

3/29/96

Todd --

Karen Abramson gave us the attached message request this morning (for the National Abortion Federation meeting) and asked for it in final by c.o.b. today. I called to see if we could get a little extra time, but Karen checked and said it needed to get to Betsy Myers in final today.

We based our text on a prior message for a Planned Parenthood event and on the text for the proposed video. According to the background, the video text was approved by George Stephanopoulos, the Women's Office, Fine in the DPC, and Elena Kagan.

Jim thought you might want to review the text before we return it to Karen Abramson.

Thanks.

M.

Maureen Hudson

DR

MS

3.29.96

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 29, 1996

Warm greetings to everyone gathered in San Francisco for the twentieth annual meeting of the National Abortion Federation. I am pleased to congratulate outgoing president Lynne Randall on a successful term, and I join you in commending your executive director Vicki Saporta and your incoming president, Joan Coombs, on their dedicated work.

For two decades, the members of your organization have helped to ensure that American women and their families have access to the reproductive care, counseling, and education services they need. You have stepped forward, with courage and conviction, to protect the principles of choice and personal responsibility.

As you know, I have consistently protected the right of women to make their own reproductive choices, while working to reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies. Early in my Administration, I restored Medicaid funding for abortion in cases of rape, incest, and life endangerment; stopped all proceedings on the "gag rule" that prevented women from discussing abortion with health professionals; and reversed the Mexico City policy.

I have also reaffirmed my determination to protect women's health care centers from violence by signing into law the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act, and I will always be grateful for your organization's important role in that effort. NAF's success in raising awareness about this issue helped to build a broad coalition of support for this legislation. The FACE law is working, and because of its effectiveness, we have been able to save lives and protect the rights of women. I appreciate as well your recent help in protecting the health and well-being of women facing difficult late-term pregnancies.

Even as Congress fights us on some of these issues, please know that I will strongly oppose efforts to reverse these gains. Congress must not undermine the Constitution and the principles established a generation ago in the Supreme Court's Roe v. Wade decision. I am committed to ensuring that abortion remains safe, legal, and rare. As we work together to ensure that all Americans have access to the reproductive information they seek and the quality health care they deserve, I thank you for your support and encouragement.

Hillary joins me in sending best wishes for a successful meeting.

3/29/96 E

TOOP - I will send
MAGAZINE to FLOTES
once you've
seen

—
out from Todd's box 3/30/96 Sent to HRC
3/30/96

special issue for USA

EKA
INTERNATIONAL

interviews with presidents Demirel & Clinton
EXCLUSIVE

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

3.29.96

*To Gore
miss on your trip
BR*



Demirel to Washington for talks with Clinton

POWERFUL PARTNERSHIP

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

3.29.96

✓
NSC

RELATIONS WITH GREECE

Last Sunday, the Turkish Prime Minister, in a major policy opening, proposed to Greece a comprehensive process of peaceful settlement.

We do hope that this process, in all its far-reaching consequences in the region and beyond, will be as momentous as the Middle East Peace Process and the Dayton Peace Agreement.

The ultimate goal is to find comprehensive and lasting solutions to all the differences and problems between the two sides in accordance with international laws.

An eventual settlement can only be viable and lasting if it is built on the rights and legitimate interests of both countries.

Turkey respects the territorial integrity and the inviolability of borders of all her neighbours. Greece is no exception.

Turkey respects the status quo established in the Aegean through international agreements. In this context, Turkey wishes to see that all disputes pertaining to the Aegean are settled through peaceful means, in accordance with international law and international agreements establishing the status of the Aegean.

Accordingly, Turkey made a call on Greece to enter into negotiations without preconditions and with a view to settling all the Aegean questions as a whole.

The appropriate peaceful means can be identified for each problem during the course of these talks. Nothing is ruled out as a method. We are prepared to discuss in good faith third party settlement mechanisms based on mutual acceptance.

Turkey also stands ready to conclude a political document/declaration or an Agreement on Friendship and Cooperation.

