

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Press Secretary

Series/Staff Member: Mike McCurry

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 11102

FolderID:

Folder Title:

Abortion

Stack:

S

Row:

94

Section:

3

Shelf:

10

Position:

1

Office of the Press Secretary - Mike McCurry

Press Guidance: January - July, 1997

Abortion

Adoption

Affirmative Action

Agriculture

Aids

Air Pollution

Airline Safety

American Airlines

Americorps

ANWR

Appointments

Appropriations

Archives

Assault Weapons Ban

Awards

Bank Reform

Bills/Legislation

Book Group

Budget

Budget Negotiations

Cabinet Information

ENCLOSURES FILED OVERSIZE ATTACHMENTS

*1104 filed 3/13/48
OT*

11102

NARA 8356

Campaign Finance Reform

Campbell, Senator

Ceremonies

Child Development

Child Support

Child Welfare

Children's Television

Chelsea

Church Burnings

COIA

Commerce

Community

Completed Media Requests

Congress

Congressional Black Caucus

CPI

Crime

Cummock, Victoria

DC Plan

Deaths

Debate

Defense

Democrats

Denied Media Requests

DNC

Drug Policy

Economy

Education

Electronic Commerce

Electronics

Environment

Events

FAA

Family and Medical Leave Act

FBI Files

FEMA

Health

Immigration

IRS

Medical

Medicare

Minimum Wage

NASA

Nielsen Ratings

Race Relations

Talking Points

Tax Reform

Technology

Television

Tobacco

Trade

Transportation

Travel

Travel - Bills

Travel Concerns

Treasury

Welfare

Women's Office

Late Term Abortion
May 21, 1997

- The President intends to veto the Santorum bill when it reaches his desk.
- There were no last-minute lobbying efforts by the President on this issue. Senator Nickles discussed it with the President at the bipartisan Congressional meeting, and the President indicated that he intended to veto the legislation if it passed.
- There were staff contacts with Hill staffers on this subject yesterday, but not high-level efforts.

ME Glynn

Talking Points on Late-Term Abortion

5/21/97

- The President will veto the Santorum bill because it does not adequately protect women from grievous physical harm.
- The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG), which is the organization of specialists who know the most about this issue, agrees with the President that the bill ^{could} endanger women, because it prevents doctors from using a procedure that in a few cases best protects women from serious injury.
- The AMA's last-minute endorsement of the Act will not lead the President to change his position. The changes that the AMA bargained for in the bill protect doctors from criminal prosecution, but do not protect women from serious physical injury.
- The AMA insisted that a peer review process take place before any criminal prosecution,
- But these changes do not help the few women -- like the women who were with the President when he signed the bill -- who need the procedure that the bill prohibits in order to prevent grievous injury. The President vetoed the bill last year to protect these women, and he will veto the bill again to protect them.
- The AMA itself concedes that the procedure may be necessary to save a woman's life and that the bill must have a life exception to protect the few women faced with this danger. The President is saying only that this exception must extend to the few other cases in which the procedure is necessary to save a woman from serious physical harm, such as loss of the ability to have other children.

Q&A on Late-Term Abortion

Question: Does the AMA's endorsement of the Partial Birth Abortion Act -- and its statement that the partial-birth procedure is not good medicine -- change your view of this legislation?

Answer: No, because I am still not convinced that this bill adequately protects women from grievous injury. Let me remind you that the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, which is the organization of doctors that knows the most about this issue, opposes this bill for the same reason I do -- because it prevents doctors from using a procedure that in a small group of cases best protects women from serious physical injury. The AMA endorsed this bill after bargaining for a change that protects doctors. I've implored Congress to make a narrow change in the bill to protect women -- to ensure that they don't suffer grievous injury because Congress has tied the hands of their doctors -- and I will not sign the bill until I get it.

Question: Senator Daschle has now said that he will vote for the Partial Birth Abortion Act. Does this mean that your veto will be overridden?

Answer: We'll have to see how the votes line up -- but that's not going to affect my decision. I will veto this bill because I think it doesn't adequately protect women from serious physical injury. I have said over and over that if Congress were to add a narrow exception covering these few cases, I would gladly sign the bill. But I will not sign the bill until it has that narrow exception for grievous injury, no matter how the votes stack up in Congress.

Late Term Abortion
May 15, 1997

BACKGROUND: You were asked yesterday how the President feels about receiving a letter from 10 former Presidents of the Southern Baptist Convention criticizing your position on late term abortion.

