

chson

—

ROBERT L. WALD

GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

March 6, 1997

The President William J. Clinton
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President,

On August 9, 1996, I wrote to advise you of my decision to step down as Chairman of the Romanian-American Enterprise Fund (RAEF). I stated:

I have had no greater honor than your selection of me, two years ago, to be the founding Chairman of the Romanian-American Enterprise Fund. During this period, I have sought in every way possible to advance the Fund's statutory mandate to promote the development of a vibrant private sector of the Romanian economy. The Fund is now fully operative in Washington and Bucharest and we have established close and effective liaison with the Romanian government. We have undertaken a wide range of investment initiatives and have a number of new works in progress. I am particularly proud of the talented Romanian staff we have assembled in Bucharest . . .

At that time, I enthusiastically endorsed the choice of Harry Barnes, former U.S. Ambassador to Romania, as successor Chairman. I believed that Ambassador Barnes would bring to the position the diplomatic skill to conciliate sharp differences among Board members over the Board's role vis-a-vis management. I stated that I would remain an active member of the Board and give my full support to Chairman Barnes.

I now regretfully advise you of my decision to withdraw from the RAEF Board of Directors effective this date. My

317197

Phil -

From Mack McHenry

Send to Dorskynd?

Coord with Nish Yes ☒
No ☐

cc: Exec Clerk Yes ☒
No ☐

C

The President William J. Clinton
March 6, 1997
Page 2

expectations have not been realized. In the past six months, governance of the Fund has eroded. Senior management has become dysfunctional and unaccountable. Tensions within the Board have become irreconcilable and the Board has defaulted on its oversight responsibilities. The core operation of the Fund in Bucharest has been torn as a result of improvident Board action. I can no longer conscientiously serve on the Board.

Ambassador John Davis and Wynelle White have advised me that they are also resigning as Directors.

Thank you for your confidence in me. I remain dedicated to the developmental goals of the Fund, to the Fund's potential for contributing importantly to economic reform in Romania, and to U.S. efforts to lift the Romanian people.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Wald

ROMANIAN-AMERICAN ENTERPRISE FUND

Wynelle Watson White, *Director*

March 5, 1997

1997 MAR 7 AM 9:21

The Honorable William J. Clinton
President of the United States
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500-0005

Dear Mr. President:

You know how pleased John and I were three years ago when you appointed me to the Board of Directors of the newly established Romanian-American Enterprise Fund (RAEF). Since then, I have worked devotedly for the Fund, recognizing always that the Congress had set up the Fund with taxpayer money to support the impoverished Romanian people in their efforts to develop a free market economy.

RAEF had a most promising start in its first year, but in the past year, there has been no effective Board oversight of management and, since I view myself as a trustee, the level of the Fund's expenses in relation to its investments has caused me great concern.

I believe that the Board and management have lost sight of the vital development purposes of the Fund and that unwise investment practices have blemished the Fund's (and the U.S.'s) image in Romania.

We operate as a private nonprofit corporation and U.S. State Department and USAID officials have repeatedly told us that the government has no oversight responsibility; that is exclusively the province of the Board. If this is so, I question the appropriateness of the use of taxpayer money.

I also question the value of a Fund embodying the generosity of the U.S. people, yet delivering so inefficiently its benefits to the people of the host country.

With several other members of the Board, I have opposed actions of the Board and management which I believed were inconsistent with our mandate. I have now concluded that there is no prospect of reconciling differences on the Board. After a year of unsuccessful effort, I do not believe that my further service is in any way helpful. It is with concern and sadness that I submit to you my resignation from the Board. I understand that

President William Clinton
March 5, 1997
Page 2

Ambassador John Davis and former chairman Robert Wald are also submitting their resignations.

John and I immensely valued our twenty-five years of friendship and work with you and the First Lady and I will forever appreciate the opportunity to serve you and our administration. I offer my continued help in the future.

Respectfully yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Nellie".

Nellie White

Carol -
: Need letter to go
with remarks. Are
Dorisking on one like
others and check with
Betty. Phil

Please send
Harriman remarks
(I've attached the remarks.
B.)

*work
minxin
just marvellous
to do so*

Jennie and James Repard thank you for everything you did for her grandmother, Pamela Harriman, and for the family. She would have greatly approved of the spectacular sendoff from Washington and Paris. Your hospitality at Blair House was extremely kind and gracious. Your tribute to her was wonderful and very moving.

