

XX, in other words, to waive or vitiate that portion of rule XX.

If objection had been made at the point when the unanimous consent request was made to send the bill to conference, then the bill could have been referred to the proper standing committee, and then, if and when reported out of the committee would have been brought up for consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

At this point, and under the parliamentary situation, the bill was sent to conference by unanimous consent; and this applies to all bills that go to conference by unanimous consent, if there be provisions therein that might be subject to the first sentence of rule XX. If there is no objection made at that time, the bill goes to conference; which in this case had the effect of suspending that portion of rule XX. Therefore, it is properly before the House at the present time as part of the conference report and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I add one comment since this is a very important question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will, of course, hear the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this did not go to conference by unanimous consent because it was never in the House bill. It was in the Senate bill and it never got in the House bill until last night.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call to the attention of the gentleman from Virginia that the unanimous consent request was made to take a bill from the Speaker's desk with Senate amendments thereto, and disagree to the Senate amendments and request a conference.

Of course, the Chair has already ruled on the point of order.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, may I be recognized on this particular point?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, there was a unanimous consent request to take the bill with Senate amendments from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate. I made that request myself.

(Mr. SMITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] that the statement of the Managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 19, 1966.)

Mr. MILLS (during the reading of the

statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the Managers on the part of the House be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me say first that there is no one in this House who is more concerned about orderly procedure than I am nor about the fact that it is becoming more difficult with each passing year to have tax bills passed through the House and through the Senate without a great number of amendments being added when the bill is in the other body.

I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, whatsoever to the other body working its will with respect to the subject matter which is sent to it. And they do amend our bills.

The social security bill, as I recall, which we passed in 1965 had in excess of 500 amendments attached before it was finally passed by the Senate. The Senate amendments, however, in that instance were by and large germane to the subject matter of the bill. My recollection in that instance is that as to those which were not germane to the subject matter of the bill we succeeded in causing the Senate conferees to agree to eliminate them. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter over which conferees have a great deal of difficulty and, of course, we have our share of those difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13103 is the bill which the House passed on June 15, 1966. The bill as passed by the House added as its primary objective the equal tax treatment by the United States of nonresident aliens and foreign corporations. Additionally, to the extent consistent with the primary objective of this bill, it was designed to provide increased incentives for investment by foreigners and foreign corporations in the United States. The bill as passed by the Senate adopted, with little change, the House-passed version of the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966. This part of the bill as passed by the Senate is contained in title I.

In addition, the Senate added other amendments to the bill which appear as titles II, III, and IV. These relate to other Internal Revenue Code provisions and the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act as well as other matters. I will first discuss the amendments made with respect to the Foreign Investors Tax Act and then the other amendments.

AMENDMENTS TO FOREIGN INVESTOR TAX ACT

The amendments made by the Senate to the Foreign Investors Tax Act were primarily perfecting changes which