- Last June, the President received a letter from several former presidents of the Southern Baptists Convention criticizing the veto of the late term abortion bill.
- The President responded to their letter on June 7, 1996. (See attached.) In it, he says, "Let me be clear. I do not contend that this procedure, today, is always used in circumstances that meet my standard. The Procedure may well be used in situations where a woman's serious health interests are not at risk. I do not support such uses, I do not defend them, and I would sign appropriate legislation banning them."

Drafted: MEGlynn

DRAFT

May 14, 1997
(Senate)

H.R. 1122 - Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1997
(Solomon (R) NY)

H.R. 1122 contains the same serious flaws as H.R. 1833, an identical bill that was passed during the 104th Congress and vetoed by the President on April 10, 1996.

The President will veto H.R. 1122 for the reasons he expressed in his veto message of April 10, 1996, which is attached.

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

April 10, 1996

TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 1833, which would prohibit doctors from performing a certain kind of abortion. I do so because the bill does not allow women to protect themselves from serious threats to their health. By refusing to permit women, in reliance on their doctors' best medical judgment, to use this procedure when their lives are threatened or when their health is put in serious jeopardy, the Congress has fashioned a bill that is consistent neither with the Constitution nor with sound public policy.

I have always believed that the decision to have an abortion generally should be between a woman, her doctor, her conscience, and her God. I support the decision in Roe v. Wade protecting a woman's right to choose, and I believe that the abortions protected by that decision should be safe and rare. Consistent with that decision, I have long opposed late-term abortions except where necessary to protect the life or health of the mother. In fact, as Governor of Arkansas, I signed into law a bill that barred third trimester abortions, with an appropriate exception for life or health.

The procedure described in H.R. 1833 has troubled me deeply, as it has many people. I cannot support use of that procedure on an elective basis, where the abortion is being performed for non-health related reasons and there are equally safe medical procedures available.

There are, however, rare and tragic situations that can occur in a woman's pregnancy in which, in a doctor's medical judgment, the use of this procedure may be necessary to save a woman's life or to protect her against serious injury to her health. In these situations, in which a woman and her family must make an awful choice, the Constitution requires, as it should, that the ability to choose this procedure be protected.

In the past several months, I have heard from women who desperately wanted to have their babies, who were devastated to learn that their babies had fatal conditions and would not live, who wanted anything other than an abortion, but who 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 ever bear children again. For these women, this was not about choice -- not about deciding against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth, and the only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

I cannot sign H.R. 1833, as passed, because it fails to protect women in such dire circumstances -- because by treating doctors who perform the procedure in these tragic cases as criminals, the bill poses a danger of serious harm to women. This bill, in curtailing the ability of women and their doctors to choose the procedure for sound medical reasons, violates the constitutional command that any law regulating abortion protect both the life and the health of the woman. The bill's overbroad criminal prohibition risks that women will suffer serious injury.

more

(OVER)

2

That is why I implored Congress to add an exemption for the small number of compelling cases where selection of the procedure, in the medical judgment of the attending physician, was necessary to preserve the life of the woman or avert serious adverse consequences to her health. The life exception in the current bill only covers cases where the doctor believes that the woman will die. It fails to cover cases where, absent the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I told Congress that I would sign H.R. 1833 if it were amended to add an exception for serious health consequences. A bill amended in this way would strike a proper balance, remedying the constitutional and human defect of H.R. 1833. If such a bill were presented to me, I would sign it now.

I understand the desire to eliminate the use of a procedure that appears inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be even more inhumane.

The Congress chose not to adopt the sensible and constitutionally appropriate proposal I made, instead leaving women unprotected against serious health risks. As a result of this Congressional indifference to women's health, I cannot, in good conscience and consistent with my responsibility to uphold the law, sign this legislation.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE,
April 10, 1996.

• • •

Late Term Abortion

Press Guidance
May 14, 1997

Daschle and Feinstein Amendments

Both Daschle and Feinstein prohibit post-viability abortions generally. They differ in two ways from HR 1122:

- They apply to all procedures, including but not limited to partial birth.
- They apply only to abortions performed after the fetus has become viable.

Both contain health exceptions.

Feinstein:

- Exempts an abortion if “in the medical judgement of the attending physician, the abortion is necessary to avert serious adverse health consequences to the woman.”

Daschle:

- Exempts an abortion when the physician certifies that continuation of the pregnancy would risk grievous injury to the woman’s physical health.
- Greivous injury is defined as a severely debilitating disease or impairment specifically caused by the pregnancy, or an inability to provide necessary treatment for a life-threatening condition.