*Blair
Remain?
sent?*

97 MAR 6 4-5 1955

Dear Mr President and Mrs Clinton,

Thank you very much indeed for everything you have done for my grandmother, Pamela Harriman, over the past several days. Her death was a great shock because it was so unexpected, and a tremendous loss to all of us, but Pam would have greatly approved of the spectacular send-off she was given from Washington and Paris. Your hospitality at Blair House was extremely kind and generous; it was a great honor for the family to stay there, and we were looked after marvellously by Mrs Valentiner and her team. Everybody's

*work
minxin
just marvellous
to do so*

Jennie and James Repard thank you for everything you did for her grandmother, Pamela Harriman, and for the family. She would have greatly approved of the spectacular sendoff from Washington and Paris. Your hospitality at Blair House was extremely kind and gracious. Your tribute to her was wonderful and very moving.

*Blair
Remain?
sent?*

kindness has made the part go
easier for us all. In addition, your tribute
to Pam was wonderful and very moving,
and we all think she got the "best
job" as we were able to see her often
in Paris!

Thank you so much again for
everything.

With our very best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

Jennie and James Repard

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT FUNERAL SERVICE FOR AMBASSADOR PAMELA HARRIMAN

Washington National Cathedral

February 13, 1997

We gather in tribute to Pamela Harriman -- patriot and public servant, American Ambassador and citizen of the world, mother, grandmother, great-grandmother and sister, and, for so many of us here, a cherished friend. She adopted our country with extraordinary devotion. Today, her country bids her farewell with profound gratitude.

Hillary and I have often talked about what made Pamela so remarkable. It was more than her elegance, as unforgettable as that was. It was more than the lilt of her voice and her laughter -- more, even, than the luminous presence that could light up a room, a convention hall or even the City of Light itself. It was more than her vibrant sense of history and the wisdom that came to her from the great events she had lived and those she had helped to shape -- from the Battle of Britain to the peace accord in Bosnia.

I think it was most of all that she was truly indomitable. One day the train she was on to London was bombed twice during the Blitz. She simply brushed off the shards of glass, picked herself up and went to the office to do her work at the Ministry of Supply. She was 21 years old.

More than 40 years later, all of us who knew her saw the same resolve and strength again and again -- most tenderly, in the way she gave not only love but dignity and pride to Averell, who, as long as he was with her, was at the summit, even to his last days.

In 1991, she put her "indominatability" to a new test in American politics, forming an organization with a name that made the pundits chuckle because it did seem a laughable oxymoron in those days: Democrats for the '80s. For members of our party at that low ebb, she became organizer, inspirer, sustainer, a captain of our cause in a long march back to victory. She lifted our spirits and our vision.

I will never forget how she was there for Hillary and for me in 1992 -- wise counsel, friend, a leader in our ranks who never doubted the outcome, or if she did, covered it so well with her well-known bravado that no one could have suspected.

Today, I am here in no small measure because she was there. She was one of the easiest choices I made for any appointment when I became President. As she left to become our Ambassador to France, she told us all with a smile, "Now my home in Paris will be your home. Please come and visit, but not all at once." It seemed she had been having us at her home all at once for too many years. So a lot of us took her up on her invitation to come to Paris. After Hillary and I had been there the first time, I must say I wondered which one of us got the better job.

In many ways her whole life was a preparation for these last four years of singular service and achievement. She represented America with wisdom, grace, and dignity, earning the confidence of France's leaders, the respect of its people, the devotion of her staff.

Born a European -- an American by choice, as she liked to say -- Pamela worked hard to build the very strongest ties between our two countries and continents. She understood that to make yourself heard you had to know how to listen. And with the special appreciation of one not native born, she felt to her bones America's special leadership role in the world.

Today we see her legacy in the growing promise of a Europe undivided, secure and free -- a legacy that moved President Chirac last week to confer upon Pamela the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor, France's highest award. He said then that seldom since Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson had America been so well served in France.

There is one image of Pamela Harriman I will always treasure. I can see her now, standing on the windswept beaches of Normandy on the 50th anniversary of D-Day. She had told many of us of the long, tense night in England half a century before, as they waited for news about the transports plowing toward the shore, filled with young soldiers -- American, British and Free French. Now, fifty years later, history had come full circle, and she was there as an active life force in the greatest continuing alliance for freedom the world has ever known.

I was so glad that Randolph read a few moments ago from the book of Sir Winston Churchill's essays that Pamela loved so well and gave to so many of us who were her friends. The passage he read not only describes her own life, it is her valediction to us, her final instruction about how we should live our lives. And I think she would like this service to be not only grand, as it is, but to be a final instruction from her to us about what we should now do.

