

THE STORY OF 1995

A YEAR OF PRESIDENT CLINTON'S LEADERSHIP

In this season of hope, we can look back at a year of great progress for America. Under President Clinton's leadership, Americans are gaining renewed faith in our economy and our shared prospects for the future. Around the world, the President's vision is bringing peace to places that have until recently known only terror and war. Nineteen-ninety-five was a year of enormous challenges. We faced terrible moments and hard decisions. But we met them head on. Tragedies that could have stopped us instead brought us together and drove us forward. As the year comes to a close, we should be very proud of all that we have accomplished together: We have done much to build a stronger, safer world for our children -- and for generations of Americans to come. We have shown again that America is built on three basic values: That we believe we can all have dreams of a better future; that we believe our hard work can make our dreams come true; and that in America, we are all in this together -- not as individuals acting alone, but as one nation moving forward in unison.

PEACE AT HOME: STANDING UP FOR OUR SHARED VALUES

Much of the year has been devoted to the debate over the budget. The debate over the budget is nothing less than a debate about our values and our future. Americans spent 1995 talking with each other about what kind of country we will be as we enter a new century -- deciding what kind of a world we want to give our children and grandchildren. The budget process hasn't always been easy, but under President Clinton's leadership Americans have used this national discussion to state clearly what we think is essential:

- Balancing the budget, because we must lift the burden of reckless debt off the backs of future generations. Since President Clinton came to office, he has cut the deficit nearly in half. He has done so in a way that is fair to all and protects our fundamental values. Now we must finish the job of balancing the budget. But we must do so in a manner that remains true to these core convictions that have served us so well for so long.
- Protecting Medicaid and Medicare, so that we honor our commitment to our parents, to our children, and to Americans with disabilities by seeing to it that all have health care.
- Educating our children, so they can make the most of their lives and pass a better America on to their children.

- Preserving our environment and protecting the public health, by making sure that the water we drink and the air we breathe are safe, and that our magnificent natural wonders are preserved for generations to come.

The budget debate has also reminded many people that the national government **can** improve the lives of Americans. Government should be streamlined, and in the last three years President Clinton has reduced the federal workforce by more than 200,000 positions. But to dismantle the national government entirely would be to walk away from our obligations to one another and to future generations. In America, our government has always been one of the ways we make concrete our commitment to our families, our communities, our country.

PEACE AT HOME: WORKING FOR COMMON GROUND

In moments of great adversity, Americans refused to come apart, and instead we came together.

- We rushed to the aid of the victims and survivors of the Oklahoma City bombing. Americans spoke with one voice to repudiate those who had turned away from the democratic process and advocated violence as a means to achieving political ends.
- Instead of heightening racial tensions, Americans transformed the Million Man March into an opportunity to renew our discussion about the racial divide in our country. Under President Clinton's leadership, we found not rancor, but honesty.

PEACE AROUND THE WORLD: AMERICAN LEADERSHIP MADE THE DIFFERENCE

President Clinton has used his leadership to help bring about peace and reconciliation around the world. Under the President's vision, America is not a policeman, but a peacemaker.

- With our leadership, the tragic assassination of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin became not an excuse to stop the Middle East peace process, but a reason to give it new life. Finally, Israel and Syria will sit down together in the United States to find a way to live together peacefully.
- The Dayton Agreement and our decision to join in the international effort to secure the peace in Bosnia has given the people of the former Yugoslavia a chance to rebuild their lives. In the face of four years of horrible violence, Americans decided that we have a moral obligation to help peace take root in that war-torn country.

- In Northern Ireland, they are celebrating their second Christmas of peace. In Haiti, they are celebrating the peaceful transfer of power from one democratically elected president to another. During President Clinton's visits to both these countries, the gratitude for America's leadership was visible in dramatic ways.

HARD WORK OF DEMOCRACY

Democracy is hard work. It is never quiet. And in times of great change, like those in which we live today, it is rarely tidy. But in our more than 200 years as a country, the harder we have worked, the more progress we have made. And in 1995, Americans, under President Clinton's leadership, worked very hard. We found the strength to work through problems that had once defeated us. We moved beyond short-term concerns and political pageantry to work creatively to build our home together. Yes, we still have a lot to do: too many children grow up in the shadow of crime and poverty; too many children miss out on the opportunity of a good education; too many hard-working Americans are putting in long hours for low pay. But there's no reason we can't meet these challenges, too. The inspiring changes we've seen in 1995 put the American people - with their ability and their values -- in a strong position to help make the American Dream real for all our citizens.