FYI: The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists endorsed the Daschle amendment yesterday. The AMA has refused to take a position on any of the pending legislation, but has expressed skepticism about the procedure generally.

Drafted: MEGlynn
Cleared: EKagan

GUIDANCE ON DASCHLE ABORTION LEGISLATION
MAY 13, 1997

- * As you know, the President has made it clear all along that he would sign legislation to ban late-term abortions as long as that legislation provided adequate protection to the life **and** health of the mother.
- * So far, Congress has declined to send him legislation that protected the mother's health.
- * Senators Daschle and Feinstein have both been working hard to design legislation that would address this concern.
- * We have been examining both proposals, and the President is very eager to get a report on them this afternoon. We will have more to say about this after the President has had an opportunity to receive the information he is looking for.

(Mike -- we might endorse both equally. Daschle says "grievous injury and defines it." He also imposes significant, but civil, penalties. Feinstein also imposes civil penalties, though less serious, and says "serious adverse health consequences" and doesn't define them. This has been our mantra, but we can't lean toward her.)

TOIV
Podesta

Q&A on Late Term Abortion

Question: Do you remain committed to vetoing the partial birth abortion bill? Didn't you base your prior veto of the bill on false information -- i.e., that this procedure is performed on only a few hundred women in desperate circumstances?

Answer: I will veto the bill, for the same reason as before -- because it doesn't adequately protect women from serious harm. I based my veto on the fact that there are a small group of women in desperate circumstances who need this procedure in order to save their lives or prevent serious injury to their health. Let's be clear: I've never said that these are the only circumstances in which the procedure is used; I've just said that these few women need to be protected. If Congress does so, I will gladly sign the bill, because I think this kind of procedure should be banned except when necessary to save the life of a woman or prevent serious harm to her health.

Question: If Congress were to add a health exception to the partial birth bill you vetoed last year, that bill would prohibit all partial birth abortions -- even if done before viability -- that aren't done for life or serious health reasons. Would you really sign a bill of that kind?

Answer: I have made very clear my condition for signing the partial birth bill. I told Congress that I would sign the bill if it protected women who need the procedure to save their lives or avert serious harm to their health. I continue to take that position. If Congress adds a provision to the bill that protects women who need the procedure for life or serious health reasons, I will sign that bill.

Question: Would you sign Senator Daschle's bill prohibiting all post-viability abortions except when done to save the life of a woman or avert serious harm to her health?

Answer: I have not seen Senator Daschle's language, but I believe that I could sign his bill. I have long opposed elective late-term abortions, regardless what procedure is used: when I was Governor of Arkansas, I signed into law a bill that barred all third-trimester abortions, with an appropriate exception for life or health. And last year, I said I would sign such a bill at the federal level. Assuming Senator Daschle's bill adequately protects women who need late abortion to prevent serious harm to their health, I will make it the nation's law.

4-2-97

Tiller/Protection of Abortion Doctor by US Marshalls

BACKGROUND: There was a story in the *Washington Post* yesterday which connected US Marshalls protection that Wichita physician George Tiller received because he has been threatened (and in 1993, shot) by anti-abortion groups and his contributions to the Democratic Party. Dr. Tiller also attended a coffee in the White House in June, 1996.

Dr. Tiller's spokeswoman said that he would have made the donation irregardless of his protective status because President Clinton is pro-choice, while Senator Dole held the opposite view of abortion. Dr. Tiller has a history of donating to Democratic political candidates.

Justice Department spokesman John Russell said,

“The decision to give him protection had absolutely nothing to do with political contributions. I don't think that the personnel that made the decision had any idea or asked any questions about political affiliations. The bottom line is we're trying to prevent a death -- in an area that is very volatile and where there has been precedence for death.”

White House spokesman Lanny Davis said,

“Without commenting on the specific situation of this particular situation of this particular individual, we can state categorically that no government action ever resulted because of a campaign contribution.”

Q: Does the President think that it is proper for the Democratic Party to solicit funds from an individual who is receiving US Marshal protection?

A: If individuals who receive US government services are disqualified from contributing to political parties, then no citizens of the United States will be able to make a contribution. As US citizens, we benefit from a variety of services from the federal government. Without a doubt, it is proper for any US citizen to participate in the political process by making a donation to a political party.

As to why Dr. Tiller is or is not receiving federal protection now, I would refer you to the Justice Department.