Let me quote just a portion of what was said a few moments ago: "Let us reconcile ourselves to the mysterious rhythm of our destinies such as they must be in this world of time and space. Let us treasure our joys but not bewail our sorrows. The glory of light cannot exist without the shadows. Life is a whole . . . and the journey has been well worth making."

Throughout her glorious journey, Pamela Harriman lightened the shadows of our lives. Now she is gone. In the mysterious rhythm of her destiny, she left us at the pinnacle of her public service, with the promise of her beloved America burning brighter because of how she lived in her space and time. What a journey it was, and well worth making.

May God comfort her family and countless friends, and may He keep her soul indomitable forever.

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN
3/7/97

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

March 6, 1997

MR. PRESIDENT:

The attached memo from Sandy Berger and Kitty Higgins asks for your decision on one item and updates you on three others with regard to the Gulf War Illness investigation.

Information. 1) Tomorrow, the White House will receive the Action Plan from DOD, VA and HHS for implementing the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Illnesses; 2) Consistent with one of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, OSTP will tomorrow issue a Presidential Review Directive to begin the process of ensuring that the government has learned its lesson in better safeguarding the health of soldiers in prospective deployments. 3) You should also be aware that CIA/DOD are still finding classified documents relevant to the Gulf War, although none of the documents change our understanding of the nature or level of risk soldiers may have endured at Khamisiyah or elsewhere in the theater.

Action. The memo also recommends that you accept Secretary Jesse Brown's recommendation (Tab A) to extend from two years after service in the Gulf theater, to December 31, 2001, the eligibility period during which symptoms must be documented for Gulf War veterans with undiagnosed illnesses in order to qualify for compensation. This is in direct response to your directive of January 7 when you asked Secretary Brown to review this criteria. Secretary Brown has concluded that, despite our broad federal research effort, there is "insufficient information about the nature of these illnesses to justify the current limitation." *If you approve, you will announce this at the top of your press conference. Erskine and John Podesta concur in the recommendation.*

☒ Approve eligibility period extension ☐ Disapprove ☐ Discuss

Phil Caplan *Phl*

*Copies sent to
COS*

3/7/97

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 6, 1997

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

SAMUEL BERGER *JSB*KITTY HIGGINS *Kitty*

SUBJECT:

Next Steps Relating to Gulf War Illnesses

Purpose

To decide the next steps relating to Gulf War illnesses.

Background

There are three current developments relating to Gulf War illnesses:

1. Your receipt of a recommendation from Secretary Brown (Tab A) to initiate rulemaking to extend from two years following service in the Gulf theater to a date certain of December 31, 2001 the eligibility period during which symptoms must be documented for Gulf War veterans with undiagnosed illnesses to qualify for compensation. Such an extension would be major news with veterans and well-received by Members of Congress.
2. Your receipt from the Secretaries of Defense, Health and Human Services, and Veterans Affairs of the integrated Action Plan for implementing the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee (PAC) on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses as set forth in its Final Report. This comprehensive Action Plan will have been delivered within the 60-day period you directed in your remarks on January 7, 1997 when accepting the Final Report from the PAC.
3. Initiation, consistent with one of the PAC recommendations, of a Presidential Review Directive (PRD) to address "Health Preparedness for and Readjustment of Veterans and Their Families After Future Deployments." This is the key prospective piece which will ensure that we act on the "lessons learned" to better safeguard the health of soldiers in future deployments.

You should be aware that DOD and CIA are still finding classified documents relevant to events that occurred during the Gulf War.

To our knowledge, none of the documents identified to date change in any significant way our understanding of the nature or level of risk to which our soldiers were subject at Khamisiyah or elsewhere in theater. We are implementing a process to declassify systematically and quickly the documents, inform all of the relevant agencies and Congressional committees and make the documents public in a timely manner. One possibility being considered is a routine weekly press conference for regularizing the release of this information.

We are exploring the best way to make these announcements tomorrow. Our objectives are to: (1) highlight all that is being done to take care of veterans (e.g., compensation, health care and research); (2) demonstrate "immediate" follow-through in terms of the Action Plan; (3) underscore the importance of implementing Gulf War "lessons learned" to better safeguard the health of soldiers on future deployments; and (4) reinforce your continuing commitment to openness.

RECOMMENDATION

That you accept Secretary Brown's recommendation to initiate rulemaking to extend the presumptive eligibility period for compensating Gulf War veterans with undiagnosed illnesses to December 31, 2001.

Approve _____

Disapprove _____

Discuss _____

Attachment

Tab A Secretary Brown's Letter of March 6, 1997

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

*Must see
him*

*Want to see
him*

March 3, 1997

Councilman Noach Dear
4424 Sixteenth Avenue
Brooklyn, New York 11204

Dear Noach:

I just received your wonderful note citing the
Mishpatim-Statutes verse. I loved the passage
-- now, if only you could share it with some of
our critics.

