

portunity to move to instruct the House conferees to not accede to the Senate provision which would increase the weight of trucks from the existing 73,000 pounds to 80,000.

I thank the gentleman.
Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I fail to see the consequences of the gentleman's motion, so where the conferees can go into conference and make their decisions would be the most appropriate way to go about an orderly consideration of a bill in conference.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA).

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA).

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. With this question, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WRIGHT, KLU-CZYNSKI, JOHNSON of California, HARSHA, and CLEVELAND.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill S. 3934.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5463) entitled "An act to establish rules of evidence for certain courts and proceedings."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 17468. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17468) entitled "An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and

appoints Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MONROYA, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. PAS-TORE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MATHIAS, and Mr. TOWER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 17468, APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1975

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 17468, making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SIKES, PATTEN, LONG of Maryland, OBEY, MCKAY, MAHON, McEWEN, BROWN of Wisconsin, TALCOTT, and CEDERBERG.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3341, TRAVEL EXPENSES AMENDMENT ACT OF 1974

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 3341) to revise certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to per diem and mileage expenses of employees and other individuals traveling on official business, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection. The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 6, 1974.)

Mr. BROOKS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on October 7, the House passed legislation to increase the per diem and mileage allowances for Government employees while traveling on official business. The House language differed from that of the Senate and a conference was needed. The conferees have met and filed their report.

The report essentially follows the House language. I will summarize very briefly the points of disagreement between the two versions and the recommended solution:

First, the House language provided for the per diem rates to be set by regulation up to \$35 per day. The Senate language sets a flat rate of \$35. The conference report accepts the House language.

Second, the House conferees agreed that the per diem rate for travel outside the continental United States should be set by the President, not the Administrator of the General Services Administration.

Third, when foreign travel expenses exceed the per diem allowance, a supplement of \$21 was agreed to. The House bill had provided \$20; the Senate bill \$23.

Fourth, with regard to mileage reimbursement, the Senate had provided for minimum rates of 9 cents for motorcycles, 16 cents for automobiles, and 20 cents for airplanes. The Senate bill contained an automatic escalator with no statutory maximum. The House bill contained no minimum rates but maximum allowances of 9 cents for motorcycles, 18 cents for automobiles, and 24 cents for airplanes. The conference report adopts a minimum-maximum concept with the following ranges: 8 to 11 cents for motorcycles; 15 to 20 cents for automobiles; 18 to 24 cents for airplanes.

Fifth, the conferees accepted the House provision for an annual adjustment rather than a semi-annual adjustment in these rates.

Sixth, finally, the House conferees accepted provisions in the Senate bill providing that per diem and mileage reimbursements for disabled veterans entitled to such be at the same rates as those set for Government employees, and a Senate amendment prohibiting additional appropriations in fiscal year 1975 to cover any increased expenditures as a result of passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report reflects a reasonable resolution of the differences in the Senate and House measures. It will alleviate an inequitable burden now on Federal employees without being extravagant or wasteful. I urge its adoption.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 3341, which was unanimously agreed to by the conferees. The bill will set the per diem at a rate not to exceed \$35 and the mileage allowance for the use of privately owned vehicles at 15 cents per mile for both Federal employees and veterans with service-connected disabilities traveling to and from Veterans' Administration facilities.

During the past year there were more than 10 million visits by such veterans to VA facilities. The current VA per diem of \$12 and mileage allowance of 6 cents are inadequate.

With the high cost of gasoline, food, and lodging, veterans simply can no longer afford to make the necessary trips to the hospitals and centers to obtain their medical care. In many cases to

December 16, 1974

Miller
Minish
Mink
Mitchell, Md.
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Nedzi
Nix
Obey
O'Neill
Owens
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Price, Ill.
Quile
Rallsback
Randall
Rangel
Rees
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Roberts

Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Roncallo, Wyo.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Roybal
Runnels
Ryan
Sandman
Sarbanes
Schroeder
Seiberling
Shuster
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Stagers
Stanton
Stanton,
J. William
Stanton,
James V.
Stark
Steed
Steelman
Stephens
Stokes
Studds

NAYS—143

Abdnor
Archer
Ashbrook
Aspin
Bafalls
Baker
Bauman
Beard
Bennett
Blester
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke, Fla.
Burleson, Tex.
Butler
Camp
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Chappell
Clancy
Cleveland
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Cotter
Coughlin
Crane
Cronin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert
W., Jr.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dennis
Devine
Dickinson
Downing
Evins, Tenn.
Flowers
Flynt
Forsythe
Fountain
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Gaydos
Gettys
Gilman
Goldwater

