the ''splendid little war'' was officially underway. The Spanish-American War is generally remembered for the destruction of the *Maine*, Roosevelt's Rough Riders, and America's first acquisition of colonies. Many people tend to forget that the American victory was initiated and secured by the American activity not in the Caribbean but in the Pacific. And as we commemorate the centennial anniversary of the Spanish-American War, I would like to draw attention to a couple of unresolved issues which are a legacy of this conflict and our self-perception as an ''anticolonial'' but nevertheless colonial power.

This was the war that clearly established the United States as a colonial power in the world. The island of Guam was first acquired as a coaling station in 1898 and has since become America's foothold in Asia. Over the years Guam has provided a much-needed opportunity for the United States to protect its vast Asian interests and, more importantly, secure its military goals. Guam's strategic location in the western Pacific continues to be its major value to this country, and I am proud to say that we on Guam have realized this value and are more than willing to draw attention to it, particularly to our determination to finally exercise self-determination.

The acquisitions resulting from the 1898 war plunged the United States Government into uncharted political territory. Never before had noncontinental real estate come under its control. Prior to the acquisition of the islands, the continental American territories were intended for eventual incorporation into the Union of States. What then was to be the fate of these new possessions? And this issue continues today.

There are no easy solutions to this particular problem. However, we are currently presented with a rare opportunity to deal with it not only in the case of Puerto Rico, but in the case of Guam.

I would also like to draw attention to an issue with the Philippines. We have, in Wyoming, a structure designated as a memorial to American servicemen attacked and killed in the town of Balangiga, Philippines. One hundred years of misrepresentation and misinformation has gradually transformed this memorial into a symbol of a slanted and mistaken view of history, a reluctance to admit and correct mistakes from the past, and resistance to advance to the future.

On November 7 of last year I introduced H. Res. 312, urging the President to authorize the transfer of ownership of one of the ''Bells of Balangiga'' currently displayed in Wyoming to the people of the Philippines. Contrary to several misconceptions, H. Res. 312 recognizes that the memorial at F.E. Warren Air Force Base has a legitimate but not exclusive right to memorialize tragic events which occurred during the Philippine Insurrection, and does not seek to dishonor the memory of the American troops who perished in the Philippine Insurrection or to disestablish the monument in Wyoming. H. Res. 312 proposes a compromise wherein both the Philippines and the United States will share in the legacy of these historic symbols.

The matter touches upon a greater issue and reflects the true nature of our special relationship with the Republic of the Philippines. In the course of subduing the Philippines right after the Spanish-American War, over 4,000 Americans and over 200,000 Filipinos died. The Bells of Balangiga are a symbol of that conflict. For us, they are the trophies of war that marked the killing of over 50 Americans, and for Filipinos they represent the eventual order to kill every Filipino male over the age of 10 on the island of Samar. If we share these bells, we bring honor to both countries and all who suffered and died.

Today, each and every one of us is faced with a challenge. As we commemorate the centennial of the Spanish-American War, we must decide whether we should focus upon the true dimensions of this historic event, reflecting upon its far-reaching results, take advantage of the knowledge we have gained, learn from our experience, and bring resolution to these issues, or perhaps we should just save all these lofty aspirations for the bicentennial.

THE ''GIVE FANS A CHANCE ACT''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, this month a little drama is being acted out in New York City and the venue is Yankee Stadium. What should have been the glorious 75th anniversary of ''the house that Ruth built'' may in fact see the end of a tradition unless New York City comes up with perhaps as much as $1 billion.

This is another example of professional sports, instead of being a source of civic pride, are to be often a symbol of what people do not like. The players now are the television networks, major corporate sponsors, athletic equipment and apparel giants. The fans appear to be almost an afterthought.

This trend, some would suggest, started about 40 years ago when the Brooklyn Dodgers tore the heart out of that community by moving a very profitable franchise to the West Coast in pursuit of greener pastures.

It continues today. I have heard from fans all over America: Houston, Chicago, Sacramento. New York is just simply the most recent and perhaps the most egregious example. And of course it has come full circle because recently the Dodgers were sold again, this time to Rupert Murdoch, and the trend is growing. Over 50 million people live in and around communities with sports teams which have recently moved or are threatening to relocate.

The change of focus away from the fans has become more acute as these leagues have upped the ante. Between now and the year 2006, more than $7 billion will be spent on new stadiums, most of which will be public money. In comparison to the stadiums, teams are cheap. The stadiums currently under construction range in price from perhaps $250 million to, in the case of the New York Yankees, as we have mentioned, perhaps $1 billion or more.

