1996 authorizations and reducing the remaining authorizations by half. These reductions were applied equally among all affected Senate authorizations, with minor exceptions.

The managers are committed to achieving a balanced budget, and intend that all authorizations be considered as part of the levels within the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, if enacted, or any subsequent balanced budget act.

Section 811—House recedes to Senate section 521 with modifications. Total authorization is $468 million. Funds may be used for, among other purposes, to create a Federal Bureau of Investigation counterterrorism and counterintelligence fund; expand and improve the instructional, operational support, and construction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation academy; and construct an FBI laboratory, provide laboratory examination support.

Section 812—House recedes to Senate sections 522 and section 912 with modifications. Total authorization is $31 million. Funds may be used to help the Customs Service meet the increased demands occasioned by the enactment of this Act.

Section 813—Senate recedes to House Section 601 with modifications. Total authorization is $20 million. Funds may be used to help Immigration and Naturalization Service meet the increased demands occasioned by the enactment of this Act, including the purpose of detaining and removing alien terrorists.

Section 814—House recedes to Senate section 524 with modifications. Total authorization is $172 million. Funds may be used by the Drug Enforcement Administration to fund antiviolence crime initiatives; fund major violators of Federal antidrug statute initiatives; and enhance or replace the infrastructure of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

Section 815—House recedes to Senate sections 503 and 525, with modifications. Total authorization is $41 million. Funds may be used by the Department of Justice to hire additional Assistant United States Attorneys, and provide for increased security at facilities housing Federal workers.

This section also increases the maximum reward authority available to the Attorney General for information relating to international terrorists.

Section 816—House recedes to Senate section 526 with modifications. Total authorization is $90 million. Funds may be used by the Department of the Treasury to augment counterterrorism efforts, augment White House security, and expand Presidential protection activities.

Section 817—House recedes to Senate section 910 with modifications. Total authorization is $2 million. Funds may be used to help the U.S. Park Police meet the increased demands occasioned by the enactment of this Act.

Section 818—House recedes to Senate Section 911 with modifications. Total authorization is $41 million. Funds to be used for the activities of the Federal Judiciary, including increased workload of the Federal courts occasioned by the enactment of this Act.

Section 819—Senate recedes to House Section 701 with modifications. Total authorization is $5 million. Funds to be used to provide grants for specialized training or equipment to enhance the capability of local fire and emergency service departments to respond to terrorist attacks and acts of mass violence.

Section 820—Senate recedes to House Section 702 with modifications. Total authorization is $20 million. Funds may be used to provide assistance to foreign countries facing an imminent danger of terrorist attack that threatens the national interest of the United States or puts United States nationals at risk.

Section 821—Senate recedes to House Section 703 with modifications. Total authorization is $10 million. Funds may be used to develop technologies to combat terrorism.

Section 822—Byrne grant program is modified include a program to develop and implement antiterrorism training programs and to procure equipment for use by local law enforcement authorities. Total authorization is $100 million.

Section 823—House recedes to Senate Section 527 with modification. This section provides that funding for this subtitle is authorized to be made from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, established by Title XXXI of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (P.L. 103–322).

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

Section 901—House recedes to Senate Section 622. This section codifies the extension of United States territorial sea, as defined by a 1988 Presidential Proclamation. This area would then be included within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the U.S. for purposes of the criminal law. This section also adopts non-conflicting state law in the territorial sea.

Section 902—House recedes to Senate section 904. This section provides that voter registration cards (or similar documents) will not qualify as proof of U.S. citizenship.

Section 903—Senate recedes to House amendment title XIII. This section provides limitations on fees for representation of defendants in criminal cases.

Section 904—House recedes to Senate section 913. This section provides severability for the provisions of the Act.

HENRY HYDE,
BILL MCCOLLUM,
STEVEN SCHIFF,
STEVE BUYER,
BOB BARR,
CHARLES SCHUMER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
STROM THURMOND,
ALAN K. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–198)

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

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. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President and the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

APPROVING REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995 WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 400) approving regulations to implement the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 with respect to employing offices and covered employees of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read as follows:

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.

