FISCAL YEAR 2004 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF NOVEMBER 14, 2003—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L. 108–90)	30,216	18,192	0
Interior Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L. 108–108)	19,673	13,202	0
Total, appropriations acts:	422,346	313,178	0
Continuing Resolution Authority: Third Continuing Resolution, 2004 (P.L. 108–107)	325,871	174,311	−1
Total, enacted this session	771,288	505,110	−135,432
Cleared, pending signature:			
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (H.R. 1588)	4,418	960	4
Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2004 (H.R. 2559)	9,316	2,567	0
District of Columbia Military Retirement Equity Act of 2003 (H.R. 3054)	1	1	1
An act to re-authorize certain school lunch and child nutrition programs (H.R. 3232)	7	7	0
An act to amend Title XXI of the Social Security Act (H.R. 3288)	0	9	0
Total, cleared, pending signature:	13,742	3,544	5
Entitlements and mandatories: Difference between enacted levels and budget resolution estimates for appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	357,573	337,353	0
Total Current Level [1], [2]	1,861,384	1,883,370	1,330,943
Total Budget Resolution	1,880,555	1,903,502	1,325,452
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	0	0	5,491
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	19,171	20,132	0
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2004–2008:			
House Current Level	0	0	8,376,570
House Budget Resolution	0	0	8,168,933
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	0	0	207,637

[1] Per section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level excludes the following items: outlays of $262 million from funds provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act of 2003 (P.L. 108–69); budget authority of −$9 million and outlays of $573 million from funds provided in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L. 108–83); budget authority of $87,547 million and outlays of $37,103 million provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, 2004 (P.L. 108–106); and budget authority of $400 million and outlays of $67 million provided in the Interior Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L. 108–108).

[2] For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the budget resolution does not include Social Security administrative expenses. As a result, the current level excludes budget authority of $3,812 million and outlays of $3,819 million for these items.

Notes.—P.L.=Public Law.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE GOODS MOVEMENT PROJECTS OF NATIONAL ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE (H.R. 3398)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of this Congress, legislation that I recently introduced.

The Goods Movement Projects of National Economic Significance is legislation that addresses some of our nation's most pressing transportation and economic needs.

THIS IS THE PROBLEM

How freight moves through our communities is an important issue with far reaching implications. Goods movement is the driving force of our nation's economy. This is a state issue, a Federal issue and it is an issue that directly affects the communities in which we live.

According to the Federal Highway Administration, $7.4 trillion in goods were moved on the nation's highway system in 1998, directly employing 10 million people.

In 2000, $706 billion in international merchandise trade flowed through U.S. Seaports and $646 billion was handled by our Railroads.

The volume of goods is projected to grow nationally by 67 percent over the next two decades.

This tremendous growth in international trade will continue to place an increasingly heavy burden on our nation's seaports, trade corridors, highways and rail lines.

Traffic congestion, delays, accidents, and freight transportation costs have increased as a result.

On a human level—our citizens are spending more and more time stuck in traffic instead of at home with their families.

THIS IS THE HISTORY

Over the past 30 years our population has grown, our international trade has increased and our congestion has worsened.

For example, in 1970, trade was 12 percent of U.S. gross domestic product (GDP). Today, it is over 25 percent.

Since 1970 the population of the U.S. has grown by 40 percent. At the same time, the number of registered vehicles has increased by 100 percent while our road capacity has increased by only 6 percent.

By the year 2020, shipment of containerized cargo moving in and out of the United States will increase by more than 350 percent.

By the year 2020, total domestic tonnage of freight carried by all U.S. freight systems will increase by at least 67 percent and international trade will increase by nearly 100 percent.

The transportation reauthorization bill is the perfect opportunity for us to address these pressing transportation infrastructure needs.

TEA–21 began to address Goods Movement issues with the creation of the Borders and Corridors Program.

But we need to take it further during this reauthorization bill.

Back in 1998 when the Borders and Corridors program was created in TEA–21, the intent was to create a discretionary program that provided federal funding for transportation projects and initiatives that supported, enhanced and helped the movement of goods and economic development through the gateway and trade corridors in this country.

The program provided $140 million a year. During the first 3 years the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) received over $2 billion in grant requests per year.

After the third year, the entire Borders and Corridors program had been earmarked.

Aside from the fact that the authorized amount of $140 million per year was far too low to meet our Nation's infrastructure needs, the earmarking of this program has proved problematic.

It has prevented communities and regions from developing comprehensive programs and plans that addresses goods movement issues of our transportation infrastructure.

We must have a dedicated source of funding to ensure that goods movement and projects of economic significance can be built and that these projects contribute to the overall efficiency of the national transportation infrastructure.

As we continue the dialog of reauthorizing the transportation bill, the Goods Movement Projects of National Economic Significance needs to be a part of that conversation.

THIS IS WHAT WE MUST DO

Goods Movement Projects of National Economic Significance will do the following:

It will provide $3 billion per year to a Goods Movement Program.

Given the history of the Borders and Corridors Program we can safely assume that our transportation infrastructure can use at a minimum, $3 billion a year, or $18 billion for the life of the 6-year reauthorization bill.

This legislation separates the Borders and Corridors Program and creates one strong Corridor and Gateway Program.

Corridor projects represented 95 percent of the project requests for the Borders and Corridors program.

My legislation focuses our resources on projects and initiatives that promote the safe, secure and efficient mobility of goods and on the immediate and long-term needs of our transportation infrastructure.

This legislation combines and enhances elements of two highly successful transportation programs. This program uses the criteria from the Corridors program and combines it with the fiscal responsibility of the full funding grant agreement of the transit New Start Program.

Specifically, this program provides $1½ billion a year, $9 billion over the life of the reauthorization bill for local communities, states and the Federal Government to plan and build Goods Movement projects.

