

1995. A product of Guam's public schools and the University of Guam, Mayor San Miguel is the daughter of Juan Atoigue and Esperanza Diwa San Miguel, and the loving mother of Esperanza, Michelle and Samantha. Mayor San Miguel's terms in office resulted in the paving, resurfacing and naming of numerous streets in the villages of Chalan Pago and Ordod. Her effort and leadership made the streets of Chalan Pago and Ordod safer by having numerous power poles and street lights installed, as well as the construction of bus shelters for the children of her village.

With a population of more than 40,000, the Municipality of Dededo is Guam's largest village. It might well qualify as a city rather than a village. The Honorable Jose Agualo Rivera has served the people of Dededo for 16 years after having served as a federal civil servant from 1947 until his retirement as Assistant Fire Chief in 1981. First elected as Assistant Village Commissioner in 1984 and then as Mayor in 1989. During his tenure, the village of Dededo grew steadily and prospered. Mayor Rivera worked hard and lobbied hard for the infrastructure and capitol improvements necessary to keep up with the rapid growth and development of his village. Of the eight children born to the late Jose Ulloa Rivera and the late Carmen Agualo Rivera, Mayor Rivera was an only son. He and his wife, the former June Santos Shimizu, are the proud parents of five children, nine grandchildren and two great grandchildren.

#### INDIA OBSERVES CEASE-FIRE IN KASHMIR

##### HON. ROBERT WEXLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 13, 2000*

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, on November 19th, the Government of India announced a one-month unilateral cease-fire in Kashmir. India's Prime Minister, Atal Behari Vajpayee, ordered all Indian security forces to cease operations in Kashmir during the month of Ramadan, the Muslim period of fasting and prayer. An article in the New York Times on November 20th described India's action as "a rare, hopeful step toward ending more than a decade of violence in Kashmir." Prime Minister Vajpayee stated, "I hope that our gesture will be fully appreciated and all violence and infiltration across the Line of Control and the international border will cease and peace prevail."

Regrettably, India's courageous step for peace was immediately rejected by the four major Muslim guerrilla groups that have been battling since 1989 to forcibly tear the state of Jammu and Kashmir away from India.

Still, despite the snubs from the militant leaders, India is making good on its cease-fire offer. Since the beginning of Ramadan at sundown on Sunday, November 26, Indian security forces have been under orders to conduct no operations against the guerrilla groups, and to react with force only if they are attacked.

Unfortunately, it didn't take long for an attack to come. According to an account in the November 28 edition of The Washington Post, militants used a land mine to blow up an Indian army truck, killing three soldiers. There

was additional violence as guerrillas tried to infiltrate into India's territory, across the Line of Control from Pakistani-held areas. These border incursions are clearly an attempt by the militants to provide a response from India, thereby undermining the cease-fire. India has a right to defend its territory, and these defensive actions are consistent with the cease-fire.

There are indications that the Kashmiri people welcome the cease-fire, despite the threats from the militants. According to a November 27 article in The Washington Post, entitled "Kashmiris Hopeful as Truce Begins":

"The cease-fire is a good thing for us, but unfortunately the militants do not agree," said Nazir Ahmed, 30, a mason in the village of Wathura, which was reduced to rubble early this month during a clash between rebels and security forces. "I'm afraid there will be more killings, because one side wants to prove a point."

In addition, there have been warning signs that some rebel groups have no intention of honoring the truce, which Vajpayee announced Nov. 19. Since then, there have been two attacks on civilians, including the killing of five Sikh and Hindu truck drivers on a Kashmiri highway.

There has been speculation that the attacks were intended to drive a wedge between Muslims and people of other faiths in Kashmir at an especially sensitive moment, thus undermining the cease-fire.

Such attacks must be condemned, in the name of human rights and fundamental decency. As to the broader issue of India's brave action, I urge the U.S. Government to express in the strongest terms our strong support for the difficult step for peace that India has taken.

#### EXPRESSING SORROW OF THE HOUSE AT THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE JULIAN C. DIXON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SPEECH OF

##### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 8, 2000*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of the Honorable JULIAN C. DIXON. JULIAN was a steady force in the Congress for more than twenty years.

Before entering the House in 1979, JULIAN served six years in the California State Assembly. While there, he won the favor of his colleagues and was Chairman of the Assembly Democratic Caucus.

I became aware of JULIAN through his efforts to secure federal funds for the people of California. For example, he was instrumental in federal efforts to mitigate the impact of the 1992 civil disturbance by introducing a dire emergency supplemental appropriations bill to help businesses and families hurt by the riots. Seeking to better serve his constituents, JULIAN served four two-year terms on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Of particular interest to his constituents, JULIAN focused attention on the CIA-crack cocaine connection. He was the highest ranking Democrat.