Drafted: ME Klynn

Cleared: Cheryl Miles

Talking Points on Abortion Clinic & Police Stop Cases
Contact: Myron Marlin 616-2777]
Department of Justice

Schenck v. Pro-Choice Clinic Case

- We are pleased that the Supreme Court has reaffirmed the government's interest in protecting a woman's right to gain access to a reproductive health clinic.
- Once again, the Court approved buffer zones that keep people who have previously engaged in obstructive conduct away from clinic entrances and driveways. [6-3 ruling on that point.]
- It was only on the facts of the case that the Court said it could not support creating a so-called floating buffer zone around women entering clinics. [8-1 ruling on that point.]
- We will continue to protect the rights of women who seek reproductive health care and enforce the clinic access law that President Clinton signed in 1994.

Maryland v. Wilson Police Stop Case

- The Supreme Court yesterday agreed with Attorney General Reno who argued that police officers should be able to ask passengers to step out of a car during a traffic stop.
- The Attorney General had heard from many police officers who expressed a need to have this authority.
- In a 7-2 ruling, Chief Justice Rehnquist wrote that the passenger's rights were outweighed by the government's interest in public safety.
- The Court also cited the fact that in 1994 alone there were more than 5,000 assaults and 11 officers killed during traffic pursuits and stops.

#

Drafted: Myron Marlin, DOJ, 616-2777
Cleared: Dennis Burke, DPC, 6-5568

**Additional Q&A re Supreme Court decision on police car stops
Per Dennis Burke, DPC, 6-5568**

- Q. There have been a rash of cases in which police officers have abused motorists. Will this decision lead to more harassment of motorists?
- A. This decision only gives police officers the discretion to request that a passengers step out of the car. They already have the authority to ask the driver to get out. This is a logical extension of that authority -- nothing more. In light of how many officers are injured or killed every year in traffic cases, the ruling in this case is based on a public and police officer safety need.

MEMORANDUM

01/14/97

TO: April Melody
FROM: Mike Gauldin, Department of the Interior *GAULDIN*

The Christian Defense Coalition (Rev. Patrick Mahoney, anti-abortion) is seeking court relief to allow them to demonstrate on both sides of Penn. Ave between 9th and 10th Streets during the Inaugural Parade, Jan. 20.

The National Park Service has denied the Coalition's permit application for this time and place because the area they want is already permitted to the Inaugural Committee and the area does not reasonably permit multiple occupancy.

In the denial letter which was sent to Rev. Mahoney December 16, the National Park Service offered two alternate locations for the demonstration, 1) north end of John Marshall park, 4th and Penn., 2) northeast quadrant of the Ellipse, 15th and E Streets. Both sites are within sight of the parade route. Two other locations were applied for by the Coalition and permits for these two locations for Jan. 20 have been issued, Lafayette Park for 200 participants and Washington Monument grounds for the display of 4,400 crosses.

It is only the location on Penn. Av that has been denied by NPS. This location was applied for Nov. 13, after the parade route had been permitted to PIC. In subsequent discussions, it was determined that some 300 Coalition participants planned to stand adjacent to one another on both curbsides of the entire block while each participant carried a 4x4-foot photograph depicting "large graphic pictures of late term aborted children."

Press Guidance
January 16, 1997

Atlanta Bombing

Two explosions occurred earlier today in an Atlanta building housing a family planning clinic.

- FBI and ATF officials are on the scene investigating.
- Law enforcement officials on the scene will hold a press conference at the site at 2 pm. The US Attorney, the lead FBI Special Agent in Charge (SAC), the lead ATF SAC, and a representative of the Georgia Bureau of Investigation will participate.

* DOJ will forward additional talking points.

A Melody per Bert Brandenburg, DOJ

Brandenburg/Justice
202/616-2777
1/16/97

Justice Department Abortion Violence Talking Points for Mike McCurry

- The FBI and the ATF are on the scene investigating, and we are determined to get to the bottom of this case and bring the perpetrators to Justice. We are still getting information on who may have been injured, but we don't yet know of any deaths.
- The U.S. Attorney, FBI, and ATF will hold a press conference at 2:00 at the site of the bombing. (*Q: Why there? A: To send a message that these cowards will not win.*)
- Despite today's bombing, clinic violence appears to be dropping. According to the Justice Department, there were an average of 15-16 bombings and arsons per year from 1993-95. In 1996, that number dropped to 7. A report released by the Feminist Majority today says that abortion clinic violence has dropped for two straight years.
- The drop in violence is due in part to the federal government's enforcement of the FACE law (Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act), which prohibits threats, violence, and physical obstruction against providers of reproductive health care services. Since May, 1994, when President Clinton signed this legislation, a task force set up by Attorney General Reno to fight violence against abortion providers has brought 12 civil cases and fifteen criminal cases under FACE.

