

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Rex M. Horne, Jr.
Immanuel Baptist Church
1000 Bishop Street
Little Rock, Arkansas 72202

Dear Rex:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure. I know that you feel very strongly about this matter.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Bill Hybels
Willow Creek Community Church
67 East Algonquin Road
South Barrington, Illinois 60010

Dear Bill:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Bill Clinton". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned below the typed name "Bill Clinton".

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Fred C. Kammer, S.J.
President
Catholic Charities USA
Suite 200
1731 King Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Dear Fred:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ben Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Gordon MacDonald
Grace Chapel
Three Militia Drive
Lexington, Massachusetts 02173

Dear Gordon:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

Mr. Greg Warner
Associated Baptist Press
Post Office Box 23769
Jacksonville, Florida 32241

Dear Greg:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure. I understand that you feel very strongly about this matter.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Ron Clinton" with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

Mr. Don Argue
President
National Association
of Evangelicals
450 Gunderson Drive
Carol Stream, Illinois 60188

Dear Don:

I wanted to thank you for your thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which as you know I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ben Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Anthony Mangun
3411 Bayou Rapides Road
Alexandria, Louisiana 71303

Dear Anthony:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Bill Clinton" with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending from the end of the name.

Letters on Partial Birth Abortion

Cardinal Bernardin
Cardinal Hickey
Cardinal Law
Cardinal Mahoney

Ms. Kate Britton
Rev. Anthony Campolo
Amb. Raymond Flynn
Rev. Jim Henry
Mr. Herb Hollinger
Rev. Rex Horne, Jr.
Rev. Bill Hybels
Rev. Fred Kammer
Rev. Gordon MacDonald
Mr. Greg Warner

Mr. Don Argue
Rev. Anthony Mangun

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Bernardin
Archbishop of Chicago
Post Office Box 1979
Chicago, Illinois 60690

Dear Cardinal Bernardin:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ben Cline

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

His Eminence James Cardinal Hickey
Archbishop of Washington
Post Office Box 29260
Washington, D.C. 20017

Dear Cardinal Hickey:

I want to thank you for your letters on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ben Cline

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

His Eminence Bernard Cardinal Law
Archbishop of Boston
Cardinal's Residence
2101 Commonwealth Avenue
Brighton, Massachusetts 02135

Dear Cardinal Law:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ben Cline

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

His Eminence Roger Cardinal Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015-1194

Dear Cardinal Mahony:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

Kate Britton
8708 Brook Road
McLean, Virginia 22102

Dear Kate:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Anthony Campolo
Eastern College
10 Fairview Drive
St. Davids, Pennsylvania 19087

Dear Tony:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure. I know that you feel very strongly about this matter.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

The Honorable Raymond L. Flynn
American Ambassador
The Vatican
APO AE 09624

The Honorable Raymond L. Flynn
American Ambassador
The Vatican

Dear Ray:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Jim Henry
First Baptist Church
3701 L. B. McLeod Road
Orlando, Florida 32805-6691

Dear Jim:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure. I understand that you feel very strongly about this matter.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ron Clinton", followed by a long horizontal flourish.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

Mr. Herb Hollinger
Baptist Press
Suite 750
901 Commerce Street
Nashville, Tennessee 37203-3699

Dear Herb:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure. I understand that you feel very strongly about this matter.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Tim Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Rex M. Horne, Jr.
Immanuel Baptist Church
1000 Bishop Street
Little Rock, Arkansas 72202

Dear Rex:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure. I know that you feel very strongly about this matter.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ron Clement

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Bill Hybels
Willow Creek Community Church
67 East Algonquin Road
South Barrington, Illinois 60010

Dear Bill:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Bill Clinton". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned below the typed name "Bill Clinton".