NOT VOTING—50

Adams
Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Bell
Brasco
Brotzman
Broyhill, Va.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Carey, N.Y.
Chamberlain
Clark
Eshleman
Grasso
Griffiths
Hanna
Hanrahan

Sullivan
Symington
Taylor, Mo.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornton
Traxler
Treen
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vander Veen
Vanik
Veysey
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Whalen
White
Widnall
Williams
Wilson,
Charles H.,
Calif.
Wilson,
Charles, Tex.
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young, Ga.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zwach

Price, Tex.
Pritchard
Quillen
Rarick
Regula
Rinaldo
Robinson, Va.
Rogers
Roy
Ruth
St Germain
Sarasin
Satterfield
Scherle
Schneebeil
Sebellus
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Spence
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stuckey
Symms
Talcott
Taylor, N.C.
Teague
Thone
Tiernan
Ullman
Walsh
Wampler
Ware
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolf
Wylie
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Ill.
Young, S.C.
Zion

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof), the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mrs. Grasso.
Mr. Howard with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Clark.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Rooney of New York.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Carey of New York.
Mr. John L. Burton with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Litton with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Eshleman with Mr. Hanrahan.
Mr. Hastings with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Huddart with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Steell with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Mizell with Mr. Luken.
Mr. Vander Jagt with Mr. Maraziti.
Mr. Young of Florida with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Anderson of Illinois with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Arends with Mr. Parris.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Ruppe with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Towell of Nevada.
Mr. Phillip Burton with Mr. Wyman.

The vote was announced as above recorded.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY AMENDMENT OF 1974

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill (S. 3934) as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill S. 3934.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the Senate bill as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill (S. 3934) just passed, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON)?

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman object to the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON)?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KOCH. The motion that I have at the desk is one to instruct the managers on the part of the House—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York reserves the right to object. For what purpose now does

the gentleman request the opinion of the Chair?

Mr. KOCH. I would appreciate the Chair advising me whether this is the appropriate time to move to instruct the House conferees with respect to this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman that until the unanimous-consent request to send the bill to conference is granted, a motion to instruct would be premature; but if the gentleman would withdraw his reservation and if the request is granted, then a motion to instruct conferees would be in order.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. HARSHA

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. HARSHA: Mr. HARSHA moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill S. 3934, be instructed to insist upon paragraph (6) of section 102 and to insist upon section 110 of the House amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) is recognized for 1 hour in support of his motion.

(Mr. HARSHA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I shall certainly not take 1 hour. This is a motion to instruct the conferees on the Highway Act of 1974, simply to instruct the conferees to insist upon the House provision on the so-called rural highway provision on the off-system roads.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief statement?

Mr. HARSHA. I will yield for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. KOCH. Yes. As the gentleman knows, because he and I participated a few moments ago in the debate on suspension of the rules, I advised the body that what I wanted to do was to make certain that the House did not accept the Senate provision in the Senate bill with respect to increasing the weight of trucks. I said that the scenario we would see played out on this floor would be a preemption of my motion to instruct by a member of the Committee so as to make it impossible for me to do that. My only opportunity would then be to ask the House to vote down the previous question when the gentleman from Ohio or someone on that committee would make, as the gentleman did frame, in some innocuous way, a motion to instruct.

The scenario which I suggested, I think the gentleman would agree, has in fact occurred. I will ask the House at the conclusion of the debate—hopefully, we will not go through the charade and agony for an hour—to vote down the previous question, so that then I will have an op-

deny them sufficient funds to travel to VA facilities is to deny them treatment.

The bill will give the Administrator of General Services the flexibility to continue utilizing the "lodging plus" concept of per diem reimbursement. Section 5707(a) does not preclude the use of the current "lodging plus" method of computing per diem. Under this method, the traveler is allowed a fixed amount for meals and expenses as determined by the Administrator plus the cost of lodging. The resulting amount, subject to the statutory limit, is the per diem rate applied to the traveler's reimbursement. If the Administrator determines that the mileage allowances fall below the statutory minimum authorized in the bill, we encourage and direct GSA to work with the Congress to draft legislation which would resolve any inequities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to adopt this conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8958) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the disposal of certain excess and surplus Federal property to the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of any group, band, or tribe of Indians, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 11, after "located" insert: "Provided, That such transfers shall be made to Oklahoma Indian tribes recognized by the Secretary of the Interior when such land (1) is located within the boundaries of former reservations in Oklahoma as defined by the Secretary of the Interior and when such land was held in trust by the United States for an Indian tribe at the time of its acquisition by the United States, or (2) is contiguous to land presently held in trust by the United States for an Oklahoma Indian tribe and was at any time held in trust by the United States for an Indian tribe."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That such transfers of real property within the State of Oklahoma shall be made to the Secretary of Interior to be held in trust for Oklahoma Indian tribes recognized by the Secretary of the Interior when such real property (1) is located within boundaries of former reservations in Oklahoma as defined by the Secretary of Interior and when such real property was held in trust by the United States for an Indian tribe at the time of acquisition by the

United States, or (2) is contiguous to real property presently held in trust by the United States for an Oklahoma Indian tribe and was at any time held in trust by the United States for an Indian tribe."