While a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, JULIAN advocated programs important to the defense/aerospace industrial base in California. In addition, he secured years of funding for educational programs, including a mathematics and technology enrichment program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in saluting a great American, a great Congressman and a great human being—JULIAN C. DIXON.

#### THE NATIONAL CAMPAIGN FOR HEARING HEALTH

##### HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 13, 2000*

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I support the National Campaign for Hearing Health. The campaign was launched a year and a half ago by the Deafness Research Foundation to put hearing health on the national agenda. With 28 million Americans suffering from hearing loss—from newborns to senior citizens—they are committed to promoting research, prevention, detection and intervention that will ensure that every American has the potential to lead a hearing life.

Working with the campaign, I am pleased to announce the recent formation of the first-ever Congressional Hearing Health Caucus. The caucus is a bipartisan group of congressional Members committed to the study and support of hearing health issues. Caucus co-chairs include myself, Representatives JIM WALSH, CAROLYN MCCARTHY, and JIM RYUN, who knows first-hand the impact of hearing loss. We are greatly interested in these vital issues that affect so many Americans' health and well-being.

While the increase in the availability of newborn hearing tests represents tremendous progress—we all realize that screening is just the first step. We must begin to look to the future and prepare for the time when 100 percent of newborns are screened at birth. We must ensure that, once a baby's hearing loss is detected, all parents have access to the appropriate interventions—be they digital hearing aids or cochlear implants—regardless of their economic status.

Block grant funding provided to the states through last spring's Walsh bill—also known as the "Newborn Infant Hearing Screening and Intervention Act" is also expected to be a catalyst to advance newborn screening and intervention programs through the states. But it too is only a beginning.

Once a baby's hearing impairment is identified, early intervention with either hearing aids or a cochlear implant is critical. Somewhere between 6 and 24 months, a "hearing impaired child" brain starts to shut down that part that processes speech and language. Every hour, two babies in America suffer irreversible damage to their brain's ability to process speech and language. Every hour, two babies cross that 24 month critical window without the hearing assistance they need.

The issue of funding is one that must be addressed. Today, the campaign is releasing its Medicaid Reimbursement State Report Card—to examine state-by-state the levels of reimbursement provided to low-income families for cochlear implants—one of the new technologies available for hearing impaired children and adults.

While Medicaid, a joint federal and state program designed to provide medical coverage for low-income families, does cover cochlear implants for eligible children in virtually all states reimbursement levels vary widely from state to state.

These figures are troubling, especially since studies have shown that cochlear implants provide significant overall savings over the course of a lifetime in comparison to special education costs. It is clear that we have reached a point where our technology has outpaced our policy—leaving us with a situation that is clearly unacceptable—too many children denied life-altering hearing assistive technology due to lack of income or inadequate funding.

And the problem does not exist under the Medicaid system alone. Private insurance reimbursement for cochlear implants has been found to be even more limited than Medicaid, despite the clear benefits of this technology. As precedent has shown, changes in Medicaid and Medicare can lead to changes in private insurance coverage as well. It is our hope that this data will lead to greater awareness of reimbursement discrepancies in Medicaid policy and will encourage changes that will in turn lead to changes in private insurance reimbursement policy.

With thousands of potential implant candidates born each year in the United States, we simply cannot afford to ignore this issue any longer. All children in America should have access to this miracle of technology, regardless of their income, socio-economic status or place or residence. By improving Medicaid reimbursement for children, we can ensure that the most vulnerable in this country—low-income children—can have the world of sound open to them.

A CORRECTION THE NEW YORK  
TIMES SAW FIT NOT TO PRINT

**HON. BARNEY FRANK**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 13, 2000*

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago our Republican colleagues instituted a new procedure known as Corrections Day to deal with mistakes Congress has made. I did not think that the concept would do a great deal, and I believe it has been only marginally useful, although it has of course done no harm. But as I thought about it, it struck me that there would be a much more useful procedure to be called Corrections Day—namely, an opportunity for Members of the House to correct the errors that are propagated by the media. Unfortunately, given the number of these, and the great reluctance of the media to engage in correction of its own errors, a Correction Day would not suffice, and I can see that dealing with the errors of the media on a regular basis would probably crowd out other important business from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

But I do think that from time to time it is useful for us to take advantage of this forum to correct errors in those instances when the medium propagating the error has refused to do so itself. I do this because the public is entitled to an accurate picture of what its elected officials are saying and doing, as opposed to

one which includes inaccuracies stubbornly maintained. And I have also found that where one is misquoted, and fails to take concrete action to correct the misquotation, one may subsequently be held accountable for it by people who have read it, and have seen no objection to it.