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Fred C. Kammer, S.J.
President
Catholic Charities USA
Suite 200
1731 King Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Dear Fred:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ben Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Gordon MacDonald
Grace Chapel
Three Militia Drive
Lexington, Massachusetts 02173

Dear Gordon:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

Mr. Greg Warner
Associated Baptist Press
Post Office Box 23769
Jacksonville, Florida 32241

Dear Greg:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure. I understand that you feel very strongly about this matter.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Bill Clinton" with a stylized flourish at the end.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

Mr. Don Argue
President
National Association
of Evangelicals
450 Gunderson Drive
Carol Stream, Illinois 60188

Dear Don:

I wanted to thank you for your thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which as you know I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ben Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Anthony Mangun
3411 Bayou Rapides Road
Alexandria, Louisiana 71303

Dear Anthony:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Bill Clinton" with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke at the end.

Letters on Partial Birth Abortion

Cardinal Bernardin
Cardinal Hickey
Cardinal Law
Cardinal Mahoney

Ms. Kate Britton
Rev. Anthony Campolo
Amb. Raymond Flynn
Rev. Jim Henry
Mr. Herb Hollinger
Rev. Rex Horne, Jr.
Rev. Bill Hybels
Rev. Fred Kammer
Rev. Gordon MacDonald
Mr. Greg Warner

Mr. Don Argue
Rev. Anthony Mangun

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Bernardin
Archbishop of Chicago
Post Office Box 1979
Chicago, Illinois 60690

Dear Cardinal Bernardin:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ben Cline

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

His Eminence James Cardinal Hickey
Archbishop of Washington
Post Office Box 29260
Washington, D.C. 20017

Dear Cardinal Hickey:

I want to thank you for your letters on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ben Cline

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

His Eminence Bernard Cardinal Law
Archbishop of Boston
Cardinal's Residence
2101 Commonwealth Avenue
Brighton, Massachusetts 02135

Dear Cardinal Law:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ben Cline

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

His Eminence Roger Cardinal Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015-1194

Dear Cardinal Mahony:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ben Cline

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

Kate Britton
8708 Brook Road
McLean, Virginia 22102

Dear Kate:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Anthony Campolo
Eastern College
10 Fairview Drive
St. Davids, Pennsylvania 19087

Dear Tony:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure. I know that you feel very strongly about this matter.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

The Honorable Raymond L. Flynn
American Ambassador
The Vatican
APO AE 09624

The Honorable Raymond L. Flynn
American Ambassador
The Vatican

Dear Ray:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Jim Henry
First Baptist Church
3701 L. B. McLeod Road
Orlando, Florida 32805-6691

Dear Jim:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure. I understand that you feel very strongly about this matter.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Bob Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

Mr. Herb Hollinger
Baptist Press
Suite 750
901 Commerce Street
Nashville, Tennessee 37203-3699

Dear Herb:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure. I understand that you feel very strongly about this matter.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ron Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Rex M. Horne, Jr.
Immanuel Baptist Church
1000 Bishop Street
Little Rock, Arkansas 72202

Dear Rex:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure. I know that you feel very strongly about this matter.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Bob Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Bill Hybels
Willow Creek Community Church
67 East Algonquin Road
South Barrington, Illinois 60010

Dear Bill:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Bill Clinton".

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Fred C. Kammer, S.J.
President
Catholic Charities USA
Suite 200
1731 King Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Dear Fred:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ben Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Gordon MacDonald
Grace Chapel
Three Militia Drive
Lexington, Massachusetts 02173

Dear Gordon:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

Mr. Greg Warner
Associated Baptist Press
Post Office Box 23769
Jacksonville, Florida 32241

Dear Greg:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure. I understand that you feel very strongly about this matter.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Bill Clinton" with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke at the end.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

Mr. Don Argue
President
National Association
of Evangelicals
450 Gunderson Drive
Carol Stream, Illinois 60188

Dear Don:

I wanted to thank you for your thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which as you know I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

Ron Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 10, 1996

The Reverend Anthony Mangun
3411 Bayou Rapides Road
Alexandria, Louisiana 71303

Dear Anthony:

I wanted to let you know my thoughts regarding H.R. 1833, a bill banning a certain abortion procedure.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except 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 such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of 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. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Bill Clinton" with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.