Mr. BROOKS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman be good enough to give us a brief explanation of what is involved here.

Mr. BROOKS. I will be glad to explain this to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa. I would say that I had planned to make a few comments. If I could make them now, I think they would be helpful.

Mr. Speaker, on November 18, the House passed by voice vote H.R. 8958, to provide that surplus Government property located within the boundaries of Indian reservations be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior to hold in trust for the Indian tribe occupying the reservation.

During Senate consideration of the bill, a question arose as to whether Oklahoma Indian tribes were excluded from its provisions. Apparently the word "reservations" is not used with regard to Oklahoma Indian lands even though many tribal lands are held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior in circumstances analogous to "reservations" in all other States.

The Senate Government Operations Committee adopted an amendment to make certain that Oklahoma Indians were included in the bill as was intended. I wholeheartedly support the objective of that amendment.

There is a technical problem with the language, however. The Senate amendment may be interpreted to authorize these transfers directly to the Oklahoma Indian tribes. In the provisions applicable to all other Indian tribes the transfers would be to the Secretary of the Interior to hold in trust for the Indian tribe. The additional amendment I am offering to the Senate amendment would correct that inadvertent inconsistency.

Mr. GROSS. Does this clarify the status of the Oklahoma Indians with respect to the word "reservations?"

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas a question: Would the action the gentleman now proposes bring our version of the bill in conformity with the Senate version, as well as clarifying the status of the Oklahoma Indians?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. This is just a technical amendment to make the matter clear.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BROOKS)?

There was no objection.

The amendment to the Senate amendment was agreed to.

The Senate amendment as amended was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 17481, THE HARRY S. TRUMAN MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1495) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1495

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17481) to establish the Harry S. Truman Memorial Scholarship Program, and for other purposes, and all points of order against section 11 of said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 17481, the Committee on Education and Labor shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 3548, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 17481 as passed by the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

One hundred and seventy-five Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 695]		
Adams	Chisholm	Edwards, Ala.
Addabbo	Clark	Edwards, Calif.
Archer	Clay	Erlenborn
Armstrong	Cleveland	Esch
Badillo	Cochran	Eshleman
Beard	Collier	Fish
Bergland	Collins, Ill.	Foley
Blackburn	Cotter	Fraser
Boland	Culver	Fulton
Brademas	Daniels,	Gialmo
Brasco	Dominick V.	Grasso
Broomfield	Danielson	Griffiths
Brotzman	Davis, S.C.	Grover
Broyhill, Va.	Davis, Wis.	Haley
Burton, John	Dellenback	Hanna
Carey, N.Y.	Dellums	Hansen, Idaho
Carter	Derwinski	Hansen, Wash.
Cederberg	Dulski	Harsha
Chamberlain	Du Pont	Hastings

H 11990

Hawkins	Melcher	Runnels
Hébert	Mills	Ruth
Hillis	Minshall, Ohio	Ryan
Hinshaw	Mitchell, N.Y.	Shibley
Hogan	Mizell	Shoup
Hollfield	Moorhead, Pa.	Sikes
Horton	Morgan	Smith, N.Y.
Howard	Mosher	Steele
Hudnut	Murphy, N.Y.	Sullivan
Jarman	Nelsen	Thompson, N.J.
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara	Tiernan
Jones, N.C.	O'Neill	Towell, Nev.
Karsh	Parris	Udall
King	Pike	Vander Jagt
Kuczynski	Podell	Whitehurst
Kuykendall	Powell, Ohio	Wright
Kyros	Qule	Wyatt
Litton	Rangel	Wydler
Lujan	Barick	Wyman
Lukens	Rees	Yatron
McEwen	Reid	Young, Alaska
McSpadden	Rhodes	Young, Fla.
Macdonald	Roberts	Young, Ga.
Maraziti	Robison, N.Y.	Zablocki
Martin, Nebr.	Rodino	Zion
Mathias, Calif.	Roncallo, N.Y.	Zwach
Mathis, Ga.	Rooney, N.Y.	
Meeds	Rosenthal	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). On this rollcall 296 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 17481, THE HARRY S. TRUMAN MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP ACT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON). Pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule, House Resolution 1495, is an open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 17481, which was considered in the House on the 3d of December under suspension of the rules and received a majority of support of it, 236 to 149.