At the same time, we have proposed a comprehensive set of confidence building measures related to military activities.

To this effect, we wish to enter into talks on an exploratory basis without prejudice to the respective positions of the both sides.

It is only natural that both countries should refrain from any action damaging the new atmosphere. Greece should be warned against any *fait accompli* in the Aegean, especially against any attempt to extend territorial water beyond the existing 6 miles. Both countries should not alter the *status quo* in the Aegean through unilateral steps or *de facto* actions.

On the other hand, success in bringing a comprehensive solution to the problems in the Aegean might be expected to contribute to the settlement of the Cyprus issue within its own parameters.

This is an historic opportunity. The wisdom and vision displayed by both Atatürk and Venizelos resolved the differences that had emerged after a war between Turkey and Greece. Today, that same spirit should inspire us to settle all our problems in an atmosphere of peace and friendship and certainly not in the aftermath of a military conflict.

In this task, both countries will need the help and encouragement of our allies and friends. We are grateful for the invaluable support given by the U.S. to the Turkish initiative.

Such an opening in relations between Turkey and Greece is expected to have a positive impact on our overall relations with the West.

The new atmosphere is also expected to be conducive to putting an end to the harmful effects of Greek-American lobbying in the U.S. Congress which strain from time to time Turkish-American relations.

The strong U.S. support to the conclusion of the customs union with the EU is very much appreciated. Closer ties between Turkey and the EU are expected to result in opening the perspective of Turkey's full membership both to EU and WEU. We will equally appreciate strong backing on them.

THE NAGORNO-KARABAKH CONFLICT

Turkey would like to see an early solution of the dispute over Nagorno-Karabakh. We are ready to closely work with the U.S. to achieve this.

The settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict should be found within the framework of the OSCE/Minsk process, in line with the Budapest Summit decision of December 1994. We should support the efforts of the Minsk Conference Co-chairmen. Direct talks between Azerbaijan and Armenia should also be encouraged.

We attach particular importance to the success of direct negotiations on the declaration of principles of self-rule. It is not too much to expect from the parties to come to an agreement on the text of such a declaration by the Summit in Moscow, provided that they have the political will to do so. We should see to it that the short time available till then must be used by the parties in the best way.

Our objective should be to reconcile respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Azerbaijan and the security concerns of the Nagorno-Karabakh Armenians.

To our regret, the last round of bilateral talks seems to have not gone well. Though I do not wish to put the blame on anyone, I must however state that to seek independence under the guise of self-rule by using the argument of security is neither justifiable nor defensible. A maximum self-rule, as in the examples of Tatarstan or Aaland Islands or of a combination of these two and a safe and free passage through the transit zone plus appropriate guarantees should in our view meet the security concerns of Nagorno-Karabakh people. Moreover, one should keep in mind that security is also a matter of concern and problem for the Azeri side.

We firmly believe that President Aliiev genuinely wants a quick and just solution but not a solution at all cost. He flatly rejects the rumors that Azerbaijan is dragging its feet and waiting for the Russian elections to take place so that it can get better terms for the solution. As was publicly announced by President Aliiev, Azerbaijan is prepared to give largest possible autonomy to Nagorno-Karabakh provided that all the occupied territories including Lachin and Shusha are evacuated and the displaced persons are allowed to return to their home.

In order to encourage Armenia to adopt a constructive attitude and to strengthen the hands of President Ter Petrossian vis-a-vis his own public opinion, we have in the past made certain unilateral gestures to Yerevan, including the opening of the H-50 air corridor. This time, in response to the US suggestion and with the same purpose, Prime Minister Yilmaz publicly announced last week that Turkey is going to open her land borders with Armenia following the signature of the declaration of principles without waiting for the conclusion and implementation of the political agreement.

Though we recognize Russia as a major player in the resolution of the conflict, we are however concerned with Moscow's tactics to regain the influence they lost in the area following the disintegration of the former Soviet Union. We are not sure whether Russia wants a speedy solution, or is trying to delay it.

