

openly mock the feelings and sensibilities of the victims and their descendants—to once again victimize the victims.

This is why it is so important to recognize—openly and freely, officially and informally, every single day—the events of the Armenian Genocide.

America, along with the rest of the world, is famous for using the words “never again,” when speaking about the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust carried out by Nazi Germany. Unfortunately, “never again” happens over and over again—in Cambodia, in Rwanda, in Kosovo, and now in present-day Sudan.

It has been a blessing to me in my work that when genocide threatens any people, anywhere in the world, the Armenian-American community has always worked to bring these events to my attention and to the attention of U.S. and international policymakers. The Armenian-American community has always joined with other organizations to educate the public about present-day horrors and to organize relief and support for victims and survivors.

In this way, through these works, the tragedy of the Armenian Genocide is transformed into a legacy of life, of hope, of survival and resistance.

So, I come here today not only to remember and honor the martyrs, survivors and descendants of the Armenian Genocide, but to honor and celebrate this community, which has given back so much to this city and our country.

Please let me thank you—each and every one of you—for allowing me to share this day with you.

CELEBRATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTERNATIONAL REPUBLICAN INSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise because today marks a very important anniversary. We all know that Ronald Reagan in the mid-1980s talked about the fact that as we pursued an end to the Cold War militarily, one of the important things for us to do was to also engage in democracy-building around the world. Today actually marks the 20th anniversary of the International Republican Institute, which is an arm of the National Endowment For Democracy.

We all remember the anxious final years of the Cold War, when President Reagan, in a speech he gave in 1982 to the British Parliament, envisioned moving toward a world in which all people are at least free to determine their own destiny. Now, that speech led to the creation of the National Endowment for Democracy, and within that is the International Republican Institute. Since that time, the IRI has conducted programs in over 75 countries, from Haiti to Kazakhstan. Its efforts to train political parties, encourage voter participation, and enact institutional reforms within governments have no doubt contributed greatly to President Reagan's goal.

IRI's continued commitment is evident in its current efforts in Iraq and

Afghanistan. As we confront the threat of terrorism in the post-September 11 world, I am confident that the International Republican Institute will continue as an important contributor to the cause of freedom.

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized during morning hour debates.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will take aim at a looming injustice. The marriage tax penalty was a relic of 40 years of persistent tax hikes codified by Democrat Congresses into Federal law. In essence, it punished married taxpayers simply for being married. The standard deduction married couples could take was less than that allowed for two single taxpayers, thus the Tax Code discouraged marriage and sent a message to married couples around the country that they were not as entitled to their own money as singles were.

In 2001, a Republican Congress passed and a Republican President signed a tax relief package that corrected this injustice and brought marriage equity to the Tax Code. In 2003, as the economy worked to recover from 2 years of recession, terrorism, and war, we moved to expedite marriage penalty relief. Unfortunately, the marriage penalty, like some B-movie vampire, just will not die. It keeps rising from the dead to wreak more havoc on the paychecks of American families.

The marriage penalty is hoping to reappear next year in a smaller form and to be fully revived in 2010. So this week the House will take up legislation to make sure that the marriage tax penalty does not get its sequel. Instead, we will pass a bill to extend full marriage penalty relief through 2010 and beyond so that marriage tax equity becomes a permanent principle in Federal law.

Any way you look at it, marriage tax equity just makes sense. In the first place, any time we can establish flatter, fairer, and lower taxes on working families, we are doing right by the national economy. We are creating jobs, careers, and opportunities all across this country. And, second, we are telling those married couples struggling to make it that we will not turn our backs on them.

Allowing the marriage penalty to resurface in the future would represent a targeted tax hike on married couples and a direct attack on family budgets around the country. We can and must protect families from such an attack, and the bill we will take up this week will accomplish that goal.

Though the economy continues to rebound, working families still need our help. This week we will have an opportunity to provide it to some of the people who need it the most.

