DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President. I understand that we are in session for Senators to speak for up to 10 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, we are here on Saturday, and we just had a very significant vote in the Senate. The vote was on whether we would move to a bill, fully debatable, to raise the debt ceiling without any strings attached.

The Republicans, en bloc, voted against that. As a result—since we need 60 votes to bring a bill to the floor—the vote was 53 to 45. There should be no mistake in anyone's mind. This was a very clear vote, simply to move to a bill, fully debatable, amendable even, but the Republicans would not even vote to go to that bill today.

Quite frankly, I must admit that when I was driving in to the Senate, I was thinking about this. I thought what we will do is that we will get on the bill. Obviously they will vote for cloture to proceed to the bill, and then we will get on the bill. I was wondering to myself how long we will have to be on the bill, what kinds of amendments would be offered, and then would we have to file cloture on that bill also.

I was quite surprised to see every Republican vote against even going to the bill. It begs credulity. I am incredulous at this, especially with the markets opening in Asia later tomorrow, on Sunday. How are they going to read this? I think if we had voted to at least move to the bill and debated it, they would have stabilized somewhat because they would say at least they are willing to talk about it. Now they can look at the bill and say simply, Republicans are not going to discuss this.

It is shocking that this would have transpired today at this last minute. No one gave up anything in the bill. It was simply to move to the bill, and the Republicans said no.

We have been closed for 2 weeks. I have come to the floor several times, as I know others have, to talk about this irresponsible and dangerous episode in our Nation's history. I understand that different groups are coming together trying to float some kind of an idea.

I hope something comes of it. I truly hope cooler heads will prevail and we will reach some agreement that will allow the government to reopen, allow the debt ceiling to be extended with no strings attached for at least 1 year or more—at least to get us through the next elections of 2014—and then we ought to go to negotiations.

Our Budget Committee passed a budget. The House passed its budget. They should meet and try to work it out in conference. Our Appropriations Committee passed our bills. The House hasn't passed all of them. Then we could go to work and work these things out in the next 6 weeks, up to December 1. I hope that works and we get that kind of a compromise, but I do not want to see some kind of compromise which says to one side or the other that you have to do this or you have to do that.

It should be open. Our Budget Committee is under the able guidance and direction of Senator MURRAY of Washington. I am not a member of the Budget Committee, but they ought to go to conference without any strings attached or some artificial levels put in. They ought to take what we passed as the budget, as the House did.

What is happening is that—and it is getting worse every day, another week, another 2 weeks—it is unfathomable how many more people are going to be hurt.

A lot of Americans may think sequestration wasn't a big deal or that closing the government wasn't. I saw a piece in the paper where some tea party people were meeting. What came through is they weren't being directly hit or hurt by the government shutdown.

One respondent was quoted in the paper as saying: We need to go back to the late 1800s, the way this country ran then, where everybody grew their own vegetables.

I would say to that person: If you want to grow your own vegetables, you can grow your own vegetables. If you want to live somewhere without electricity, air conditioning, with no health care, and never go to the doctor, you should be able to do that. But why should you make the rest of the country go back to the 1800s?

This is what a handful of people are trying to do. They can't do it legislatively, they can't do it through the courts, they can't do it politically, and they can't win elections on that basis. So they are trying to do it by holding a gun to our heads, keeping the government closed, and threatening to default on the full faith and credit of the United States.

I wish to say in the few minutes I have remaining what another yearlong sequester would mean in human terms. These are things that come under the jurisdiction of my Appropriations Committee, which I have been privileged to chair or where I have been the ranking member since 1989. We have never had these kinds of problems before—Republicans or Democrats—when Republicans ran it or Democrats. I have been back and forth on this many times, in terms of Republicans chairing it—Democrats, Republicans, Democrats. We have never had these kinds of problems.

If we go 1 more year under sequester, that means 177,000 fewer children will get Head Start services—177,000—and 1.3 million fewer students will receive Title I education assistance. What is Title I? This goes to the poorest kids, the poorest families, the poorest areas. So 1.3 million low-income kids won't be helped.

Oh, our kids will be fine, kids from the middle class, the upper class, and of Senators and Congressman. They have money. I am talking about the poor kids, and there are 1.3 million.

There are 760,000 fewer households that would receive less heating and cooling assistance under the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, and mostly they are elderly poor people.

There will be 9,000 fewer special education staff in the classroom. In other words, under IDEA we provide money for special education teachers and support staff for special education students, and 9,000 will be cut.

