

#### Siñora Anita Arriola

Interview conducted by Isa Kelley Bowman, Ph.D., and Leiana S.A. Naholowa'a, M.A. candidate (University of Guam), 2015. Video recording produced by Leonard Leon with assistance from Kenneth Gofigan Kuper.

Video interview @ http://honggamona.com/video/sinora-anita-arriola

Anita: My name is Anita Arriola. I am an attorney. My family is the Arriola family from Barrigada, also known as Arot and our, my, my mother's family is from Sinajana, the Perez family, and their family name is Ginya.

Liz: Thank you. Would you mind telling us, some of the highlights, from the time, a few years ago, when you were dealing with and very much at the forefront of the whole controversy surrounding the bill that outlawed abortion on Guam?

Anita: The bill was known as Public law 20-134 and it was a law that banned all abortions on Guam except of in the case where the mother's life was endangered, it had no exception for rape, incest, or for severe fetal deformity, or any other exceptions. And it also contained an anti-solicitation provision, which made it illegal for women to solicit abortions or advise, you know, where to get abortions. And that made the law kind of unique because that anti-solicitation provision hadn't been seen in any other pervious abortion laws, and so that law was passed I believe some time in 1990, by Governor Joseph Ada; he signed it into law, after the legislature passed it. And so I became involved because I was living in Guam at the time. I had just returned from practicing law in San Francisco for several years, and I was, you know, opposed to the law. I was here when the bill was debated on before the legislature, and then it was, when it was signed into law by Governor Ada and pretty much immediately after he signed the law, you know, I contacted people that I knew back in San Francisco and in New York, particularly the ACRU to advise them about this law and to tell them about, you know, the repercussions of this type of a law in Guam, but also in the entire United States because we're an american territory. And as a result of those phone calls, I had, you know, a person named Janet Benshoof, who was an attorney with the ACLU RFP, the Reproductive Freedom Project, at the time, and she came out here to Guam and assisted me in lobbying against the bill, but you know of course we were unsuccessful because the bill was enacted into law.

Liz: And she actually...didn't she like deliberately violate the no solicitation aspect of the bill?



Anita: Yes, she did. When she came out here, you know, I had never met her before, but when she came out here, we sat down and basically talked about the strategy of opposing this bill, you know, she tried...she and I tried to get a meeting with Governor Ada to influence him into not signing the bill into law. We, you know, we also talked to other legislators. I had submitted written testimony opposing the bill, and Janet appeared before, I believe it was the Rotary Club, at that time, to essentially violate the law and to test the provisions. She read from the Hawai'i yellow pages to advise women on Guam where to get abortions in Hawai'i, and that sparked, you know, her prosecution under the law.

Liz: What made you choose that strategy? Do you remember?

Anita: Well, you know the law was so extreme. Uhh...with that anti-solicitation provision, that we felt that, that that was probably the biggest way to get everybody's attention. You know, that this was such a bad law, that it violated not only women's, doctor's, nurses', and other people's civil rights in terms of their right of privacy and their right to an abortion but also, and, and to perform abortions, but also their right of free speech that not only that abortions could not be had on Guam, but that you couldn't even discuss it. You couldn't advise women about where to go for abortions. You know, a doctor and a nurse could not advise their patient, even about what their options were. If they had an unwanted pregnancy or if there was a rape, or incest, or severe fetal deformities. And so, you know, that, that was the strategy that I think was intended to highlight how bad the law was and also how extreme it was.

#### (Cut to next clip)

Anita: Well... I think that I would have to start with my parents. (Anita lets out a loud laugh). You know, my, as we all do. You know, my parents raised and educated us to be all independent thinkers. Uhh...we all went to college. They uhh, really reared us to to value education, to value and express our own opinions and points-of-view. And, I think anyone who knows our family can definitely say that each of us has strong points-of-view and at many times we are often opposed to each other. But we respect each other's point-of-view. And we, you know, we also uhh, you know, supported each other's right to express those points-of-view even if we disagree with them. And, that has actually happened over the last, many years. Some of us are in public service; some are not. Some are in, uhh, private, you know, organizations or businesses and we have expressed quite different views, on many pieces of legislation, on many pieces of public policy, but we still respect each other's viewpoints even if they are in, uhh, disagreement. And so, you know, I started out by saying that, you know, that's