THE YEAR IN NUMBERS

- Nearly 7.7 million new jobs created since President Clinton took office.
- Under President Clinton, the deficit has been cut dramatically, from \$290 billion in 1992 to \$164 billion.
- In 1995 the deficit was reduced for the third year in a row, the first time that has happened since Harry Truman was in office.
- Consumer sentiment has been higher under President Clinton than under any administration since Lyndon Johnson's.
- Lowest combined rate of unemployment and inflation since 1968.
- Falling interest rates.
- Rising stock market closed at 5,000 for first time ever.
- Unemployment now under 6 percent for the 15th month in a row, widely considered to be the definition of full employment.
- Dramatic decrease in unemployment in traditionally high unemployment regions.
- 15-year high in homeownership; Nearly 1 million new homeowners in the past year.
- A new high in new business formation, with more than approximately 2 million new businesses since 1993.
- 20,000 more police officers on the streets since the signing of the President's crime bill in 1994.
- Violent crime down 5% for the first half of 1995.
- Reported homicides are down 12% in the first half of 1995 when compared with the same time in 1994, the largest drop in at least 35 years.
- Federal workforce cut by over 200,000 positions since the President took office; 16,000 pages of regulations eliminated. Government on its way to being the smallest it's been since John F. Kennedy was President.
- Welfare rolls, the poverty rate, teen pregnancies and business failures are down. The number of students going to college and people leaving welfare for work is up.
- 47 percent of Americans say they are better off today than they were four years ago. Only 26 percent think they are worse off.

December 11, 1995

DRC
SCAFF
F41

MEMORANDUM TO DISTRIBUTION

FROM: DAN COLLINS

RE: NOVEMBER POLLING REPORT

Attached is a summary of selected public opinion polls released during November. The date indicated for each poll is the last day the poll was conducted. If the survey date was not available, the date of release was used. Polls from earlier months are also included to indicate trends. Polling on the following issues is included in the report:

- Presidential Approval Ratings (p.1) -- President Clinton's overall approval rating topped 50% in several polls during November and is now equal to or higher than the past five Presidents' ratings at similar points in their administrations.
- Bosnia (p.2) -- Although the President's speech on deploying troops to Bosnia was well received, public support for the mission continued to decline during November.
- Federal Budget (p.3) -- A CBS News poll found 53% of those surveyed believed the President was more concerned than Congress about what was best for them and their families in the current budget debate.
- Medicare Reform (p.4) -- A Time/CNN poll found 74% of those surveyed were against cutting the growth of Medicare in order to balance the budget.
- Congress (p.4) -- Several polls found the public concerned that GOP proposals will go too far.

Polling on the **economy** and **foreign policy** are also included in the report. Please contact us if you have questions or need additional information.

Distribution:

Leon Panetta
Erskine Bowles
Harold Ickes
George Stephanopoulos
Michael McCurry
Don Baer
Doug Sosnik
Alexis Herman
Carol Rasco
Marcia Hale
Margret Williams
Anne Walley
Michael Waldman
Evelyn Lieberman
Stephanie Streett
Jack Quinn

OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH

MONTHLY POLLING REPORT

NOVEMBER 1995

(For communications planning purposes only)

NOVEMBER 1995 POLLING REPORT

KEY EVENTS

11/1/95 Bosnian peace talks began
 11/4/95 Israeli Prime Minister Rabin assassinated
 11/8/95 Colin Powell announced he would not run for president
 11/13/95 President vetoed debt ceiling increase
 11/13/95 President vetoed the continuing resolution
 11/14/95 Federal government shut down

11/19/95 Temporary budget compromise reached
 11/21/95 Bosnian peace agreement reached
 11/27/95 President addressed the nation on sending troops to Bosnia
 11/28/95 Congressional hearings on troop deployment began
 11/28/95 President departed for Europe

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S APPROVAL RATINGS

		<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>
CBS News	11/27/95	53%	40%
WPost/ABC News	11/19/95	54%	41%
WSJ/NBC News	11/19/95	49%	42%
Gallup	11/18/95	53%	38%
USA Today/CNN	11/8/95	52%	41%
LA Times	10/30/95	50%	44%

TREND

		<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>
NYT/CBS News	10/24/95	47%	39%
USA Today/CNN	9/24/95	48%	44%
Gallup	8/7/95	46%	42%
	7/9/95	48%	42%
	6/6/95	47%	42%
	5/14/95	51%	42%
	4/6/95	47%	45%
	3/19/95	46%	45%

HISTORICAL COMPARISON

		<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>
Gallup			
Bush	11/24/91	52%	39%
Reagan	11/21/83	53%	37%
Carter	11/19/79	38%	49%
Ford	11/24/75	41%	46%
Nixon	11/2/71	49%	37%