I hope to see you before long.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

Send copy to Scheduling?

Yes ☒

no ☐

Carol

2363677
Mishpatim
Feb 4, 1997
2007

COUNCILMAN NOACH DEAR

4424 16th Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11204

Phone -(718) 633-9400
Fax -(718) 633-9403

February 4, 1997

The President
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

I read this week's Torah portion in synagogue, *Mishpatim*-Statutes, from the Book of *Shmos*-Exodus. It discusses courts, laws and respect for leaders, which I found to be fascinating reading on the day you were to give the State of the Union address.

One verse in this Torah portion states, "You shall not revile God, and you shall not curse a leader among your people." The commentary on this verse states, "The Sages derive that the word *Elokim* in this verse refers to judges, as well as to God. Thus, although it is forbidden to curse *anyone*, the Torah singles out judges and leaders, because their responsibility to render decisions and enforce judgment makes them vulnerable to the imprecations of those they rule against."

Violating this prohibition against cursing leaders carries a severe punishment. You therefore have divine assurance that the President of the United States cannot be cursed. As everyone can see, the tactics of your opponents have not succeeded and they will not succeed in the future.

I would like to relate to you an anecdote about General George Washington that relates to this idea. He was about to go to war at Trenton, very much down and feeling helpless about the apparent imminent loss ahead. He met up with one of his soldiers, who told him he would win the war and would become President. General Washington asked the soldier how he knew this; was it because he was a member of the "People of the Prophets"? The soldier answered that yes, he was Jewish.

FEB 5 1997

President Clinton

Page Two

This exchange strengthened General Washington, who told his men they would win because the People of the Prophets speak the truth. After he was elected President, George Washington brought this former soldier into his administration. Because President Washington was sensitive to moral issues and had a great sense of history and destiny, qualities that you also possess, he felt that with a nascent Jewish community in the United States it was important to have an adviser who conveyed a strong Jewish identity.

With the strength of the American Jewish community today, that need has only grown. I would be happy to communicate with you further on this issue at your convenience.

Sincerely



Noach Dear

I am waiting patiently to
see you - I hope it happens
soon
warmest regards - My J-L
give you the strength and
fortitude to continue leading
our great country
Noach

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

3/7 2:10 pm

TO: Frank Baines

Bob Damm

RR: Phil Caplan

I've just received this and
understand it may be announced
either tomorrow morning in the radio
address or Sunday. Either way,
this is on the super fast track. Can
we get this cleared?

March 7, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR ALL HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Since I signed the historic welfare reform law, I have urged businesses, non-profit organizations, and religious groups across the nation to help make its promise of opportunity real by offering jobs to welfare recipients. We are making great progress, but there is more to do. And today, I take action to ensure that the federal government, as the nation's largest employer, contributes to the greatest extent possible to this national effort.

I therefore direct each of you, as head of an agency or department, to use all available hiring authorities, consistent with statute and prior executive memoranda, to hire people off the welfare rolls into available job positions in the government.

In particular, I direct you to expand the use of the Worker-Trainee Program and other excepted service hiring authorities. The Worker-Trainee Program allows agencies to quickly and easily hire entry-level persons for up to three years, with the ability to convert the appointment to career status if the employee has performed satisfactorily. Though recently underutilized, the program allows agencies to bypass complex federal personnel hiring rules and procedures to bring people into the most junior grades of the workforce.

I further direct you, in recognition of the different characteristics of the various agencies' workforces, to prepare an individualized plan for hiring welfare recipients and to submit that plan to me within 30 days. This plan should have three principal components:

- The plan should contain a survey indicating in which divisions and for which particular positions your agency can most easily hire welfare recipients.
- The plan should describe in detail how the agency intends to recruit and hire qualified welfare recipients. This description should include a proposed local outreach program, building upon the government's existing nationwide employment information systems, to bring federal job opportunities to the attention of welfare offices, state and private employment offices, nonprofit organizations, and others that work with welfare recipients on a regular basis.
- The plan should describe in detail how the agency will ensure that welfare recipients, once hired, perform well enough to keep their jobs. The agency should include in this aspect of the plan proposals for on-the-job training and/or mentoring programs.

I expect each agency head to report to me about his or her plan at a special cabinet meeting called for that purpose. Following this meeting, I also expect monthly reports on implementation.

