Due to intelligence penetrations by the North Vietnamese, most of the commandos were captured. No rescue attempts were ever made. Many of the com-

mandos were tortured and some were killed by the North Vietnamese. Beginning in 1962, CIA officers began crossing the names of captured commandos off the pay rosters and telling their family members that they were dead. Many of the commandos survived the war. After varying periods of time they were set free by the Vietnamese government. Two hundred of the commandos now living in the U.S. filed a lawsuit last year asking that all living commandos be paid \$2,000 a year for every year they served in prison—an estimated \$11 million. In 1996 the CIA decided to provide compensation to the commandos. Unfortunately, even after this decision was made, the CIA continued to invoke the Totten doctrine to avoid payment.

I have encountered numerous cases in which the CIA has reneged on commitments CIA agents made to foreign nationals who put their lives on the line to provide valuable intelligence to the United States. Absent Congressional action, the Totten doctrine allows the CIA and other intelligence agencies to ignore legitimate cases, and have these cases summarily dismissed without a trial.

In a paper published in the Spring, 1990 issue of the *Suffolk Transnational Law Journal*, Theodore Francis Riordan noted that "when a court invokes Totten to dismiss a lawsuit, it is merely enforcing the contract's implied covenant of secrecy, rather than invoking some national security ground." The bottom line: the U.S. government can, and has, invoked the Totten doctrine to avoid solemn commitments made to U.S. intelligence operatives.

Existing federal statutes give the Director of Central Intelligence the authority to protect intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure. I understand the importance to national security of preventing unauthorized leaks of information that could compromise U.S. intelligence sources and methods. That is why my bill directs the special judicial panel to take into consideration whether the information that would be disclosed in adjudicating an action would do serious damage to national security or would compromise the safety and security of U.S. intelligence sources. In addition, the bill provides that if the panel determines that a particular case can go to trial, it may prescribe steps that the court in which the case is to be heard shall take to protect national security and intelligence sources and methods, including holding the proceedings "in camera."

Supporters of the U.S. intelligence community have criticized court involvement in intelligence cases by noting that most federal judges do not have the expertise, knowledge and background to effectively adjudicate intelligence cases. In fact, in the United States versus Marchetti, the Fourth Circuit took the position that judges are too ill-informed and inexperienced to appraise the magnitude of national security harm that could occur should certain classified information be publicized. I must respectfully and strenuously disagree with this type of reasoning. Federal judges routinely adjudicate highly complex tax cases, as well as other tort cases involving highly technical issues, such as environmental damage caused by toxic chemicals. It's absurd to assert that judges can master the complexities of the tax code and environmental law, but somehow be unable to understand and rule on intelligence matters.