But wait a minute. The average value of a baseball team is only $134 million. The average for a football franchise, $205 million. Thus, these stadiums cost significantly more than the teams themselves; in the case of the Yankees, as much as four times as much.

Madam Speaker, it would be cheaper for the community just to buy the team. Well, there is one city in America that does not have to worry about this little drama. Green Bay, Wisconsin, one thirty-fourth the size of Los Angeles, owns perhaps the most successful franchise in American sports. But the NFL will not let it happen again. They have passed rules against municipal ownership.

The Federal Government must stop aiding and abetting this abuse. We are not innocent bystanders. Besides the massive tax subsidies that we provide for the construction of stadiums, we provide an antitrust exemption that enables professional sports franchises to make billions of dollars. The NFL, for instance, will earn $17.6 billion over the next 5 years. We have made the NFL rich, yet the NFL will not allow another community to own its franchise.

That is why I have introduced the ''Give Fans a Chance Act.'' It would tie the sports broadcast antitrust exemption to the elimination of rules that prohibit public ownership. And it would give communities a voice in relocation decisions.

The advantages are clear: It would end the franchise feeding frenzy; it would make stadium decisions based on what is good for a team and community, not on what looks to be blackmail; it will make it easier to get support for needed stadium expansions; and will help eliminate the cynicism that is permeating professional sports.

Sports fans from coast to coast love this idea. There is a congressional responsibility to help these fans, since we helped create this monster. I urge my colleagues to give fans a chance and support H.R. 590.

PRESIDENT SHOULD SUPPORT RELIGIOUS FREEDOM, RATHER THAN APPEASE OPPRESSIVE GOVERNMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, yesterday the President of the United States provided one of the most stunning rationalizations in history about the need for appeasement in the face of persecution. I submit today's front page article from the New York Times and encourage my colleagues to read it.

What is so bad about the ''Freedom From Religious Persecution Act'' according to President Clinton? That it will force the administration to ''fudge,'' and that is the President's term, reporting on violations so they would not have to carry out the sanctions imposed by this act.

There apparently was no mention by the President that the bill, the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act, provides a very generous waiver, a total waiver for the President. He can waive the sanctions for national security reasons or if doing so would advance the objectives of the act.

As we consider this act, Madam Speaker, we should know that Catholic priests are in jail in China, Catholic bishops are in jail in China, even evangelical pastors are being persecuted in China. The Chinese government has plundered Tibet. I have been to Tibet. I have visited and gone outside the prisons to hear how they are persecuting Buddhist monks and Buddhist nuns. They are persecuting the Muslims in China, and yet the President says this legislation is a ridiculous act.

What the President and State Department fear most about this bill is the fact that it requires them to look at facts and take action. This administration wants to appease these governments when they are perpetrating evil, the same type of evil that when Ronald Reagan was President of the United States, he talked about the evil empire when he gave that very profound speech in Orlando back in the early 1980s.

President Clinton made his remarks when he stopped by a meeting with prominent evangelical leaders. He went on to describe President Jiang Zemin as a person who ''knows a lot about Christianity in China.'' That is what the President said. ''He knows a lot about Christianity in China.'' He said he ''understands the issue.''

Yes, Jiang Zemin understands the issue. He understands that he puts priests in jail. He understands that he puts bishops in jail. He understands that he puts evangelical leaders and lay pastors in jail. He understands that he persecutes the evangelical church and the Catholic church. He understands that he plunders Tibet and he brutalizes the Buddhist monks and nuns. He understands that he breaks the backs of the Muslims in China. He understands.

What does the President mean, that President Jiang Zemin understands? Does he mean he is sympathetic? Then let him open up the jails and allow these people to come out. And for the President of the United States to say this is wrong.

Madam Speaker, let me remind my colleagues that President Jiang Zemin is president of a country which systematically imprisons Catholic bishops and priests, imprisons protestant pastors and lay people, tortures Buddhist monks and nuns.

Has our President ever been to Tibet? No. Has anybody from the administration been to Tibet? No. I have been there and talked to the monks, and seen the plunder that is taking place. I say this is a shame. Yes, President Jiang Zemin knows about Christianity. He knows how to persecute it.

But, Madam Speaker, Christianity will rise in China. Christianity will be there when President Jiang Zemin is gone. And the Catholic church will prosper and the evangelical church will prosper, and the church will rise up and be there long after President Jiang Zemin is gone from there. But what a disgrace for this President to say and infer that President Jiang Zemin is sympathetic to the church in China.