NOVEMBER 1995 POLLING REPORT

THE ISSUES

BOSNIA

Sending US troops as peacekeepers

		<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>
"20,000 troops" mentioned			
Harris	12/3/95	29%	67%
CBS News	11/27/95	33%	58%
ABC News	11/27/95	39%	57%
WPost/ABC News	11/13/95	38%	58%
Just "troops" mentioned, no number			
USA Today/CNN	11/27/95	46%	40%
USA Today/CNN	11/8/95	47%	49%
Time/CNN	10/19/95	42%	50%
Time/CNN	Sep. 95	52%	43%

President Clinton's handling of Bosnia

		<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>
ABC News	11/29/95	40%	50%
ABC News	11/27/95	43%	44%
CBS News	11/27/95	41%	43%
WPost/ABC News	11/13/95	44%	39%
USA Today/CNN	11/8/95	38%	46%
USA Today/CNN	10/22/95	37%	47%
LA Times	9/18/95	45%	38%
Time/CNN	June 95	36%	45%

President's speech on sending troops to Bosnia

CBS News	11/27/95	
41%	Watched or listened to the speech	
60%	Believed the President did a good job	
USA Today/CNN	11/27/95	
30%	Were more likely to support sending troops following the speech	
58%	Believed the speech had no effect on their opinion	
9%	Were less likely to support sending troops following the speech	

Has the President adequately explained why troops need to go to Bosnia?

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
CBS News	11/27/95	45%	39%
USA Today/CNN	11/8/95	30%	58%

FOREIGN POLICY

President Clinton's handling of foreign policy

		<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>
WPost/ABC News	11/13/95	54%	39%
NYT/CBS News	10/24/95	41%	44%
USA Today/CNN	10/22/95	43%	44%
LA Times	Sep. 95	50%	40%
LA Times	June 95	42%	49%
WSJ/NBC News	Jan. 95	50%	38%

NOVEMBER 1995 POLLING REPORT

FEDERAL BUDGET

Who do you blame for the Federal gov't shutdown?

		<u>President</u>	<u>Leaders</u>	<u>Both</u>
WSJ/NBC News	11/19/95	27%	47%	N/A
WPost/ABC News	11/19/95	24%	51%	20%
CBS News	11/19/95	28%	51%	N/A
USA Today/CNN	11/18/95	25%	47%	21%
Gallup	11/14/95	26%	49%	19%
Wpost/ABC News	11/13/95	27%	46%	20%

Should the President veto the GOP budget bill?

		<u>Yes</u>
USA Today/CNN	11/18/95	58%
WSJ/NBC News	11/19/95	56%
WPost/ABC News	11/13/95	55%
USA Today/CNN	11/8/95	60%
WSJ/NBC News	11/2/95	61%

Trust more/more confidence to make decisions on the budget

		<u>President</u>	<u>Leaders/</u> <u>Congress</u>
CBS News	11/19/95	44%	39%
NYT/CBS News	10/24/95	39%	44%
USA Today/CNN	8/30/95	35%	44%

CBS News 11/19/95

53% Believed the President was more concerned than Congress about what is best for them and their families in the current budget debate

Handling budget issue

		<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>
ABC News	11/19/95		
	Clinton	49%	42%
	Congress	21%	71%

Position on budget issues comes closer to your own

		<u>President</u>	<u>GOP</u> <u>Congress</u>
WPost/ABC News	11/19/95	56%	36%
WPost/ABC News	11/13/95	53%	37%

Dragging out/Playing politics with the budget

WPost/ABC News 11/13/95

65% Believed Congress is playing politics with the budget
52% Believed the President is playing politics with the budget

WSJ/NBC News 11/19/95

63% Believed the GOP Congress is dragging out the budget debate
54% Believed the President is dragging out the budget debate

NOVEMBER 1995 POLLING REPORT

MEDICARE REFORM

Who do you trust more to make decisions on Medicare?

		GOP	
		<u>President</u>	<u>Congress</u>
CBS News	11/19/95	53%	35%

Cutting growth of Medicare to balance the budget

		<u>Oppose</u>
Time/CNN	11/6/95	74%
Harris	10/1/95	70%

GOP proposals

USA Today/CNN 11/8/95

- 75% Opposed the GOP proposal to cut the rate of spending on Medicare
- 66% Opposed the GOP proposal to cut the rate of spending on Medicaid
- 61% Believed the GOP plan to change Medicare will not protect, preserve and strengthen Medicare

Confidence in to come up with good policies for Medicare

Harris 11/6/95

<u>All adults</u>		GOP in	
		<u>President</u>	<u>Congress</u>
Great Deal		23%	9%
Only Some		50%	50%
Hardly any		26%	40%