the way that our parents raised us. I also went to a women's school. You know, I attended Smith college. I also attended, uhh, a girl's high school. An all girls high school here on Guam, the Academy of Our Lady of Guam, and those certainly shaped my views, in terms of watching very strong independent girls and women make up their minds about, you know, all kinds of issues, in particularly the right to autonomy, integrity of a woman's body. And then, you know, I went to Georgetown law school, where I was involved in a public interest, law program and I represented, people with underserved interests. Uhh, and then I practiced law in San Francisco at a public interest law firm called Public Advocates, which also served underserved interests and, you know, primarily I did a lot of litigation involving civil rights and constitutional violations. A lot of housing, racial, education, and other discrimination cases, those were the cases that I primarily handled. And so, you know, it was sort of a natural segway to come back to Guam and even though I was in a private firm, to to oppose this law, which I thought, you know, really violated the constitutional rights and privacy rights, not just of women but of everyone, in Guam.

Anita: Well, there was a lot of... a lot of, you know, division. It was a very decisive issue, the law really created a great deal of opposition to the bill as well as support for the bill, and you know, I mean, I just remember the Archbishop, you know, Archbishop Apuron standing, you know, at the legislature, and you know, uhh, exhorting the senators to pass this bill and you know I really felt that was a violation of the separation between church and state, but you know, I mean, I think, I... you know, it reminds me of that saying by Martin Luther King, that you know, when you are silence, something... I'm paraphrasing, but something to the effect of you know, when you are silent is really when, you know, you are allowing injustices to persist. And you know I couldn't be silent about it, every way in which I had been raised, every influence in which, that had had a big impact in my life in terms of my education and my public interest law career, you know, led me to oppose this law. I couldn't be silent about it. I... I think the thing that really assisted me greatly was having the support of the ACLU, other people and friends in the United States, mainland, but also having a really great core group of people here in Guam, who really almost literally came out of the woodwork. I mean, I...I was amazed and I think a lot of people were amazed at the number of people who came out in opposition to the bill despite the support of the bill, you know, by the Catholic Church. I mean, you know, the Guam Nurses Association came together, the Guam Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, both of which were main plaintiffs in the case, you know formed immediately and said you know we're going to oppose this law because you know it...it ultimately affected their medical practice. It affected their patients. It affected the nurses' ability to talk to the patients about what their options were.



You know, and then uhh... a lot of people came out just really believing that this was an extreme bill. I think maybe if it hadn't been so extreme there might have been, you know, less opposition and less of a ground swelling of support and opposition to the law, but I think because of its extremeness, you know, people really came out and just thought, "This is a bad law," and we...it should not have effect in Guam.

Anita: Well specifically speaking about the right to an abortion, I think that, you know, I think that its fairly clear that the right to life's movement is now on eroding the right to an abortion bit by bit, stage by stage, step by step, and they are doing that by, you know, by passing these bills and these laws, that, you know, are just making it so much harder for abortion clinics and providers to survive or for them to give and provide any abortion services at all. And we see that with, you know, all of the recent state legislations, particularly I would say in the last 5 or 6 years. You know where states are passing laws that, you know, are... are preventing clinics from operating in a particular way. So I think the strategy now is not to pass outright abortion bans because I think that they believe that's probably not going to go anywhere, that, that ban will probably not be upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court. So their strategy now is just to erode it little by little, you know, state by state. And so far, you know, some of those attacks are working, but many others are not.

Liz: Do you see any of that happening on Guam?

Anita: They have already happened in Guam. I mean we already have quite a few pieces of legislation that have passed without very much, you know, debate or discussion. You know, for example, one recent law that passed was that now doctors have to give the fetal age of fetuses, you know, that are aborted. And you know various types of laws like that where really they're just trying to penalize abortion providers. I don't really see the point to something like that, but they are trying to make it harder and harder and more regulated for abortion providers. I suppose to be caught in some of, some kind of, you know, web of criminal wrongdoing so that they can punish these abortion providers. They...they seem to be more punitive than anything else.

Liz: Certainly not medically necessary

Anita: Absolutely not medically necessary.



Liz: Okay, but it's very interesting too because of course the issue was decided in the courts...public law again, but the issue was decided, ultimately, according to U.S. federal law.