One other thing I want to raise, Madam Speaker. I want to submit an article which was in Mother Jones magazine showing how USA*Engage, a lobbying group downtown run by Anne Wexler, is attempting to manipulate prominent religious leaders in the United States. One USA*Engage memo obtained by Mother Jones described how Company X is assigned to talk to one of the country's most well-known religious leaders and Company Y is assigned to talk to another prominent leader. It goes on.

I am saddened that USA*Engage and the Wexler group would attempt to manipulate leaders in this country of different denominations, while priests are being persecuted and slavery is taking place in Sudan. 1.1 million Christians have been persecuted in Sudan because of their faith. Because they love Christ and they want to stand for Christ, they are persecuted for Christ. And Anne Wexler and USA*Engage join up, join up to defeat legislation which will send a message to these people that we care, that we remember the words of the Declaration of Independence: We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men and women are created equal and given rights by their creator God, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And for USA*Engage to attempt to manipulate this progress is very, very sad.

Madam Speaker, yesterday the President of the United States provided one of the most stunning rationalizations in history about the need for appeasement in the face of persecution.

I submit for the record today's front page *New York Times* article and encourage my colleagues to read it. What is so bad about the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act according to President Clinton? That it will force the administration to ''fudge'', and that's the President's term, reporting on violations so they would not have to carry out the sanctions imposed by the act.

There apparently was no mention by the President that the bill provides for very generous waiver authority: he can waive the sanctions for national security reasons or if doing so would advance the objectives of the act.

What the President and the State Department fear the most about this bill is the fact that it requires them to look at the facts and take action. He wants to continue appeasing governments even when they are perpetrating evil.

President Clinton made his remarks when he stopped by a meeting with prominent evangelical leaders. He went on to describe President Jiang Zemin as a person who ''knows a lot about Christianity in China'' He ''understands the issue,'' the President said.

Let me remind you that President Jiang Zemin is the President of a country which systematically imprisons Catholic bishops and priests, imprisons Protestant pastors and laypeople, tortures Tibetan Buddhist monks and nuns and sends its security forces to break up underground worship services. President Jiang Zemin rules a country that uses brave dissidents as pawns in ego-politics—releasing prominent dissidents in exchange for favors by the United States.

I am pleased that Wang Dan and Wei Jingsheng have been released. But it does not reflect progress. The Chinese government has not released Pastor Peter Xu, one of China's most prominent house church leaders; Bishop Zeng Jingmu, a 77-year-old Roman Catholic bishop; or the Panchen Lama chosen by the Dalai Lama, a 5 year-old boy who has not been seen or heard from for over two years. All of these individuals were on the list of thirty prisoners raised by the recent, and highly-touted, religious leader's delegation to China. Not one of the thirty religious prisoners have been released since the delegation's visit.

Sure Jiang Zemin knows about Christianity—he knows how to repress it.

There is a growing movement in the United States demanding that the U.S. government take action against governments that persecute religious believers. That is what President Clinton fears the most—having to take action. To avoid action, he says the administration will be forced to ''fudge'' the facts. What an abomination.

But there is another issue that I wanted to bring to my colleagues attention. The efforts being waged by USA*Engage and some top-dollar Washington lobbyists to defeat the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act by trying to manipulate prominent American religious leaders. I urge all my colleagues to read the recent article in Mother Jones magazine that I am submitting for the record.

Mr. Speaker, I am really saddened by this action. It is so disappointing to see what has been taking place and to what lengths some will go to defeat a bill which seeks only to help people being persecuted for their faith. Catholic bishops and priests are in jail in China. Tibetan Buddhist monks and nuns are being tortured in Tibet. Bahai's are being persecuted in Iran. Muslims and Christians are being persecuted in Sudan. Yet, the lobbying beat goes on. What a sad commentary.

I believe it is entirely inappropriate to manipulate American religious leaders. Yet, according to the article, that appears to be what is happening. One USA*Engage memo obtained by *Mother Jones* describes how company X is assigned to talk to one of this country's most well known religious leaders and company Y is assigned to talk to another prominent leader. It goes on. How disappointing.

Suffering Catholics, Protestants and Muslims in China do not have top-dollar Washington lobbyists. Christian slaves in Sudan cannot hire K Street law firms. Tibetan Buddhists have no funds to launch slick PR campaigns.

