

running, it is important that we start being reasonable. We not only reduce spending and stop deficit overspending, but we start paying back some of that huge, huge debt that we already owe.

Mr. CHRYSLER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, we have put forth a bipartisan budget. Every budget that we have submitted in this Congress has had bipartisan support, where the President, who has now submitted five budgets, has yet to receive the first Democrat and/or Republican and/or independent vote for any of the budgets that he has supported.

So, certainly, we have a good, strong bipartisan effort, and I think that is what we are going to see come to the floor in the next few weeks, and the President has yet to get his first vote for anything.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There are two numbers that I think the American people and all of us should remember about the President's budget. One number is \$300 billion, one number is \$200 billion. He spends \$300 billion more than Republicans. He increases or has higher taxes, \$200 billion more, than the Republican proposal.

#### CUTTING BUDGET DEFICITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to set the record straight here, talking about all the budgets the President has submitted. If you want to be honest about this thing, in all honesty, the budget you people offered there was not the President's budget. You made a big to-do about it. You took some numbers out of some statements that were made. It was not a budget that was offered by the President of the United States. That is totally wrong.

Mr. Speaker, when you wanted to rewrite history, you offered a budget. The budget passed. The President vetoed it. You went into deliberations with the President of the United States. You said, "We will not talk anymore until the President offers a balanced budget scored by CBO." That was the big argument in this House and in the Senate and across this country, scored by CBO.

The President came up with a budget that was scored by CBO. It was not to your liking, so you said, "No, that is not good enough. You have to move closer to where we want to go. And if you do not, if you do not accept our deal, there will be no deal and we will shut the Government down."

Let us not rewrite history here in these 5-minute speeches. The President in good faith offered a 7-year budget scored by CBO. The President stood in this well on his State of the Union Address and said, "We have got enough

cuts to balance the budget in 7 years." Why do you not agree to take these cuts and balance the budget, and then we will talk about these philosophical arguments later?

You mention Medicare, you mention Social Security, you mention Medicaid. When you start talking about these programs, gentlemen, I hate to say it, but you do not have any credibility. You opposed all of these programs since their inception. You opposed Social Security, you opposed Medicare, and one of the candidates for President of the United States, our dear Senator from the other body said, "Thirty-five years ago I stood and said it would not work. I fought Medicare." Your Speaker of this House said, "It is going to die on the vine. Medicare, we hope it dies on the vine." Your majority leader said, "Social Security should never have been established." So your record ain't good on these programs.

If you want to talk about philosophy and these things, we can talk about that, but there is a proposal that the President of the United States has offered that balances the budget in 7 years, and it is scored by CBO.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

My good friend from Michigan is a wonderful Member, and I am very fond of him. But his memory is short; it tends to be a little on the convenient side. The gentleman has forgotten where this big debt came from.

When Jimmy Carter left office and Ronald Reagan came in, the national debt of the United States was \$700 billion. With Reagan's first budget, the so-called Gramm-Latta budget, Democrats over here warned that the practical consequences of that was going to be that it was going to enormously increase the debt because it immensely increased military expenditures, cut expenses in other programs slightly, and gave a massive tax cut to the well-to-do.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of that, the national debt by the time that Mr. Reagan left office went from \$700 billion to \$4.5 trillion. It multiplied somewhere between 5 and 7 times.

My Republican colleagues, in talking about debt, deficits, and fiscal irresponsibility, forget the fact that it was their budget. They also forget the fact that the Democrats during that period of time who controlled the House cut, cut the Reagan budgets by \$49 billion, and they reapportioned the money so we spent less on defense and we spent more on environment, on health, on senior citizens, on education, and on things that are really important to the long life of this country.

I want to tell my good friend something else. He is complaining about the entitlement programs. The Republicans on this side of the aisle came up with a great idea, that cost-of-living should be included in Social Security.

Up until that time, the Congress always raised Social Security payments and adjusted the income and the outgo so that the two figures would be roughly in balance, and so that the fund would remain safe and secure and solvent. There was a congressionally managed program, which we managed very carefully.

