

"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

to develop and maintain a research, development and deployment roadmap for the provision of high-performance computing systems for use by the research community in the United States. By putting OSTP in charge of developing the program's long-term vision, this provision will help ensure a robust planning process so that our national high-performance computing effort is not allowed to lag in the future.

Let me close by reflecting for a moment on how much things have changed in the past 13 years since Congress first passed legislation on high-performance computing. Incredibly, all of the power of the world's top supercomputer in 1991, the Cray C90, is now available to us in a desktop PC. Hearing a comparison like that, it might be tempting to think that today's supercomputers are so powerful that we could not possibly need anything with greater capabilities. But technological advances make new things possible, things that were literally unimaginable before. As we meet in this Chamber today, we cannot imagine the kinds of problems that the supercomputers of tomorrow will be able to solve. But we can imagine the kinds of problems we will have if we fail to provide researchers in the United States with the computing resources they need to remain world class. I believe that the High-Performance Computing Revitalization Act will guide Federal agencies in providing needed support to high-performance computing and its user communities. Our Nation's scientific enterprise, and our economy, will be the stronger for it.

ENERGY TASK FORCE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today I hope we are one step closer to prying the doors of the White House open in regard to Vice President CHENEY's Energy Task Force.

For 3 years now, the Vice President has done everything he can to keep the records of the Energy Task Force secret. The secret task force developed President Bush's energy policy, a policy that was then made into legislation here in Congress, legislation that is now stalled in the other body. Nevertheless, the end result was bad energy policy. There is no doubt that the energy industry succeeded with its influence during these secret, closed-door meetings in crafting a policy that benefited them rather than benefiting Americans who at the time desperately needed relief from high energy prices.

Mr. Speaker, today Americans face high gas prices, but they should not be fooled by claims from congressional Republicans and President Bush that the legislation they pushed would reduce the cost of energy in this country.

Instead, the President's plan was nothing more than a payback to the oil and gas industry numbering in the billions of dollars and embedded in tax incentives, loan guarantees, liability protection and research and development.

For 3 years, the Vice President has refused to let the American people know who made up this Energy Task Force. For 3 years now, the Vice President has refused to let the American people know how and why the task force came to the conclusions that it did.

Finally, after 3 years of hiding the information, today the U.S. Supreme Court hears from the Vice President's lawyers why CHENEY thinks it is so important that this information remain secret. Today, the Supreme Court hears from the Sierra Club and the conservative group, Judicial Watch, who sued Vice President CHENEY seeking an accounting of energy industry participation in crafting the Bush administration's destructive energy policy. A district court has already ordered the administration to provide information about participation from those industries but once again the Bush administration refused to divulge any information. Fortunately, the court denied the request, and last December the Vice President appealed that decision to the Supreme Court.

So what does the Vice President do once he realizes the Supreme Court would be hearing the case? He goes duck hunting with one of the Supreme Court justices as a guest of an energy executive. The situation begs several questions. First, was the energy executive hosting the Vice President and Justice Scalia a member of the Energy Task Force? Second, was the Vice President attempting to use this trip to Louisiana as a way to persuade Justice Scalia that the documents being requested should remain secret under the cloak of executive privilege? And, third, how could either Vice President CHENEY or Justice Scalia think this trip to Louisiana for duck hunting, in which both flew to and from together on Air Force Two, would not look like a conflict of interest?

Justice Scalia should have recused himself from this case, but Vice President CHENEY should have realized how this trip would appear to the American public. Think about this for a minute. Imagine that you are a plaintiff in a case and you learn that the defendant and the judge had vacationed together several months before. Would you accept that scenario? The Sierra Club asked Justice Scalia to recuse himself but Justice Scalia refused.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will please suspend.

The Chair must remind all Members that remarks in debate may not engage in personalities towards the President or the Vice President. Policies may be addressed in critical terms, but personal references of an offensive, accusatory nature are not proper.

The gentleman may proceed in order. Mr. PALLONE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just hope the Cheney decision in this case is not another 5-4 decision in which Justice Scalia is the deciding vote in favor of the Vice President.

It is time for the Vice President to come forward with the list of participants on the Energy Task Force. What information is so damaging that the Vice President does not want to make it public? I think the time has come for both President Bush and Vice President CHENEY to lift the cloak of secrecy on its national energy plan and basically disclose what happened, who the participants were, and how and in what way they influenced the energy bill that came forward here in the House and is now in the other body. I think it is very wrong for them to continue to not provide this information, not disclose who was involved, and frankly have to go to the Supreme Court to try to make the Supreme Court say that that information should not be divulged.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SCHROCK) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Balance and scales belong to the Lord; all the weights used with them are of His making.

Lord, with wisdom and power, direct the activities of this Congress. May the scales of equal justice always be the goal. With discretion and surety guide every decision, and may Members find balance in their personal lives.

May truth never outweigh goodness. May desirable kindness never blind the truth.

Help Your people know when to pray and how to act.

Bless all conversations with patience and charity that all know when to speak and how to listen.

In the end, all success and every judgment can be measured only by You. Whatever evaluating criteria or determining weight we use remains of Your making now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the