Over 65

Great Deal	38%	11%
Only Some	39%	37%
Hardly any	22%	51%

CONGRESS

Congressional Approval

		<u>Approve</u>
WPost/ABC News	11/19/95	27%
CBS News	11/19/95	22%
NYT/CBS News	10/24/95	31%
WSJ/NBC	9/22/95	30%

GOP Proposals

WSJ/NBC News 11/19/95

- 62% Concerned that GOP proposals will go too far
- 49% Plurality disagreed with GOP proposals

USA Today/CNN 11/8/95

- 74% Opposed cutting student loans
- 66% Favored cutting taxes
- 57% Believed GOP proposals to cut spending go too far
- 53% Opposed reducing the Earned Income Tax Credit
- 42% Plurality favored changing fed environmental regulations

Time/CNN 11/6/95

- 60% Agreed the Republicans in Congress are going too far in cutting back government programs

NOVEMBER 1995 POLLING REPORT

THE ECONOMY

President Clinton's handling of the economy

		<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>
WPost/ABC News	11/13/95	47%	48%
USA Today/CNN	10/22/95	44%	49%
Harris	10/1/95	53%	44%
LA Times	9/18/95	48%	46%
CBS/NY Times	Aug. 95	41%	48%
	Apr. 95	38%	52%
	Nov. 94	37%	56%
	Apr. 94	43%	45%
	Nov. 93	38%	47%

Where economy is heading

		<u>Getting Better</u>	<u>Getting Worse</u>	<u>Staying the Same</u>
USA Today/CNN	11/8/95	17%	30%	52%
CBS/NY Times	Aug. 95	14%	27%	58%
	Mar. 95	18%	27%	53%
	Nov. 94	20%	26%	53%
	Apr. 94	24%	25%	50%
	Nov. 93	19%	24%	57%
Time/CNN	11/6/95			
51%	Believed they are "better off" than three years ago			
55%	Not worried about maintaining their standard of living during the next five years			

Current condition of the economy

		<u>Very Good/Excellent</u>	<u>Fairly Good/Good</u>	<u>Only Fair</u>	<u>Fairly Bad/Poor</u>	<u>Very Bad/Very Poor</u>
USA Today/CNN	11/8/95	2%	28%	47%	22%	N/A
NYT/CBS News	10/24/95	2%	53%	N/A	33%	10%
NYT/CBS News	Aug. 95	4%	51%	N/A	31%	13%
	Mar. 95	3%	52%	N/A	29%	13%
	Nov. 94	2%	53%	N/A	33%	10%
	Apr. 94	3%	51%	N/A	33%	11%
	Nov. 93	2%	40%	N/A	38%	18%

NOVEMBER 1995 POLLING REPORT

MISCELLANEOUS

Two most important issues for the government to address

Harris	<u>Oct. 95</u>	<u>Apr. 95</u>	<u>Aug. 94</u>	<u>Jan. 93</u>
Federal deficit	18%	18%	7%	19%
Crime	16%	21%	24%	3%
Health care	16%	19%	55%	31%
Medicare	14%	X	X	X
Welfare	12%	19%	5%	2%
Taxes	11%	20%	7%	7%
Economy	10%	7%	9%	26%
Education	9%	7%	6%	10%
Programs for the elderly	7%	6%	2%	3%
Jobs	6%	8%	9%	19%
Drugs	5%	5%	3%	3%
Domestic/social issues	5%	6%	6%	10%
Foreign Policy	4%	2%	8%	6%
Homelessness/programs for the poor	4%	X	X	X
Medicaid	4%	X	X	X
Programs for the poor	3%	7%	7%	7%
Race relations	3%	X	X	X
Abortion	2%	3%	4%	9%
Defense	2%	2%	1%	X
Family values	2%	1%	1%	X
World peace	2%	2%	2%	2%
Human/civil rights	2%	2%	1%	X

Note -- All other issues were mentioned by 1% or fewer

"X" -- Issue wasn't mentioned or was previously included with other issues

What are you most dissatisfied with?