The rule waives points of order for one provision, section 11, which has an implicit appropriation in it for the funding of this program.

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any substantial opposition to the passage of the rule. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DEL CLAWSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) has explained the rule. It is an open rule with 1 hour of debate waiving points of order against section 11 for failure to comply with clause 4, rule XXI.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri one question, if I may. There has been some discussion about the status of the Hoover Memorial bill. In the Rules Committee last week there was an attempt to report a rule making in order the Hoover Memorial bill as an amendment to this bill. The attempt failed. Now I understand that the Hoover Memorial bill may be placed on the list of suspensions for tomorrow. Could the gentleman from Missouri shed

any light on the status of the Hoover Memorial bill?

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the bill is going to be added to the suspensions for tomorrow and I would tell the gentleman I intend to support that procedure.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, as previously explained, House Resolution 1495 provides for 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 17481, the Harry S. Truman Memorial Scholarship Act, and that the bill will be open to all germane amendments. The rule also provides for a waiver of points of order against section 11 for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI, which deals with appropriations on a legislative bill. In order to facilitate going to conference, the rule makes it in order to insert the House-passed language in the Senate bill.

The purpose of H.R. 17481 is to establish the Harry S. Truman Memorial Scholarship program.

The scholarships are to be awarded on the basis of a nationwide competition. At least one such scholarship is to be awarded annually in each State in which there is a resident applicant who is qualified. Scholarships are to go to those who demonstrate an outstanding potential for, and plan to pursue a career in, public service.

Each scholarship will carry an annual stipend of \$5,000, or the full cost of tuition, fees, books, room and board, whichever is less.

The program is to be administered by the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation, which is to be directed by a 13-member board of trustees; \$30 million is authorized to endow the scholarships. All the expenses of the foundation, including scholarships and administrative costs, are to be paid from the income of the endowment. The committee report specifies that no additional funds shall be given to the foundation beyond the \$30,000,000.

The cost of the bill is \$30,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend a vote on the resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Now that we have the Truman-Hoover larder, I guess, straightened out insofar as the construction of a building, I believe it is a building on the campus of Stanford University at a starting cost of \$5 million, and this evening we have the Truman Scholarship Foundation at a cost of \$30 million.

I am going to oppose both of them because I think there is a time and a place for all things, and this is neither the time nor the place to commit the taxpayers of this country to spend \$37 million in memory of two former Presidents of the United States. Lord knows, we need to save some money; we need to pay something on the Federal debt. We need to take some of the burden off the backs of the taxpayers instead of adding more to it.

Here are two items that can well go over until we see better day in the life of this country. We have no business considering either one of them in this session of Congress or in the next, or until we can see some clear light ahead as far as the financial picture of this country.

I repeat, I am opposed to both of them, and I happen to be one of many members of the board of trustees of the Hoover Library. I oppose both of these bills because we ought not to saddle on the backs of the taxpayers these obligations—obligations of this kind that can be put off until a better day.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in light of what the gentleman from Iowa has just said, it would appear to me that the defeat of the rule in this instance certainly would be no reflection on the great former President, Mr. Truman; or another great former President, Mr. Hoover.

This is just, as I think was stated, not the time or place to take up these things that require a little more sober thought, and particularly a little more analysis with respect to the financing.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

May I say first, in response to the gentleman from California, that each of these projects has had deep and careful thought in its respective committee. In the one instance we have dealt with the Committee on Education and Labor so far as the Truman scholarships are concerned. It has been carefully analyzed in that committee. In the other committee, the matter of the Hoover scholarship has been taken up in the House Administration Committee, so that the question of whether it has been given careful consideration is not a valid comment, whatever one may feel about the measures.

Second, so far as the funds and the question of whether or not at this time in the history of this Nation we should be appropriating these funds, may I remind the Members of the House that we are not here dealing with an appropriation bill. We are here dealing with an authorization bill. Under the terms and contents of that bill and the way the program would be advanced, there is no need for funds in this year, and there very probably is no need for such funds next year, but the program must be gotten underway so far as authorization is concerned.

So, I say to both my friends, the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from California, the arguments that they may, however sincerely, make are not pertinent to the discussion of this bill tonight.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.