My Republican colleagues did not like voting on that, and they figured that the best way they could get out of casting that vote was to then tie it to the cost-of-living, so that is how Social Security began to get out of balance, because my Republican colleagues came up with a splendid idea that Social Security should become essentially a pay-as-you-go, rather than a trust fund program. That is why we have that program to address today. That is why the budget is in such a mess.

#### AMENDING TITLE XI, D.C. CODE

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

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak today on a bill that we have introduced, H.R. 1855. This is a bill that amends the District of Columbia Code, title XI of the D.C. Code, but basically what it does is it allows Dr. Elizabeth Morgan and her daughter Ellen to return to the United States.

This bill is the product of my own deepest feelings and knowledge, and as a society, we are far more sensitive to the pain that children can feel than we were when I was coming of age. Legislative bodies across the land at every level have recognized the importance of listening more carefully to what children say, and the laws that we now pass arise from an enormous and growing body of evidence that in many cases of domestic stress and conflict, it is too easy to lose sight of who is being harmed.

Commonsense actions to slice through the Gordian knot of pride and anger can often prevent permanent emotional damage and allow wounds to heal as quickly and completely as possible. That is what H.R. 1855 attempts to do. That is all H.R. 1855 intends to do.

Domestic conflict and stress can take many forms. Its victims are too often unintended and innocent. As a local jurist has said in connection with the very situation that gives rise to this bill, when elephants fight, the grass suffers, so I believe that I would not be true to the great lessons I have learned in life were I to just take the easy way out when confronted with a difficult situation involving a child's life.

Yes, it would be easy for me to ignore Ellen Morgan, a soon-to-be 13-year-old American child who is afraid to come back to our country, our country, unless this bill is passed. It might be easy for us to ignore Ellen Morgan, to wash our hands of her unusual and tragic situation, but I believe that would be

wrong. I believe very strongly that I owe it to this 13-year-old child still within me to try to intervene to break the truly vicious cycles that have impacted Ellen Morgan's life.

What I want to do and what this bill does is to permit Ellen Morgan to be and feel free to return to the United States with no cloud of legal intervention over her head. She deserves to have that choice. In the real world she does not have that freedom now. This bill is an opportunity, perhaps the last chance, to heal the wounds that are all too fresh in Ellen's life.

If there were another approach that Ellen could take, I know she would have taken it by now. We have attempted to allow the District of Columbia Superior Court to make appropriate motions to rehear this case, to revisit the situation, and as of yet they have been unable to do so, even though several years have elapsed since 1989, when this body and the other body put forward a bill that allowed Elizabeth Morgan to get out of jail for contempt and resume habitation with her daughter in New Zealand.

If I felt that Ellen was free to return to this country unfettered I would not do anything about this bill, but this bill, I think, represents the best approach that can be taken under all the circumstances. The bill is straightforward. It seeks to make out only very minor and temporary changes in title XI of the District of Columbia Code.

Under the Home Rule Act, the District government cannot amend title XI, and thus cannot legally legislatively affect this case. Only Congress can make these changes. These changes are only temporary and will sunset when Ellen reaches the age of majority and custody-visitation issues would be moot.

H.R. 1855 reflects the commonsense basic principle that the law ought not to compel one who has reached the age of reason from being forced to be unsupervised with someone by whom that person asserts they have been sexually abused. As a practical matter, such visitation cannot be enforced, and would create even greater danger if it were. Permitting a child of 13 and above to choose whether or not such custody or visitation should occur under the strict and limited strictures of this bill is the only sensible course.

The basic facts which form the necessary background of this bill bear repeating. There is an outstanding court order for the District Court for the District of Columbia dated August 28, 1987, in the case of Morgan versus Foretich. Under that order Dr. Morgan was jailed for civil contempt in the District of Columbia after she hid her child, Hilary, now known as Ellen, and refused to give that child up for court ordered unsupervised visitation with her father. At that point her income approached \$1 million a year. She gave that up to go to jail for 2 years to protect her daughter. She spent over 2 years in the District of Columbia jail.

