

the likelihood. Ninety percent. Yet we say that the prisons are too crowded and we probably have to let these people out early on good behavior. Oftentimes they tell their probation officers and the courts that they are sick and they need help; and yet they are told, well, you will have to find it somewhere in the mental health corridor of your community.

We expect them to show up. That is another really mind-boggling thought here, that we tell these people that have been convicted of violently raping women and children that they should show up to a local official and register so that they can be on an offender list. That is not going to happen, so we have to stop trusting them to show up and register.

As we begin this process, I welcome both sides of the aisle, as I mentioned my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), in this debate to try to strengthen and codify into law things that will actually work. No more panaceas, no more feel-good solutions, no more expectations that these people who commit these crimes repeatedly will somehow become models of behavior in their communities. We have to be sure that they are monitored. Whether it is through ankle bracelets or other means, we will insist that they be followed, that they be pursued, and if they violate again that they never be let out of jail to harm another individual or innocent citizen.

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

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### OPPOSED TO CAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the Central American Free Trade Agreement, otherwise known as CAFTA. As many of my colleagues here know, CAFTA is nothing more than a green light for corporations to outsource American jobs.

I am appalled by some of the awful provisions in this shameful trade agreement. When you look at the restrictions on Central American workers and the outsourcing of American jobs, you will quickly realize that there is nothing free about the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

My friends, make no mistake, if we ratify this agreement there will be no jobs left in this country to outsource. Did we not learn anything as a body from the NAFTA agreement? The lesson we should have learned from NAFTA was that not all free trade agreements give us fair trade.

For instance, NAFTA, which was supposed to be this great jobs creator, middle class creator in Mexico, failed to create the middle class that it promised. Since NAFTA, the rich are getting richer in Mexico while poverty and income disparity are more prevalent than ever. As NAFTA failed to protect the middle class, so will CAFTA.

Congress needs to step up and tell the administration that worker protections matter. We need to do what is right and support trade policy that is fair and balanced. We need to do what is right and make agreements that strengthen labor protections, not overlook them. We need to do what is right for safeguarding the environment. We need to do what is right for all working people and scrap this terrible agreement. We have a moral obligation to make trade fair for all Americans and the rest of the world.

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

(Mr. MELANCON addressed 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHUSTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the greatest public servant and political leader the City of Chicago has ever produced, the late Mayor Richard J. Daley.

Mayor Daley, who passed away in 1976, was elected and inaugurated to his first term as mayor 50 years ago this month. It is not an overstatement to say that the Chicago most of the world recognizes today is a legacy of Mayor Daley. In his 21 years in office, Mayor Daley earned the nickname Dick the Builder, as he helped guide the construction of the Sears Tower, O'Hare Airport, the John Hancock building, Chicago's expressway system, McCormick Place, twice, and dozens of other renowned landmarks synonymous with the city. Richard J. Daley turned the city of Al Capone and pork bellies into the world capital of Mies Van der Rohe and jet travel.

The great Chicago songwriter Steve Goodman put it this way in a tribute song: "When it came to building big buildings, no job was too tough. Daley built McCormick place twice because once was not enough."

Last night, Richard J. Daley's memory was honored at a dinner by those who knew and worked with him as well as by individuals who simply wanted to celebrate the legacy of this great American leader. Appropriately, events took place on the campus of the University of Illinois at Chicago, UIC, which the mayor felt was his greatest achievement. So strong was his commitment to education that for nearly 30 years, from his days in the Illinois General Assembly in the 1930s until the completion of UIC in the 1960s, Richard J. Daley fought to bring a branch campus of our State's world-class public university to the people of Chicago and the region.

The mayor's achievements were not limited to the city's skyline. He was a political leader who others, such as Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Baynes Johnson, counted on not only for support but good advice on important issues of the day.

Mayor Daley was truly a self-made man. Before he was the leader of one of the world's great cities, he was a kid from the Bridgeport neighborhood who put himself through college and law school working as a cowboy at the famous Union Stockyards. As a State legislator in the 1930s, he married a lovely young woman from Bridgeport named Eleanor "Sis" Guilfoyle, with whom he raised seven outstanding children, including Richard M. Daley, the current mayor of Chicago; John Daley, chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Cook County Board and Democratic Committeeman of the 11th Ward; and William Daley, former U.S. Commerce Secretary. However, Mayor and Mrs. Daley were as proud of their children who pursued careers in teaching and homemaking as they were of their sons involved in public service.

I had the honor to meet Mayor Daley once as a young man. After my father's inauguration as a Chicago alderman in 1975, our family met the mayor and Mrs. Daley at a reception. As the young Alderman Lipinski shook Mayor Daley's hand, it seemed the mayor did not recognize him, until the ever-observant and ever-gracious Sis Daley gently reminded the mayor who the gentleman in front of him was.