There will be $291 million less for childcare subsidies for working families, for people who need childcare subsidies. They are low income, they are going to work every day, but they need some childcare help—$291 million cut away from that. How many will not be able to go to work or what will they do with those children? Will they put them in substandard childcare facilities?

One thing that is mind-boggling is we have a program in Medicare that goes after fraud, waste, and abuse. We know from the past that for every dollar that we put into that, we actually recover $7.90. I don't mean something phony. I mean we actually bring back $7.90 for every $1 dollar we put into it.

Because of the cut under sequester that means in the next year there will be $2.7 billion that we will not recover. By reducing the number of people in the fraud, waste and abuse section, that means it opens the door to fraud. People say: Oh, they are not there. They are not checking, right?

People say: Well, now we are going to give them flexibility under sequester. But there is no flexibility. That has to be cut.

Another yearlong continuing resolution under sequester means $2 billion less for the National Institutes of Health, which means 1,300 fewer research grants.

Again, I would say that people say: Well, we will give flexibility. My colleague on the other side says: We will have sequester, but we will leave flexibility to the departments.

Let's see how that goes.

The funds for the Administration for Children and Families—what would they do? Would they preserve Head Start slots by cutting childcare subsidies?

At NIH, would you preserve cancer research by cutting Alzheimer's research? These are terrible choices. Flexibility does not answer these questions. It is not the answer.

When they talk about flexibility, I know what is on their mind—military spending. Everybody likes to talk about the sequester and the level of sequester. Do you know what the House did? A sequester says it is 50/50, 50 percent cut from defense, 50 percent from

nondefense discretionary. What the House did in the Ryan budget was to leave things whole and take it out of things like Head Start, IDEA, special education, and programs such as that. They took it out of there, but they left defense whole. That is not at all what was in sequester.

In my area of Health and Human Services, education, labor, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, NIH, next year we would cut about $34 billion. People will say, I don't know what that means. As I said, it is how many more children will not be in Head Start, how many more families will not get childcare subsidies, how many more research grants will not be funded by the NIH. We will not have our Centers for Disease Control and Prevention epidemiologists out in the field watching for food outbreaks, foodborne illnesses, et cetera.

It is a disaster if we continue with the yearlong sequester and a continuing resolution. That is why we need a short-term one, so our committees can go to work. Perhaps cooler heads will prevail, and we can get a better budget for next year before the end of the year. To me, this is the way to proceed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. I commend the words of our chairman, the senior Senator from Iowa, for his warnings about the impact of sequestration and the across-the-board indiscriminate cuts. We are grateful for that because we need to be thinking about what happens down the road when we have a budget agreement.

I want to start today with a brief comment on what happened earlier. At about noontime we had a vote, which is a procedural vote which I was hoping would go in a certain direction, but it didn't. It was a vote to move forward on the question of how we are going to avoid default. I don't think it is the last word on this issue for the next few days, but I was hoping that the Republicans would at least allow a debate on how we can avoid default. So far that hasn't happened, but we are confident that in the next couple of days we will resolve this. But I do think it is important we lay a foundation for why we need to avoid default, because we have talked a lot about the consequences and the impact of a government shutdown—and that remains what might be called a clear and present danger to the middle class and to our economy—but we have to talk at the same time about the consequences of default because we are only days away from the deadline.

Maybe the best way to start is not with numbers but with part of a letter I received from a constituent this week. The letter was dated October 8, so my assumption is that most of what is contained in this letter are fears about and the impacts from the shutdown only. The sentiments expressed in this letter will only grow in significance and severity as we get closer to the deadline and closer to default. I am reading just in pertinent part. This particular constituent is from northeastern Pennsylvania, about an hour from where I live, but in the same basic region. She talked about her own circumstances and that of her husband and then she continued on:

> Besides our personal difficulties due to the budget impasse, my elderly parents live with the worry of when and if they will receive their Social Security checks. At 85 and 83 they should not have this uncertainty. These should be their golden years. It breaks my heart to hear my mother say she can't sleep and has a stomachache from the worry about where our country is headed. Middle- and low-income families cannot afford another economic downturn. We are just barely recovering from the last one.