These projects will ultimately enhance local, regional, and state economies, and ultimately the national economy.

Finally, $1½ billion a year or $9 billion over the life of the reauthorization bill will be dedicated to funding projects of National Economic Significance.

Throughout the country there are national bottlenecks that congest our communities and slow our national economy down.

As we all know from experience—if there is a bottleneck on the highway, traffic several miles away can be affected.

If the type of gridlock that I just described happens and goes unchecked, it will affect an entire region, and the entire country, and ultimately our economy and the livability of our communities.

These are projects located throughout the country that are ready to go major investments in the national transportation infrastructure.

By funding these projects we will be stimulating the national economy while investing in the long-term health of our national transportation infrastructure.

This legislation, like the entire transportation reauthorization bill is an economic stimulus package. For every billion dollars invested in public transportation infrastructure 47,000 jobs are created.

I ask my colleagues to strongly support this legislation as part of the transportation reauthorization bill.

Join me and support The Goods Movement Projects of National Economic Significance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan addresed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addresed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RYAN of Ohio addresed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

A FREE PRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration has openly demonstrated its dissatisfaction with the stories that the major media has chosen to broadcast about Iraq, saying that the news media too often covers the negative events that occur in Iraq but rarely reports the positive happenings there. In fact, in their peak in order to achieve its desired results, the administration has regularly pressured reporters to find the so-called good news in Iraq or lose access.

Perhaps the reason reporters have been focusing on the so-called negative stories about Iraq has something to do with the fact that since the start of the war in March, over 412 soldiers have been killed in action, in fact, two more today. Over 2,000 have been wounded and at least 7,000 have been evacuated to hospitals for noncombat medical conditions, not to mention that approximately 4,000 unarmed Iraqis have perished since the war began.

□ 2330

You have to agree, it is a bit easier to understand the media's decision about which stories to report when those tragic numbers are considered.

Still, the White House wants reporters to focus on the supposedly good news, but intimidating reporters into writing stories that make President Bush look good is not enough for the White House. Instead of just spinning the news, Bush's people want nothing short of controlling the information that comes back to the United States from Iraq. They want to have final say as to what gets reported and what does not, what the American public actually knows and what is spoken only in faded whispers halfway around the world.

So they decided to do what any autocratic, propaganda-loving dictator like Saddam Hussein himself would have done, bypass the media entirely.

The Coalition Provisional Authority, which runs Iraq and was created by the Bush administration, plans to create its own broadcast operation which will broadcast live to the United States 24 hours a day from Iraq, and one of the worst parts about this project is that the money to pay for it comes from the $87 billion in emergency supplemental funds that Congress recently approved to continue military operations in Iraq. That means that the U.S. taxpayers are paying for Bush's propaganda campaign that attempts to falsify and falsely mold their perceptions about the increasingly unsustainable situation in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time the Bush administration has dared to control the media. Fearing that support for his Iraq policy would fade if Americans caught sight of U.S. soldiers returning home in flag-draped caskets, the Bush administration banned all news coverage and photography of dead soldiers' homecomings on all military bases. This new, government-run propaganda operation, which is informally referred to within the administration as C–SPAN Baghdad, represents a new low even for the Bush administration. Influencing the media is one thing; controlling it is something entirely different.

Mr. Speaker, we must stay on top of this.

HISTORY OF MEDICAID

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to give my colleagues a little bit of history about the entitlement programs.

When I was in the Indiana State Senate in 1969, the Federal Government came to Indiana and said if we did not take the Medicaid program, they would withdraw $2.5 million in Federal highway funds from Indiana. They were, in effect, blackjacking our State, and I went to the floor of the State Senate and said we ought to tell them to keep their $2.5 million because it will cost us 10 times that much if we take the Medicaid program. Boy, was I off.

The Medicaid program that we thought would end up around $20, $25 million is now $1.4 billion or 70 times, 70 times what we anticipated, and then the Medicare program, which was passed in 1965 I believe, it was supposed to cost $3 billion the first year. In fact, it was $3 billion. In 2001, it was $241 billion. That is 80 times more, 80 times more than it was initially.

The prescription drugs that are in the bill that we are talking about right now they said was going to cost $400 billion, that provision. The bill has not even gotten out of the conference committee yet, and it is already up to $432 billion according to CBO. If we look at the way the Medicaid program has progressed over the past 25 to 30 years and we look at how the Medicare program has progressed over the past 25 to 30 to 40 years, we can assume that the prescription drug benefit is going to go out of sight as well, and if that happens, if it goes up say 70 times, like Medicare and Medicaid did, we could see an annual expenditure for prescription drugs of $2- or $3 trillion. This thing could bankrupt America.

So we should be looking at another approach, which is the reimportation that we talked about, putting competition and market prices into effect and competition to keep the prescription drug prices down. Seventy-six percent of the seniors in this country already have prescription drug coverage. So we are only talking about the other 24 or 25 percent, and yet we are going to have an all-encompassing program when we should only be helping those who truly need the help, but for those who really are looking forward to the program, let me just give my colleagues some facts, and I hope that there may be some seniors and my colleagues who are paying attention to this.

The premium per year is $420. Then there is an additional $275 deductible. That is a total of $695 the seniors will have to pay before they get a dime, and then they pay 25 percent of the first $2,200 of prescription drugs that they buy. That is another $550. So they are going to pay $1,245 before they get a dime, $1,245, and then for that $1,245, they are going to get $1,650 in coverage.

That is not the end of it because between $2,200 and $3,600 there is no coverage whatsoever. So that is another $1,400 that they will be out of pocket. If we add that together, that means if a senior citizen has to spend $3,000 on