educational loans to employees of a particular company must meet a number of criteria to avoid severe Federal tax penalties. Those criteria are designed to assure that such foundations were not set up as tax shelters or to provide nonmonetary compensation or benefits to employees. I agree with the good intentions of the current law, however, one of the requirements stifles the ability of private foundations to design scholarships for particular purposes. I am referring to the ''25-percent test.''

Under current law, a private foundation—usually established and funded by a single individual or employer—can offer scholarships to only 25 percent of students who apply. That means three out of four applicants must be turned down, not because of lack of merit or lack of funds, but to satisfy Federal rules.

My bill would remove that requirement from Federal law, but keep in place the seven guidelines the IRS has drawn up to meet the law's ''objective and nondiscriminatory'' standard. That way, private foundations could design more focused programs without weakening the safeguards against using such organizations for tax benefits or as hidden compensation. It also removes current law's discrimination against small communities with a single large employer.

Our laws should not discourage support for higher education. Foundations, reflecting the demonstrated generosity of their financial supporters, should not be told by the Federal Government that they have to deny three out of four of the students who may need their help. Rather, the door should be open for expanding the opportunities available to individuals.

TRIBUTE TO BOB LEE

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great community leader in my home State of Colorado, Mr. Bob Lee. Although Bob recently retired from Daniels and Associates, he remains active in and continues to be sought out for advice and guidance by everyone from his neighbors, to Presidents of the United States.

He is a dedicated conservative and has been an active member of the Republican Party. He was first elected Denver County Republican chairman in 1958, and was instrumental in implementing a statewide plan to build a solid organization.

Word of Bob's skills and his conservative convictions traveled rapidly around the country. While he never intended to give up his real state career in Denver, he was called upon to advise and direct numerous campaigns. At the request of Richard Nixon, he agreed to run a successful legislative campaign in New Jersey, resulting in the Republicans controlling both Houses there for the first time in 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, Bob Lee and his wife Bee recently celebrated their 57th wedding anniversary, and I know you will join me in congratulating them on their wonderful marriage. Together they have three children, five grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren. They are respected in their community, which they have given so much back to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, last night I was present for roll vote No. 279, amendment 37 to H.R. 3666, the Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies appropriations bill. I slipped my voting card into the electronic voter tallying device and voted no. However, due to an electronic error I was recorded as not voting. I regret that my no vote was not recorded. As a result, my vote was paired with the minority leader.

AMERICAN LAND SOVEREIGNTY PROTECTION ACT OF 1996

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation which will require the specific approval of Congress before any area within the United States is subject to an international land use nomination, classification, or designation. International land use designations such as World Heritage Sites, Biosphere Reserves and some other international land use designations can affect the use and market value of non-Federal lands adjacent to or intermixed with Federal lands. Legislation is needed to require the specific approval of Congress before any area within the United States is made subject to an international land use restriction. The rights of non-Federal landowners need to be protected if these international reserves are created.

This legislation asserts the power of Congress under article IV, section 3 of the U.S. Constitution over management and use of lands belonging to the United States; protects State sovereignty from diminishment as a result of Federal actions creating lands with international designations; ensures that no U.S. citizen suffers any diminishment or loss of individual rights as a result of Federal actions creating lands with international designations; protects private interests in real property from diminishment as a result of Federal actions creating lands with international designations; and provides a process under which the United States may when desirable designate lands for inclusion under certain international agreements.

Many Americans may be surprised by the expanse of our Nation's territory which is subject to various special international restrictions, most of which have evolved over the last 25 years. The most extensive international land use designations are UNESCO Biosphere Reserve Programs and World Heritage Sites. These international land designations have largely been created with minimal, if any, congressional input or oversight or public input. They are usually promoted as a type honorary title which will provide additional publicity resulting in increased tourist visits and a corresponding increase in economic benefits. Promoters at UNESCO Biosphere Reserves and World Heritage Sites say these programs are voluntary and nonbinding.

However, in becoming a party to agreements underlying international land use designations, the host government explicitly promises to undertake certain actions to protect these areas and limit or prohibit certain land uses. Honoring one of these agreements could force the Federal Government to choose between regulating surrounding non-Federal land uses to conform to the designated international use of breaking a pledge to other nations.

Federal regulatory actions could prohibit certain uses of non-Federal lands outside the boundary of the international designation, thereby causing a significant negative impact on the value of non-Federal property and on the local and regional economy. This legislation would compel the Congress to consider the implications of an international designation and protect non-Federal lands before the designation is made.

FDA APPROPRIATIONS

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I again note that the Appropriations Committee is recommending increased funding for the Food and Drug Administration. As chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, I commend the Committee on Appropriations for its strong support of the Food and Drug Administration, which plays an important role in protecting public health. In addition, I commend my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations for their oversight activities regarding the Food and Drug Administration.

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations has worked diligently in this Congress to identify shortcomings in FDA's performance of its important duties and work with the agency to correct those shortcomings. No problem in agency performance is as vexing as the systematic failure of FDA to meet its statutory duties to timely review various applications and petitions about food, drugs, and medical devices. Indeed, not only does the agency fail to meet its statutory duty for timely reviews, the agency refuses to acknowledge it. In testimony before the Committee on Appropriations, as well as the Committee on Commerce, Commissioner Kessler has boasted of meeting the goals of the Prescription Drug User Fee Act, alluding to objectives he identified and included in letters sent to Congress that were then made part of the legislative history of the Prescription Drug User Fee Act. However, Commissioner Kessler's testimony has consistently ignored the plain language of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act specifying review periods. Given Commissioner Kessler's legal training, one would expect that his testimony might be more mindful of the plain language of FDA's authorizing statute.

Timely review of applications and petitions is a matter of very real consequence. Witnesses who have come before the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee have repeatedly told heart-wrenching stories of their inability to obtain in the United States safe and effective treatments that are available elsewhere. These patients, often fighting life-