On several occasions President Aliiev made it clear to us that he will continue to resist Russian maneuvers designed to get a foothold in his country. Therefore, he wants to have not only economic, but also strong political commitment of the U.S. to the future of this region, as well as to the solution of the problems therein, especially of the dispute over Nagorno-Karabakh.

Nevertheless, Aliiev feels deeply frustrated due to the lack of understanding of and support to the Azeri position as well as to insufficient response to his openings to the West, especially to the U.S.

This frustration may leave no option to Azerbaijan but to move closer to Moscow. Such a development would have serious consequences. In such a case the solution of the problem will get even more complicated, Russia being given a free hand in the region. It would at the same time threaten political, security and economic interests of both Turkey and the U.S. in the area.

We believe that, due to its strategic location, the Caucasus is vital not only for Turkey but also for the U.S. It is of paramount importance for our two countries to help parties reach a just and lasting solution.

Turkey is ready to improve its relations and establish economic cooperation with the Armenian republic, once this country gives the signs of a more positive approach to the problem.

MAIN ELEMENTS FOR THE SOLUTION OF THE NAGORNO-KARABAKH (NK) CONFLICT

- I. In our view, a just and lasting solution should be based on the following points:
 - a) An agreement on the basic principles of the self-rule for Nagorno-Karabakh, the final status being left to be decided upon at the Minsk Conference.
 - b) Reaffirmation of the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan and accordingly, withdrawal from all occupied territories.
 - c) Deployment of the peace-keeping force in the buffer zone, as well as in the whole Lachin region, Shusha and Shaumyan.
 - d) Leave the future of the transit zone, Shusha and Shaumyan to be decided upon at the Minsk Conference, together with the final status of Nagorno-Karabakh.
 - e) In the meantime, that is during the interim period, confer the administration (including policing) of these three places under international responsibility.
 - f) Demilitarization of the Lachin region for the safe and free passage of goods through the transit zone.
 - g) A concept of military balance between the forces in Nagorno Karabakh which will also include the withdrawn forces and those of Azerbaijan which may return to the evacuated territories so that neither side has a military capability to resume hostilities and launch a new offensive. (This is a vital requirement for the maintenance of peace in the zone of conflict.)
 - h) Likewise, a military balance between the forces of Armenia and Azerbaijan in the region of conflict.

II. To our understanding, the definition of self-rule is important for the Armenian side in order to fulfill its own commitment to the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan. However, a concept of self-rule which may leave the door open to independence is neither justifiable nor defensible. It will nullify the practical value of the commitment by Armenia to the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan.

In the light of the examples of the highest degree of autonomy existing in various countries, the following considerations may be usefully taken into account in the case of the Nagorno-Karabakh self-rule:

a) Nagorno-Karabakh will have its own constitution, but it cannot conflict with the constitution of Azerbaijan.

b) Nagorno-Karabakh will have legislative, executive and judiciary bodies.

c) Nagorno-Karabakh people, while holding elections for their own legislative organ, will also take part in the general elections of Azerbaijan and will have their representatives in the Azerbaijan National Assembly.

d) Nagorno-Karabakh will have the right to conclude economic, commercial and cultural agreements with third countries, while political and military external relations will be excluded.

e) The official languages of Nagorno-Karabakh will be both Armenian and Azerbaijan languages.

f) The right to taxation will be shared between the central government and Nagorno-Karabakh authorities.

g) Azerbaijan may not deploy its armed units and police forces in Nagorno-Karabakh.

CAUCASUS AND CENTRAL ASIAN REPUBLICS

One of the auspicious developments of the post Cold War era, after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, has been the emergence of newly independent states in the Caucasus and Central Asia. This has created a better equilibrium for the peace and stability of the entire region.

The preservation of the independence, sovereignty and the territorial integrity of these newly independent states is a common task for the West.