I was recently the subject of a blatant misquotation in the New York Times, and to my regret, but not my surprise, the New York Times declined to print the Letter to the Editor correcting it. In an article published on the Sunday of Thanksgiving weekend, Times reporter Michiko Kakutani, lamenting incivility in public dialogue, incorrectly said that I had “compared Republicans’ intolerance to that of the Taliban.”

In fact, I did no such thing. I did say in 1998 that the Republicans’ claim that they were behaving in a bipartisan fashion during impeachment was as credible as the Taliban would be if they claimed to be practicing religious tolerance. Apparently, the notion of an analogy is absent from the Times style book. Because I do agree that we should refrain from unjustified incivility, I wrote to the New York Times in the hopes that they would clarify the situation by acknowledging their error and went on to explain that I had made no such comparison. The Times refused to do so. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my unpublished letter to the New York Times be printed here to correct the mis-impression the New York Times left, and refused itself to correct.

I should note, Mr. Speaker, that not all media outlets share this reluctance to acknowledge their errors. The Providence Journal which subscribes to the New York Times news service also ran the article, and I was pleased to note that the Providence Journal ran the Letter to the Editor which I had submitted also to them and a copy of which I submit to be printed here.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
*Washington, DC, November 27, 2000.*

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR, The New York Times, New York, NY.

DEAR EDITOR, Michiko Kakutani’s November 26th article on polarization of the national dialogue incorrectly says that I “compared Republicans’ intolerance to that of the Taliban.”

I did not. When House Republicans praised themselves for bipartisanship, after unilaterally deciding how to structure the impeachment process, I said that if what they did was bipartisanship, then what the Taliban was doing was religious tolerance. That is, I compared the Republican approach to bipartisanship to the Taliban’s approach to religious tolerance.

Ms. Kakutani should understand that when you answer an aptitude test question by saying that C is to D as A is to B, you are not accusing C of being B.

My point was that the Republicans were inaccurate in claiming to be partisan, not that they were forcing women members of Congress to cover themselves completely.

BARNEY FRANK.

[From the Providence Journal, Dec. 5, 2000]

I DIDN’T SAY GOP = TALIBAN

(By Barney Frank)

The news media have incorrectly reported that I compared Republicans’ intolerance to that of the Taliban [the Islamic fundamentalist group ruling Afghanistan].

I did not. When House Republicans praised themselves for bipartisanship, after unilaterally

deciding how to structure the impeachment process, I said that if what they did was bipartisanship, then what the Taliban was doing was religious tolerance. That is, I compared the Republican approach to bipartisanship to the Taliban approach to religious tolerance.

The writer of the article should understand that when you answer an aptitude test question by saying that C is to D as A is to B, you are not accusing C of being B.

My point was that the Republicans were inaccurate in claiming to be bipartisan, not that they were forcing women members of Congress to cover themselves completely.

1960 HAWAII PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION PROVIDES ROADMAP FOR RESOLVING FLORIDA ELECTION DISPUTE

**HON. PATSY T. MINK**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 13, 2000*

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, yesterday’s Supreme Court ruling stopping the recount of Presidential votes in Florida was most unfortunate.

In his dissent Justice Stevens refers to the 1960 Hawaii Presidential election as an example that the provisions of Title 3 of the United States Code do not mandate that the recount must have been completed by December 12: “[the provisions] do not prohibit a State from counting what the majority concedes to be legal votes until a bona fide winner is determined. Indeed, in 1960, Hawaii appointed two slates of electors and Congress chose to count the one appointed on January 4, 1961, well after the Title 3 deadlines.” (Bush v. Gore, slip opinion at 30.)

So that Members have the benefit of the full story of the 1960 contested Presidential election in Hawaii, I want to present its story and lessons.

The Florida Presidential dispute contains all the elements present in the 1960 Hawaii Presidential election: an apparent winner on election night; a contest by the apparent loser; a court-ordered recount; the certification of one set of electors by the Governor while the recount was under way; a court decision declaring the apparent loser the winner after a recount completed after the date the State’s electors met; competing slates of electors presented to the Congress; and a joint session of Congress choosing which slate of electors to accept.

The resolution of that dispute provides valuable guidance for the Congress and the Nation as we try to determine the next President of the United States.

The results of the 1960 Presidential election in Hawaii between Richard Nixon and John Kennedy originally showed Nixon a winner by 141 votes. Based on those results, the Republican slate was issued a certificate of election by the Acting Governor on November 28, 1960. The results were challenged by 30 Democratic voters who filed suit to require a recount in 34 of the State’s 240 precincts. The suit was opposed by the State’s Republican Administration, which contended that there was not sufficient time to complete the recount before the December 13, 1960 deadline for certifying electors, six days before the December 19, 1960 date set for the electors to meet.