Anita: Yes

Liz: And...and... so that was...that was what decided the issue and so on. But do you ever, because there is sort of a decolonization movement, there's talk about the different political statuses: independence, free association, statehood, like if Guam were to move from being unincorporated territory to a different political status, and I just...sometimes I think if Guam became independent or some sort of free association the U.S. federal law might no longer apply. And you talked about how when there was sort of a groundswell of support, or there sort of a grassroots support for women's, you know, legal right to an abortion here, that, that's. I guess what I'm asking is do you think that Guam really wants an abortion ban? Like in itself, the people of Guam? Or not?

Anita: No, I don't think so. I mean my experience in that lawsuit and in talking to people, and in, you know, even...even in just, you know, the last couple of decades since that lawsuit. I mean I think people generally support the right to an abortion, even in Guam, and they're, you know, but as with the right to an abortion, it's a very private thing. You know, people are not necessarily willing to discuss it or talk about it because it's...most people view it as an issue of privacy. You know, it's what happens in the bedroom. It's what happens with a woman's own body. They don't want to talk to other people about it necessarily and by the same token they don't want to be...to have other people's views imposed upon them. You know, it's a very private right. That's why it's called, you know, a right of privacy. And so, I think that, you know, for example if we had, you know, a poll or a survey that was done today on Guam, "Do you support the right to an abortion in Guam?" you know as opposed to, "Do you want all abortions to be banned on Guam?", if you...do you support the right to an abortion on Guam? I think you would be really interested in what the uhh...survey would say. When the survey was done and a commission by the University of Guam back then during the abortion case, you know, a plurality of people basically disagreed with Governor Ada's decision in signing the bill into law. I think there was like 44% disagreed with it; 39% agreed with it. But, you know, it...it...it basically showed that Guam was not overwhelmingly pro-life as many people, you know, kind of assumed. So...so, you know, I mean, a direct answer to your question. I just...I don't really believe that a lot of people support an abortion ban on Guam and primarily because of the right to privacy, but also because, you know, on Guam we're unlike other states. You can't just drive to another state to get an abortion



the way that you can in the United States. You can't can't go to another county. You can't go to another city. You can't drive across to another state. You've got to go to Japan or the Philippines or Hawai'i and those are long distances to travel. That's a lot of money; that's a lot of inconvenience. It's a lot of...it...it has an impact on a woman's health. You know, so I...I...I...I really believe that people would not support an abortion ban in Guam.

Liz: Oddly (16:03?)

Anita: I'm not really familiar with, you know, women's access to healthcare now. I mean I was I aware of it, you know, when I was doing the lawsuit because that formed a big part of, you know, the case. And, you know, how women had access to healthcare and whether or not that...that law would infringe on that access to healthcare. Now as far as I know, you know, I think it's...it... I think there is a big impact on women who don't have the sort of the socioeconomic status or even the educational status to be aware about what's available in Guam, in terms of contraceptives or you know even just generally. You know...women's reproductive healthcare, but other than that I can't really speak specifically to that issue.

Liz: For example, you know, I heard that in the public school system here there is an abstinence-based sex education curriculum and that, I've, you know, I've pulled my students at the university and they've told me similar things. I've spoken to public health workers about it. So that's, you know, a little troubling, and the high rates of teen pregnancy on Guam, for example. You know, it's just something that I...I see these things tying together, you know.

Anita: Well of course they are, I mean they're all tied together. You know when...when you talk about a woman's access to healthcare that has an impact on whether or not they're going to get, you know, adequate prenatal care, whether they're even going to get education or you know medical care involving you know just their body, and whether or not they're even prepared to, you know, bear a child. So you know all those things are definitely intertwined, in terms of, you know, what...what the policy is in public high schools or private high schools about contraception or abstinence or reproductive health. You know those are polity...policy decisions that are being made by the legislators that are being made by the Governor and the administration. Whether or not those actually work? I'm not so sure. And just as you mentioned, you know, the...the teenage pregnancy rate apparently is indicating that it's not working. You know, we have a very high teenage pregnancy rate. I...I believe that it's gone down in the last couple of years, but you know it's always been extremely high and it's been one



of the highest in the nation. And as far as I know I...I haven't really seen any comprehensive report or study that can definitively say why we have that high rate, whether it's that they don't have access to healthcare or contraceptives, you know; I don't know.