This can be best achieved by protecting them against foreign pressures and by extending a helping hand to enable them to stand on their own feet politically, economically and socially.

Their survival as independent countries as masters of their destinies is the key to the maintenance of peace and stability in their respective regions.

The Caucasus is Turkey's gateway to the Central Asian Republics with which we have historical, cultural and linguistic ties. Azerbaijan is yet another such country.

Conversely, Turkey is the natural access to the West for the countries of the Caucasus and Central Asia.

The Azeri-Emenian conflict is presently blocking the access to and from Central Asia for Turkey.

It is also rendering Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan vulnerable to the pressures from Russia.

The preservation of the independence and sovereignty of these three countries is crucial for the secure transport of the Caspian oil to Western markets.

Turkey is the natural opening to the West for the landlocked Armenia.

Turkey stands ready to normalize her relations with Armenia and engage in fruitful economic cooperation with that country when there is enough progress towards a peaceful solution in the Azeri-Armenian dispute.

Turkey has made it clear recently that once a declaration of principles is concluded between the two conflicting sides, it would be ready to open its border with Armenia.

It will be recalled that Turkey reopened the H-50 air route as a gesture of goodwill to Armenia. So far there has been no reciprocal gesture.

In view of the above, it is absolutely necessary to work on the two sides towards an earliest agreement.

(A detailed note and a paper on the main elements for the solution of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict are attached hereto.)

As far as both the Caucasus and Central Asia, the United States is expected to devote more attention to the area in view of the Russian policies and actions and the activities of Iran to project its influence or to export its own regime thereon.

We appreciate American efforts to formulate a common position of the CFE flank issue. We hope that the US will use its influence over Russia for the resolution of this problem also with a view to enhancing the security of the Caucasian republics and peoples.

The decision taken on the 15th of March at the Russian Duma with regard to the CIS might prove to be a bad omen for the future. This is the latest addition to a chain of Russian foreign policy formulations causing concern in the last few years.

We should not overlook the importance of this decision by the Duma. After all, the same people that have brought in the Communist-nationalist majority to the Duma will be electing the next Russian President in June.

We are duty bound to work together to help the countries of the Caucasus and Central Asia in every possible way.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS

Turkey, as a regional country, having invested high hopes in the attainment of peace, stability and shared prosperity in the Middle East, strives to contribute, both on bilateral and international levels, to the success of the Peace Process.

Recently, I made visits to both Israel and the Palestinian National Authority. The impressions from these visits confirmed our conviction that at this delicate juncture, the eventual success of the Israeli-Palestinian track of the Peace Process hinges primarily on how best to address the security concerns of one and the urgent economic needs of the other.

At Sharm el-Sheikh, the participating leaders reiterated their commitment to the success of the Peace Process and their resolve to combat in a united front against all forms of terrorism.

The present closure of the borders between Israel and the Palestinians compounds the economic and social woes of the Palestinians. This heightens the risk of provoking undesirable and uncontrollable reactions and might even come to threaten Israel's own security which that country tries hard to protect.

The earliest possible re-opening of the Israeli-Palestinian border is a matter of importance and urgency.

While in Gaza, I observed that the Palestinian people are becoming less motivated towards supporting the Peace Process. This is due to the fact that they have not so far seen the tangible economic benefits of the Process in their daily lives.

Therefore, each country has to make sure that the pledges it made since the Washington Conference in 1993 to help the Palestinians are fulfilled without further delay.

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

From the very beginning of the hostilities in Bosnia and Herzegovina Turkey and the United States worked hard to protect innocent lives and to put an end to the tragedy and untold sufferings of the Bosnian Muslims.

The key role played by the United States in bringing peace to Bosnia and Herzegovina and in signing of the Dayton-Paris Peace Agreement is much appreciated.

The truth is, peace was only made possible by achieving a relative military balance on the battleground between the warring sides.

Today, the implementation and eventual preservation of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina will be equally dependent on establishing a relative military parity between the parties.