Times Mirror	10/30/95
Health care system	21%
Crime	20%
Washington politics	17%
Taxes too high	14%
Economy	13%
Lack of family values	13%
Gov't spending	12%
Welfare reform	9%
Education system	9%
Lack of jobs	8%
Cuts in social spending	8%
Foreign policy	8%
Federal deficit	5%
Race relations	5%
Court system	5%
Low wages	2%

1833

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Pls take to Belm
Berman

Copies for

me

JEN

DFINB

Lyn

TALKING POINTS ON H.R. 1833

- The President vetoed H.R. 1833 -- which would have prohibited a certain kind of abortion procedure -- for one reason: because it failed to include an exemption permitting the use of this procedure in those rare cases where a physician says its use is necessary to protect a woman from serious injury to her health. The President could not sign a bill that would have abandoned women facing such serious health risks.
- The procedure described in the bill troubles the President deeply and he does not support its use on an elective basis. But this bill went too far because it would have banned use of the procedure even when it was the only or best hope of averting a serious threat to a woman's health, including her ability to have children in the future.
- The bill provided an exception only when a doctor believes a woman faces death -- not when the doctor is convinced that she faces real, grave risks to her health.
- Before vetoing this bill, the President heard from women who desperately wanted babies, were devastated to learn that their babies had fatal conditions, wanted anything other than an abortion, but were advised by their doctors that this procedure was their best hope of preventing death or grave harm, including the loss of reproductive ability.

For these women and others, this was not about choice. These babies were certain to perish before, during, or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave harm was going to be done to the woman.

- It was to protect women in these rare and tragic circumstances that the President asked Congress to add an exemption allowing use of the procedure when, in the doctor's medical judgment, it is necessary to save a woman from serious adverse consequences to her health. The President told Congress he would sign such a bill. Congress refused.
- The President rejects the contention that his proposed exemption would create a huge loophole. Congress, working with the Administration, could draft a bill making clear that serious harm to health means just that -- and doesn't include trivial complaints such as headaches or inconvenience.
- As to the claim that this procedure is never medically appropriate, the best answer comes from the medical community itself, which broadly supports the use of the procedure where a woman's serious health interests are at stake.
- These are tough and tragic cases. Criminalizing the use of this procedure where a woman's doctor believes it is her best chance to avoid serious injury is no answer. And politicizing the debate serves no one. The President stands for a common sense solution and is ready and willing to work with Congress to achieve it.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 13, 1996

The Most Reverend Edmond L. Browning
Presiding Bishop
The Episcopal Church
815 Second Avenue
New York, New York 10017

Dear Bishop Browning:

Thank you for your letter of May 8 concerning H.R. 1833, legislation banning a certain abortion procedure, commonly referred to in the press as partial birth abortion. I appreciate your explication of the Church's position on this matter. As you know, in late March, Congress passed that bill and on April 10, I vetoed it because of its failure, in certain rare and compelling cases, to prevent serious threats to women's health.

My own position on this bill has been widely misrepresented and misunderstood. Some, including those more interested in creating a political issue than in putting real, meaningful limits on the use of this procedure, have deliberately distorted my views. But I know that a great many people of good faith -- and of all faiths -- are sincerely perplexed about the veto. That is why I would like to take this opportunity to explain the basis for my decision.

Let me begin with a word of background. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except, as the Supreme Court requires, where necessary to protect the life or health of the mother. As Governor of Arkansas, I signed into law a bill that barred third trimester abortions, with an appropriate exception for life or health, and I would sign a bill to do the same thing at the federal level if it were presented to me.

The particular procedure aimed at in H.R. 1833 poses a most difficult and disturbing issue, one which I studied and prayed about for many months. Indeed, when I first heard a description of this procedure, I anticipated that I would support the bill. But after I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to believe that this rarely used procedure is justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious consequences to her health.

-----predicament:

health in danger, as well."

necessary.

faces real, grave risks to her health.

appropriate legislation banning them.

woman to avoid serious risks to her health. I recognize that there

I also understand that many who support this bill believe that any health exception is untenable. In a letter sent to me on April 16 by our leading Catholic Cardinals, they contend that a "health" exception for the use of this procedure could be stretched to cover most anything -- for example, youth, emotional stress, financial hardship or inconvenience.

That is not the kind of exception I support. I support an exception that takes effect only where a woman faces real, serious adverse health consequences. Those who oppose this procedure may wish to cite cases where fraudulent health reasons are relied upon as an excuse -- excuses I could never condone. But people of good faith must recognize that there are also cases where the health risks facing a woman are deadly serious and real. It is in those cases that I believe an exception to the general ban on the procedure must be allowed.

Further, I flatly reject the view of those who suggest that it is impossible to draft a bill imposing real, stringent limits on the use of this procedure -- a bill making absolutely clear that the procedure may be used only in cases where a woman risks death or serious damage to her health, and in no other case. I know that it is not beyond the ingenuity of Congress, working together with this Administration, to fashion such a bill.

Indeed, that is why I implored Congress, by letter dated February 28, to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. Congress ignored my proposal and did so, I am afraid, because there are too many there who prefer creating a political issue to solving a human problem. But I reiterate my offer now: if Congress will produce a bill that meets the concerns outlined in this letter, I will sign it the moment it reaches my desk.

