[69](...continued)

When the Budget Act was drafted, the reconciliation procedure was crafted very carefully. It was intended to be used rather carefully because, in essence, Mr. President, it vitiated those two significant characteristics of this place that many have grown to respect and admire. Some think it is a marvelous institution of democracy, and if you lose those two qualities, you just about turn this U.S. Senate into the U.S. House of Representatives or other parliamentary body.

. . . .

. . . . If the House Rules Committee clears a bill, it makes no difference to them whether it is on reconciliation or freestanding. They set the rules for debate in that institution then and there. We do not have that. The only Rules Committee we have is the floor of the U.S. Senate and a relatively new one called reconciliation.

Today we have met the enemy. As Pogo says "We met the enemy and he is us." We are going to use the process available under the Budget Act to strip from this bill not only those matters which the Parliamentarian would call extraneous but also those which were never intended because they are not pure deficit reduction matters. Thus, they are broader than the Byrd rule, irrelevant and extraneous, and we are going to strike them.

. . . .

Mr. GORTON. . . .

First, we are doing what we ought to do. As the distinguished majority leader said earlier during the course of this debate, the purpose of a reconciliation bill is to reduce the budget deficit. . . .

Second, and equally important, by this course of action this evening we are not doing what we ought not to do. The distinguished minority leader pointed out that many of the extraneous elements in this resolution before this amendment include good legislation. From a brief review of that legislation, I know this Senator agrees with well over half of those pieces of substantive legislation. But all of them, whether this Senator agrees with them or not, share one feature in common: They have not been debated on the floor of the Senate and cannot be effectively debated as a part of a reconciliation bill. They cannot effectively be amended as a part of a reconciliation bill.

Thus, their inclusion, whether they are good, bad, or indifferent, would utterly destroy the very purpose of the Senate of the United States, as so eloquently described by the President pro tempore last Sunday. It is absolutely essential that, even with this legislation, we have the right to debate and the right to amend.

. . . .

Mr. RUDMAN. . . .

I would say it was informally advanced beyond the Byrd rule by what we have now adopted. I guess I would call it an informal Dole-Mitchell-Sasser-Domenici-Packwood-Bentsen amendment which simply said: If it does not raise revenue or save money, we do not want it in here.

(continued...)