

in a remote area near the Richmond Municipal Airport. According to Mayor Cornett, the opportunity costs of this Federal meddling is high. The city wants to update fire department equipment, but is strapped for the funding. Curbs, sidewalks and streets need repairs, but the demands of the Federal regulations come first. The city of Richmond is not unique in this regard. The U.S. Conference of Mayors with the firm of Price Waterhouse assessed the cost of 10 unfunded Federal mandates and found that they consumed 11.7 percent of local revenue—(August and September 1993).

As I stated, the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995 is an important first step. To do the full work of right-sizing the Federal Government, this Congress must also: First, address existing unfunded mandates—H.R. 5 directly addresses only prospective mandates; Second, level the playing field between public and private entities—that is to say, private sector entities that provide services such as utilities should receive the same relief from regulation as publicly held entities; and third, reduce barriers to privatization. With regard to the last—privatization—I hope to introduce an amendment to H.R. 5 to reduce barriers to the privatization of federally financed infrastructure assets by State and local governments.

State and local governments should have greater control over infrastructure decisions, on roads, utilities, and airports. Current Federal policy greatly restricts the options available to those governments to manage infrastructure assets with little regard to local priorities.

My amendment would allow State and local governments to transfer Federal-aid facilities to the private sector—either by sale or long-term lease—without repayment of Federal grants, provided the facility continues to be used for its original purpose. This legislation is an extension of Executive Order 12803 on Privatization that President Bush signed in 1992. It would not interfere with any contractual obligations agreed to by local government owners in connection with previous grants.

In my home district, the Second Congressional District of Indiana, there are many examples of successful privatization efforts. Two in particular are the Muncie Youth Opportunity Center and the Anderson Community Hospital Pregnancy Plus Program. The Muncie Youth Opportunity Center is a home for disadvantaged young people privatized and supported by private donations under the very able leadership of Judge Steven Caldemeyer. The center was previously administered by Delaware County and since its privatization, the center has renovated its facilities and begun to serve more needy children in my hometown. The Anderson Community Hospital Pregnancy Plus Program offers prenatal care to women of limited means. Previously

run by the Madison County Department of Health, since privatization, the program has nearly doubled the number of women who have access to prenatal care in this program and expanded to provide post-natal care.

Just adjacent to my district, the city of Indianapolis is a leader in privatization. Indianapolis Mayor Steve Goldsmith has moved 50 public services into the private sector by way of competitive bidding, at a savings of \$115 million.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill and support for my amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DEFAZIO 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 Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MCINNIS 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 New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. VELÁZQUEZ 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 Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BEREUTER 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 Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PROPOSED CHANGES TO H.R. 4, WELFARE REFORM LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that in H.R. 4, the welfare reform legislation, as introduced, unjustly treats taxpaying legal immigrants the same as illegal aliens. The two are very different.

Therefore, today I am introducing legislation that will ensure that taxpaying legal immigrants are not discriminated against.

I am encouraged that the behind the scenes work I have already undertaken appears to have brought the Speaker's and other Republican leaders' attention to this problem. I very much welcome their willingness to fix their oversight. My intention in introducing this bill is to make readily available—to the appropriate committee and subcommittee chairmen—legislative language to fix this flaw. Having introduced this bill, I am hopeful it can be amended into H.R. 4 as soon as possible.

Legal immigrants should not be used as an excuse for a broken-down welfare system that has failed to bring people out of poverty.

The majority of those who receive benefits are either American citizens or illegal aliens.

The frustrations of this country's failed attempts to curb the illegal immigration crisis should not turn into a backlash on legal immigrants.

These law abiding immigrants patiently wait and study for 5 years to become U.S. citizens while illegal aliens have no regard for the law. Legal immigrants contribute to the national identity, whereas illegal immigrants can all too often become a burden to the Nation's taxpayer.

I was an immigrant who entered the United States lawfully. I worked hard for an education and I couldn't wait for the chance to become an American citizen. I still take personal pride knowing that I worked hard, paid my fair share of taxes, earned my way, and provided for my family.

I decided to enter public service so I could pay back my country for the opportunities that it gave me.

Where is the incentive for immigrants to pay taxes, and to enter the United States legally if they are cut off from the system?

With this kind of discrimination why not enter illegally? We should prevent that—not encourage it.

This is why I believe that saving money from denying legal, taxpaying immigrants the benefits for which they have paid and may need in the future, is not the answer.

Instead, Congress should focus on how to get people already on welfare off of it quickly. The Federal Government has spent billions of tax dollars on people who originally needed a temporary helping hand, but soon became accustomed to getting a free ride.

Over time, our country has created a permanent society dependent on the Federal Government. That must be changed.

H.R. 4—the Republican welfare reform bill—will be an effective first step in that process. With the changes I have proposed today, I believe the Republican efforts at welfare reform will be even fairer and more successful.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time out to talk about an issue which I raised briefly in the 1-minute earlier, the question of congressional reform.

I would like to take time because today marks the 1-week point of the strongest and most dynamic reform of this institution that we have seen in decades, and there has been this sense

among many that January 4 brought about an end to the issue of congressional reform.

The new Members who are represented, among others, by the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] here on the floor insisted that we pass a resolution in the Republican conference which called for continued review of the issue of reform of this institution. Because while we have spent a couple of years in the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress and in our Republican conference talking about the need to reform the Congress, we have not completed our job.