The Freedom from Religious Persecution Act is about them. Who speaks for them?

I have been to many of those countries.

I have spoken to many persecuted people. Almost everywhere I go I hear over and over—please speak out for us. We cannot speak for ourselves. We are voiceless, powerless minorities who are being victimized by powerful governments. If the American government does not speak for us, who will?

H.R. 2431 is not about trade—its about taking away taxpayer subsidies (including taxpayer subsidized trade) from governments that persecute people of faith.

H.R. 2431 does not cut off non-humanitarian aid to countries until they are engaged in "widespread, ongoing" and particularly severe kinds of persecution. In the face of killing, rape, torture, imprisonment, enslavement and other violent action, how can the President tell the American people that the United States government will continue trying to "understand" their point of view?

Passage of this bill is important to help those who suffer for their faith.

Madam Speaker, I submit the following article for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 27, 1998]

CLINTON ARGUES FOR "FLEXIBILITY" OVER SANCTIONS—U.S. TEMPTED TO "FUDGE" ON REPRESSIVE NATIONS

(By Elaine Sciolino)

WASHINGTON, April 27.—President Clinton criticized laws today that automatically impose sanctions on countries for behavior that Americans find unacceptable. He said such legislation put pressure on the executive branch to "fudge," or overlook, violations so that it would not have to carry out the sanctions.

Mr. Clinton made his unusually frank remarks during an appearance before a group of about 60 evangelical Christian leaders at the White House. They were meeting with Samuel R. Berger, the national security adviser, in the Roosevelt Room.

Specifically, Mr. Clinton asked the group to withdraw its support for pending legislation that aims to reduce religious persecution overseas by imposing trade and aid sanctions on repressive regimes.

Last week the House International Relations Committee approved, by 31 to 5, a bill that would impose export and aid sanctions on countries that endorse or permit violent attacks on religious believers. Among other provisions, the sanctions would ban imports from such countries, prohibit loans by multilateral institutions and make it easier for victims of religious persecution overseas to qualify for asylum or refugee status.

Mr. Clinton made clear to the visitors just how difficult it is for his Administration to produce honest analyses about a country's behavior when Congress passes laws that require sanctions the moment a country violates what Congress defines as good behavior. legislators weigh in on issues including human rights, drug cooperation and efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

The President singled out punitive legislation against Russia, Iran and Cuba as examples of Congressional initiatives that boxed him in.

"What always happens if you have automatic sanctions legislation," he said, "is it puts enormous pressure on whoever is in the executive branch to fudge an evaluation of the facts of what is going on. And that's not what you want. What you want is to leave the President some flexibility, including the ability to impose sanctions, some flexibility with a range of appropriate reactions."

Later he repeated the point, saying that automatic sanctioning "creates an enormous amount of pressure in the bowels of the bureaucracy to fudge the finding."

Mr. Clinton did not say whether the Administration had ever "fudged" the facts to avoid imposing sanctions.

But the Clinton Administration, like its predecessors, has been criticized for ignoring or excusing obvious violations of United States sanction laws to justify continuing to do business with certain countries.

Earlier this year, for example, the Administration certified that Mexico, America's second-largest trading partner, was fully cooperating in antidrug efforts despite evidence to the contrary that could have required economic sanctions.

Some lawmakers and arms-control experts have criticized the Administration for not imposing sanctions on China for its sale of germ warfare equipment to Iran and its continued nuclear cooperation with Iran and Pakistan.

In addition, American lawmakers have threatened to improve economic sanctions on Russian enterprises that aid Iran's missile program if Russia does not fulfill its pledges to block the assistance. The Administration has strongly opposed the move.

It has also been cautions in declaring that some foreign companies are trafficking in formerly American-held property in Cuba. Such a declaration would automatically hamper the companies' operations in the United States and their executives' ability to enter the country.

As for Iran, the Administration has avoided deciding whether to impose sanctions against countries or companies that invest heavily in its oil sector, despite legislation requiring the United States to do so.

Mr. Clinton's remarks provided a rare opportunity to observe him in a private setting in which he did not expect reporters to be present.

The meeting was not listed on his public schedule, and he was told only later that a reporter had been invited to attend.

During the meeting, the president of the National Association of Evangelicals, Don Argue, told Mr. Clinton, "These are praying people," and asked how the group's members should pray for him.

The President asked that they never say a prayer for him that they didn't say for his family as well.

