Known as the freeway killer, Bonin, who was executed February 23, confessed to murdering 21 people in southern California in 1979 and 1980. He had been receiving Social Security disability insurance checks since he was diagnosed with a mental illness in 1972, but the Government failed to cut off the payments when he took up residency on death row in 1982. Federal law prohibits him from eligibility for these payments, but Bonin continued to receive monthly disability checks ranging from $300 in 1982 to $589 last month.

For such outrageous and indefensible disregard for their responsibility to the taxpayer, and unfortunately this is a circumstance that isn't new, the Social Security Administration get my Porker of the Week Award.

THE REPUBLICANS ARE AT IT AGAIN

(Mr. KLINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, just like that 4-year-old child with a sweet tooth, the Republicans are at it again, reaching back in that cookie jar, trying to grab Medicare cuts, Medicaid cuts, education cuts. Tax cuts for the wealthy is what they are going to balance it with.

This is like the sword of Damocles dangling over our heads by a thread. The elderly are worried, the poor are worried, those who run hospitals, those who are medical providers are worried.

We are looking in the State of Pennsylvania at the possibility of 52 rural and small-town hospitals closing. Many of these actions have been taken already just because of the threats that the Republicans have held over our heads over the past 2 years. They were spanked by the public for their misbehavior, their irresponsible behavior in putting together the 1996 budget, but here they come again, the same irresponsible behavior in 1997. And I think when November rolls around, the public will spank them again.

But just like that 4 year old with its sweet tooth, the Republicans just cannot keep their fingers out of that cookie jar.

THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago I coauthored a memorandum asking our community chairmen to look at waste, fraud, and abuse in the administration, examples of dishonesty, and ethical lapses, and influences of labor union bosses and corrupt activities in the labor unions. We are finding now that that particular memo is producing results. I now have information that shows allegations against the labor unions for organized crime activities.

Imagine my surprise, then, when we are exercising our right of the public to know about what goes on, to have the Democratic freshman, eight of them, write a letter to the Speaker saying that this is something that should not be pursued and, in fact, the memo should be withdrawn. Well, now we know why. We have now gone back and figured out that those eight freshmen who wrote that letter have received over $1 million from the very labor unions that they are seeking to protect.

That is right: over $1 million in contributions from those that they do not want investigated.

The public has a right to know about these things; $1 million in contributions should not get in the way of the public's right to know.

TITLE III OF H.R. 3286 BAD FOR INDIAN CHILDREN

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, in 1978, Congress enacted the Indian Child Welfare Act to prevent ''[t]he wholesale separation of Indian children from their families * * * perhaps the most tragic and destructive aspect of American Indian life today.'' H.R. Rept. No. 95–1386. The law recognizes that Congress, which has ''responsibility for the protection and preservation of Indian tribes,'' believes ''that there is no resource that is more vital to the continual existence and integrity of Indian tribes than their children.'' The U.S. Supreme Court in 1988 wrote that ''[t]he protection of this tribal interest is at the core of the Indian Child Welfare Act which recognizes that the tribe has an interest in the child which is distinct but on a parity with the interest of the parents.''

But title III of H.R. 3286 would significantly undercut this important law. Title III contains provisions that would add a new race-based Indian identity test focusing upon a child's significant cultural, social, and political contacts instead of tribal membership, would ignore the important role of the extended family in Indian culture, would lead to increased litigation, and would have the effect of excluding tribal members from coverage of the Indian Child Welfare Act.

These provisions were written without any effort to discuss or meet with Indian tribes, which are not only the people whose culture and interests are at stake, but are sovereign governments. I reiterate: there have never been hearings on these provisions.

Democrats and Republicans alike on the Resource Committee, which has jurisdiction over the Indian Child Welfare Act, strongly disapprove of railroading this bill through the House without adequate consideration, and I urge my colleagues to vote to strike title III that amends the Indian Child Welfare Act.

Contrary to opponents' assertions, studies since passage of the Indian Child Welfare Act indicate that it has worked well by motivating courts and agencies to place greater numbers of Indian children into Indian homes. Testimony we received in 1995 indicates that there may have been only 40 contested Indian adoption cases in the past 15 years, less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total number of Indian adoption cases during that period. The vast majority of those problem cases are the direct result of willful violations of the act and can be addressed by changes to the law that promote greater notification and sanctions for violations.

I am prepared to work on amendments to the act in a careful and deliberate manner. But title III of H.R. 3286 is neither careful nor deliberate; it is irresponsible legislation in response to isolated anecdotes, and given the lack of even superficial consideration of its impacts, it does not belong to H.R. 3286.

I urge my colleagues to support our efforts to strike title III on the House floor.

BILLIONS OF DOLLARS

(Mr. BAKER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I guess the Clinton-Gore reelect team and the Democrats are not raking up enough cash from the trial lawyers and other special interests. While raising millions and millions of dollars in campaign funds at all kinds of fundraisers, Clinton has managed to nail the taxpayers for his opposition research staff. Thanks to Time magazine, American taxpayers have found out White House staff has been doing campaign work for the President.

Imagine my surprise. His rapid-response team White House staff, funded exclusively by the taxpayers, are now blatantly working on campaign-style responses and attacks for the President's campaign.

I guess we really should not be surprised. This administration has been the most partisan and political in history, from their globe-trotting Cabinet members to their bloated White House staff. With Cabinet Secretaries like Bruce Babbit and Jesse Brown and others running around the country attacking Republicans on the taxpayers' dime, this pattern of taxpayer ripoff for the Clinton reelection is appalling.

And just think: These are the Cabinet officials that are not yet being investigated.

HAPPY MOTHER'S DAY TO AMERICAN MOTHERS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have come