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.

The Republicans also argued that if some of the votes were to be recounted, all the votes should be recounted.

The recount began on December 13, 1960. By the time the electors met on December 19, 1960, only one-third of the votes had been recounted, but Kennedy had an 83 vote lead. Based on the earlier certified results, the Republican electors met and cast their three votes for Nixon. The Democratic electors also met and cast their votes for Kennedy even though they did not have a certificate of election from the State.

The recount was not concluded until December 28, 1960. Kennedy was declared the winner by the court by 115 votes. The court entered its judgment on December 30, 1960.

When Congress met to count the electoral votes on January 6, 1961, it had before it three certificates from Hawaii. The first was the certificate of the Republican electors dated December 19 accompanied by the November 28 certificate of the Acting Governor of Hawaii that the electors had been appointed as a result of the November election.

The second was the certificate of the Democratic electors dated December 19, 1960 casting their votes for John Kennedy.

The third certificate was from the Republican Governor of Hawaii dated January 4, 1961 certifying that the Democratic electors had been elected ''agreeably to the provision of the laws of the said State, and in conformity with the Constitution and the laws of the United States'' as ''ascertained by judgment of the Circuit Court.'' The Governor annexed a copy of the court's decision to the certificate of election.

Vice President Nixon, sitting as the presiding officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, suggested that the electors named in the certificate of the Governor dated January 4, 1961 be considered the lawful electors from Hawaii. There was no objection to the Vice President's suggestion, and the three electoral votes from Hawaii were cast for John Kennedy.

This result was supported by both Senators from Hawaii, Republican Hiram Fong and Democrat Oren Long and Democratic Representative DANIEL K. INOUYE.

The precedent of 40 years ago suggests the means for resolving the electoral dispute in Florida: count the votes under the supervision of the court pursuant to Florida law, both slates of electors meet on December 18 and send their certificates to Congress; the Governor of Florida send a subsequent certificate of election based on the decision of the count supervised by the court accompanied by the decision of the court; and Congress accepts the slate of electors named by the Governor in his final certification.

Under this procedure Florida need not rush to complete its recount in an attempt to meet unrealistic deadlines set by the court or the legislature. The key date is not December 12 or December 18. It is January 6, the date on which the electoral votes are counted. As the 1960 experience of Hawaii shows, the Florida recount does not have to be completed until just before the electoral votes are counted.

TRIBUTE TO MR. DEREK E. BROOMES

HON. JOSE E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 2000

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to Mr. Derek E. Broomes who was recently elected as the new Chairman of the Board for the Caribbean American Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Inc. (CACCI). He is the third Chairman of CACCI's Board in its 15-year history. Mr. Broomes is the Chief Financial Officer of the Bronx Overall Economic Development Corporation (BOEDC).

As Chief Financial Officer of BOEDC, Mr. Broomes is responsible for administering a $110 million budget for economic development in the Bronx. BOEDC, the economic consultant to the Bronx Borough President, also administers the Bronx Initiative Corporation, a certified US Small Business 504 loan company.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Broomes is a former Inspector General of the New York City Department of Investigations. He also served as Deputy Commissioner and Agency's Chief Contracting Officer at the NYC Human Resources Administration.

Mr. Broomes is a London University trained financial economist. He holds a Master of Science/CPA degree in public accounting and finance from the Graduate School of the City University of New York, where he has also done work toward a Ph.D. in economics and finance. He holds a Diploma in Economics and Finance from the London School of Economics and a Diploma in Mathematics and Physics from the University of London. He is a member of the Institute of Management Accountants and a member of the Institute of Financial Executives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Derick E. Broomes and in commending him for his outstanding achievements and wishing him continued success at CACCI as well as BOEDC.