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.