Like all great leaders, Richard J. Daley had his share of setbacks and critics, but his legacy was and is Chicago's reputation, the City That Works. Mr. Speaker, let us not forget this legacy on the 50th anniversary of Mayor Richard J. Daley's inauguration.

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

(Mr. FEENEY addressed 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 Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky addressed 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 South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina addressed 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 Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### DEMOCRAT CAMPAIGN AGAINST MAJORITY LEADER

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, the Democrat leadership has led their party on a campaign against the Republican majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), through baseless character assassinations and misleading attacks. It is time to start hearing the truth, though.

The media reported yet that the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), a Democrat, disclosed in 2001 that a registered lobbyist paid for her trip to Puerto Rico, a trip the minority leader was also on, in clear violation of House rules.

On February 28, the minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), publicly called for an investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the majority leader. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) stated: "These are substantive allegations," that must be "fully investigated by the Ethics Committee."

□ 1745

But so far there have been no calls for an investigation of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) or the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) by the rest of the Democrat leadership. Is this hypocrisy? Democrats want to apply the House rules, but they do not want to apply the rules to themselves. Let us see if the Democrats really care about ethics or if they are more interested in personal attacks.

I believe these developments are further evidence that the Democrats are not interested in taking a thorough, honest look into the allegations against the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY); all they want to do is obstruct the work of the House of Representatives.

Yesterday Republican leaders of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct agreed to impanel a formal investigation into the recent allegations regarding the majority leader, but Democrats flatly refused to allow the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to begin the work this year.

Instead of allowing the case to be heard in an appropriate venue, an investigation by the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, Democrats are trying to use the media to launch a partisan, politically motivated attack against the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader, rather than giving the gentleman from Texas an appropriate opportunity to respond.

Majority Leader DELAY has said over and over that he has done nothing wrong, and has expressed his desire to publicly present and state his case. Indeed, he wants an ethics hearing to clear his good name and to keep ethics from being used for partisan, political purposes.

Appearing before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is the most appropriate venue for this to happen. The refusal to even allow the case to be heard before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is clear evidence that the Democrat leadership is not concerned about seeing this matter reviewed. They only want to use this situation to obstruct the legislative process.

It is a move carefully designed by partisan political hacks, carefully designed to achieve nothing more than purely partisan political gain. These actions obstruct legislation that the American people want.

So far under the majority leader's leadership, Republicans have passed a comprehensive energy policy, killed the death tax for small businesses and family-owned businesses, improved America's highways by passing a transportation bill, passed tort reform, passed bankruptcy reform, and is poised to modernize and strengthen our Social Security system.

Rather than effect change through elections, they have chosen, the Democrat leadership has chosen, to use partisan attacks and a conspiracy of character assassination to destroy the reputation of one of the most successful legislative leaders in this century and in the last century and, in fact, in congressional history.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more unethical than falsely accusing another human being in order to destroy that person's reputation. There is nothing more unethical, there is nothing more disgraceful than falsely accusing another human being. That is

what the Democrat leadership has done, that is what the minority leader and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) are doing. They are stonewalling the ethics process for partisan gain, and we will not stand for it.

We ask the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the Democratic leadership to stop these attacks. Call off the dogs.

Mr. Speaker, we need a reasonable ethics process in this House. We need to say enough is enough when it comes to partisan political attacks. Let us move forward with the American people's agenda.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWARZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again it is an honor to not only address the House, but the American people, to make sure that this government stays within the realm of the responsibility that the American people have given us to come to this U.S. House of Representatives and this Congress to represent them and their needs and their family's needs.

Those great Americans that have worked their entire lives to save and be a part of the Social Security system, to make sure that we hold our promise to their well-being not only during their retirement years, but even those that are beneficiaries of those that have passed on.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader, has designated this hour for the 30-something Working Group. And every week we come to the floor to address not only the House, but we keep the American people up to date on what is happening regarding Social Security and the challenges they are facing with the ongoing effort not only by the President, but also by some Members on the majority side to privatize Social Security.

I can tell Members that we pride ourselves on making sure that we get not only accurate, but up-to-date information so we can share not only mainly with the Members of this Congress the importance of the reason why they need to stand up and represent their constituents.

I must say I am very pleased that a number of Democrats on this side of the aisle, and I do mean almost 110 percent, I will say there are many Democrats who are big, heavy supporters of Social Security and do not want to see it privatized. I believe we are 100 percent.

I believe, on the majority side, we have a few Members who are holding out and are saying they are not going to gamble with their constituents' future, their guaranteed retirement.

Last week we talked about the 48 million Americans that celebrate a Social Security benefit which is right