To that end, Turkey, apart from her earlier participation in UNPROFOR activities as well as Deny Flight and Sharp Guard Operations, presently takes active part in IFOR, the joint police force in Bihac and the rebuilding of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The training and equipping of the Bosnian Army is the latest joint effort between Turkey and the United States.

Since the United States' commitment to IFOR operations is for a period of only one year, the training and equipping the Bosnian army to meet the challenges of tomorrow is a matter of urgency.

The conference convened on the 15th of March in Ankara has been a very positive first step in that direction.

The United States is expected to make its best efforts to recruit more financial assistance from other countries and especially from wealthy Arab states for this worthy cause. We will try our best to the same end.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

96 MAR 28 P 6:18

March 28, 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR TODD STERN

FROM: STEPHEN NEUWIRTH

The Mayor of Toledo, Ohio, attended the "One Strike and You're Out" event at the White House today. While he was here, he dropped off the attached envelope with correspondence for the President.

Todo:

- 1) Send to POTUS? — 4 — ✓ — 7
- 2) ^{Scheduling} To ~~Booked~~ for reply? — ✓ — 4 — 7
- 3) CC: to Marcia Hale? — ✓ — 4 — 7

-John

3/28/96

CITY OF TOLEDO

CARLETON S. FINKBEINER
MAYOR



96 MAR 28 P 6 : 19

March 27, 1996

The Honorable William J. Clinton
President of The United States of America
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20000

Dear Mr. President:

Toledo is alive, vibrant and the Renaissance in this city is continuing due to the public/private partnership of local government and private industry. Chrysler Corporation and the City of Toledo's commitment to invest capital for operations and infrastructure for Jeep's Wrangler and the Cherokee have resulted in continued economic prosperity for the 5,500 workers at the Toledo Jeep Plant and continued revitalization of our community.

Chrysler Corporation is committed to build 110,000 new Wranglers this year at the Toledo Jeep Plant. Fifteen percent (15%) of these new vehicles (some with right-hand drive) will be exported to Europe and Asia. The exportation of Chrysler Corporation Jeep products along with other Toledo corporations goods have played a critical role in offsetting cyclical economic downturns for Toledo's corporations and small businesses.

It is with the above in mind that I would like to extend an invitation to you to visit Toledo and experience first hand the cooperative working relationships between the public and private sectors (i.e., Chrysler Corporation's Toledo Jeep Plant with its excellent labor/management committee and the City of Toledo). These public/private efforts have enhanced local economic development and foreign business exportation.

Team Toledo

One Government Center • Suite 2200 • Toledo, Ohio 43604 U.S.A. • Phone 419/245-1001 • Fax 419/245-1370

Attached for your review, please find a couple of articles that illustrate the direction and Renaissance of this community.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Yours for a Strong Toledo,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. Finkbeiner', with a large loop at the start and a horizontal line extending to the right.

Carleton S. Finkbeiner
Mayor

CSF/WU:dm

March 7, 1996

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

3 28 96

MEMORANDUM

To: The President

From: Nancy Hernreich
Rebecca Cameron

Re: Kate Britton

Kate Britton wrote that she would like to come visit with you - for even 60 seconds - re: your intention to veto the partial-birth abortion bill. She asks this "in light of the significance of the issue and [her] deep concern for you."

Has she seen my
letter to Cong. on this - ? - Be

Staff Secy -
Can you get
me the letter?
Johns info on it
Thanks -
MJS

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
February 28, 1996

The Honorable Henry J. Hyde
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I understand that the House is preparing to consider H.R. 1833, as amended by the Senate, which would prohibit doctors from performing a certain type of abortion. I want to make the Congress aware of my position on this extremely complex issue.

I have always believed that the decision to have an abortion should be between a woman, her conscience, her doctor, and her God. I strongly believe that legal abortions -- those abortions that the Supreme Court ruled in Roe v. Wade must be protected -- should be safe and rare. I have long opposed late-term abortions except, as the law requires, where they are necessary to protect the life of the mother or where there is a threat to her health. In fact, as Governor of Arkansas, I signed into law a bill that barred third trimester abortions except where they were necessary to protect the life or health of the woman, consistent with the Supreme Court's rulings.