I recognize that many people will continue to disagree with me about this issue. But they should all know the truth about where I stand: I do not support the use of this procedure on demand. I do not support the use of this procedure on the strength of mild or fraudulent health complaints. But I do believe that we cannot abandon women, like the women I spoke with, whose doctors advise them that they need the procedure to avoid serious injury. That, in my judgment, would be the true inhumanity.

I continue to hope that a solution can be reached on this painful issue. I hope as well that the deep dialogue between my Administration and people of faith can continue with regard to the broad array of issues on which we have worked and are working together. Again, thank you for your letter and for the opportunity to set forth my own views.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

May 13, 1996

The Most Reverend Edmond L. Browning
Presiding Bishop
The Episcopal Church
815 Second Avenue
New York, New York 10017

Dear Bishop Browning:

Thank you for your letter of May 8 concerning H.R. 1833, legislation banning a certain abortion procedure, commonly referred to in the press as partial birth abortion. I appreciate your explication of the Church's position on this matter. As you know, in late March, Congress passed that bill and on April 10, I vetoed it because of its failure, in certain rare and compelling cases, to prevent serious threats to women's health.

My own position on this bill has been widely misrepresented and misunderstood. Some, including those more interested in creating a political issue than in putting real, meaningful limits on the use of this procedure, have deliberately distorted my views. But I know that a great many people of good faith -- and of all faiths -- are sincerely perplexed about the veto. That is why I would like to take this opportunity to explain the basis for my decision.

Let me begin with a word of background. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except, as the Supreme Court requires, where necessary to protect the life or health of the mother. As Governor of Arkansas, I signed into law a bill that barred third trimester abortions, with an appropriate exception for life or health, and I would sign a bill to do the same thing at the federal level if it were presented to me.

The particular procedure aimed at in H.R. 1833 poses a most difficult and disturbing issue, one which I studied and prayed about for many months. Indeed, when I first heard a description of this procedure, I anticipated that I would support the bill. But after I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to believe that this rarely used procedure is justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious consequences to her health.

Last month, I was joined in the White House by five women who desperately wanted to have their babies and were devastated to learn that their babies had fatal conditions and would not live. These women wanted anything other than an abortion, but were advised by their doctors that this procedure was their best chance to avert the risk of death or grave harm which, in some cases, would have included an inability to bear children. These women gave moving, powerful testimony. For them, this was not about choice. This was not about choosing against having a child. Their babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage they were going to suffer. One of them described the serious risks to her health that she faced, including the possibility of hemorrhaging, a ruptured cervix and loss of her ability to bear children in the future. She talked of her predicament:

"Our little boy had...hydrocephaly. All the doctors told us there was no hope. We asked about in utero surgery, about shunts to remove the fluid, but there was absolutely nothing we could do. I cannot express the pain we still feel. This was our precious little baby, and he was being taken from us before we even had him. This was not our choice, for not only was our son going to die, but the complications of the pregnancy put my health in danger, as well."

Some have raised the question whether this procedure is ever most appropriate as a matter of medical practice. The best answer comes from the medical community, which broadly supports the continued availability of this procedure in cases where a woman's serious health interests are at stake. In those rare cases, I believe the woman's doctors should have the ability to determine, in the best exercise of their medical judgment, that the procedure is indeed necessary.

The problem with H.R. 1833 is that it provides an exception to the ban on this procedure only when a doctor can be certain that a woman's life is at risk, but not when the doctor is sure that she faces real, grave risks to her health.

Let me be clear. I do not contend that this procedure, today, is always used in circumstances that meet my standard -- namely, that the procedure must be necessary to prevent death or serious adverse health consequences. The procedure may well be used in situations where a woman's serious health interests are not at issue. But I do not support such uses, I do not defend them, and I would sign appropriate legislation banning them.

At the same time, I cannot and will not countenance a ban on this procedure in those cases where it represents the best hope for a woman to avoid serious risks to her health. I recognize that there

are those who believe it appropriate to force a woman to endure real, serious risks to her health -- including, sometimes, the loss of her ability to bear children -- in order to deliver a baby who is already dead or about to die. But I am not among them.

I also understand that many who support this bill believe that any health exception is untenable. In a letter sent to me on April 16 by our leading Catholic Cardinals, they contend that a "health" exception for the use of this procedure could be stretched to cover most anything -- for example, youth, emotional stress, financial hardship or inconvenience.

That is not the kind of exception I support. I support an exception that takes effect only where a woman faces real, serious adverse health consequences. Those who oppose this procedure may wish to cite cases where fraudulent health reasons are relied upon as an excuse -- excuses I could never condone. But people of good faith must recognize that there are also cases where the health risks facing a woman are deadly serious and real. It is in those cases that I believe an exception to the general ban on the procedure must be allowed.