To ensure deep and continuing involvement in this issue by the White House, I ask the Vice President to take on the project of overseeing this effort. Based on his expertise in federal

workplace issues, he will assist all agencies in carrying out their commitments.

Finally, I direct appropriate agencies to take three steps that will assist all low-income federal employees, whether or not former welfare recipients.

- I direct each agency head to notify all employees eligible for the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) of both their eligibility and their ability to receive EITC monies each month in their paychecks. Currently, not all agencies inform qualifying employees of their eligibility and options for payment.
- I direct the General Services Administration (GSA) to issue within 30 days guidelines regarding use of the Federal Fare Subsidy Program, including the option to offer fare subsidies based on the employee's income. This option, which agencies may not now realize they have, will enable more agencies to participate in the Fare Subsidy Program.
- I direct the GSA, after consultation with all federal agencies, to report back to me within 30 days on plans to assist low-income federal workers in finding affordable child care. This report shall include information on agency-sponsored child care centers and agency contracts with local child care resource and referral services, as well as recommendations on any appropriate expansion of these arrangements to provide assistance to low-income federal workers.

John F. Pendergrass
Route 2, Box 124
Charleston, Arkansas
72933

Telephone: 501-965-2922
FAX: 501-965-7663

3/7/97

Send to *Doug Bird*
Scheduling

Yes ☐

No ☐

*What's on
going on
dies? C.*

February 26, 1997

Ms. Nancy Hernreich
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500-2000

Dear Nancy:

My wife, Kaye, and I are planning to be in Washington D.C. for the National Cattlemen's Beef Association Board of Directors Meeting, March 19th through March 23rd, 1997.

When we were there last year, we were subjected to many remarks from our Kansas acquaintances regarding the fact that we visited the White House. They commented that we should enjoy it this year because next year they would be visiting the White House when their man was President. They were very mean-spirited in their statements.

If possible, could we visit with the President during our trip in March? Arkansas is the largest cattlemen's association in the United States with 16,000 members. We would like to present an honorary membership to President Clinton for all the work he did for our association during his terms as Governor.

We would also like to have the President become a member of the National Cattlemen's Beef Association if we can arrange it. I will pay the dues if this does not create a conflict of interest.

We will be staying at the Hyatt Regency Capital Hill Hotel, 202-737-1234, beginning March 19th after 1:00 p.m.

Any assistance you can provide would be sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

John F. Pendergrass

John F. Pendergrass

cc gc
stop

3/6/97

Don -

Spoke with Todd.

If it is our policy
not to tabulate surveys for
anyone, then shouldn't
do so for these guys.

Phil

CD Perkins 2/24
- writing in checks
for work

10: Cheryl Lewis, Jim Horkins
From: Corrie McHugh

Is this something
that we can explore or is
it a problem because
of lobbying?

2/21/97

To: Laurie McHugh 456-6423

From: Jurate Kazickas, GOOD HOUSEKEEPING Magazine

I spoke with Lisa Caputo today about the following matter and she suggested contacting you. I would appreciate your advice and help. It concerns the President's proposals on adoption reform and how Good Housekeeping Magazine where I am the Washington correspondent, can get behind them. We have 25 million readers, one of the largest constituencies in the world.

Last year we formed the Good Housekeeping Lobby, which periodically encourages our readers to write to officials or legislators on issues which particularly affect them. In our first effort, we generated more than 100,000 letters to Senators Bradley and Kassebaum regarding "drive-by deliveries." They told us Good Housekeeping made a difference in the swift passage of their bill. I have enclosed the article we ran and the coupon which our readers sent.

In our May issue, due to reach the newsstands in mid-April, we are addressing foster care and adoption. We would like to activate the Lobby on behalf of the President's proposals. Our coupon wording is attached.

It is very possible that the White House will receive 100,000 letters on this subject. We assume that the President would surely like to know that one of his major initiatives has this kind of support from Americans.

What we need is only a commitment that the White House will tabulate the number of such letters. That means that our readers would send them to the President in care of a named staff person. This is important because our readers want to know that their voices have been heard and that their activism has made a difference. And, while the final bills on foster care and adoption are being voted on, whether in Committee or on the floor, the White House would have a very powerful ally in the form of our Lobby.

Our deadline for the May issue is next week. Please let me know as soon as possible if the White House is willing to participate in this effort. I can be reached at 212-831-0787(H) or 212-426-0051. My Fax is 212-426-0261. Thank you very much.



GOOD HOUSEKEEPING LOBBY:

Dear Mr. President:

Please count me as a supporter of your efforts to encourage legislation and initiatives that will double the number of children adopted out of foster care over the next five years. I support your proposed plans to give bonus federal monies to states that increase their adoption rates, provide technical assistance to agencies to recruit parents and place children, and require speedier hearings after a child enters the foster care system. Every child in America deserves loving parents and a healthy, stable home.