The procedure described in H.R. 1833 is very disturbing, and I cannot support its use on an elective basis, where the abortion is being performed for non-health related reasons and there are equally safe medical procedures available. As I understand it, however, there are rare and tragic situations that can occur in a woman's pregnancy in which, in a doctor's medical judgment, the use of this procedure may be necessary to save a woman's life or to preserve her health. In those situations, the Constitution requires that a woman's ability to choose this procedure be protected.

I have studied and prayed about this issue, and about the families who must face this awful choice, for many months. I believe that we have a duty to try to find common ground: a resolution to this issue that respects the views of those -- including myself -- who object to this particular procedure, but also upholds the Supreme Court's requirement that laws regulating abortion protect both the life and the health of American women.

I have concluded that H.R. 1833 as drafted does not meet the constitutional requirements that the Supreme Court has imposed upon us, in Roe and the decisions that have followed it, to provide protections for both the life and the health of the mother in any laws regulating abortions.

I am prepared to support H.R. 1833, however, if it is amended to make clear that the prohibition of this procedure does not apply to situations in which the selection of the procedure, in the medical judgment of the attending physician, is necessary to preserve the life of the woman or avert serious adverse health consequences to the woman.

I urge the Congress to amend H.R. 1833 to ensure that it protects the life and the health of the woman, as the law we have been elected to uphold requires.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
February 28, 1996

The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr.
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Joe:

I understand that the House is preparing to consider H.R. 1833, as amended by the Senate, which would prohibit doctors from performing a certain type of abortion. I want to make the Congress aware of my position on this extremely complex issue.

I have always believed that the decision to have an abortion should be between a woman, her conscience, her doctor, and her God. I strongly believe that legal abortions -- those abortions that the Supreme Court ruled in Roe v. Wade must be protected -- should be safe and rare. I have long opposed late-term abortions except, as the law requires, where they are necessary to protect the life of the mother or where there is a threat to her health. In fact, as Governor of Arkansas, I signed into law a bill that barred third trimester abortions except where they were necessary to protect the life or health of the woman, consistent with the Supreme Court's rulings.

The procedure described in H.R. 1833 is very disturbing, and I cannot support its use on an elective basis, where the abortion is being performed for non-health related reasons and there are equally safe medical procedures available. As I understand it, however, there are rare and tragic situations that can occur in a woman's pregnancy in which, in a doctor's medical judgment, the use of this procedure may be necessary to save a woman's life or to preserve her health. In those situations, the Constitution requires that a woman's ability to choose this procedure be protected.

I have studied and prayed about this issue, and about the families who must face this awful choice, for many months. I believe that we have a duty to try to find common ground: a resolution to this issue that respects the views of those -- including myself -- who object to this particular procedure, but also upholds the Supreme Court's requirement that laws regulating abortion protect both the life and the health of American women.

I have concluded that H.R. 1833 as drafted does not meet the constitutional requirements that the Supreme Court has imposed upon us, in Roe and the decisions that have followed it, to provide protections for both the life and the health of the mother in any laws regulating abortions.

I am prepared to support H.R. 1833, however, if it is amended to make clear that the prohibition of this procedure does not apply to situations in which the selection of the procedure, in the medical judgment of the attending physician, is necessary to preserve the life of the woman or avert serious adverse health consequences to the woman.

I urge the Congress to amend H.R. 1833 to ensure that it protects the life and the health of the woman, as the law we have been elected to uphold requires.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
February 28, 1996

The Honorable Orrin G. Hatch
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Hatch:

I understand that the House is preparing to consider H.R. 1833, as amended by the Senate, which would prohibit doctors from performing a certain type of abortion. I want to make the Congress aware of my position on this extremely complex issue.