the
Justice
Department
under

476-6110

CLINTON GORE '96

PRESS RELEASE

For Immediate Release:
August 6, 1996

Contact: Ann Lewis
Deputy Campaign Manager
202/496-5027
Joe Lockhart
National Press Secretary
202/496-5063

STATEMENT BY ANN LEWIS DEPUTY CAMPAIGN MANAGER

Two months ago Bob Dole said that his platform would definitely include tolerance language on the issue of abortion:

*"It has been resolved. I think I make that decision--it's not negotiable.
It's the decision. And that's going to be in the plank."
(CNN Inside Politics 6/10/96)*

Yesterday, Bob Dole agreed to the demands by Pat Robertson and Pat Buchanan, and walked away from his own commitment to "tolerance" toward those Republicans who support a woman's right to choose. Now the 1996 Republican platform, like Bob Dole's record, is clearly and consistently anti-choice.

Bob Dole opposed *Roe v. Wade*; voted against ending the gag rule in family planning clinics; and voted against the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act which protects clinics from violence. His platform will oppose *Roe v. Wade*. His platform will call for a constitutional amendment that would make abortion illegal for every woman in every state. His platform will demand the appointment of judges who meet an anti-abortion litmus test.

With his decision to abandon mainstream Republicans, and adopt Pat Robertson's and Pat Buchanan's definition of "tolerance", all traces of Bob Dole's reported move to the center have been erased.

###

P.O. Box 19300 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-9300 • 202 · 331 · 1996 • FAX: 202 · 496 · 4849

PAID FOR BY THE CLINTON/GORE '96 PRIMARY COMMITTEE, INC. • CONTRIBUTIONS TO CLINTON/GORE '96 ARE NOT TAX-DEDUCTIBLE.

CLINTON GORE 96

Bob Dole
An Extremist, Anti-Choice Agenda
June 21, 1996

Dole Will "Outlaw" a Woman's Right to Choose

"If I'm President, I think we can actually ... can we outlaw abortion? Well, I propose to, I'd like to overturn Roe v. Wade."

Bob Dole, November 1995

- **"My Position Is Clear"**

As Dole has said himself, "My position is clear and on the record. I've been opposed to abortion on demand ever since this issue became an issue in Congress. I've never varied from that position. I've supported a constitutional amendment to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. I've voted for Hyde abortion funding restrictions and for Jesse Helms' proposal." (Conservative Digest, January 1986)

- **"Not Negotiable" on Constitutional Amendment**

On CNN earlier this month, Dole was asked whether the GOP's platform on choice "has been resolved." Dole responded that his party's platform would call for a constitutional amendment outlawing abortion: "It's not negotiable. It's the decision. And that's going to be in the plank."

- **Voted Against Clinic Safety**

Dole voted against passage of the conference report on S.636, the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act, which established criminal and civil penalties for persons who use force, threat of force, or physical obstruction to interfere with access to women's health clinics.

- **Dole Would Use an Anti-Choice Litmus Test for Supreme Court Appointments**

In a November 1995 address to an anti-choice audience in Iowa, Dole referred to the time since *Roe v. Wade* as "this very sad chapter in our history" and stated that Supreme Court Justices should strictly interpret the Constitution and promised, "I would only appoint such people." (AP, November 11, 1995)

Dole's platform will call for a constitutional amendment making abortion illegal for every woman. Now Bob Dole wants the votes of pro-choice women so that he can win the White House and pursue his extreme, anti-choice agenda.

P.O. BOX 19300 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-9300 • 202 · 331 · 1996 • FAX: 202 · 496 · 4849

PAID FOR BY THE CLINTON/GORE '96 PRIMARY COMMITTEE, INC. • CONTRIBUTIONS TO CLINTON/GORE '96 ARE NOT TAX-DEDUCTIBLE.

Fact Sheet V

Promoting Reproductive Health Services for Women

"Certain choices are too personal for politics." *President Clinton and Vice President Gore*

The President is committed to ensuring that all women have access to reproductive health and family planning services, that all women are able to determine the number and spacing of their children, and that abortion is safe, legal and rare.

Reversed the Gag Rule

During his first week in office, President Clinton reversed the previous administration's attempts to prevent federally funded family planning clinics from providing full information on options for resolving unintended pregnancies.