STOP THE FISCAL MADNESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes during morning hour debates.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this week the American people will see that what our Republican friends lack in policy candor they more than make up for in chutzpah. Why do I say that? This week, as we have just heard, the Republican majority is expected to take up legislation that would permanently eliminate the marriage penalty. Everybody on this House floor is for that objective.

But do not be fooled. Democrats and Republicans both agree that married couples should not have to pay more in taxes than they would as unmarried individuals filing separately. That makes sense. That is fair. We are for it. Members in both parties agree that the so-called marriage penalty should be remedied.

However, here is the crucial difference between the Republican bill and our Democratic substitute. Our bill is paid for, theirs is not. What is the difference? The difference is that the penalty that we are eliminating in terms of marriages will be passed along to every young family in America, every young person in America. All of my children and my grandchildren will pay an additional penalty in the interest they will have to pay because of the irresponsible policies being pursued by the majority.

That is right. With a record budget deficit this year of more than half a trillion dollars, and with a projected 10-year budget surplus of \$5.6 trillion inherited by this administration turned into a projected deficit of more than \$4 trillion, an almost \$10 trillion turnaround to the negative, our friends on the Republican side of the aisle plan to drive us even deeper into debt.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), perhaps summed up the Republican fiscal policy best on March 17 when he said, and I am quoting, “We don't believe that you should have to pay for tax cuts, period.” Well, Mr. NUSSLE and my Republican friends, of course you do not; but our children and grandchildren will have to pay that bill. Somebody, sometime, sometime in the future will have to pay the piper.

According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, this Republican marriage penalty bill will cost \$96 billion over the next 10 years. None of it is paid for. And to make matters worse, House Republicans intend to bring up bills in the next 3 weeks to make the 10 percent tax bracket and child tax credit permanent. We are for that. It ought to be paid for. And to temporarily fix the alternative minimum tax. We are for that. It ought to be paid for.

Again, Democrats support such legislation, but it must be paid for so that we do not simply say to our children,

"You pay for it"; to our grandchildren, "you pay for it, we don't want to."

Democrats believe it is a serious failure to pay for these tax cuts, which not only threatens our economic future as these deficits grow and the American people become more concerned about rising interest rates, as Alan Greenspan last week said was a definite possibility, but we also have a responsibility.

We talk a lot about personal responsibility. We passed a bankruptcy bill, and we made it tougher for people to go into bankruptcy because we said they needed to be responsible. I voted for that bill. It was a bipartisanly supported bill. We need to be responsible on behalf of the public that sent us here and on behalf of future generations.

Meanwhile, as we debate this tax bill, Republicans on both sides of Capitol Hill are riven by internal conflict. They still have not produced a budget conference report for fiscal 2005 because of the intransigence of House Republicans to accept pay-as-you-go rules. That sounds very common sense. You pay as you go. You pay your bills. We talk about every American family having to do that. That may be the case; but we do not have to do it, and we are not doing it.

Alan Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve, said applying pay-as-you-go to both expenditures and revenues is essential if we are to have fiscal responsibility. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle sent us a budget which says we are going to do that; but on this side of the Congress we have overwhelming, almost unanimous, support, if not unanimous support, for that proposition. It was in place from 1990 to 2002. But it was changed. Why? Because it would make us be responsible, and being responsible would not allow us to do some of the things the Republican majority wants to do.

Here is what the Bipartisan Concord Coalition said, headed up by, among others, Senator Warren Rudman, a Republican from New Hampshire, and three other budget watchdog groups have said about such pay-as-you-go rules: "If Congress wants to pass particular tax cuts, it should either reduce mandatory programs or raise other revenues to offset the tax reduction measures, not simply give itself a free pass to enact tax cuts without financing them."

It feels good for us to say, Hah-hah, we have cut your taxes. Hooray. But unless we cut spending at the same time, which is what pay-as-you-go says we need to do, then do not pass that debt along to future generations. That is all it says. Every responsible American with common sense would say, yes, that is what we ought to do.

They have turned the foreign sales corporation bill, another bill which requires that some \$5 billion in export subsidies be repealed and replaced by modest tax breaks, into a \$170 billion special-interest giveaway.

