
⁶⁵(...continued)

order and motions to reject with respect to such Senate amendment in accordance with applicable provisions of this clause and to effect final determination of these matters in accordance with such provisions.

RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Rule XXVIII(4) & XXVIII(5) (1988).

On October 16, 1986, Senator Simpson introduced another Senate Resolution, on behalf of Senators Roth, Domenici, and Chiles, modifying the earlier resolution. That resolution (S. Res. 509, 99th Cong., 2d Sess, 132 CONG. REC. S16,415 (daily ed. Oct. 16, 1986)) read much as does subsection (d) now.

Again, Senator Roth explained the resolution:

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, on December 19, 1985, the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 286, which I authored. The purpose of Senate Resolution 286 was to extend the prohibition against extraneous matter in reconciliation bills and resolutions, popularly known as the Byrd rule after its distinguished author, to House language coming over to us either in a conference report or as a House amendment. But for Senate Resolution 286, the Senate would have been in a position of imposing a much needed discipline on itself while facing the prospect that the House could load down reconciliation bills and resolutions with all kinds of extraneous matter.

When the Senate considered Senate Resolution 286, I noted its similarity to rule XXVIII of the House rules by which the House seeks to protect itself against Senate provisions that would violate House rules on germaneness if offered there. Under Senate Resolution 286, when the point of order against extraneous matter is made and sustained, the offending language is deemed stricken and the Senate is permitted to consider the remainder "under the rules and practices of the Senate and applicable law."

In contrast, in the analogous situation under rule XXVIII of the House rules, after the offending language is deemed stricken, the opportunity to debate and to make further amendments is restricted under the rule and the practices of the House. In practical terms this means that one making a point of order does not have to overcome the burden that his or her success might unravel all the negotiations that led up to the conference report or amendment in question.

Therefore, on reflection, it is my considered opinion that Senate Resolution 286 needs to be amended so that successful points of order intended to surgically remove offending language, do not provide the occasion for unraveling the remaining language of conference reports which Senate conferees have worked out in conference.

The amendment to Senate Resolution 286 would preserve the original purpose of that resolution but would further refine the implementation, in the case of conference reports or House amendments, by limiting debate and, in the case of conference reports, by precluding amendments.

Conference reports as such are not subject to amendment. It would be highly inappropriate, therefore, to allow such language to become amendable once extraneous matter is removed by a successful point of order. Unfortu[na]tely, that result would occur without the adoption of the pending resolution because a conference report falls as a matter of parliamentary law when a successful point of order is made against it. And when the conference report falls, the last amendment or amendments are before this body subject to further debate and further action.

(continued...)