FEB 21 '97 10:50AM GOOD HOUSEKEEPING 212 265 3307

Across the country, babies just hours old are being discharged from hospitals—simply to satisfy insurance companies. Tiny lives are at risk. Here's how you can help stop this shocking practice.

Pat Steenland, 40, a professor of English literature in Moraga, CA, gave birth to her first child, Miya, March 15 at 12:05 A.M. A mere fourteen hours later, at 2:00 P.M. on Thursday, the hospital discharged her. "I wasn't at all ready to go home," says Steenland. "I had been up two nights straight because I kept going into labor and then stopping. I was exhausted. I had also started hemorrhaging and was hooked up to an IV with Pitocin to stop the bleeding." The hospital really wanted to send her home at noon but, says Steenland, "a very nice nurse gave us two extra hours. I was hooked up to the IV until literally ten minutes before I walked out the door."

But that wasn't the worst of it. Once home, on Friday night, Miya started to wail. Her temperature was 102.7. Steenland and her husband, Glen Moriwaiki, an artist, called their pediatrician, who told them to unwaddle her. That brought her temperature down. On Saturday morning they took her to the doctor's office where a blood test was taken. On Monday morning they got a call that Steenland remembers as "just chilling." The blood test showed signs of a massive infection that could be streptococcus. The doctor told Steenland to take Miya immediately to Children's Hospital Oakland. "We were terrified," she says.

Miya was rushed to intensive care and started on intravenous antibiotics. When the culture from the blood test finally came back, it confirmed that she had alpha streptococcus, a rare but fortunately mild form.

When the hospital was ready to release her, Health Net, the family's HMO, wanted to have a home nurse come to their home once to teach Pat and Glen how to administer antibiotics to their infant daughter with an intravenous needle in her scalp. "I told them 'No,'" Pat says. "Fortu-

nately someone at the hospital was doing the negotiating for me so it was easier. I said either they pay for five days of home nurse visits or five more days of intensive care. Finally they agreed.

"But they didn't let up the pressure," Steenland says. "The home nurse tried to get us to learn to flush the IV line so she could come only two times a day instead of four. One night the line was jammed and the nurse had to replace it and draw blood from my daughter's scalp, and I said, 'You expected me to deal with this? It was hard enough to watch.'"

"It really was a terrible ordeal, a trauma," Steenland remembers. "Fortunately, Miya's perfectly fine now—for her, it's as though nothing happened. For us, it's going to be with us for the rest of our lives. I think the twenty-four-hour rule is a terrible policy. I don't know how many babies are going to be born they change it?"

A potent coalition of doctors, mothers, and some of the nation's leading pediatricians are wondering the same thing and have joined forces to lobby Congress against what have been known as "drive-through deliveries." This refers to a policy of releasing mothers and their newborns from the hospital too soon—anywhere from eight to 24 hours after birth. The result has been a growing number of infants who've developed life-threatening complications—and even died.

In May, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) issued a statement calling for a moratorium on the practice and called upon insurance companies to prove that early discharge is safe. For many years, ACOG and the American Academy of Pediatrics have recommended that mothers and newborns spend 48 hours in the hospital unless, in select cases, doctors deem earlier release safe, according to strict criteria. (According to the National Center for Health Statistics,

FEB 21 '97 10:51AM GOOD HOUSEKEEPING 212 265 3387

P.2/3



tics, the average length of stay for mothers and babies dropped from 4.1 days in 1970 to 2.4 days by 1993.) In its statement, ACOG cited reports of two serious problems that doctors were suddenly seeing: babies suffering brain damage from untreated jaundice that parents weren't trained to recognize, and breast-fed babies suffering from dehydration because mothers didn't realize they weren't getting enough milk. Soon after, the American Medical Association passed a resolution saying that discharges should be "determined by the clinical judgment of attending physicians and not by economic considerations."

Obstetricians also complained loudly about how difficult early discharge was on women. "The risks are greater to the newborn than the mother," says Anthony Caggiano, M.D., past president of the New Jersey Obstetrics and Gynecology Society and president-elect of the Medical Society of New Jersey. "But our concern is the abuse of mothers. They are exhausted, they're sore, yet they're also wired because of the new baby and all the people calling and visiting. They don't have time in twenty-four hours to take a deep breath and get a good night's sleep and learn how to take care of their newborn and themselves before they leave the hospital."