In September 1989, Congress enacted H.R. 2136, sponsored by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from northern Virginia [Mr. WOLF], Public Law 101-97. This law limited to 12 months the amount of time that an individual could be imprisoned for civil contempt in the family division of the D.C. Superior Court. This legislation essentially freed Dr. Morgan from jail.

□ 1245

From there she went to Australia, where she is exiled today, until this legislation can pass. Mr. Speaker, I intend to do everything I can in the coming months to move this bill out of committee and to move this bill to passage.

#### BRING THE MORGANS HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by seconding and commending my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] for moving this legislation.

I want to bring the House up to speed on where we are on this so when this issue comes up, we can pass it very, very quickly.

Back in 1989, Dr. Morgan was in jail for 2 years. We passed the legislation, that passed this House overwhelmingly, to have her released from jail. She and her daughter then went to New Zealand, and they are there wanting very desperately to return home.

Why is it important that we allow this to take place? Dr. Morgan has had a very serious life-threatening operation in New Zealand and will need two additional operations.

Second, Dr. Morgan's mother, who is 81 years old, who is in New Zealand taking care of both Dr. Morgan and the daughter, Ellen, is elderly; and the concern is, what if something were to happen to her, and with Dr. Morgan ill, what would happen with regard to Ellen?

Third, Dr. Morgan's father, who is in his 80's, is in a hospital now and not very well, and we do not know what is going to happen with regard to that.

Last, Dr. Morgan's husband, who lives in the Washington, DC area, can only visit her twice a year; and it is very difficult to commute to New Zealand, cost-wise and time-wise, so he visits her twice a year.

Since this Congress has acted in the past on this issue, what we are going to be asking, through the leadership of Congressman DAVIS, is that we bring this bill up early and get it out so that Dr. Morgan and her daughter, Ellen, can return to the United States without fear of Judge Dixon, without fear of incarceration.

It is the humanitarian thing to do; it is the right thing. All you have to think of is, if you have a daughter in this case, what would you do? It reminds me of the story years ago about

a man without a country. These are people, frankly, without a country, that cannot get back into their own country.

I would like to also submit for the RECORD, if I may, a copy of the letter from Dr. Morgan's husband, detailing the medical condition and the circumstances surrounding Dr. Morgan.

I have pledged to the family that I am going to work with Congressman DAVIS, and we will put this bill on any bill that moves, any appropriations bill; and if we get to the end of the year and it has not passed, then as chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Committee on Appropriations, I will put this bill in the transportation appropriations bill so that it will be passed and be signed.

Our goal is that Dr. Morgan and her daughter, Ellen and her mom will be allowed to return to the United States early this year, hopefully before the springtime is over.

So in closing, when Members have the opportunity to vote on this, we would hope for unanimous consent and complete support, and I want to commend my colleague, Mr. DAVIS, for taking the leadership to allow Dr. Morgan and Ellen Morgan and Mr. Morgan's mom to return to the United States.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is important for the House to know that Dr. Morgan and her daughter are, frankly, gagged right now from even communicating with Members of Congress or lawyers in the United States because a New England gag order has come as a result of legal efforts by her former husband to do that, and that has made this more difficult. So we are communicating through friends as we approach this, but our efforts to speak directly have now been thwarted, too, which I think adds to the urgency of moving this legislation through at this time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is right. Many times all we hear about on both sides are economic issues. We have passion for them. We should also have passion and compassion for people who are in a situation like this, and through the Davis bill, this family will be able to be reunited and come back to the United States, hopefully before, it would be nice, before the end of springtime.

A copy of the letter mentioned earlier follows:

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT,  
January 23, 1996.

Hon. TOM DAVIS,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN DAVIS AND WOLF: As you requested, I provide the following update concerning my step-daughter, Ellen Morgan,