

in our society. Let's talk about what it means for some individual States.

I mentioned yesterday that this amendment would provide \$54 million in much needed relief to my home State of Maine. That would help avoid the necessity for draconian cuts in essential social service programs such as our Medicaid Program. But let's look at a few other States.

For Alabama, for example, this would mean \$92.6 million; for Alaska, it would be \$32.2 million; for Arizona, \$144 million; for Arkansas, \$80 million.

Let me skip down a bit. For Florida, \$359 million; for Georgia, \$208 million; for Hawaii, \$28 million; for Idaho, \$28.6 million. Indeed, the Governor of Idaho, our former colleague, Governor Kempthorne, has worked very hard as an advocate for this important legislation.

In other words, every single State in the Nation would be by this amendment provided with much needed relief. That is why we need to act. Otherwise, States are going to have no choice but to slash essential programs.

We have new figures coming out today that show the fiscal crisis affecting our partners, the States, has widened still further. According to the National Conference of State Legislators, States have used up two-thirds of their cash on hand. The gap between revenues and spending has hit \$36 billion and is expected to be \$58 billion, affecting 46 States. We must act. I urge my colleagues to reject the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 2 minutes.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. DASCHLE. Would my colleague from West Virginia withhold for a moment? If the Senator from West Virginia will yield, I appreciate my colleague's courtesy.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I yield.

#### TERRORISM RISK PROTECTION ACT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, as all of our colleagues know, over the last many weeks we have been attempting to work out an arrangement whereby we can go to conference on terrorism insurance. I am very pleased to be able to report this morning that we are now in a position to be able to do so. I have been in consultation with the Republican leader, and I am prepared now to present a unanimous consent request in that regard.

I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 252, H.R. 3210, the House-passed terrorism insurance bill, that all after the enacting clause be stricken, the text of S. 2600 as passed by the Senate be inserted in lieu thereof, the bill as thus amended be read the third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair be author-

ized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate with the ratio of 4 to 3, all without intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 3210), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER appointed Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DODD, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. ENZI conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### GREATER ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE PHARMACEUTICALS ACT OF 2001—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Almost 17 minutes on the Republican side and 7 minutes on the Democrat's side.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield me 8 minutes?

Mr. GRAMM. I would yield him 10 minutes. He deserves to be heard.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I rise in support of the budget point of order that was raised by my colleague from Texas. I am a little disappointed that the chairman of the Budget Committee didn't raise it. It is the responsibility of the Budget Committee. I have had the pleasure of serving with my colleague from Texas on the Budget Committee. That is the reason why we have a Budget Committee and the reason why we tried to pass a budget. We didn't pass a budget this year for the first time since 1974. Shame on this Congress. Shame on this Senate. Shame on, frankly, the leadership in this Senate for not getting it done.

It is maybe the most fiscally irresponsible thing we have not done and, as a result, there is no limit to how much money we can spend.

A budget point of order still lies on an amendment such as this, or any amendment, until the end of September, so we are raising a budget point of order for good reason. My colleague from Texas and the sponsors of the amendment, say this is a \$9 billion amendment. This will increase Federal spending. You can come up with a list to show that every State is going to benefit. I know my State is going to benefit \$93 million. I am sure my Governor would send me a letter saying please vote for this; we need help. And they do.

I agree with my colleague and very good friend from Maine. A lot of States are in very difficult times.

If you have an amendment on the floor that says here is \$9 billion, and cut it up, every State is going to benefit. You could have every State Governor saying pass this amendment. What is wrong with it? Yes, states are having a difficult time. The Federal Government is having a difficult time, too. The Senator from Texas pointed out that the Federal deficit is much

larger than the States' deficits. The Federal deficit, if you include Social Security, is \$322 billion. Things may have deteriorated for State revenues, but they have deteriorated significantly for Federal revenues.

It is not just borrowing against Social Security. It is borrowing against the American people. The American people are going to have to borrow this \$9 billion. They will have to pay interest on it. My biggest concern is that it is not a \$9 billion amendment. I know the amendment is temporary. I know it is retroactive.

It is kind of interesting how we are going to spend retroactive money. This goes back and says we are going to increase spending going back to April of this year. And then presumably, we are going to do it through this September, and then next year.

It is an amendment that is for about 1 1/2 years. My concern is it won't be a year and a half. If you increase these formulas, States are going to still be in difficult times next year. They are going to say: Let's make this permanent. These formulas, in many respects, are good. We don't want them to ever go down. We never want the States to get less.

If it is temporary, and here is a 1.35 percent increase in Federal match, what makes anybody think this won't be extended? This amendment is a \$100 billion amendment. If it is extended, I can tell you if we pass this—and it may well be that my good friend from West Virginia has the votes. The administration is very opposed to it, illustrated in a letter from them that I have here. But if it becomes law, I have no doubt whatsoever that a year from now colleagues will say: Let's make this permanent. States are still in trouble. Governors will say: Let's make this permanent. Let's just increase the Federal share. It is free. It came from the Federal Government.

I just happen to disagree with that. If this is made permanent, we are talking about spending \$100 billion—\$9 billion basically for the first year—\$100 billion. We are just going to do that? Next year we may not be able to make a budget point of order if we don't figure out some way to get fiscal discipline. We are just going to pass \$100 billion, and have colleagues stand up and say: I can't believe these deficits are so high.

This amendment increases the Federal share. It increases FMAP. Times are tough, and we are going to increase the Federal share on Medicare.

Wait a minute. Times were good in the last several years when we had the largest surplus in the country. Did we see an increase in the Federal share when States were doing very well?

We have never said this should be based on the economy or on States' ability to pay. The formula for the FMAP is based on the States' income relative to the Federal income. The States' income was much higher than the norm with Federal income. They