can bring the country back in that direction, especially when put in the perspective of where we got it 3 or 4 short years ago?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the gentleman.

MISLEADING STORY BY CNN AND TIME MAGAZINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DIAZ-BALART). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many can remember, but about 2 weeks ago CNN started their headline news. Their leading story on CNN was how the United States military used a poisonous gas that by international treaty is a violation and considered a war crime. CNN did not say there was speculation. CNN did not say there was an allegation. The CNN/Time article said it was used to go in and get American defectors.

What CNN/Time failed to mention to the American public was their source of information. The original source of information was a lieutenant. The lieutenant did not remember this gas. In fact, he said he forgot it for 25 years, went without this memory, until he happened to be interviewed by one of the reporters with CNN and Time.

During that interview on Easter Sunday, and by the way, the gentleman is a heavy drinker, he all of a sudden recalled that 25 years ago the United States military went and used poisonous gases on the Viet Cong. It is an international war crime.

So CNN goes to their second source. CNN does not mention to the American public that their second source has filed for a full disability, so he has every incentive to come out and agree with the first source's story.

Guess what? Thank goodness, Newsweek decided to look a little closer, to investigate the facts, not to run a story that impugns the United States government, impugns the United States military, impugns the commanding officers during that period of time, impugns the President of the United States, Richard Nixon, by alleging that this poison gas, a war crime, was used in secret.

No, Newsweek decides to do their homework. Guess what they find out? They are the ones that come out and say, wait a second, the other people involved in this say this is a bunch of nonsense. The pilots say, it could not possibly happen, we did not have masks. The general, who by the way was a third source for Time/CNN, 88 years old and in an assisted care facility, denies that he said what Time and CNN said he said.

Peter Arnett, we all know Peter Arnett, what was his response to Newsweek? ''It is one side of the story. I think it was a fair article.'' Yes, well, Mr. Arnett, you were not on the receiving end of this thing. How would you like to have your integrity, and to the executives at CNN and Time, how would you like your integrity impugned? How would you like that to happen to you before they went and verified the facts?

Not a credit to Time magazine, not as the partnership of Time/CNN, but in credit to Time, I will say, and in reverence to full disclosure, Time magazine has said that they are going back to the story, they are going to reinvestigate the story, and they will report the facts as they find them. So at least they have acknowledged that they need to look at this just a little closer.

But does this remind Members of a Richard Jewell kind of case? Remember Richard Jewell, the so-called alleged Olympic bomber, who the press could not wait, within hours, and in fact, they were there at the time the police went to Mr. Jewell's apartment? They destroyed the man. Just remember this story. All of us remember 2 weeks ago what Time and CNN did.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Members that Time and CNN and every other press, every other publication or every news media in this country expects the United States Congress to have integrity, expects us to check our sources. We know any time or a lot of times we do not, we get barbecued by them. That is as it should be. But it should also run in the other direction.

In my opinion, the United States of America has a military that is second to none, has a military that has lots of officers and lots of enlisted people who have very high integrity, are people of strong dedication, strong moral values.

How do Members think they felt when on the lead story out of CNN, and Time runs a big story in Time magazine, that says that the United States military committed war crimes, war crimes? The same kind of crimes, war crimes, that people were executed after World War II for committing war crimes. These national publications accused our government of committing a war crime by using, by the way, the chemical sarin, of using that chemical.

□ 1930

My gosh, these are two of the leading media institutions in this country, and they have an ethical obligation to check those sources. Thank goodness that Newsweek stepped forward and ran the kind of investigation they ran.

I beg of Time magazine, to all those executive officers, and I hope some of them are listening tonight as I speak to my colleagues here, I beg of these people, go back, check that story. And if that story is not true, give the United States military, the United States military personnel, President Nixon and everybody else that was impugned by those articles and by that press release, give them the same kind of coverage and retraction of this article as you gave in attack as a result of this article.

THOUGHTS ON EVENTS IN TIANANMEN SQUARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DIAZ-BALART). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from New Jersey for allowing me to proceed at this moment, appreciate that very much.

In May of 1989, students began a protest for democratic reforms in Beijing's Tiananmen Square. Their movement began modestly, then swelled to thousands as they occupied the square in what they saw as a people's movement. From the flat stone of the square they erected a 10-foot-tall likeness of the world's most recognizable symbol of freedom, the Statue of Liberty.

Threatened, divided, Beijing's hardline leaders invoked martial law and ordered the army to the square. Huge throngs, possibly amounting to more than 1 million Chinese, took to the streets to defy martial law and block troops from their planned crackdown on China's young freedom fighters.

The world saw gripping pictures of an unarmed man refusing to give way to an approaching tank.

''With the people behind us, we'll succeed,'' one student told a reporter. ''No government can survive by using the Army against its own citizens.''

Tragically, he was wrong.

The New York Times reported the following scene on June 4, 1989:

> Tens of thousands of Chinese troops retook the center of the capital early this morning from pro-democracy protesters, killing scores of students and workers and wounding hundreds more as they fired submachine guns at crowds of people who tried to resist.

The hard-line leaders gave personal attention to the students' Statue of Liberty. ''Push it down,'' they ordered.

We stand with the students. We do not stand with the dictators. The students of freedom look to their teachers, to the shining city on the hill. Lady Liberty searches the horizon for her fallen likeness. She listens for our voice. Let us be her voice.

Let us say for her, as Moses said to Pharaoh, ''Let my people go.''

Let them go out of your prisons of conscience. Let them go out of your slave labor camps. Let them go out of your forced abortion clinics, and let our brothers and sisters worship our God, the creator and sustainer of the universe. Yes, with Lady Liberty, let us say, ''Let my people go.''

Last week, 51 Members of this House sent a letter to the President pleading with him not to be received in Tiananmen Square. Go, if you must, to China, but do not go to Tiananmen Square, we urged. Do not let compromise and cajoling wash away the memory of those students.

They died for freedom. Let that stand. Let the dictators know that no American President will be received