Supports Reproductive Health and Family Planning

Under President Clinton, the annual budget for the Title X Family Planning Program has increased from \$173.4 million to \$193.3 million. This program is the primary federal mechanism for direct provision of reproductive health and family planning services to low-income women. It is estimated that subsidized family planning services, such as those provided through Title X, prevent more than 1 million unintended pregnancies and 500,000 abortions each year. In 1994, at the International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo, the United States agreed with more than 150 nations to promote reproductive health for all women and to address the threat to women's health from unsafe abortions.

Establishing Clinic Safety

President Clinton signed the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act to fight the escalating violence against women and doctors at women's health clinics.

Moved Forward with Reproductive Research

President Clinton ordered that the ban on mifepristone, a drug that terminates pregnancy without surgery, be revisited. Currently, the drug is undergoing clinical trials in the U.S.

Establishing Services for Victims of Rape and Incest

Under President Clinton, the Department of Health and Human Services implemented a congressionally ordered change to Medicaid to include abortion services for women whose pregnancies result from rape or incest, in addition to saving the life of the woman.



April 25, 1996
 Publication: SR-27-Dem. Agenda

The Republican Agenda vs. Women

Introduction	1
Economic Security	3
Health Security	6
Education	8
Crime and Violence	9
Welfare Reform	10
Opportunity	10
Choice	11
Conclusion	13

DPC Staff Contact: Debra Silimso (202-224-3232)

Democratic Policy Committee
 United States Senate
 Washington, D.C., 20510-7050
 Tom Daschle, Chairman
 Harry Reid, Co-Chairman



- **Affirmative action has created better educational opportunities for women. From 1976 to 1980, the percentage of medical degrees earned by women jumped from 19 percent to 33 percent, and law degrees from 23 percent to 41 percent.**
- **Affirmative action has helped women move into high-paying male dominated professions.**
- **Women-owned businesses are a driving force behind economic growth and job creation. Women own 5.9 million businesses—34 percent of all domestic firms. They employ 6.3 million workers—35 percent more than the Fortune 500 companies. Affirmative action programs have helped women owned business compete for Federal contracts and grow.**

Choice

Many Republican leaders would like to outlaw a women's right to choose completely. Unable to do that, the anti-choice majority is pursuing a strategy to chip away at women's rights. As a result, there have been a record number of abortion-related votes in this Congress (24 in the House, 19 in the Senate) In some cases, rather than bring the matter up for a freestanding vote, Republicans have attached a barrage of legislative "riders" to other, must-pass bills:

The Republican-led Congress, while claiming to want less government, has inserted itself into decisions best left to a woman, her family and her doctor.

- **Federal employees cannot choose a health insurance plan that covers abortion services. Rep. Chris Smith (R-NJ) says the ban should be extended to all health insurance plans.**
- **Women in the military stationed overseas cannot get abortions in military hospitals—even if they want to pay the costs themselves.**

- **International family planning organizations will be denied funds if they provide abortion counselling—even with their own non-Federal funds. Such Federal funds are used to provide health care, prenatal care and nutrition to disadvantaged women around the world.**
 - **States will be allowed to deny Medicaid funding for abortions—even for victims of rape and incest.**
 - **A Republican attempt to eliminate completely the federal family planning program (Title X) was only narrowly defeated (224-204). The program provides low-income women with exams, lab tests, and family planning services and has enjoyed 25 years of bipartisan support.**
-
- **Medical resident training programs for ob-gyn no longer need to provide training in abortion procedures, training that is recommended by the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education.**
 - **Republicans in the House tried to prohibit the District from using its own funds to pay for abortion at any District of Columbia public hospital or clinic.**
 - **The President vetoed an attempt to outlaw a rare late-term abortion procedure—the first attempt by Congress to ban a specific medical procedure thus presenting a direct Constitutional challenge to *Roe v Wade*. The Senate had rejected an amendment which would have allowed the procedure to be used to save the life of the woman and avert serious health consequences.**

3/15/96
S. Janna

Voters For Choice Survey Research Update
(As Of March, 1996)

1) Many Republicans Think Bob Dole Is Pro-Choice:

- A) CNN/Time Poll
2/24/96
1002 Registered GOP Voters
Margin of Error: +/- 3%

37% of registered GOP voters support Bob Dole. Of these Dole supporters,
51% think Bob Dole supports a pro-choice position.