Liz: Yeah

Anita: You know actually, having seen the abortion debates in the United States and been involved in the protests and demonstrations back there, I actually thought that, the... the protests and the demonstrations and the discussion on Guam were a lot tamer. We did not have the type of really, you know, emotional divisiveness and, you know, rhetoric, and violence in Guam that occurs in the United States when this issue was raised. Back then when we had the law, I mean certainly there was demonstration; there were protests. There was haranguing from the pulpit, the different Catholic churches by the priests, but you know, I... I really found that there was more of a respectful debate about it and a respectful discussion about it, way more than occurs in the United States. If you look at the debate and discussion that's going on now about abortion rights here on Guam, there are a few people who are not from Guam who have really imported this sort of "mainland" style of rhetoric into the abortion debate here on Guam, and who are just, you know just downright, you know, no... I mean I guess...I guess that I'm trying to think about the right term, but it's basically, you know, they...they just aren't taking any hostages. It's a no hostage type of a situation where they are going to, any person that is in favor or abortion rights they are going to castigate them, demean them, you know bring in their family, you know, etc. And I don't know if you guys...if any of you have looked at any of those blogs, but they are really mean-spirited. They're divisive; they're violent. You know, one person accused one of the female senators of having an abortion when she never had. You know, and...and of... calling...trying to call people out...calling the senators out if...if they supported, you know, the right to an abortion, any way, shape, or form. That is not something that we saw back in the 1990s, that's really U.S. mainland imported rhetoric that I really disagree with and think has no place here on Guam. You know, we never had it before. We shouldn't be having it now. And...and I think it's...I guess the way...best way to say it is I think it's really shameful that people do that because we're a small island. You know, and I think people understood that back in the 1990s. People understood that at some point along the way, you know, we know each other's families. We have to live with each other during a typhoon, during an emergency we're going to call on each other, and we're not going to do this "in your face" you know political, you know, speech or demonstration that happens so much in the United States. Because in the United States you can put down, you know,



your protest signs and you can go back to your home, and you're probably never going to see these people again. In Guam, you will, and you know I've learned, just like in the legal field, you know, you don't burn your bridges. You know, people understand that even though we may be very upset and very divided about an issue, we know that at some point down the line, somewhere in our career, somewhere in our children's lives, we're going to call on our neighbors because we're going to need them and they're going to need us and so the rhetoric back in the 1990s was really a lot tamer. Nowadays with the people who are doing the blogs and who are, you know, on the anti-abortion movement, they are just, you know, incredibly...incredibly divisive, and I don't like it; I don't agree with it.

Liz: Oh yeah...and how does one deal with that kind of imported, divisive rhetoric? Have you been the target?

Anita: Of course! Of course...oh yeah! I...I mean I was put up on the blog. My mother's name was put up on the blog as well. You know, some of my other family members. Well, uhh, you know you give more power to people like that when you respond to them, and so you know...I...I tend to ignore people like that because paying attention to them feeds on their ego and so much of this is about ego and about how they feel like that their position is right and they want to prove that they're right, and you know that kind of thing. And so I just...I...I ignore it unless there's, you know, a bill before the legislature that I feel very strongly about that I will go and testify against.

I think one of the attractions for, you know, much of the media and the national press about this case was the fact that my mother had sponsored, you know, the anti-abortion bill, and then you know here was her daughter who was opposing it. not only in the legislature, but also you know in court. And...so the attraction for the media was you know, wow this is a...you know they played on it in every possible way that they could. They called it the gener...generational gap. They called it, you know, this is the sign of the times. Uhh...and in many ways it was all of that, you know, but it was also about two very strong persons who had very different, you know opposing views about an issue and yet could still you know live together and be a family, you know, despite those opposing views. You know, as I said before our family was raised to be you know very independent thinkers, very opinionated people. We were not only allowed; we were encouraged to express our opinions and that's what happened in this case. You know, my mother had her opinion about this issue and she felt strongly about it and sponsored this bill. And I had my opinion about it and felt very strongly about it and opposed it, and then filed an action in court, you know, based on my views. I think one thing that's really not mentioned very often about the case is that



another irony is that the person who wrote Guam's abortion law was Senator Concepcion, uhh I'm sorry...yes Senator Concepcion Barrett...her name is Senator Concepcion Barrett and her daughter, Elizabeth Barrett-Anderson, was the attorney general at the time who issued a decision, or a... an attorney general opinion opining that public law 20-134 was unconstitutional. Guam's abortion law really just tracks the Supreme Court's decision in Roe vs. Wade, and that abortion law, which still remains the abortion law today was...was passed back in 1973 when senator Barrett was a ... was a one of the few female senators in the Guam legislature. So, you know, it's not just a story about my mother and I; it's also a story about, you know, here's a strong, female, Guam senator, Senator Barrett sponsoring a law that, you know, tracked the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Roe vs. Wade, and allowed abortions in Guam. You know, and then you know her daughter, you know generations later...a couple...or one generation later issuing an attorney general opinion opining that public law 20-134 was unconstitutional and in violation of, you know, her mother's law. So you know, those...those are...I mean I think they're pretty consistent stories that we have, you know strong Chamorro women who have strong opinions about these kinds of issues, particularly when they affect our rights as women, you know, to determine our own bodily integrity and autonomy. And it's not just, you know the... my mother and I, and Senator Barrett and Liz Barrett-Anderson; those are not anomalies. If you had been here during that time, you would have seen that, you know, strong women came out from all over Guam to protest this law and they came out from all walks of life. And they came out very strongly, you know against the law, and it was really to their credit that they came out because there was a lot of pressure for people not to come out. It...you know, against the law. I mean there was you know definitely the church. There was also familial pressure, you know, don't go out and sit there and say anything about it. We don't want any repercussions, you know, but people did. Well you know it all begins at home right? I mean that's really where everything begins, and if you have discussions in home about what, you know, your body is going through, the changes its going through and what you need to expect and you know what's going to happen and how babies are made, and how they you know are delivered. I mean that's really where education begins and it has to begin at the home, and you know I...I...I think when you're not having that kind of education at home so many misconceptions can happen with young girls and young boys, and that's you know, and if you don't have it at home, where are they going to get it? They're going to get it from their peers and if their peers are, you know, looking at the internet, or getting information from, you know, other sources that are not so credible, or not so reliable and they're passing that information on to you know their classmates and...and their peers with...within their age group, they're not getting the best kind of information that we can



possibly give them as parents. ... you know and it's a difficult thing to you know to...to talk to or girl or boy about sex and about, you know, what their options are in terms of reproductive healthcare but you know those discussions have to be held. And it's not just about having babies...it's about you know...it's about transm...transmission of sexual diseases and...and...and other healthcare issues that...that affect kids not just, you know reproductive rights and...and you know how babies are made. So to me it really begins at home. And...and if we are teaching parents that they cannot discuss these kinds of issues with kids, it's taboo or it's forbidden or you can only teach them one point of view, then you know in my opinion I think we're giving a big disservice to our kids and not exposing them to all points of view about what...what options are out there and what's available to them. You know, so...so there's the school and then you know in terms of the church and what they're teaching, you know let's face it a lot of people are Catholic; I am. I go to church regularly. What they say at church, you know, resonates with a lot of people. It's...It's where you get your religious instruction and so a lot of kids and parents are going to be influenced by you know what is said in church. But you know, I...I see in church also that there are many times when the priest will get up there and will give a homily about you know abortion. We're having a right to life march here, and you know abortion is murder, etc. and I can see that a lot of parents are really uncomfortable that this is being said in front of children because you know, are children really you know old enough to understand what this means and if you're not having that discussion at home and the only discussion you're having is a one-sided point-ofview from a priest, in church or in you know a private Catholic school then what are the kids really learning? You know so...so in my opinion I really believe it's really important for everyone to be educated and to be given all points of view about reproductive healthcare and about access to...not to just abortions. certainly abortions, but also you know contraceptives and everything else. If the first time that a child learns about contraceptives, you know, in adulthood well it's no wonder that we have you know such a high teenage pregnancy rate right? It all begins with education.

Anita: You know that's one of the things that we presented in the abortion case. We thought that a really important part of the abortion case was to present evidence showing that you know abortions predated Catholicism here on Guam that Chamorro women and suruhanas practiced various methods of abortion, either with... you know with...certain herbs and medicines that they used or you know with other you know types of you know manners...primarily herbal...herbal remedies and medicines that you know that would result in an abortion. You know...and we did that primarily because Governor Ada's attorneys asserted argument in the case that essentially said that Guam is Catholic. Abortions are



not you know allowed here on Guam and that law simply you know follows through with the Catholic tradition in Guam. And...and the...the...the sub... sub context of that is the Catholic i.e. Chamorro tradition in Guam and you know we just thought that's not true because every...every article, every writing that we had ever seen and read about showed that you know abortions in Chamorro culture predated Catholicism. And...and just in answer to your question about you know Vince Diaz and his article, you know I respect...I respect Vince...I respect his writings...I respect his opinions. I...I don't believe that and I don't agree with his you know statements or his opinion that to be Chamorro is be Catholic. You know, I...uhh, we have many Chamorros who are not Catholics and that's really kind of taking away from them that you know they're not Chamorro; they have to be Catholic in order to be Chamorro. And I think that a lot of Chamorros would have a really big disagreement with that notion. You know certainly Catholicism is a big part of our culture and our island...now, but that wasn't always so. You know and, you know I...I don't think that I would say you know I'm a Cath...I'm a, you know I'm...I'm Catholic because I'm Chamorro or I'm Chamorro because I'm Catholic. I am Chamorro because of my race. You know Catholicism is something that is part of my religion. So you know, I you know again, I think history and...and everything that we know about our Chamorro culture shows that you know abortions were practiced way back in times before Catholicism came to Guam.

Liz: Oh no.

Leiana: Oh yeah I'm good. Sorry, I know we took up a lot of your time.

Liz: Okay, thank you so much, is there anything further that you would like to say? Or we haven't asked?

Anita: Not...

Liz: Like to be on record

Anita: Not really. You know I guess it's just interesting to me that you know that this abortion continues to be you know, so divisive and continues to be an issue. You know I'm kind of feeling like you know, 20 years on from that lawsuit...actually you know 27 years on from this lawsuit and we're still fighting you know this...this cause. We're still fighting this...this issue and you know I just...I just had hoped and thought that this issue would be laid to rest with *Roe v. Wade*, but you know it's becoming more and more of an issue because of the sort of conservative nature of many of the politicians who are you know now in



Congress, who are you know in charge of public policy...not just Guam, but you know everywhere in the United States. But I...you know, I...I believe that we are going to continue to see efforts to try to erode the right to an abortion. It's really at this point, you know an issue that has to end up in the U.S. Supreme Court, whether those...whether or not those types of laws you know are going to be upheld or not.

Leiana: Right, hmm...

Anita: So...I...I mean so is the premise of that article that I shouldn't have gone outside of Guam and I should just you know had my own opposition here.

Leiana: No, it wasn't about that.

Anita: Or I was importing like an American, Westernized viewpoint, is that the premise of it?

Leiana: I can't fully recall...but it was... it was critiquing like the ACLU's involvement and the women with the...

Anita: Janet

Leiana: The directory. Yeah, you know it was looking at their whole like, use of you, kind of thing...it was and I can't remember it and I'm totally paraphrasing.

Anita: Oh that's interesting

Leiana: I need to find and I can send it to you, and you can just have your opinion of it, you know because it...it really was interesting when I read it.

Anita: So you know in the public interest area of law, which is you know what I practiced back in San Francisco and also as a law student. The...there is this notion that when you try to affect change and, particularly changes in public policy through the law, you don't do it just you know individually and in many cases you don't do it just with the case in front of you; you do it globally because whatever public policy affects Guam will affect the United States and everybody recognized that which is why, you know, they...they...people became involved in it. The media you know, put a lot of attention in Guam was because that law was going to have a huge impact on the Supreme Court cases that were coming up involving and challenging the right to an abortion. And so in the public interest area of law we always look at how do we get the best and the most widespread



amount of support for our particular issue and you know what...what...what we want to do, like the right to an abortion and that's why you know I reached out to the ACLU in San Francisco when I did all these cases. The ACLU, many...many civil rights organizations were involved in my lawsuits because that's how you get the broadest impact. You know, it wasn't because I couldn't do it on my own.

Leiana: It's a good start.

Anita: Oh yeah absolutely.

Leiana: And it's the only way to go.

Anita: Let's face it; it worked (loud laugh). I mean it got...it got the attention of a lot of congress people like Barbara Boxer and you know George Miller who...who oversaw a lot of Guam issues you know in their committees in Congress. And they were just appalled about the law. And so it definitely worked because there was a lot of attention paid...not the type of attention that the Governor wanted you know because it was a lot of negative attention but it worked in terms of making sure you know this kind of an issue should not...this kind of a law should not go into effect in Guam.