
outlays or authority reported under subsection (a),²⁶⁷ or

²⁶⁶(...continued)

Committee are estimated at \$420 million. Thus when the Veterans' Affairs Committee reports the bill, the entire \$422 million will be charged against the Veterans' Affairs Committee's allocation. If S.190 is sequentially referred to the Armed Services Committee and that Committee reports it unchanged, the \$420 million in cost to their programs would at that time be scored against the Armed Services Committee's allocation and would no longer be charged against that of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. If, however, the Armed Services Committee takes no action on the bill, the full \$422 million cost would remain a charge against the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Letter from Robert D. Reischauer to Sen. Alan Cranston (July 31, 1990). Director Reischauer referred to the Matsunaga Veterans Disability Benefits Improvement Act of 1990, S. 190, 101st Cong., 1st Sess., 135 CONG. REC. S551-52 (daily ed. Jan. 25, 1989). On September 20, 1990, the Veterans Affairs Committee reported the bill (without a written report), 136 CONG. REC. S13,507-08 (daily ed. Sept. 20, 1990), and the Presiding Officer referred it to the Armed Services Committee.

When Director Reischauer stated that "when the Veterans' Affairs Committee reports the bill, the entire \$422 million will be charged against the Veterans' Affairs Committee's allocation," he wrote of the assignment of responsibility, rather than the timing of the charge. Senate Budget Committee staff have advised that they will generally not charge legislation against a committee's allocation before the legislation comes to the Senate floor. *See supra* note 261.

²⁶⁷ *See supra* pp. 88-90.

Note that a later sentence of this paragraph (*see infra* p. 102) exempts appropriations from the point of order under this subparagraph.

Before enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act, the point of order under this paragraph lay only against exceeding a committee's allocation to a subcommittee or program, not against exceeding the budget resolution's allocation to a committee. Section 13112(a)(7) of the Budget Enforcement Act extended the point of order to legislation that would exceed either. *See infra* p. 709.

Before enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act, if a committee had not yet filed its allocation under section 302(b), no point of order could lie under section 302(f), because no basis would exist on which to determine whether the Committee had exceeded its allocation. In such a case, the point of order would lie under section 302(c). 132 CONG. REC. S10,693 (1986); Senate Precedent PRL19860807-003 (Aug. 7, 1986) (LEGIS, Rules database). This precedent may have continuing application only for appropriations, which a later sentence of this paragraph (*see infra* p. 102) exempts from the point of order against exceeding the budget resolution's allocation to a committee.

(continued...)