

---

<sup>514</sup>(...continued)

amended would cause revenues to fall below the revenue floor, if the bill as reported would not have done so. *See id.* This precedent creates a limited window of applicability for section 311(a)(1): A Senator must raise a point of order against an amendment during the pendency of the amendment, or forever lose the right to question under section 311(a)(1) the deficit-increasing effect of the bill as amended. Note, however, that by virtue of the differing language of section 311(a)(2) (*see infra* p. 186) a point of order will lie under that subsection even when it will not lie under this subsection.

Note the following series of inquiries by Senator Chafee of the Chair (Senator Humphrey of New Hampshire):

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This amendment reduces revenues below the level expressed in the second budget resolution, and therefore the point of order is well taken.

Mr. CHAFEE. I ask the Chair if the entire bill before us does not do the same. We just adopted an amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania that reduced revenues by \$25 million. Will the Chair offer his opinion on that situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill as reported is revenue neutral for the fiscal year 1985. Therefore, it is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. CHAFEE. Would the President be good enough to explain? We just adopted on the floor an amendment by a voice vote that cost \$25 million. Is that *de minimis* or does that not count? Is that not real dollars?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment likewise would have been subject to a point of order, but the amendment having been agreed to, the point of order is now moot.

Mr. CHAFEE. But the amendment is now part of the bill. So is the whole bill not subject to a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the bill is treated on the basis on which it was reported from committee.

Mr. CHAFEE. That is parliamentary jargon that I do not quite understand.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask what the Chair is ruling: Is it that first we look at the bill as introduced and since the bill is revenue neutral, it is not subject to a point of order? Each amendment as it comes along may or may not be subject to a point of order, but you do not impute it backward to the bill when it is added. Do I understand the ruling correctly?

(continued...)