(2) Regulation on rights and protections under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, page S238.

(3) Regulation on use of lie detector tests by the Capitol Police, page S261.

(4) Regulation on rights and protections under the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988, page S263.

(5) Regulation on rights and protections under the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act, page S271.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] each will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution before us with regard to congressional coverage.

While largely ministerial, they represent one more important step in bringing ourselves under the workplace laws we have long imposed, often too cavalierly in my view, on other employers.

Let me just say that I still occasionally express some wonderment that this day is finally here. The Congressional Accountability Act regulations represent the culmination of a several-year process in the Opportunities Committee in which the now-majority party repeatedly attempted to extend the laws of the workplace to our own employees, with proper enforcement mechanisms including access to the courts with jury trials.

Enactment of the Congressional Accountability Act, like the unfunded mandate legislation which was also enacted this Congress, has created a long-needed institutional brake—a yellow flag—on the passage of laws this institution too easily imposed in the past on all other workplaces while exempting itself. As importantly, the law finally extended the same workplace protections other workers have to our own employees. While these laws are not perfect there is no reason why our workers should be under different standards. And now that we are forced to comply with these laws, we will learn from experience and better identify with problems of compliance endured by our constituents. In fact, I can guarantee it. Proposals for future workplace requirements and reform of existing laws will gather a lot closer attention by every member of the Opportunities Committee and the House. And it's about time.

True, the protections of some laws had been applied in the past to the House, but the protections were hollow because employees never had the same right to court enforcement that their counterparts in the private sector and the executive branch enjoyed. And there were no signs there would ever be such enforcement! Indeed, as recently as 1991 when I had CRS do an analysis of the issue, we were still arguing over whether court enforcement posed constitutional concerns. Fortunately, that analysis, which found there were not significant concerns, growing public awareness over the double standard enjoyed by Congress, and, most importantly, the outcome of the last election, brought us here today. Yes, the issue is now bipartisan, and I am glad it is, but it is clear that real—truly effective—congressional coverage was the result of the last election. We've come a long way in a year's time.

Indeed, the only shadow cast over today is that it took so long in coming. As I have noted in the past, the irony of Congress in exempting itself from the laws it imposed on others is so obvious that one wonders how it so long escaped criticism. But I am gratified that those of us who long fought for strong congressional coverage enforcement now have amply company.

The first House resolution before us, House Resolution 400, simply provides for approval of the regulations issued by the Office of Compliance, including those under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Family and Medical Leave Act, as applicable to House employees.

After we proceed with this resolution, we will take up House Resolution 401 which provides for educational assistance by the Office of Compliance by employees who are not involved in deciding cases, and only to the same extent as such assistance is provided by the Department of Labor to the employers it regulates. The resolution also provides for a settlement procedure to ensure that taxpayer funds are protected from abuse.

Last, we will take up Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, already passed by the Senate, applying the regulations issued by the Office of Compliance to certain of the so-called instrumentalities of the House and Senate. These are offices administered by both the House and the Senate—such as the Congressional Budget Office, the Architect of the Capitol, and the Capitol Police—and, therefore, have to be covered through a concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I support these resolutions.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Accountability Act—Public Law 104–1—became effective on January 23, 1996. This law created the Office of Compliance, an independent office within the legislative branch, which is responsible for educating Congressional offices on how to comply with the laws made applicable to the Congress, as well as for providing a procedure for resolution of employee grievances, and for adopting regulations to implement these laws. These regulations must be approved by the House.

The Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance adopted regulations which were published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 22, 1996. In anticipation of these regulations, on December 19, 1995, the House agreed to House Resolution 31 and House Concurrent Resolution 123, which provided for provisional approval of these regulations until the Committees of jurisdiction could review them and make a final recommendation to the House.