The he added, "I'll tell you what the prayer I say every night is: 'To be made an instrument of God's peace, to have the words in my mouth and the meditations in my heart and to be on God's side.' That's about as good as I can do here."

Mr. Clinton also shared a story about his daughter, Chelsea, freshman at Stanford University. He said she often logged on to the Internet in the evening and called him to ask him about something she had read in the early edition of the next day's newspaper.

"She knows I work late," Mr. Clinton said. "So some night at a quarter to one or something, the phone rings. It's Chelsea."

In his remarks, Mr. Clinton also unabashedly boasted that American religious freedom should be the model for countries that persecute their people over religious beliefs.

"The only answer for any of these countries is to basically have a system that America has," Mr. Clinton said. "I've always tried to be a little bit careful about telling anybody that we know best about everything."

But, he added, in this case, "we know best."

Still, he waxed philosophical about the need to understand other countries' "historical nightmares" before judging them too harshly.

"It's also important when you deal with a country to know what its historic bad dreams are," he said.

America's bad dream goes back to the Civil War, he said. Russia's goes back to invasions by Napoleon and Hitler, and China's goes back to internal disintegration.

In trying to persuade Russia that the eastward expansion of NATO was not a threat, for example, Mr. Clinton explained: "You know that NATO would never invade Russia, and it's not rational from our point of view. But then, America was never invaded by Hitler or Napoleon."

Mr. Clinton also described President Jiang Zemin of China as a leader who understands the concerns of the United States and "knows a lot about Christianity" in China. "I think he understands this issue and I think that if we just keep pushing along, I think that he will be more likely than not to advance it," Mr. Clinton said.

He added that he had spent "a lot of time" coaching Mr. Jiang during his trip to Washington last year on how to handle their joint news conference.

Mr. Clinton said he had told Mr. Jiang, "You've got to learn how to smile when they hit you right between the eyes."

"I said, 'That's the way we do it over here.'"

[From Mother Jones, May/June 1998]

SO YOU WANT TO TRADE WITH A DICTATOR

(By Ken Silverstein)

Americans may be fickle when it comes to politics, but as politicians and moviemakers know full well, there's one reliable "gimme": We hate dictators. Tyrants, autocrats, despots—we just don't like them.

So imagine how tough it would be to build a public campaign promoting trade with countries such as Iran, Burma, or Nigeria, whose dictatorial regimes have horrible human rights records. That's the challenge for a coalition of the nation's biggest corporate exporters, including aerospace titan Boeing; construction equipment giant Caterpillar; the country's biggest oil companies, including Unocal, Chevron, Mobil, and Texaco; and other Fortune 500 firms such as IBM and Motorola.

All have money to make overseas, and economic sanctions are just another obstacle. Now the coalition, led by its front group, USA*Engage, will have its two big shots at success.

For starters, it plans to file a lawsuit to overturn the "selective purchasing" laws that have sprung up in 18 different cities across the U.S. banning government contract work from being awarded to companies that trade with tyrannical regimes. More impressively, they have already managed to have a bill introduced in Congress—which appears to have been drafted by their own lobbyists—that would severely restrict the use of sanctions, and would pave the way for greater trade with outlaw nations. How will they convince legislators, or the voting public, that trading with dictators is good? Their strategy is detailed in a series of internal memos obtained by Mother Jones that describe how to spin the most morally questionable of campaigns—with help along the way from religious leaders and institutions such as the Rev. Billy Graham and the Catholic Church.

STEP 1—FIND YOUR SALES TEAM

The anti-sanctions drive is run out of the National Foreign Trade Council, a prominent Washington, D.C., trade association that represents the nation's 500 biggest exporters.

But when it came time for its attack on sanctions, the NFTC needed a cover—provided, preferably, by someone who was liberal, popular, and well-connected. So in early 1997, it hired Anne L. Wexler, who heads the Wexler Group, and recently was ranked one of the capital's 10 most influential lobbyists by Washingtonian magazine.

The ultimate power broker, Wexler has Beltway access to burn, and her liberal credentials include working as a campaign organizer for Eugene McCarthy's 1968 presidential race, doing a stint as a consultant for the government watchdog group Common Cause, and serving, from 1975 to 1977, as the associate publisher of Rolling Stone during its muckraking heyday. Wexler followed that with a job as a top aside in Jimmy Carter's White House before launching her political consultancy, which boasts executives with close ties to President Clinton (Betsey Wright, his chief of staff when he was governor) and to Newt Gingrich (former Pennsylvania Republican Rep. Bob Walker, formerly a close Gingrich ally).