In May, Maryland passed a law requiring that infants who are discharged in 24 hours meet certain medical criteria and receive a home visit. In June, New Jersey legislators passed a stricter law mandating insurance companies and HMOs to cover a 48-hour stay in the hospital if the mother requests it. Alan Langsner, M.D., senior consultant of pediatric cardiology at St. Barnabas Medical Center in Livingston, NJ, told legislators that "it is only a matter of time before an infant with a correctable cardiac lesion dies in the name of early newborn discharge." Parents, doctors say, have no way of recognizing the subtle signs—bluish red or purplish blood or small changes in skin coloring—of that heart condition.

By summer, bills were introduced in New York, California, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts. In June, Senator Bill Bradley (D-NJ) filed a bill to require health insurers to allow new mothers to remain in the hospital for a minimum of 48 hours (96 hours for a cesarean); Senator Nancy Kassebaum (R-KS) signed on as a cosponsor. In the House, Congressman George Miller (D-CA) proposed a similar bill. Even the leading ladies in both political parties—First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and New Jersey's

voiced support. Governor Whitman signed her state's bill at a New Jersey hospital and then, for the photo opportunity, stood bedside with a new, smiling mother. And Hillary Clinton said on *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, "I personally am appalled that we are now discharging mothers with babies as soon as we possibly can get them out the door."

Throughout the emotional debate, the insurance companies and HMOs have stood firmly opposed. Why? It costs from \$700 to \$1,110 for an additional day in the hospital for each of the four million babies born each year. In defense of the early-release policy, Susan Pisano, spokesperson for the Group Health Association of America, says, "These decisions need to be made on a patient by patient basis by the attending physician, not by legislators in some cookie cutter approach."

It was in 1993 that insurance companies—especially HMOs—began asking their doctors to make sure mothers and newborns were discharged in 24 hours (two to three days for cesarean sections). State Senator John J. Matheussen (R-NJ), who sponsored his state's 48-hour bill, says that HMOs force their doctors to comply. Holly H. Roberts, D.O., an obstetrician-gynecologist in Red Bank, NJ, says that an HMO she works with, which she declines to name, "came into my office and showed me a chart of how soon their doctors got their patients out and threatened to drop me from their system if I didn't get my patients out sooner. They also told me there would be a financial incentive if I decreased my patients' length of stay."

In some states it has dropped even lower. In 1994, 16.6 percent of the babies discharged from California hospitals—90,000 babies—went home in under 12 hours. And in March 1995, the Southern California Permanente Medical Group, a division of Kaiser Permanente, the nation's largest HMO, issued a memo to its doctors asking them to "encourage" mothers to leave the hospital "as early as eight hours after delivery." They were also warned that, even with such breathtakingly speedy discharges, home health visits were "not to be used routinely." The memo—which was made public by a Los Angeles-based watchdog group called Consumers for Quality Care (CQC)—gave the doctors a checklist of things to tell new mothers about why they should go home early, including the fact that "hospital food is not tasty." Elaine Burn-Pyrez, spokesperson for CQC, says, "It's outrageous because it's totally profit driven. It's clearly not giving any concern to the mother or the newborn."

Indeed, some feel conditions have deteriorated to sheer recklessness once hospitals got into the early discharge habit. "Initially HMOs intended only full-term, healthy babies to be released within twenty-four hours," says Susan Panny, M.D., a pediatrician in the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. However, when her department did a study of Maryland births they found that in 1992, 22.2 percent of all newborns who were not considered healthy were discharged before 24 hours. "It's very scary," Dr. Panny says.

One of those scary things that pediatricians are seeing—which they almost never saw before—is permanent brain damage caused by untreated jaundice. Jaundice is very common among newborns and causes no problems when babies are treated soon after de-

Augusto Sola, director of neonatal clinical services at the California San Francisco Medical Center, "I remember showing me pictures of babies with jaundice. He said, 'Your generation is very lucky to see this problem again.'" So when seeing babies with untreated jaundice, he checked the hospital's records. He discovered that from 1974 to 1994, five babies had been admitted with the condition. All five had been discharged from area hospitals between eight and 28 days of age, and four of the five had no home nurse or physician for release. In the 20 years prior, there had been no admission for the condition at UCSF because "no mother can be expected to diagnose jaundice and get the baby treated," Dr. Sola says. "Even if you see it on it."

Michelle Bauman, a New Jersey mother who is a mathematician and a school publishing company, sadly remembers the birth of her son, Nigel, at 12:12, 1994. Since her insurance company paid for a second day, mother and son were discharged the next evening around 10:30. "The nurse said, 'I know what was wrong. He just hasn't adjusted well,'" she says. "The next day, a Wednesday, a nurse came and told me he was jaundiced, and I thought that and to just expose him to sunlight. Shivering and cold, he said his immune system was as weak as other children's."