Now, on January 4 we did a number of things that were extraordinarily important, having Congress comply with laws that are imposed on every other American, very important; trying to reduce the number of committees and subcommittees in the Congress, very important; reducing the number of committee staff, very important. But we have not completed that effort.

I believe that it was really a first step on the road toward even further reform of the institution.

Now, as we look at some of the things that we would like to do, I believe that this review effort that the Republican conference has put together will have a great deal of input from new Members of this institution, and as they familiarize themselves with the workings of Congress, I am convinced that they will come up with a wide range of recommendations which will include, among other things, probably even more streamlining of the committee process. We, I believe, still need to look at changes that conceivably could be made throughout the 104th Congress.

Also, a number of the items that came up in our rules package need to be incorporated in statute, and we know that if we are going to have complete and full compliance of the laws imposed on every other American, we cannot simply do it with a rules change here. We are going to have to look at a statute.

So I think that what needs to be realized is that tremendous reforms were made with those votes that were cast 1 week ago today, but much work lies ahead. We, of course, during this 100-day period are focusing on the balanced budget amendment, unfunded mandates which we are discussing right now upstairs in the Committee on Rules, and a wide range of other items, and then following the first 100 days, we obviously are going to be addressing items which were actually included in that advertisement that appeared in TV Guide magazine, that pointing out things like health care reform. We have not ignored that, and there are other proposals that will be debated as we go on into the rest of the 104th Congress.

It is important to realize that the 104th Congress is not going to be 100 days long. It is a 2-year period. While we address issues beyond the 100 days,

included among them will be further reform of this institution.

A TRIBUTE TO ED MADIGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLILEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to recognize a former colleague of ours, a Member who represented that part of central Illinois that I now have the privilege to represent, the gentleman who I followed here in these Halls of Congress in 1991, Mr. Ed Madigan.

I want to open this special order of recognition of the life of Ed Madigan with a few comments, a little background about this great individual, and a few personal comments.

Ed Madigan was born in central Illinois in January, on January 13, 1936. He graduated with a business degree from Lincoln College in Lincoln, IL, a community that was his home his entire life.

He was first elected to the Illinois House of Representatives in 1966, and he served there for 6 years until he was elected to Congress in 1972. While serving in Congress, he was the ranking Republican on the Committee on Agriculture the last 8 years in office, and he played a key part in both the 1985 and 1990 farm bills.

Ed Madigan received an honorary doctorate degree in 1974 from his alma mater, Lincoln College, and he received in 1977 honorary doctorate degrees from Millikin University and Illinois Wesleyan University.

Probably one of the great highlights of his career was when he left Congress to go and serve in the Bush Cabinet as Secretary of Agriculture. He was the 24th Secretary of Agriculture of this great country, appointed in 1991, and he served there throughout the remainder of the Bush administration.

As I indicated before, he was a lifelong resident of Lincoln, IL. He was very proud of that. He never lost the roots from which he came.

He though and believed that his major accomplishments in the field of agriculture included the part that he played in the 1985 and the 1990 farm bills. He pushed for greater market orientation in our ag policies, and he was the father of our crop insurance program.

He also began the process of reorganizing the USDA, something that we have carried forward, and he was a major contributor to the GATT negotiations. Ed Madigan not only served agriculture when he was in this Congress, but he served as the ranking member on Energy and Commerce, and on the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment.

In the 97th Congress, he was chairman of the House Research and Plan-

ning Committee, and he was twice appointed chief deputy whip.

Ed Madigan was known as a consensus builder and at the time of his death he was quoted as having said when he first entered Congress, as he began his life in the Nation's Capital, he said that he had one goal: "I have the ambition to be an influential Member of Congress and to use that influence to bring credit to myself and to help people." I think there is no doubt in all of our minds that Ed Madigan achieved that goal.

On a personal basis, Ed Madigan and I were both born within 6 months of each other in the same county, in Logan County, IL, and we both grew to manhood in that rural Illinois county. Our fathers were close friends, and Ed used to enjoy telling his somewhat long stories about how my father would try and outdo his father in some horse deal; but you know, when his story ended, his father always came out on top. But they were interesting, amusing stories.

Ed Madigan was a wonderful speaker, and he had so much charisma. He was a man of his word. He was an honorable person. Ed Madigan was loved by his constituents, respected by his constituents, and he is missed by his former constituents.

□ 1210

He is survived by his wife Evelyn, certainly one of the greatest ladies to ever serve as a spouse in the Washington scene; three daughters, Kimberly, Kellie, and Mary Elizabeth; three grandchildren, to whom he was devoted; and a brother, Senator Robert Madigan, who serves in the Illinois State Legislature, and also one sister, Sandra.

I know that everyone in Illinois joins with me, as do many of my colleagues here today, to remember Ed Madigan, to honor Ed Madigan, and to celebrate life and his service to this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Kansas, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Chairman PAT ROBERTS.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman has indicated, Ed Madigan and the Madigan family come from Illinois, Lincoln, IL, as he has stated, to be exact. And to borrow from President Lincoln's famous address, it is altogether fitting and proper that we do this.

More especially, in regard to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING], who is now so ably representing the 15th district, Mr. EWING, like Ed Madigan, serves on the House Agriculture Committee, and in many ways, I think, exemplifies Ed Madigan's legacy of positive attributes.

All of us who have admired and known and love Ed want to thank my colleague, more especially, for taking this special order.