us. He was not only a representative who knew how to get the job done, but someone who knew how to keep things in perspective.

As one editorial noted of Ed:

> You didn't have to know him well to know that at the top of his list was family. He loved to talk politics but he could also spend considerably time talking about how his wife, Evelyn, gave him the support that was really important.

The writer goes on to observe that after his election to the House, in the face of overwhelming new responsibilities and challenges, Ed's principal concern was how his family would adjust to life in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, in his all too short life, Ed Madigan contributed great intelligence and insight to the public policy debates in this country, and we will long cherish his memory. He showed us all what distinguished public service really means and we will miss him more than words can say.

I join my colleagues in expressing our deepest condolences to Ed's wife, Evelyn, and to his entire family. All Americans share in your great loss, and our thoughts and prayers are with you.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Ed Madigan, a thoughtful, consensus-seeking public servant who carved out a great career in Washington, first as a 10-term Member of this body and later as Secretary of Agriculture under President Bush.

In the House, Ed's leadership skills were demonstrated by his rise to the fifth-ranking position in the Republican hierarchy: Chairman of the party's Research and Planning Committee. He was also appointed twice as chief deputy whip.

Later, the Illinois Representative gave up his leadership post to assume the ranking Republican position on the Agriculture Committee, playing a key role for 8 years on farm legislation. He was especially instrumental in shaping the 1985 farm bill.

In addition to serving as Secretary of Agriculture at a time when the Department had a high profile, Ed was named by President Bush to serve as lead negotiator on the agriculture section of the trade negotiations under GATT.

Since leaving Government service, and until his untimely death last month, Ed had been associated with a major Illinois-based insurance company and had served on the board of a number of corporations.

Ed was a soft-spoken, generous individual who let his achievements speak for themselves. He leaves a great legacy in this body, where so many of us counted him as a good friend.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Ed Madigan's unexpected passing away came as a shock to all of us who regarded him as our friend. Had he lived, he would have celebrated his 59th birthday the day after tomorrow.

Ed Madigan served the citizens of his district in north-central Illinois for almost two decades. And he served them well.

His legislative career began in 1967 in Springfield where he served in the Illinois State House of Representatives.

He brought his many talents to Congress in 1973 after 6 years in the Illinois General Assembly. Ed's many Springfield honors included being named Outstanding State Legislator.

His legislative abilities became apparent to those of us in this Chamber shortly after his arrival in Washington. He was a master of working out compromises where others failed to make progress.

Ed was ranking Republican on the House Committee on Agriculture at the time of his resignation. He was also serving at that time as Chief Deputy Minority Whip. Ed Madigan willingly sacrificed the position he loved so much in this House of Representatives to heed the call of President George Bush to become a member of the President's Cabinet. He was the Nation's 24th Secretary of Agriculture.

Ed Madigan was a fine son of the State of Illinois. He was our colleague, and most important, he was our friend. Ed Madigan will be missed.

In closing, I would like to extend our sympathies to his wife, Evelyn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLILEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE ISSUES UNDER DEBATE ON CAPITOL HILL

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I will be joined by several of my colleagues to discuss some of the legislative issues that are being debated on Capitol Hill at this time.

I would like to start off by noting this Los Angeles Times story this morning, the devastation that is shown here from the flooding in California. I can certainly identify with this. Mine was one of the districts in the Midwest which was flooded in 1993. I worked the sandbag lines, and did my best as a Congressman to try to help many of the families, farmers, and businesses get back on their feet.

It was a devastating loss. I can certainly understand what many families and people in California are facing today.

Let me say that it has been my honor to serve in this Chamber for 12 years. I have at various times been asked by people from across the country to come to their assistance in the midst of a disaster. I have tried to do that. In fact, I have done that every time, whether it was the Loma Prieta earthquake near San Francisco or the Northridge earthquake near Los Angeles, or these floods.

I am sure they will all result in requests for assistance by the Federal Government. I will be there, because I think that is one of my responsibilities, not just to represent the 20th District of Illinois, but to serve our Nation. When some people in our Nation are in need, it is important that this Federal Government, this National Government, rally to their assistance.

Having said that, though, I would like to put into context some of the debate which is going on today on Capitol Hill as part of the Contract with America, and to give the perspective of the Contract with America on which it means to the flood victims of California and victims of future disasters.

First, if you search the Constitution of the United States, you will find no reference to a Federal obligation to pay for natural disaster assistance. It is an obligation assumed by the Federal Government, and an expensive one. In the 1950's, the Federal Government paid about 5 percent of the cost of natural disaster problems and damages across America. Today the Federal Government pays over 95 percent of the cost. We are on the hook.

In the Northridge earthquake near Los Angeles we have already spent more than $5 billion. The Federal Government came to the assistance of the State of California, a deficit-ridden Federal Government rallied to the assistance of the State of California, because the people needed help. More money will be needed because of that earthquake. More money will be needed because of these floods.

Let us talk about two issues we are debating in Congress right now. One is unfunded mandates. Let me give you an example of an unfunded mandate from the Federal Government. The Federal Energy Management Agency [FEMA] which has the responsibility to come in and pay for disasters, establishes guidelines for communities that they should follow to try to reduce flood damage.

For example, they suggest that people should not build in a flood plain if they want to qualify for Federal flood insurance. Is that a Federal mandate? Yes. Does the Federal Government pay for it? No. If the communities follow the mandate, what happens? It lessens the damage that might occur because of flooding or other natural disasters.

☐ 1310

Why is that Federal mandate important? Because ultimately Federal taxpayers will be left holding the bag when the flood hits the community. And if the community has not lived up to the Federal-mandated guidelines, that cost to Federal taxpayers is higher.

Many people will get up and condemn Federal mandates but they do not look at this perspective, that many of these mandates are necessary to make sure that we lessen the ultimate liability of Federal taxpayers.

The Governor of the State of California, Mr. Wilson, as I understand it, gave his State of the State message yesterday and in the course of that State of the State message, he said, and I quote, that he as the Governor of