His condition continued to worsen. On Friday, Dr. Charles M.D., their pediatrician, admitted to see him first thing Monday morning. As he examined the baby, he rushed to the hospital. "It was a shattering experience," he says. "I'll never forget it. That baby was so sick and very lethargic. His temperature went down to ninety-three, his heart beat was eighty-three. I was afraid the baby was

dead. He stayed two weeks in the hospital. When he was five weeks old, he started having six or seven seizures a day. His head would roll back in his head," Joseph says, "and he would go limp." Now he has a seizure only about every two days, but no one is sure whether he will ever completely recover. "This baby is not out of the woods," Dr. Charles says. "This baby could grow up to have a seizure disorder."

"That's so sick about this," says Dr. Charles, the chairman of the Insurance Committee of the New Jersey Pediatric Society, "is that we have systems in place in every major medical center to monitor and care for newborn infants. HMOs are saying all this is superfluous. They are taking all the technology that we built up for newborns in the hospital and casting it aside. We have babies dying from streptococcus because the poor, unsuspecting mother can't possibly recognize it. And yet there is no one who would go unrecognized in a newborn nursery."

Dr. Charles is talking about is the one that prompted ACOG to issue its call for a moratorium on early discharge. Michelina Alanna Bauman was born at 12:12 on May 16, an apparently healthy full-term baby. "She was as pink as a flower," her mother, Michelle Bauman, says. "She was beautiful." The next afternoon Michelle, 28,

driver, took Michelina home to their house in Williams-town, NJ. The family's HMO, U.S. Health Care, paid for mothers and full-term newborns to spend only 24 hours in the hospital.

Around 10:30 that night, Michelina started moaning and refused to eat. Her parents stayed up all night trying to comfort her. Although they had no way of knowing it, their 2-day-old baby was dying of a massive beta streptococcus infection that her tiny body was unable to fight.

At 6:00 A.M. the next morning, they called the pediatrician. During the following day, the Baumans made four calls to their pediatrician, who told them the baby probably just had gas. As the day went on, Michelle remembers, Michelina's moans got "louder and louder." Michelle tried to comfort her by putting her in her baby swing for short periods of time. At three that afternoon, purple spots began to appear on her skin, a sign a neonatal nurse or doctor would have recognized as a "terminal event." The pediatrician's office said it was probably "just newborn rash."

At six that night Michelina died in her baby swing. Michael Grossman, D.O., the vice-president of medical affairs at Kennedy Memorial Hospitals-University Medical Center of New Jersey, where she was born, says that had Michelina "spent one more day in the hospital, the infection would have been detected and treated and she would have had a fifty-fifty chance of recovery."

"The system didn't even give our baby a chance," says a distraught Michelle Bauman. "Even if they had tried all they could and she hadn't made it, it would be easier to accept. My husband and I don't even know what to say to each other. He carries the little hat she wore home from the hospital with him all the time. We have pictures of her all over the house. I walk around and talk to the pictures and tell her I'm sorry. Some days I feel like grabbing her through the picture and just holding her, but I can't do that." ★

JOIN THE GOOD HOUSEKEEPING LOBBY!

If you want to help prevent the deaths and illnesses of any more newborns due to drive-through deliveries, fill in this petition and mail it to:

Senator Bill Bradley, Washington, DC 20510.

1995

Dear Senator Bradley:

Please add my name to the list of supporters of the Newborns' and Mothers' Health Protection Act of 1995, cosponsored by Senator Bill Bradley (D-NJ) and Senator Nancy Kassebaum (R-KS), which will require insurance companies to allow mothers and their infants to spend a minimum of 48 hours in the hospital after a baby's birth.

Sincerely,

NAME

ADDRESS

Record Type: Record

To: Phillip Caplan/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: Augusta Chronicle signature request

Any word on this from counsel's office yet? Please keep me posted. Thanks.

Jim -
You were going to check
to see if the newspaper sold
any part of this service to the
school districts. Any word?
Let me know what you
found out.
Phil

Julia R. Green

02/21/97 02:12:41

PM

Record Type: Record

To: Phillip Caplan/WHO/EOP

cc: MCHUGH_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

Subject: Augusta Chronicle

Do you have an answer about whether or not the front pages of the Augusta Chronicle can be signed by POTUS or autopenned for the newspaper to distribute in poster form in classrooms? I'd like to get back the paper one way or the other so they don't hold up production. Thanks.