sequently, these restrictions will remain in place and will have a significant, adverse impact on women and families in the developing world. It is estimated that nearly 7 million couples in developing countries will have no access to safe, voluntary family planning services. The result will be millions of unwanted pregnancies and an increase in the number of abortions.

Finally, the bill contains a number of other objectionable provisions. Some of the most problematic would: (1) abruptly terminate the Agency for International Development's housing guaranty (HG) program, as well as abrogate existing HG agreements, except for South Africa, and prohibit foreign assistance to any country that fails to make timely payments or reimbursements on HG loans; (2) hinder negotiations aimed at resolving the plight of Vietnamese boat people; (3) unduly restrict the ability of the United States to participate in the United Nations Human Rights Committee; and (4) extend provisions of the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act that I have objected to in the past. I am also concerned that the bill, by restricting the time period during which economic assistance funds can be expended for longer-term development projects, would diminish the effectiveness of U.S. assistance programs.

In returning H.R. 1561, I recognize that the bill contains a number of important authorities for the Department of State and the United States Information Agency. In its current form, however, the bill is inconsistent with the decades-long tradition of bipartisanship in U.S. foreign policy. It unduly interferes with the constitutional prerogatives of the President and would seriously impair the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs.

For all these reasons, I am compelled to return H.R. 1561 without my approval.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 12, 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. RIGGS, by unanimous consent, ordered that the veto message, together with the accompanying bill, be printed (H. Doc. 104–197) and spread upon the pages of the Journal of the House.

On motion of Mr. GILMAN, by unanimous consent, further consideration of the veto message was postponed until Tuesday, April 23, 1996.

¶39.20 SUBMISSION OF CONFERENCE REPORT—S. 735

Mr. HYDE submitted a conference report (Rept. No. 104–518) on the bill of the Senate (S. 735) to prevent and punish acts of terrorism, and for other purposes; together with a statement thereon, for printing in the Record under the rule.

¶39.21 MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—VETO OF H.R. 1833

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. RIGGS, laid before the House a message from the President, which was read as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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

In the past several months, I have heard from women who desperately wanted to have their babies, who were devastated to learn that their babies had fatal conditions and would not live, who wanted anything other than an abortion, but who were advised by their doctors that this procedure was their best chance to avert the risk of death or grave harm which, in some cases, would have included an inability to ever bear children again. For these women, this was not about choice—not about deciding against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth, and the only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

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

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

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

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 10, 1996.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. RIGGS, by unanimous consent, ordered that the veto message, together with the accompanying bill, be printed (H. Doc. 104–198) and spread upon the pages of the Journal of the House.

On motion of Mr. CANADY, by unanimous consent, the veto message and accompanying bill were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

¶39.22 CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY WITH RESPECT TO HOUSE EMPLOYEES

Mr. THOMAS moved to suspend the rules and agree to the following resolution (H. Res. 400):

Resolved,

SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The regulations listed in subsection (b) are hereby approved, insofar as such regulations apply to employing offices and covered employees of the House of Representatives.

(b) REGULATIONS APPROVED.—The regulations referred to in subsection (a) are the following regulations issued by the Office of Compliance on January 22, 1996, as published in the Congressional Record on January 22, 1996 (Volume 142, daily edition), each beginning on the page indicated:

(1) Regulation on rights and protections under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, page S200.