- B) NARAL/Hickman-Brown Poll
10/23/95 - 10/26/95
800 Registered Voters
Margin of Error: +/- 3.5%

Pro-Choice GOP Voters:

- * → 44% Don't Know Dole's Position On Choice
35% Know Dole Is Anti-Choice And Disagree With Him On Issue
21% Think Dole Is Pro-Choice

Pro-Choice Independent Voters:

- * 33% Don't Know Dole's Position On Choice
57% Know Dole Is Anti-Choice And Disagree With Him On Issue
10% Think Dole Is Pro-Choice

2

2) Voters Do Not Support The GOP Platform Plank Supporting A Constitutional Ban On Abortion:

- A) CNN/Time Poll
2/24/96
1002 Registered GOP Voters
Margin of Error: +/- 3%

A Constitutional Amendment To Ban Abortion Should Not Be In The GOP Platform:

65% Agree With This Position
74% of Dole Supporters Agree With This Position

- B) NARAL/Hickman-Brown Poll
10/23/95 - 10/26/95
800 Registered Voters
Margin of Error: +/- 3.5%

The Republican Party Platform says that all abortions should be outlawed, regardless of the circumstances that led to the pregnancy and regardless of the health or wishes of the woman involved. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

29% Total Agree With GOP Platform
68% Total Disagree With GOP Platform

16% Strongly Agree
13% Somewhat Agree
14% Somewhat Disagree
54% Strongly Disagree

63% of Republican Women Voters Oppose Platform
47% Strongly Disagree
16% Somewhat Disagree

3

- C) CBS/New York Times Poll
10/22/95 - 10/25/95
1269 Registered Voters
Margin of Error: +/- 3%
(478 GOP Primary Voters/Margin of Error: +/- 5%)

The Republican Party Platform should specifically support a Constitutional Amendment to outlaw abortion:

76% of GOP Primary Voters Oppose Outlawing Abortion

3) Voters Strongly Support The Pro-Choice Plank Of The Democratic Platform:

- A) NARAL/Hickman-Brown Poll
10/23/95 - 10/26/95
800 Registered Voters
Margin of Error: +/- 3.5%

The Democratic Party Platform says that government should not interfere with a woman's right to decide whether or not to have an abortion, regardless of the circumstances that led to the pregnancy and regardless of the health or wishes of the woman involved. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

61% Total Agree With Pro-Choice Democratic Platform
35% Total Disagree With Pro-Choice Democratic Platform

42% Strongly Agree
19% Somewhat Agree
13% Somewhat Disagree
22% Strongly Disagree

52% of GOP Women Voters Support Pro-Choice Democratic Platform

33% Strongly Agree
19% Somewhat Agree

4) The Strongest Pro-Choice Argument Continues To Be Based On Anti-Government Intrusion:

- A) NARAL/Hickman-Brown Poll
10/23/95 - 10/26/95
800 Registered Voters
Margin of Error: +/- 3.5%

65% of registered voters are concerned that government will go too far trying to regulate private personal decisions like abortion.

64% of registered GOP women voters are concerned that government will go too far trying to regulate private personal decisions like abortion.

73% of registered independent women voters are concerned that government will go too far trying to regulate personal decisions like abortion.

67% of registered voters believe that most politicians who vote to restrict a woman's right to choose are hypocritical: they say they want less government involvement in the economy and a smaller government, but they turn around and give government almost total power in this private issue.

53% of registered women voters believe that politicians who vote to restrict a woman's right to choose do not trust women to make their own decisions (44% GOP women, 45% independent women, 65% of Democratic women support this belief).

DRAFT – The 1996 Democratic National Platform

1 work can stay on welfare forever. We should require minor mothers to live with their parents or
2 another responsible adult. If the Republican Party puts politics aside, we can finish the job
3 President Clinton started, and end welfare as we know it across America. Passing legislation is
4 not enough; we should make sure people get the skills they need to get jobs, and that there are
5 jobs for them to go to so they leave welfare and stay off. Welfare reform should put more people
6 to work and move them into the economic mainstream, not take jobs away from working
7 families.

8 *Child support.* Nobody has the right to walk away from the responsibility to care for his
9 or her children. If you owe child support, paying it fully and promptly is just the first step in
10 living up to your responsibility as a parent. The Clinton Administration has made a determined
11 effort to crack down on deadbeat parents, collecting a record \$11 billion in 1995 through tough
12 enforcement -- almost a 40 percent increase over 1992. President Clinton issued an Executive
13 Order to track down federal workers who fail to pay child support, and force them to pay.
14 President Clinton, Congressional Democrats, and Democratic governors all know that the
15 toughest possible child support enforcement must be a central part of any real welfare reform
16 plan -- including the President's plan to deny drivers licenses and professional licenses to people
17 who do not pay their child support. We must tell deadbeats: If you neglect your responsibility to
18 your children, we will suspend your license, garnish your wages, track you down, and make you
19 pay.