Further, I flatly reject the view of those who suggest that it is impossible to draft a bill imposing real, stringent limits on the use of this procedure -- a bill making absolutely clear that the procedure may be used only in cases where a woman risks death or serious damage to her health, and in no other case. I know that it is not beyond the ingenuity of Congress, working together with this Administration, to fashion such a bill.

Indeed, that is why I implored Congress, by letter dated February 28, to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. Congress ignored my proposal and did so, I am afraid, because there are too many there who prefer creating a political issue to solving a human problem. But I reiterate my offer now: if Congress will produce a bill that meets the concerns outlined in this letter, I will sign it the moment it reaches my desk.

I recognize that many people will continue to disagree with me about this issue. But they should all know the truth about where I stand: I do not support the use of this procedure on demand. I do not support the use of this procedure on the strength of mild or fraudulent health complaints. But I do believe that we cannot abandon women, like the women I spoke with, whose doctors advise them that they need the procedure to avoid serious injury. That, in my judgment, would be the true inhumanity.

I continue to hope that a solution can be reached on this painful issue. I hope as well that the deep dialogue between my Administration and people of faith can continue with regard to the broad array of issues on which we have worked and are working together. Again, thank you for your letter and for the opportunity to set forth my own views.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

TALKING POINTS ON H.R. 1833

- The President vetoed H.R. 1833 because the bill, which prohibits a certain kind of abortion procedure, fails to protect women from serious threats to their health, as both the Constitution and humane public policy require.
- The procedure described in the bill troubles the President deeply. He does not support use of that procedure on an elective basis. He would allow it only where necessary to save the life of the mother or prevent serious injury to her health.
- This bill went too far because it would ban use of the procedure even when it is the only or best hope of saving the woman's life or averting a serious threat to her health, including her ability to have children in the future.
- Before vetoing this bill, the President heard from women who desperately wanted babies, who were devastated to learn that their babies had fatal conditions, who wanted anything other than an abortion, but who were advised by their doctors that this procedure was their best hope of preventing death or grave harm, including the loss of reproductive ability. For these women and others, this was not about choice. These babies were certain to perish before, during, or shortly after birth, and the only question was how much grave harm was going to be done to the woman.
- Criminalizing use of the procedure in such cases, where women and their families must make a tragic choice, poses a danger of grave harm to women. A ban of this kind, aside from violating the Constitution, would be the true inhumanity.
- That is why the President, by letter dated February 28, implored Congress to add an exemption for the small number of compelling cases where selection of the procedure, in the medical judgment of the physician, is necessary to preserve the life of the woman or avert serious adverse consequences to her health. A bill amended in this way would have struck a proper balance, remedying the constitutional and human defect of H.R. 1833.
- The charge that the President's proposed exemption would create a huge loophole, allowing the widespread use of this procedure, is simply not true. The President's exemption would apply only when there is serious harm to health. Surely Congress, working with this Administration, can write legislation making clear that serious harm to health means just that -- that it doesn't include, as some have suggested, youth, low income, or inconvenience. Attacks such as this trivialize profoundly tragic situations. All one needs to do is to listen to some of the women who have had this procedure to understand what kind of harm the President is talking about.
- The President will not sign a bill showing, as this one does, total indifference to the health of women. He will sign a bill amended to protect women from serious harm by allowing this procedure in rare cases. He regrets that Congress, more interested in creating a political issue than solving a problem, has so far rejected this approach.

Partial Birth -- Message

- President vetoed this bill for one reason -- it fails to include an exception permitting the use of this procedure in those rare cases where a physician says its use is necessary to avoid serious injury to a woman's health.

He simply could not accept a law that would force women to endure serious risks to their health -- including the loss of the ability to ever have a child again.

- He told the Congress on February 28 that he would sign the bill if it included such an exception. Congress refused.
- Before vetoing this bill, the President met with women who underwent an "intact dilation and evacuation procedure. These women desperately wanted their babies; they were devastated to learn that their babies had fatal conditions; they wanted anything other than an abortion -- several of them were pro-life -- but they were advised by their doctors that this procedure was their best hope of preventing death or grave harm, including the loss of reproductive ability.

For these women and others, this was not about choice. These babies were certain to perish before, during, or shortly after birth, and the only question was how much grave harm was going to be done to the woman.

- Criminalizing use of the procedure in such cases, where women and their families must make a tragic choice, poses a danger of grave harm to women. A ban of this kind, aside from violating the Constitution, would be the true inhumanity.