□ 1245

Not only are we creating greater tax liability by passing these tax bills without paying for them, we want to see them pass, we want to pay for them, but now they are talking about this Foreign Service Corporation bill which could cost us and we could fix for less than \$10 billion, now they want to make it into a \$170 billion tax giveaway. One business lobbyist even told the Washington Post that this bill "has risen to new levels of sleaze."

Is it any wonder pursuing those kinds of policies that we have now gone into a \$10 trillion turnaround in terms of from black to red? We talk about blue States and red States. We have gone from black, having surpluses, \$5.6 trillion, four surpluses in a row from 1997 to 2001, the first time that had happened in 80 years. In just months, that was turned into escalating deficits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to come to their senses, to do what makes sense to the American families, to the American public. No married couple wants to have a marriage penalty but I do not think there is any married couple who wants to have their children saddled with the escalating debts incurred in their generation and passed to future generations.

For years, House Republicans preened as deficit hawks. Some even suggested that tax cuts are not, in fact, sacrosanct. My friend the majority leader spoke a little earlier. In 1997, the majority leader, Mr. DELAY, who just spoke, said of Jack Kemp, another Republican who ran for Vice President, a former Member of this body, an ardent proponent of supply-side tax cuts: "Jack Kemp worships at the altar of tax cuts. Jack has always said that deficits don't matter. We think that deficits do matter." So said TOM DELAY with reference to Jack Kemp. If they matter, Mr. Leader, why are we not addressing them? Why do we make them worse? Why are we escalating the debt that our children will be confronted with?

With this vote on the marriage penalty relief this week, we will see whether Republicans still believe that deficits matter.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING REVITALIZATION ACT OF 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the High-Performance Computing—or HPC—Revitalization Act of 2004, which will ensure that America remains a leader in the development and use of supercomputers. When we think of how computers affect our lives, we probably think of the work we do on our office desktop ma-

chines, or maybe the Internet surfing we do in our spare time. We do not normally think of the enormous contribution that supercomputers, also called high-performance computers, make to the world around us. These powerful machines are used in the development of pharmaceuticals, in modeling the Earth's climate, and in applications critical to ensuring our national and homeland security.

High-performance computers also are central to maintaining U.S. leadership in many scientific fields. Computational science complements theory and experimentation in fields such as plasma physics and fusion, astrophysics, nuclear physics and genomics. But the top computer in the world today, the Earth Simulator, is not in the United States. It is in Japan. Some experts claim that Japan was able to produce the Earth Simulator, a computer far ahead of American machines, because the U.S. had taken an overly cautious or conventional approach. Beginning in the 1990s, the U.S. focused on a single architecture for high-performance computing and emphasized the use of commercially available components over custom-made components. In hindsight we see that this approach has meant lost opportunities. Japan's Earth Simulator is an example of a road not taken.

The U.S. is still a leader in supercomputing. In fact, 10 of the top 20 most powerful computers in the world today are in the United States. Even so, the Earth Simulator is nearly three times as fast as the most powerful computer in the U.S., The ASCI Q computer at Los Alamos National Laboratory. But for security reasons, most U.S. scientists are unable to conduct research on the Los Alamos machine, or at machines at other similarly secure facilities that do defense and weapons work. That is why we must commit to providing sustained support for high-performance computers at our civilian Federal agencies. To achieve this aim, my bill ensures that the U.S. research community has access to high-performance computing systems that are among the most advanced in the world, and provides technical support for users of these systems.

But it is not enough to simply buy big machines. We need to have a balanced, comprehensive approach to maximize the benefits these machines can bring to science and to our Nation. My bill provides support for all aspects of high-performance computing for scientific and engineering applications.

The original legislation that my bill amends, the High Performance Computing Act of 1991, gave rise to an interagency planning process that was initially highly successful. Unfortunately, that planning process has lost the vitality it had in its early years. Congress must find a way to reinvigorate the interagency process.

My bill does so by requiring the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy at the White House