20 *Teen pregnancy.* For the first time in years, the teen pregnancy rate has leveled off and
21 begun to drop. But we all know it is still far too high. Government alone cannot solve this
22 problem. That is why President Clinton challenged community, business, and religious leaders
23 together to form a national campaign to keep the teen pregnancy rate going down. And he
24 expanded support for community-based prevention programs that teach abstinence and demand
25 responsibility. We must send the strongest possible signal to young people that it is wrong to get
26 pregnant or father a child until they are married and ready to support that child and raise that
27 child.

28 We also know that half of all underage mothers were made pregnant by a man in his
29 twenties, or even older. Statutory rape is a crime, but unfortunately the laws that protect young
30 women from it are almost never enforced. We echo the President's call to America's
31 prosecutors: Enforce the statutory rape laws vigorously against men who prey on underage
32 women.

33 *Choice.* The Democratic Party stands behind the right of every woman to choose,
34 consistent with *Roe v. Wade*, and regardless of ability to pay. President Clinton took executive
35 action to make sure that the right to make such decisions is protected for all Americans. Over
36 the last four years, we have taken action to end the gag rule and ensure safety at family planning
37 and women's health clinics. We believe it is a fundamental constitutional liberty that individual
38 Americans -- not government -- can best take responsibility for making the most difficult and
39 intensely personal decisions regarding reproduction.

DRAFT - The 1996 Democratic National Platform

1 The Democratic Party is a party of inclusion. We respect the individual conscience of
2 each American on this difficult issue, and we welcome all our members to participate at every
3 level of our party.

4 Our goal is to make abortion less necessary and more rare, not more difficult and more
5 dangerous. We support contraceptive research, family planning, comprehensive family life
6 education, and policies that support healthy childbearing. For four years in a row, we have
7 increased support for family planning. The abortion rate is dropping. Now we must continue to
8 support efforts to reduce unintended pregnancies, and we call on all Americans to take personal
9 responsibility to meet this important goal.

10 **Reinventing government.** The American people have a right to demand that
11 responsibility is the order of the day in Washington. The mission of today's Democratic Party is
12 to expand opportunity, not bureaucracy. We have worked hard over the last four years to rein in
13 big government, slash burdensome regulations, eliminate wasteful programs, and shift problem-
14 solving out of Washington and back to people and communities who understand their situations
15 best.

16 In the last four years, President Clinton, working with the National Performance Review
17 chaired by Vice President Gore, has cut the federal government by almost 240,000 positions,
18 making the smallest federal government in 30 years. The federal government is eliminating
19 16,000 pages of outdated and unnecessary regulations, has abolished 179 programs and projects,
20 and saved taxpayers billions of dollars. The President fought for and signed unfunded mandates
21 legislation. This stops Congress from requiring state and local governments to implement
22 expensive policies without providing any means to pay for them, and encourages better
23 partnerships and more balance of resources and responsibilities. After presidents since Ulysses
24 S. Grant tried to get the line-item veto and failed, President Clinton signed landmark legislation
25 that will give the President this powerful tool to cut pork-barrel spending from bills passed by
26 Congress.

27 For years, Republicans talked about making government smaller while letting it grow --
28 Democrats are doing it. For years, Republicans talked about cutting the deficit while letting it
29 climb -- Democrats are doing it. For years, Republicans talked about shifting power back to
30 states and communities -- Democrats are doing it. For years, Republicans talked about making
31 government more businesslike and efficient -- Democrats are doing it. Democrats are bringing
32 responsibility back to Washington. In the last two years, Republicans under Senator Dole and
33 Speaker Gingrich shut the federal government down in an irresponsible attempt at partisan
34 blackmail. Democrats under President Clinton said, and America agreed: Partisan threats are no
35 way to run a government. Nobody should ever shut down the government again. The
36 Republican shutdown cost the taxpayers \$1.4 billion. Democrats believe government should
37 work better and cost less -- not work less and cost more.

38 The Republican shutdown was an affront to the hardworking public servants in our cities,
39 towns, states, and nation who devote their lives to improving life in our country. Thanks to them
40 our streets are safer, our water is cleaner, and our nation is secure. Front-line federal workers