CHILD CARE

I. Funding

Yes, every budget submitted by the President has included increases in **discretionary** child care funding to improve and expand child care services. In addition, please note that the budgets that have passed, have increased spending in child care and development (which includes Head Start) from FY93 - FY96 by 28.6 percent or \$1.3 billion. (See attached summary funding table from Secretary Shalala's briefing book prepared by ASMB.)

Since some do not consider Head Start to be "child care" the increase in funding is calculated below without it. From FY93 - FY96 funding from entitlement and discretionary child care programs have increased by 28.7 percent or \$524 million. See Table 1 below for child care funding levels.

Table 1: Child Care Funding Without Head Start

FY93 - \$1.825 billion
FY94 - \$1.973 billion
FY95 - \$2.113 billion
FY96 - \$2.349 billion

We're currently providing child care services for over 750,000 low-income children and families.

II. Child Care Information

Last year the Administration launched the National Child Care Information Center (NCCIC) established to complement, enhance and promote child care linkages and to serve as a mechanism for supporting quality, comprehensive services for children and families. NCCIC activities include:

- Responding to inquiries from the public.
- Reaching out to child care providers and other interested parties via a toll-free "800" number and an NCCIC website.
- Publishing the *Child Care Bulletin*, distributed 6 times a year to Federal administrators, ACF grantees, national child care organizations and other interested in child care issues.

III. The G.O.P. Budget

H.R. 2491 is not the latest budget bill.

A. Title XX

We have been unable to find a source for the \$3.3 billion cut in Title XX. Further, please note that the Administration is not necessarily opposed to possible cuts in Title XX. So at this moment we should not highlight our opposition to possible changes.

B. Health and Safety Standards

Both House and Senate have retained the health and safety provisions.

C. Child Care Food Program (CCFP)

Status of program is unclear. However, as above, we are not necessarily opposed to possible cuts in CCFP. So at this moment we should not highlight opposition to possible changes.

IV. The G.O.P. Welfare Bill

No, the facts are not up to date. However, please note that the details of proposals continue to change as the bill proceeds to Conference. Also note that the bill adds \$4 billion for child care above the level in H.R. 4.

A. Funding for Work Requirements

The CBO estimate that States will have to spend an additional \$7 billion is an out of date number. OMB does not have an accurate number but concurs that the \$7 billion should not be used, since it is not based on current legislation.

B. Health and Safety Standards

With a vote of 96-0 the Senate restored Child Care Block Grant (CCDBG) health and safety provisions and applied them to all federally funded child care.

C. Child Care Food Program

Same as above.

V. Did the 1995 rescissions bill include child care cuts?

No, CCDBG did not have any cuts and neither did the entitlement programs in the '95 rescission bill.

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

HHS FUNDED CHILD CARE

Summary Funding Table

HHS CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS							
PROGRAM	(Budget Authority in \$ millions)						
	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997 Request	1997 +/- 1996
Discretionary Programs:							
Head Start.....	\$2,202	\$2,776	\$3,326	\$3,535	\$3,570	\$3,981	\$411
Comprehensive Child Development Centers.....	44	47	47	0	0	0	0
Consolidated Child Care & Development Block.....	(839)	(907)	(907)	(949)	935	1,049	114
<i>Child Care and Development Block Grant</i>	825	893	893	935	--	--	--
<i>Dependent Care Development Grants</i>	13	13	13	13	--	--	--
<i>Child Development Scholarships</i>	1	1	1	1	--	--	--
Temporary Child Care & Crisis Nurseries*.....	11	12	12	12	10	0	-10
SUBTOTAL, DISCRETIONARY CHILD CARE.....	\$3,096	\$3,742	\$4,292	\$4,496	\$4,515	\$5,030	\$515
Entitlement Programs: (based on recent estimates)							
Consolidated Child Care Entitlement Block /Welfare Reform.....	(774)	(859)	(1,007)	(1,152)	(1,404)	\$1,555	+ \$151
<i>At-Risk Child Care**</i>	358	264	276	297	335	--	--
<i>Transitional Child Care</i>	75	113	161	200	249	--	--
<i>JOBS Child Care</i>	341	482	570	655	820	--	--
SUBTOTAL, ENTITLEMENT CHILD CARE.....	\$774	\$859	\$1,007	\$1,152	\$1,404	\$1,555	+ \$151
TOTAL, CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT.....	\$3,870	\$4,601	\$5,299	\$5,648	\$5,919	\$6,585	+ \$666

* This program is being consolidated with the Community Based Resource Centers Program in FY 1997.

** For FY 1996, the request is \$300 million; the additional \$35 million is carried over from the prior year.

ACF-18