

We are dismayed by the suggestion that enhanced flexibility for states in making environmental and regulatory decisions would inherently harm the environment. In essence, their coverage seems to propose that regulatory reform should not be pursued because states cannot be trusted as regulators. As you well know, Mr. Majority Leader, states and local governments already are responsible for implementing and overseeing these laws.

ABC is correct in noting that "dirty air travels." However, the proposition that regulatory and environmental reform supported by governors would allow states to "set their own environmental standards" is patently false. Governors and other state and local officials do not seek to set our own environmental standards, nor would pending legislation permit us to do so. Rather, we support enhanced flexibility to implement remedies specific to our states and communities to meet federally established standards.

EPA Administrator Carol Browner's assertion that reforms would lead states to "race to lower standards" is particularly insulting. It is typical beltway arrogance to presume that state and local elected officials are somehow less interested in protecting the environment than officials in Washington. We are truly puzzled that a former state environmental director would say such a thing.

We also want to point out that environmental reform is a partisan issue only in Washington. Across the country Republican and Democrat governors, state legislators, county officials, and mayors support environmental and regulatory reform legislation to provide greater flexibility and unfunded mandate relief for states and local governments. In fact, a bipartisan meeting of state and local government officials last month in Baltimore determined that environmental reform legislation is the top priority of the state-local government coalition in the 104th Congress.

Thank you for your leadership in support of environmental and regulatory reform. We look forward to continuing to work with you to enact reform legislation that ensures that new regulations justify their costs and provides states and local governments with enhanced flexibility to meet the federal standards.

Sincerely,

GEORGE V. VOINOVICH,  
*Governor of Ohio.*  
TERRY E. BRANSTAD,  
*Governor of Iowa.*

#### IN MEMORY OF WHITE EAGLE

Mr. DASCHLE. My State of South Dakota is small in population but large in spirit. This is particularly true of the native American population that calls South Dakota home. Indian people have blazed their way into American history in countless ways. Even their names convey poetry and magic: from great leaders like Sitting Bull, Crazy Horse, and Black Elk, to modern day role models like Billy Mills and Jim Thorpe.

White Eagle—Wanblee Ska—was a Rosebud Sioux who soared on the wings of classical music. Last week, at his parents' home in Mission, SD, White Eagle died at the age of 43. In spite of his untimely death, he left a legacy that will live on for generations.

In a State where country/western music is heard on most radios, White Eagle turned his natural gift for song

into a polished operatic tenor talent. He sang for the inauguration of a President and at Carnegie Hall. Despite his relative youth, he had already been enshrined in the South Dakota Hall of Fame at the time of his death.

Dennis Holub, director of the South Dakota Arts Council, says that White Eagle was "the epitome of a great artist \* \* \* [he] sang in some of the world's finest halls but also brought his songs home so South Dakotans could enjoy them, too."

But it was not only his gift of song that made White Eagle rise on currents of critical and public acclaim. It was his courage in overcoming obstacles and misfortune, his ability to make himself continually better while remaining utterly human, that made him an inspiration to the people of South Dakota.

Although he began singing as a child and achieved some success as a church soloist and musical performer, he stopped singing after developing nodes on his vocal cords. Nevertheless, when he was subsequently asked by a friend to help out the Mile High Opera Workshop after the company lost its tenor, it became clear that White Eagle had found his true vocation.

His 30th birthday was already behind him when he began voice lessons. He continued his studies and graduated from the San Francisco Opera's Merola Opera Program. He went on to work in New York City, and with the Pennsylvania Opera Theater, the Cleveland Opera, and others.

White Eagle developed AIDS in the late 1980's. In a State where AIDS is even rarer than classical concerts, he became the human face of the disease. He could have hidden; instead, he became a powerful force for understanding and compassion.

White Eagle overcame many obstacles in his tragically short life. He succeeded, but fate decreed he would not have enough time to fully savor his success. Nor did we have enough time to enjoy his gift.

But White Eagle left an enduring legacy. Many who otherwise might not have been exposed to classical music became devotees because of White Eagle's gift. Many who might never have seen the human face of AIDS gained understanding through his courage and dignity.

My connection to White Eagle stems not only from my love of his music, but also from the fact that his brother, Robert Moore, is a former member of my Washington staff. I know I speak for my office, and all of South Dakota, as I offer our condolences and prayers of support for his family in this difficult time. We join them in mourning the untimely death of White Eagle. But, even as we mourn, we celebrate his life and his gift of music, and we remember his courage and compassion.

White Eagle will be missed, but he will not be forgotten, for the spirit of his gifts will endure for generations to come.

#### UNFUNDED MANDATES UNDER SENATE FINANCE WELFARE BILL

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, yesterday we had a very productive meeting with the President, a number of my colleagues here in the Senate, Governor Carper, Mayor Archer of Detroit, County Executive Rick Phelps of Dane County, WI, and Bill Purcell, majority leader of the Tennessee House of Representatives.

It is clear that the Work First Coalition is growing. Government leaders at all levels agree that we need to move forward with welfare reform—that we can't let extremists hold this very important reform hostage.

We have a plan. It is about work. It is about ending the cycle of dependency and helping single mothers and unemployed fathers become self-sufficient and stay that way.

The bill that was reported from the Finance Committee is not about work. It's a huge unfunded mandate to the States.

In fact, the head of the bipartisan U.S. Conference of Mayors may have put it best when he called the Republican welfare reform plan the "mother of all unfunded mandates."

It's ironic that S. 1, the first bill the Republican leadership introduced this Congress, was a bill to stop unfunded mandates. Now they want to dump a \$35 billion unfunded mandate on the States.

Why is the welfare reform bill as reported from the Finance Committee an unfunded mandate? The reason is simple.

The bill as reported by the committee freezes Federal funding to the States at the fiscal year 1994 level in each of the next 7 years. At the same time, the bill requires an increasing percentage of welfare recipients to participate in the current-law JOBS Program, which offers education or training or other work opportunities to welfare recipients.

But, participation in the JOBS Program is not free. There is a cost to providing education or job training. In addition, when we talk about welfare recipients, we are usually talking about single mothers raising children, many of them small children or infants.

To enable a single parent to participate in an education or training program, someone has to care for her child during that time period. She may be lucky; perhaps a relative will watch her child for free. But, chances are, she will not be lucky. She, like the majority of working parents today, will have to pay for child care—will have to pay someone to take care of her child while she is away from home.

The cost of child care is not cheap. In fact, today the cost of child care is often a low-income family's largest expense—larger even than rent.

And, the problem for parents of very young children is that the cost of child care is greatest for toddlers and infants.

Certainly, if we want to put the parents of these young children to work—