That is what she says about her parents. Now, again, it is my assumption the worry and the anxiety expressed in that paragraph are solely attributable to the government shutdown. Those worries and anxieties, and, frankly, real pain, the physical pain expressed in that paragraph about her mother, will only grow the closer we get to default, because we know the consequences of default are almost unimaginable—about the worst economic hit we could take as a country. So that is why we have to take every step necessary to avoid it.

But I think the words of a constituent from Pennsylvania speak in this case for the Nation. Why should people have a worry, even if that worry is unfounded? We know Social Security checks are going out now, thankfully, but they are slowed down substantially if there is a default. We know even in a shutdown, if you reach the age of 65, it is going to take you a while to get the checks you are entitled to because the process of validating your eligibility is held up. But why should there be uncertainty? Why should any mother or father or grandmother or grandfather have an anxiety and a worry that leads them to have a stomachache, in the case of this letter, or where they can't sleep because of the political agenda of one part of one political party in one House of Congress?

So that is where things are with people's feelings and their anxieties, and we have to be able to respond to that.

The default question itself is of great significance now. Maybe 10 days ago it wasn't, but I am afraid we are in a period now where just the talk of default, just getting close to default, will have an adverse impact on our economy. This did happen in 2011. That is irrefutable. All the data, all the facts, show just getting close to default has an adverse impact on the economy. By one estimate, a recent estimate, that was almost a $20 billion hit to the economy, if you measure it over 10 years. There are all kinds of other consequences that I won't dwell on right now.

There were two statements made by Secretary of the Treasury Jack Lew in his opening statement to the Finance Committee on Thursday morning that I think we should be reminded of. This was in reference to the question, what if you go over the line in default and you have to decide which bills to pay, which is the wrong way to go, but Secretary Lew posited these two questions.

> How can the United States choose whether to send Social Security checks to seniors or pay benefits to our veterans?

That is question No. 1. Question No. 2.

> How can the United States choose whether to provide children with food assistance or meet our obligations to Medicare providers?

These are the kinds of questions we are all going to have to answer if we—as some people apparently want us to do—go over the default line for the first time in American history. To say it is fiscal madness doesn't begin to describe it.

Secretary Lew also said something else which we should contemplate today. He said:

> It is irresponsible and reckless to insist that we experience a forced default to learn how bad it is.

We have heard talk in this body and in the other body about maybe we can survive if we go over the line; that maybe it is okay, maybe we can prioritize payments. I think we should be reminded of those words. Again, that quote:

> . . . to insist that we experience a forced default to learn how bad it is.

It makes no sense and, fortunately, there is a consensus against it, but we still have work to do to prevent it from happening.

I will read as well a couple of lines from a letter I received from a friend of mine who has spent a lot more years in the financial markets and has spent a lot of years trying to get both parties in Washington to come together fiscally. I will read some lines from this memo he sent me. He was talking about what happens with default. It is like anything else—if you default on your mortgage, if you default in your personal life, you have a credit problem. He said:

> From the standpoint of our creditworthiness, a default is a default. Once you have defaulted, you are a—

And I will leave the word out he put in there because it may not be appropriate for this Chamber, but I think people can figure out what the word might be here.—

> And everyone fears they will be the next party not to be paid. As in the Lehman bankruptcy—

And here he is talking about the fall of 2008.

> the potential for unintended consequences that spiral out of control is enormous. In short, toying with default is not akin to playing with fire but is more like handling financial weapons of mass destruction. It is a violation of the trust we place in our elected leaders to safeguard the welfare of our country.

That is what this person, who I know has a lot of experience in the markets, describes could happen in the event of default.

I will conclude with some quick references to the impact of default as described by economists, as described by experts in the field of measuring the impact of default, and folks who know a lot about what would happen. I will read them as quickly as I can, because we know some of these already but we have to remind ourselves: Increasing borrowing costs. Many have talked and written about that. Damaging economic growth. Higher interest rates. Higher debt payments. Slow economic growth.

One expert was talking about the Lehman bankruptcy and then putting that in the context of a default, and making the case that a default has a much bigger impact than even the Lehman bankruptcy had.

Consider this: In 2008, the Lehman bankruptcy was an ''event that triggered the financial crisis that caused the stock market to lose half its value over just 5 months and helped to trigger the worst recession since the Great Depression.''

That was just the Lehman bankruptcy. Imagine in the context of default how much worse it could be.

Retirement savings. According to newer data, an equivalent hit could cost—comparing it to what happened in 2011—the average person in his or her fifties, who has been saving for 20 or 30 years, as much as $11,000.

Mortgage payments would be hiked. After the 2011 shutdown, mortgage spreads jumped by 70 basis points, which would have added $100 per month to the cost of a typical mortgage.

So we have data from 2011 that measures the adverse impact on mortgages just by getting close to default, not in the event of default itself.

Disrupted payments. Delayed or disrupted payments would prevent 57½ million Americans from receiving Social Security benefits in a timely manner and interfere with payments to 3.4 million veterans.

I will read two more. Moody's chief economist Mark Zandi, who has testified in front of the Senate many times—who, parenthetically, as relates to the shutdown testified yesterday over in the House, because the Joint Economic Committee is a joint committee—predicts that, just as it relates to the shutdown, in this fourth quarter, the fourth quarter we are in, we will have lost ½ point of growth. So instead of the GDP growth in the fourth quarter being 2½ percent, as Mark Zandi would have projected absent a shutdown, with the shutdown we will go from 2½ percent growth to 2 percent. That is a shutdown in one quarter. Just imagine the impact on growth if we default.

Here is what Mark Zandi says. I am quoting him directly:

> It would be devastating to the economy. Confidence will evaporate, consumer confidence will sharply decline, businesses will stop hiring, consumers will stop spending, the stock market will fall significantly in value, borrowing costs for businesses and households will rise.

And he goes on from there. But, look, you don't have to be an economist to know the impact of default. All you have to do is read what economists are saying across the board. These are people who disagree on a lot of things. They might disagree on a budget item. They might disagree on econometric modeling. They might disagree on tax cuts. They might disagree on a usual Democrat versus Republican approach to the economy. They might have fundamental disagreements on everything, but on this they are speaking with one voice: Don't default, they are telling us. Don't even get close to defaulting. Don't even talk about or debate defaulting. Just prevent it from happening. That is the overwhelming consensus.

Let me conclude with one reference here. When I got to the Senate, one of the leading Republican voices on the budget—because he happened to be the ranking member on the Budget Committee—was Judd Gregg from New Hampshire. He had been a Governor of New Hampshire and then served in the Senate for many years. This is what he had to say recently in talking about what would happen in the event of default and brinkmanship with the debt limit.

> [It] is the political equivalent of playing Russian roulette with all of the chambers of the gun loaded. It is the ultimate no-win strategy. A default would lead to some level of chaos in the debt markets, which would lead to a significant contraction in economic activity, which would lead to job losses, which would lead to higher spending by the Federal Government and lower tax revenues, which would lead to more debt.

So says the former ranking member of the Budget Committee, the former Republican Senator from New Hampshire. So the idea that some think for some reason we could go into default or even get close to it doesn't make a lot of sense.

I will conclude with this thought. That letter I started with from my constituent in Pennsylvania, who speaks for the country, I believe, when she was talking about her parents—her 82- or 83-year-old parents—and about the uncertainty they have, about the worry and the anxiety that is literally causing, in the case of her mother, according to this letter, physical pain, but even if it didn't rise to that level, just the idea of a government shutdown coupled with the potential default is causing that kind of anxiety and is really disturbing, and I think it is an insult to so many Americans.

We have to come together and open the government at long last and make sure we pay our bills and not even get close to defaulting, and then we can have negotiations and discussions for weeks and months about long-term and short-term issues. In the meantime, we have to make sure we pay our bills and open the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, as we exited the Chamber to go to our Democratic caucus, I am certain my Republican colleagues and friends were talking among themselves as well, trying to find a way forward.

A reporter stopped me and said: What do you think the Senate is going to do?

I don't know the specifics, but I am most certainly hopeful and remain cautiously optimistic that the Senate will step up to the job at hand and fulfill the promise and hopes of our Founders, who created the Senate to operate at times just like these where there seems to be no way forward, to find a way forward; where the political winds have gotten so bitter and cold, for the 100 of us to find a way forward to help keep our economy whole and operating and functioning well, not just for our Nation but for the world, which is important; to help support and bolster the recovery that is underway; to set aside the bitterness and the rancor and try to find a way forward.

I am very encouraged despite the fact that the vote was very divisive—all Republicans on one side and all Democrats on the other. I am confident because I know Members of this body well and I have been here long enough to know that the many people of good will on both sides of the aisle can try to find a way forward. And I know the President of the United States is open to negotiation.

Maybe we can find resolution within the political parties, but that is not what is important. What is important is finding a resolution in the Senate of the United States for all of the people of the United States. We do not represent narrow districts with narrow ideologies. We represent States—big ones, such as California, medium-sized ones, such as Louisiana, and small ones, such as Delaware. But inside of Delaware, inside of Louisiana, and inside of California, there are people of all different political persuasions. As Senators, when we run for office we have to listen and take all of that in and then try to make the best decisions we can. It is an honor to serve in the Senate even though it is tough, it is hard, and it is very difficult at times.

I have been proud to serve here for 18 years and be among many groups that have found compromise and the middle ground, that have tried to work to understand where the other side is coming from and move our country forward. It has not always been perfect, and none of us are perfect here, but I am proud I have at least been one to say: Count on me to try to see what we can do to resolve the situation. I want to say that today for my constituents. That is what they want me to do. That is what they sent me here for 18 years ago and what I know they want me to

continue to do. I do feel strongly on their behalf that the government should open and the 21,000 of them who have been wrongly laid off by the actions of a minority—the government needs to open, and the debt of the United States most certainly needs to be honored so this economic recovery can continue.

But there are plenty of things we can negotiate. The debt of the country is too high. We do need to have some earned benefit and potential entitlement reform—not necessarily cutting benefits from people who count on them but for the government to do its part to meet people halfway. There are always efficiencies that can be created if we work together.

So on behalf of my constituents, I am very hopeful that we can find a way forward. I think Senator REID has been providing extraordinary leadership, and hopefully we can find a way forward.

I would briefly mention that there have been some very good conversations going on about funding for the city of Washington—not a part of the Federal Government—which has not been resolved yet, but Republicans, Democrats, and the White House are working together to find a way so the District of Columbia, the city of Washington—with its own mayor and city council, its own budget, its own local funds—does not have to be caught up in a very tough circumstance that is not of their making. They are not part of the Federal Government, and neither is New York, Chicago, New Orleans, or Baltimore. They are separate cities, and they should be treated that way. We haven't found a way yet, but we are working on it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind words of the Senator from Louisiana, but I want the RECORD spread with the work she has done that I have seen in our years together in the Senate. No one has been more of an advocate for a State than the senior Senator from Louisiana. What she did after that terrible hurricane hit that area is now legendary—the ability that she had to change what had been standard procedures and law in this country for decades. We changed that for a lot of reasons. One was her advocacy. We did it because of her.

In fact, the Democrats in the Senate voted for things they never voted for before because of the good Senator from Louisiana. It was not done to help on a temporary basis but long term for the State of Louisiana.

I hope they understand what a difference one person can make. She has made a difference and she has changed things forever in Louisiana already. I am sure the best is yet to come.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRELIMINARY TALKS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as most know now—we did a press event so everybody knows, I guess, but I will say it again—I had a meeting with Senators McConnell, Alexander, and Schumer this morning to work on issues before us. The conversations are preliminary, but we are talking. I hope everyone understands how positive this is. It is the first discussions we have had here, period, during the whole pendency of this artificially driven government shutdown and not raising the debt limit when we should.

I am confident Senator MCCONNELL understands that defaulting on our debt would mean millions of jobs in the United States, not thousands, not hundreds of thousands but millions. It could halt Social Security checks, Medicare payments, and even paychecks for our men and women in uniform.

Democratic Senators agree with President Obama and we share a simple goal. We want to reopen the government and pay our bills so we can move forward in good-faith negotiations for a long-term budget to protect jobs, the middle class, and the American economy. That is our goal.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

At 12:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints the following Members to be the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of the House amendment and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. LUCAS, KING of Iowa, NEUGEBAUER, ROGERS of Alabama, CONAWAY, THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, CRAWFORD, Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. DENHAM, RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, PETERSON, MCINTYRE, COSTA, WALZ, SCHRADER, MCGOVERN, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. VELA.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title III of the House amendment, and title III of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROYCE, MARINO, and ENGEL.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sections 1207 and 1301 of the House amendment, and sections 1301, 1412, 1435, and 4204 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CAMP, SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and LEVIN.

For consideration of the House amendment to the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Ms. FUDGE.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following joint resolution was read the first time:

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

S. 1571. A bill to permit the District of Columbia to obligate and expend local funds in accordance with the local budget adopted by the Council of the District of Columbia during any period of fiscal year 2014 in which no Federal law appropriating such local funds is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS ON OCTOBER 11, 2013

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 610

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 610, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits.