

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 hard-line 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

there, not until the dictators are gone and the teachers of freedom have erected a new Lady Liberty, our gift to the students, the students of freedom.

I was in school when President Reagan, standing in front of the Berlin Wall said, "Mr. Gorbachev, take down this wall."

Many saw the scene as a reckless, silly old man standing against the night calling for the light and truth of freedom. But President Reagan was sure of what he spoke. He stood for freedom. He stood for principle, and he dared to dream of a different and better world.

How can it be that we have shifted so quickly to a place of compromise and appeasement, to a place of favoring corporate profit over foundational principles, to a place of investigating the nearly unutterable, that campaign contributions may have driven the transfer of American-made missile guidance systems to an enemy of freedom?

Last week the House voted 409 to 10 to set up a special nine-member committee with far-reaching authority to look into whether U.S. national security has been undermined in this matter. According to our intelligence agencies, at least 13 intercontinental ballistic missiles with American missile guidance systems may be pointed at the United States of America.

"Knock it down," the dictators ordered. God forbid that it should happen to the real Lady of Liberty. God forbid.

#### REPORT ON H.R. 4112, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. KINGSTON, (during the special order of Mr. NEUMANN) from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-595) on the bill (H.R. 4112) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DIAZ-BALART). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4103, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. MCINNIS (during the special order of Mr. PALLONE), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-596) on the resolution (H. Res. 484) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4103) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4104, TREASURY, POSTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. MCINNIS (during the special order of Mr. PALLONE), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-597) on the resolution (H. Res. 485) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4104) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### MANAGED CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to talk again about the issue of managed care reform, and I have said before on the floor that this issue, without question, has become one of the most important on the minds of Americans, not only in my district but I think throughout the country.

The reason that it has become so important is because patients are being abused within managed care organizations. Patients often lack basic elementary protections from abuse, and these abuses are occurring because insurance companies and not doctors are dictating which patients can get what services under what circumstances.

Within managed care organizations or HMOs, the judgment of doctors is increasingly taking a back seat to the judgment of insurance companies. Medical necessity is being shunted aside by the desire of bureaucrats to make an extra buck, and people are literally dying because they are not getting the medical attention they need and, ironically enough, are in theory paying for through their premiums.

This is not an exaggeration. Myself and the gentleman from Iowa (Dr. GANSKE), who will be joining me tonight, and other colleagues on both sides of the aisle have told numerous stories about people throughout the country who have been negatively impacted by managed care.

As I mentioned before, because of the importance of this issue, there are a number of legislative proposals that have been introduced to give patients the protections they deserve from managed care organizations. And working with the Democratic Caucus' Health Care Task Force, which I co-chair, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) introduced legislation which would provide patients with a comprehensive set of protections from managed care abuses.

His bill, the Patients Bill of Rights, is not an attempt to destroy managed care. It is an attempt to make it better. To emphasize that point, supporters of managed care reform want just that, reform, not a dismantling of managed care.

The Patients Bill of Rights would help bring about that reform by putting medical decisions back where they belong, with doctors and their patients. I have to mention that this is also a bipartisan bill, with 7 Republican cosponsors, including my colleague the gentleman from Iowa (Dr. GANSKE).

Unfortunately, though, the Patients Bill of Rights does not enjoy the support of the Republican leadership. It is not clear exactly where they stand on the issue of managed care reform. There is still a task force that the Republicans have put together and has been meeting, but so far the Republican leadership has not allowed any managed care reform bill to be heard in committee or to be marked up in committee or to come to the floor, and I believe that that is because of the power of the insurance industry that that has not happened so far.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I just wanted to say that there have been some recent important developments on this issue. I am going to let my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Dr. GANSKE) go into some of this, but I just wanted to say that legislation was introduced today by the gentleman from Iowa (Dr. GANSKE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), again on a bipartisan basis, to try to bring the Patients Bill of Rights and possibly other managed care reform to the floor through what we call a discharge petition. Basically a discharge petition is necessary when the House leadership will not allow a bill to come to the floor through the normal committee process.

I just wanted to say how much I appreciate the efforts of my colleague from Iowa, not only in introducing this discharge petition today with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) but also because the gentleman from Iowa (Dr. GANSKE) has been an outspoken champion and leader of the movement here in the House to bring the Patients Bill of Rights to the floor, and I think he deserves a tremendous amount of credit for that reason.

The only thing I also wanted to mention today about this discharge petition is that I believe that there is a tremendous amount of support for this. As my colleague knows well, we have been working closely with over 150 groups that support the Patients Bill of Rights. I think the Patients Bill of Rights now has 192 cosponsors.

Another bill on managed care reform which the gentleman from Iowa (Dr. GANSKE) has supported, the PARCA bill, has even more cosponsors, from what I understand, so I do not think it is going to be difficult to get support for this discharge petition.

The last thing that I did want to mention though, before yielding to the