I have always believed that the decision to have an abortion should be between a woman, her conscience, her doctor, and her God. I strongly believe that legal abortions -- those abortions that the Supreme Court ruled in Roe v. Wade must be protected -- should be safe and rare. I have long opposed late-term abortions except, as the law requires, where they are necessary to protect the life of the mother or where there is a threat to her health. In fact, as Governor of Arkansas, I signed into law a bill that barred third trimester abortions except where they were necessary to protect the life or health of the woman, consistent with the Supreme Court's rulings.

The procedure described in H.R. 1833 is very disturbing, and I cannot support its use on an elective basis, where the abortion is being performed for non-health related reasons and there are equally safe medical procedures available. As I understand it, however, there are rare and tragic situations that can occur in a woman's pregnancy in which, in a doctor's medical judgment, the use of this procedure may be necessary to save a woman's life or to preserve her health. In those situations, the Constitution requires that a woman's ability to choose this procedure be protected.

I have studied and prayed about this issue, and about the families who must face this awful choice, for many months. I believe that we have a duty to try to find common ground: a resolution to this issue that respects the views of those -- including myself -- who object to this particular procedure, but also upholds the Supreme Court's requirement that laws regulating abortion protect both the life and the health of American women.

I have concluded that H.R. 1833 as drafted does not meet the constitutional requirements that the Supreme Court has imposed upon us, in Roe and the decisions that have followed it, to provide protections for both the life and the health of the mother in any laws regulating abortions.

I am prepared to support H.R. 1833, however, if it is amended to make clear that the prohibition of this procedure does not apply to situations in which the selection of the procedure, in the medical judgment of the attending physician, is necessary to preserve the life of the woman or avert serious adverse health consequences to the woman.

I urge the Congress to amend H.R. 1833 to ensure that it protects the life and the health of the woman, as the law we have been elected to uphold requires.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
February 28, 1996

The Honorable John Conyers, Jr.
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear John:

I understand that the House is preparing to consider H.R. 1833, as amended by the Senate, which would prohibit doctors from performing a certain type of abortion. I want to make the Congress aware of my position on this extremely complex issue.

I have always believed that the decision to have an abortion should be between a woman, her conscience, her doctor, and her God. I strongly believe that legal abortions -- those abortions that the Supreme Court ruled in Roe v. Wade must be protected -- should be safe and rare. I have long opposed late-term abortions except, as the law requires, where they are necessary to protect the life of the mother or where there is a threat to her health. In fact, as Governor of Arkansas, I signed into law a bill that barred third trimester abortions except where they were necessary to protect the life or health of the woman, consistent with the Supreme Court's rulings.

The procedure described in H.R. 1833 is very disturbing, and I cannot support its use on an elective basis, where the abortion is being performed for non-health related reasons and there are equally safe medical procedures available. As I understand it, however, there are rare and tragic situations that can occur in a woman's pregnancy in which, in a doctor's medical judgment, the use of this procedure may be necessary to save a woman's life or to preserve her health. In those situations, the Constitution requires that a woman's ability to choose this procedure be protected.

I have studied and prayed about this issue, and about the families who must face this awful choice, for many months. I believe that we have a duty to try to find common ground: a resolution to this issue that respects the views of those -- including myself -- who object to this particular procedure, but also upholds the Supreme Court's requirement that laws regulating abortion protect both the life and the health of American women.

I have concluded that H.R. 1833 as drafted does not meet the constitutional requirements that the Supreme Court has imposed upon us, in Roe and the decisions that have followed it, to provide protections for both the life and the health of the mother in any laws regulating abortions.

I am prepared to support H.R. 1833, however, if it is amended to make clear that the prohibition of this procedure does not apply to situations in which the selection of the procedure, in the medical judgment of the attending physician, is necessary to preserve the life of the woman or avert serious adverse health consequences to the woman.

I urge the Congress to amend H.R. 1833 to ensure that it protects the life and the health of the woman, as the law we have been elected to uphold requires.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton