

(B) a targeted foreign country—

(i) is financing, or allowing the financing, of a terrorist organization within such country; or

(ii) is providing safe haven to a terrorist organization within such country.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding section 341 or any other provision of this Act, this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this amendment goes to the heart of our debate over the structure and purpose of the U.S. intelligence community. My amendment addresses the allocation of resources at Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control, or OFAC.

Much of our attention has focused on the creation of a new, independent office to oversee our intelligence activities. Often lost in this debate are the details about many of the smaller, lesser known Federal agencies whose efforts are essential to our national security.

Even though many people don't know who they are, OFAC is one of our most powerful weapons in the war on terrorism, because it is charged with tracking down and identifying the international sources of terrorist financing.

Unfortunately, OFAC is also tasked with administration of the Cuba travel ban. As we all know, U.S. policy toward Cuba is a highly emotional and divisive issue. Still, I would doubt that anyone seriously thinks that travel by Americans to Cuba poses a larger or more serious threat to U.S. interests than al-Qaida or the insurgents in Iraq, or Syria, Iran or North Korea.

My colleagues might be surprised and disturbed, then, to learn that—at the direction of the State Department—OFAC diverts more of its personnel resources to imposition of the Cuba travel ban than to any other country or project-specific issue.

According to their records, the equivalent of 21 full-time OFAC employees are allocated to the Cuba travel ban. On the other hand, only 16 are allocated to the search al-Qaida's financial sources of support.

Less than 15 full-time employee resources are spent on the former Iraq regime and its insurgents, and less than 14 are spent on Iran. Less than 10 are allocated to Syria, Sudan, and Libya combined. Afghanistan doesn't even merit one full-time employee—it receives the attention of roughly 2/3 of one full-time OFAC employee. North Korea only gets 1/3.

In other words, more OFAC personnel resources are spent on the effort to prevent Americans from vacationing in Cuba than are spent to track down and shut off the sources of funds used by al-Qaida to carry out terrorist activities.

This is an appalling diversion of our resources. If we hope to defeat the disparate threats arrayed against U.S. interests—both here at home and abroad—we must dedicate our attention to the real dangers confronting us around the world. Wisely allocating our resources will better ensure our success.

The amendment I offer addresses this imbalance by requiring an annual report from OFAC on how it allocates its resources and the criteria it uses to make those resource decisions. It also outlines criteria that ought to be considered when prioritizing the threats posed by different countries and groups. Among these criteria are the likelihood that a country or organization is: planning or sponsoring a direct attack on U.S. interests; participating in a nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons development program; financing or allowing the financing of terrorists; or providing a safe haven to terrorists.

Colleagues, this is an issue of the highest importance. My amendment simply asks for common sense in the allocation of our limited resources. We cannot expect to win the war on terrorism if we refuse to dedicate our full and focused efforts to fighting it. In this time of crisis, the American people expect us to lead with vision and clarity. My amendment offers this.

I see no credible reason why OFAC should waste precious resources creating bureaucratic red tape for Montana producers who just want to negotiate legal agricultural sales to Cuba. Instead, OFAC should focus its resources where they are more urgently needed: on shutting down the financial networks of al-Qaida and other more serious threats to U.S. interests. That is why the Chairman of the Intelligence Committee supports this amendment, and that is why the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Foreign Trade Council support this amendment.

I take this opportunity to thank Senator COLLINS and Senator LIEBERMAN, the chairwoman and ranking member managing this bill, and their staff, for all of their hard work on the Baucus-Roberts-Craig amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized. There is no further time remaining on the majority side. The minority has until 9:40 a.m.

#### IMPROVED NUTRITION AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly about an important bill that I hope we can pass before the Congress leaves town and adjourns this year. That is the IMPACT bill, of which Senator FRIST is the prime sponsor. I have cosponsored it and various other Senators have also cosponsored it.

This is a bill that passed the Senate. It is awaiting action by the House. I wanted today to come to the floor and urge the House to bring up that bill and pass it so it can be sent to the President for his signature.

Just last week, the Institute of Medicine released a report on childhood obesity. It is a report that I requested in 2001. The report indicates that the prevention of obesity in children and

youth needs to be a national public health priority.

Obesity-associated annual hospital costs for children and youth have more than tripled in two decades to \$127 billion. In adults, national expenditures associated with overweight and obesity in adults ranges from \$98 billion to \$129 billion annually. The report calls on the government, industry, media, health care professionals, the nonprofit organizations, State and local educational authorities, schools, parents, and families to take immediate steps to confront this epidemic. And the IMPACT bill I have referred to will address many of those issues.

The bill is of critical importance. It tries to focus attention on these issues. There are a variety of provisions in the bill that I think are extremely important. It will direct us toward finding solutions, first, by preparing the health care community to deal with obesity in terms of prevention, diagnosis, and intervention by adding obesity, overweight, and eating disorders to the list of priority conditions to be addressed in the health professions title VII training grants.

Second, IMPACT supports community-based solutions to increase physical activity and improve nutrition on a number of levels. It provides funding for demonstration projects in communities and schools and health care organizations and other qualified entities that promote fitness or healthy nutrition.

It authorizes the Centers for Disease Control to collect fitness and energy fitness expenditure information from children.

It directs the Agency for Health Care Research and Quality to review any new information related to obesity trends among various subpopulations, and includes such information in its health disparities report.

It allows States to use their preventive services block grant funds for community education on nutrition and increased physical activity. And it instructs the Secretary to report on what research has been done in this area of obesity.

There are a variety of other provisions in the bill. The legislation is an excellent first step in the fight to improve health. It is not the only step we need to take, but it is a first step.

We also need to assist our schools in providing healthy nutrition options and expanding physical activity programs. We need to grow the workforce such that people have access to the health care professions they need to prevent, diagnose, and treat obesity, and we need to ensure that Medicare and Medicaid provide the services necessary to help people prevent obesity and its complications.

These are not small goals, but they are critical to our Nation's health, both today and in the future.

I want to continue working with Senator FRIST and other colleagues in the Senate to find new ways to address

these goals, but before Congress adjourns this year we need to go ahead and call on the House to pass the legislation we have passed in the Senate. This is an important step and one that should not be delayed until the convening of a new Congress. I hope the House of Representatives will bring this legislation up quickly, will pass it, will send it to the President, and we can begin down the road of dealing with this serious problem that afflicts so many of our children.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. How much time is remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are 9 minutes 22 seconds remaining.

#### PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the debate last week between Senator KERRY and President Bush marked a milestone in this campaign. Some 65 million Americans tuned in to this debate, which is an extraordinary number, more than tune in to such popular television shows as the Oscars. Certainly, we believe that Presidential debates serve that audience even more.

It was an important debate because it signaled the beginning of the real campaign. Despite all the time, effort, and money, it appears that a large group of American voters are waiting to these closing weeks, listening closely to the candidates, to make the decision about how they will vote on November 2, one of the most historic elections we have witnessed in recent times.

The debate come Friday night is going to be equally, if not more, important. We will move from the critical issue of national security and foreign policy to issues of great importance related to the domestic situation in America: How are things going for America's individuals and families and businesses?

We believe, as we look at the record, that the choice is going to be very clear. We will use the same matrix, the same measure President Ronald Reagan used when he ran for President, when he asked very bluntly: Are you better off today than you were 4 years ago?

When it comes to the domestic issues, we believe there is a compelling case and a compelling argument that America is not better off today than it was 4 years ago when President George W. Bush was sworn in. The numbers speak for themselves. This President will have lost more jobs as President than any President in the history of

the United States since Herbert Hoover.

I have to explain for those not old enough that Herbert Hoover's Presidency was a disaster. It was the Great Depression. America saw more suffering from families and businesses in that period of time than at any time in that whole era, and now we have a President who came to office, George Bush, saying, give me a chance with my economic policy, and by every objective standard the President's economic policies have failed. They have failed to create jobs. We have seen an exodus of good-paying jobs. In my State, 160,000 manufacturing jobs have been lost. Some have been replaced, but virtually every single replacement job pays less, offers fewer, if any, benefits, and families find themselves falling behind.

Look at the national numbers. Consider what has happened. We have seen median household income across America decline by 3.4 percent under President Bush. That means the earning power of American families has gone down under Bush's economic policies while the costs of living have gone up. Gasoline prices are up 22 percent over when the President was elected, college tuition at public 4-year institutions up 28 percent, and family health care premiums up 45 percent. This is a back-breaking statistic because individual families cannot afford to go without health care insurance protection, and yet the cost goes up every year. It becomes increasingly expensive and less coverage is offered.

What has the Bush administration done to help working families deal with these increased costs of living? Virtually nothing. They have offered tax cuts for the wealthiest people in America, with the blind faith that if the richest people in America are given more money, somehow working Americans and middle-income Americans will prosper. It has failed. It has not worked. The debate on Friday night will focus on that.

President Bush will be held accountable not just for the situation in Iraq and the standing of the United States in the world but in terms of what he has done or failed to do for families. Listen to what has happened since President Bush has taken office: 1.6 million private sector jobs have been lost; 5.2 million more Americans have no health insurance. Since President Bush has been President, 5 million Americans have lost their health insurance, and 4.3 million Americans have descended into poverty. They were above the poverty line when President Bush came in. His economic policies have driven them below.

Household debt has risen \$2.3 billion as families borrow more money to try to keep up with the costs. Personal bankruptcies have hit a record high. The S&P 500 has dropped 15 percent, decimating retirement savings of families across the board. The No Child Left Behind Program has not been funded,

shortchanged by billions of dollars. There has been \$500 billion taken out of the Social Security trust fund, and keep this in mind: When President Bush took office, we had a \$236 billion surplus. Today, we have a \$422 billion deficit. In fact, some argue, including my colleague from Illinois, that it is almost \$700 billion when the Social Security trust fund that has been raided is added in.

This President, a so-called fiscal conservative, has driven us more deeply in debt than any President in our history, has lost more jobs than any President in 70 years. How will he answer the most basic question: Is America better off today than it was 4 years ago? By every objective measurable standard, when it comes to the comfort and hope of American families, the Bush administration has failed time and time again. They have a foreign policy which has put us in a situation in Iraq with no end in sight. They have an economic policy giving tax cuts to wealthy people, which has no sensitivity to the struggles working families are facing.

So how are the constituents of President Bush doing, what he calls his base, the wealthiest people in America? Pretty well. HMO profits are up 84 percent, CEO compensation up 20 percent, corporate profits up 15.3 percent. They are doing great on Wall Street but not too great on Main Street, and that is what the issue is going to be in St. Louis at Washington University on Friday night when Senator KERRY faces President Bush in a townhall meeting, where families from across the Midwest can ask the questions on their mind. These are the questions they will ask because they reflect the reality of family life in America.

The President promised us compassionate conservatism. He has failed when it comes to conservatism, as we have record historic deficits. He has certainly failed when it comes to compassion, as he has not addressed the most basic issues: making certain families have good jobs, that they have health insurance to cover them in times of need, that they can afford the college tuition so their kids can have a better life than they have had. These are the issues we are going to face.

What will we do in the Senate after we have considered this important bill on intelligence? We will go to a tax bill which is now in conference, which is larded up with some of the worst special interest favors we have seen in the history of this Senate. That is the best this Republican-led Senate can do, is come up with that kind of a bill at the end to give away literally tens of billions of dollars in a deficit economy to special interest groups again in Washington.

What will we do in this tax bill to help working families and small businesses pay for health insurance? Absolutely nothing. What will we do to stop good-paying jobs, manufacturing jobs, from being outsourced to other countries? Scarcely anything. Very little. It