criminal offense for a person to sell or purchase Social Security numbers. Under the bill, the FTC would be given rulemaking authority to restrict the sale of Social Security numbers, determine appropriate exemptions, and to enforce civil compliance with the bill’s restrictions. The bill would also authorize the states to enforce compliance, and provide for appropriate criminal penalties.

I look forward to working with the Vice President, who has been a leader in pressing for tougher privacy protections, as well as Senator FEINSTEIN, and my House colleagues to enact this important privacy protection proposal into law.

CONCERN REGARDING THIRTEEN IRANIAN JEWS ON TRIAL

HON. STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL
CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I express my grave concern regarding the thirteen Iranian Jews currently on trial in Iran.

These individuals were arrested over a year ago for spying on behalf of Israel and the United States. During that time, the suspects were held without access to lawyers or their relatives. There was no credible evidence to support the allegation, much less their continued incarceration while awaiting trial. This treatment is unacceptable.

The trial is now underway, but closed to all individuals who may help exonerate the defendants. The trial judge serves as investigator, prosecutor and judge with no accountability for his actions. The evidence consists of confessions that were coerced and taped by the Iranian government, as well as a few telephone calls to friends and relatives alleged to be members of Israel’s secret police. Like the McCarthy witch hunts of the 1950’s, these individuals have been deemed guilty simply by virtue of their associations. This trial flies in the face of international standards ensuring fair, impartial, and even-handed judicial decisions.

Today, I have joined a number of my colleagues to shine light on this undemocratic process by cosponsoring H. Con. Res. 307. This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the Administration should condemn this trial, cosponsor H. Con. Res. 307.

The Nicaraguan government points out that the progression that the Administration should condemn this trial, cosponsor H. Con. Res. 307.

CENRal NEW JERSEY RECOGNIZES GARRETT YOUNG FOR HIS ACHIEVEMENTS

HON. RUSH D. HOLT
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I honor a young scientist, Garrett Young, a 17-year-old homeschooled student from Branchburg. Garrett has achieved success on the state, national, and international levels. He has recently been recognized as a top winner at the International Science and Engineering Fair (ISEF) sponsored by Intel Corporation. This is the world’s largest pre-college science competition that recognizes the world’s brightest high school students coming from 40 countries for their scientific achievements.

At the international level, he took first place in the category of physics at the ISEF. He also won the Glenn T. Seaborg Nobel Prize Visit Award. The Nobel Prize Visit Award was awarded to the top two individual winners at the Fair and whom they believe will be future Nobel Prize Winners. His project was “Isolating Plasma Species Initiating Internal Electrostatic Fields for Plasma Heating,” where Garrett found a way to increase the temperature of plasma in an efficient way.

At the national level, he won “Operation Cherry Blossom.” This is a trip to Japan that is awarded by the U.S. Army to the top two individual projects of the entire ISEF competition. Garrett was awarded first place by the U.S. Naval Research Labs and the U.S. Air Force. He also received the second place Vacuum Technology Award awarded by the American Vacuum Society.

At the state level, Garrett won the Senior Division ISEF trip. He also received the Space Science Award, presented by NASA for his project studying space science, and the Metric Award given by the U.S. Metric Society for the best use of the metric system. In addition, he was awarded a medallion by Yale University as the most outstanding junior student in Science and Engineering.

All of his specialized contributions to science are a result of his creative ability and meticulous thought. Mr. Young is truly a remarkable student with a prosperous future ahead of him. Today I honor Garrett’s extraordinary accomplishments.

FY 2003 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

HON. JOSEPH M. HOEFFEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, last night the House of Representatives passed the Fiscal Year 2001 Defense Appropriations Bill. I voted in favor of that legislation because I largely support the priorities reflected in the bill by Chairman LEWIS, Ranking Member MURTHA and the Defense Appropriations subcommittee.

Today, the Budget Committee is conducting a hearing on my legislation, H.R. 3221, the Corporate Welfare Commission Act. Under the bill, a Commission would be created to root out unnecessary and wasteful subsidies, and report their recommendations to the House and Senate. Their recommendations would receive expedited floor consideration to ensure that those members of Congress were put on record on these wasteful programs.

One program which is often mentioned as one of the most egregious examples of wasteful spending, and which was mentioned today by the witnesses, is the subsidy the government gives to encourage defense mergers. The program was created in 1993 and was intended to save taxpayers billions of dollars by allowing defense contractors to charge the costs of mergers to government contracts. A recent study by the Department of Defense reflects significant cost savings for the government under this program but an independent study by the General Accounting Office could not verify DoD’s claims. According to the GAO study, the government spent approximately $850 million on just the seven largest defense contractor mergers.

I think this program deserves closer scrutiny. While I don’t question the nature of these mergers which have to be approved by the Department of Defense: I do question the policy of having the U.S. taxpayers pay at least a portion of the cost for such mergers. I urge the eventual conferees on the Department of Defense Authorization and Appropriations bills to consider a change in this policy.

THE NICARAGUAN “PROPERTY PROTECTION ACT OF 2000”

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the “Property Protection Act of 2000” with a notable list of co-sponsors. This bill will have the effect of removing the waiver for Nicaragua contained under section 527(g) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995. Under current law, the President may waive mandatory sanctions prescribed to castigate a government that has not resolved outstanding property claims made by American citizens. In the case of Nicaragua, the President has every year since enactment chosen to exercise this waiver.

I have been reluctant to seek this change to our law. It is the inaction of the Nicaraguan government in resolving a number of longstanding property claims by American citizens that compels us to take this action. The Sandinista regime, which ruled Nicaragua from 1979 to 1990, confiscated the property of thousands of Nicaraguan families and a number of American citizens. That was wrong. The United States Congress has long been on record pressing for the rights of U.S. citizens who were expropriated to be fairly compensated.

The Nicaraguan government points out that it settled over 400 property cases last year. But these numbers do not tell the whole story. In fact, many of these cases involve individuals who have simply given up hope of recovering their properties and resigned themselves to accepting Nicaraguan government bonds worth a fraction of their face value on world bond markets.
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I have been reluctant to seek this change to our law. It is the inaction of the Nicaraguan government in resolving a number of longstanding property claims by American citizens that compels us to take this action. The Sandinista regime, which ruled Nicaragua from 1979 to 1990, confiscated the property of thousands of Nicaraguan families and a number of American citizens. That was wrong. The United States Congress has long been on record pressing for the rights of U.S. citizens who were expropriated to be fairly compensated.
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There are also a number of cases that have languished unresolved for years. These include cases where the government of Nicaragua has been ordered by its own court system to make payments to Americans who had their property illegally confiscated. Another group of cases that have languished involve claims by American citizens against the government of Nicaragua for property taken in the revolution of 1979. The case involving the expropriation of Daniel L. Philpott’s property in 1979 has been pending in Nicaragua’s highest court for nearly three decades. The government of Nicaragua has failed to comply with the U.S. courts’ decisions in these cases.

The Property Protection Act of 2000, when enacted, will require the President to identify the 50 most urgent pending property claims by American citizens against the government of Nicaragua and to suspend assistance to the government of Nicaragua until these cases are resolved. This is not too much to ask. Our government has been very patient, but, regrettably, our patience seems to have been misinterpreted by the government of Nicaragua as a lack of interest.

This bill will insure that the government of Nicaragua, and other states around the world, will understand that our citizens cannot have their property stolen with impunity.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I ask that the full text of H.R. 4602 be printed in the Congressional Record.

H.R. 4602

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Property Protection Act of 2000”.

SEC. 2. PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS AGAINST EXPROPRIATIONS OF PROPERTY BY NICARAGUA.

(a) BILATERAL ASSISTANCE.

(I) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 527(g) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or the Arms Export Control Act for fiscal year 2001 or 2002 may only be provided to the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua if the President first makes a certification under subsection (d) for the fiscal year involved.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to assistance that is directed specifically to programs which serve the basic human needs of the citizens of Nicaragua.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than September 1, 2000, or the date of the enactment of this Act (whichever occurs later), and not later than September 1, 2001, the President shall prepare and transmit to Congress a detailed report listing the 50 most urgent property claims by United States citizens against the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua which shall include, but not be limited to, all property claims in which Nicaraguan courts have ruled in favor of United States citizens, and property claims by United States citizens involving Public Sector National Corporations (CORNAP).

(d) CERTIFICATION.—A certification under this subsection is a certification to the Congress that the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua has returned the nacionalized or otherwise seized property of each citizen who has a formally-documented claim against the Government of Nicaragua listed in the report under subsection (c), or has provided adequate and effective compensation equivalent to the full value of the nationalized or otherwise seized property of each United States citizen who has a formally-documented claim against the Government of Nicaragua listed in the report under subsection (c).

HONORING BALL STATE PRESIDENT JOHN E. WORTHEN—A GREAT EDUCATOR

HON. DAVID M. MINTOSH
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. McIntosh. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the floor of the House of Representatives to honor a leader in education in Indiana and the nation. In the heart of my district in East Central Indiana lies Ball State University, one of the premier institutions of higher education in the Midwest. For the last sixteen years Ball State has been under the capable guidance of University President John E. Worthen. Sadly, he is leaving the university this year.

Mr. Speaker, greatness is setting bold goals and then having the will to accomplish them. John Worthen brought vision and greatness to Ball State. With his vision, he and he and his wife Sandra much happiness as they move on to new challenges.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT E. WISE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 7, 2000, I was unavoidably detained and unable to record a vote by electronic device on Roll Number 241. Had I been present I would have voted “aye” on Roll Number 241.

On Wednesday, June 7, 2000, I was unavoidably detained and unable to record a vote by electronic device on Roll Number 243. Had I been present I would have voted “aye” on Roll Number 243.