Wexler may have come far from her days as a war protester, but her lobbying efforts still carry a liberal spin. Arguing against sanctions, she says that because they limit investment opportunities for business, ''the only people they end up hurting are U.S. workers.''

The NFTC also lined up important politicians on both sides of Washington's revolving door. It signed up seven lobbyists from Hogan & Hartson. One of them, Republican Clayton Yeutter, while acting as President Reagan's U.S. Trade representative, threatened trade sanctions against Southeast Asian countries that did not open their markets to American tobacco companies.

Another of the group's lobbyists, former Rep. Michael Barnes, a Democrat, demanded that sanctions be imposed on Haiti in 1994 when he worked as a lobbyist for ousted president Jean-Bertrand Aristide. During the first half of 1997 alone the NFTC paid $340,000 to Hogan & Hartson for its campaign against sanctions.

The NFTC also made sure to cement a relationship with a key State Department official, Undersecretary of State Stuart Eizenstat—who chairs the sanctions review team created last year by the State Department—by retaining his former law firm, Powell Goldstein.

STEP 2—PUT ON A HAPPY FACE

With its lobbying army in place, the NFTC next needed to start a front group to head the anit-sanctions drive. Engineered by the Wexler Group, USA*Engage was officially unveiled at an April 1997 press conference, during which it portrayed itself as a dynamic ''broad-based coalition representing Americans from all regions, sectors, and segments of our society.'' The address on USA*Engage's letterhead belongs to the Wexler Group, which is also where the number listed for USA*Engage rings (though callers are routed around the Wexler Group's main switchboard).

In its literature, USA*Engage claims to have more than 600 members. But when contacted, several of the smaller companies listed on its roster responded with puzzlement. Tim Hussey, president and CEO of Hussey Seating of Maine, said he had no idea what USA*Engage was. Richard Gravenhorst, co-owner of Reco Industries, a Louisiana road equipment company, also didn't know about USA*Engage, replying that his firm had little international business. Sanctions, he said, ''[are] certainly not one of our priorities.''

When he is asked about USA*Engage's bloated membership, Frank Kittredge, the NFTC president who doubles as the group's vice chairman, admits that no more than 50 to 100 companies are active participants. ''USA*Engage was formed because a lot of companies are not anxious to be spotlighted as supporters of countries like Iran or Burma,'' he says. ''The way to avoid that is to band together in a coalition.''

So who is behind USA*Engage? The oil industry, for one. Unocal's chief Washington lobbyist, Jack Rafuse, chairs USA*Engage's State and Local Sanctions Committee. Unocal co-owns a billion-dollar natural gas pipeline in Burma, and one of its partners is Burma's State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC), the military dictatorship that the State Department says used slave labor to help build the pipeline. Jefferson Watterman International, a Beltway firm that lobbies for Burma, is also a member.

USA*Engage members also include Mobil and Texaco—both of which have major investments in Nigeria and have lobbied to prevent strong sanctions against Gen. Sani Abacha's regime, despite its having imprisoned 7,000 people without charge and, among other atrocities, having executed protester and writer Ken Saro-Wiwa.

USA*Engage's chairman, William Lane, is the Washington director for Caterpillar, a company that has obvious reasons for belong to the coalition. It has its own Burmese dealership, and has business in other nations threatened with or currently under U.S. sanctions, including Sudan, Indonesia, Colombia, and Nigeria. Other USA*Engage members have just as much incentive for wanting to trade with dictators. Boeing, for instance, has long battled the government's threatened sanctions against China, where it sold one-tenth of its airplanes between 1992 and 1994. Another group of coalition members—including Westinghouse and ABB—has been pressing the Clinton administration to lift a ban on nuclear power exports to Beijing.

STEP 3—CALL IN THE RENT-A-SCHOLARS

Once USA*Engage was formed, coalition leaders quickly turned to a web of Beltway think tanks and scholars to provide the sanctions drive with badly needed intellectual ammunition.

The Institute for International Economics (IIE) prepared a study in 1997, released at USA*Engage's debut press conference, which states that sanctions cost the U.S. economy $15–$20 billion, and caused the loss of 250,000 jobs in 1995 alone. The study, confirms an IIE sanctions specialist, Kimberly Elliott, was funded ''in part'' by the NFTC.

Georgetown University law school professor Barry Carter authored another study, paid for by the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), a USA*Engage member. When it came out, NAM trumpeted the findings, saying the study showed that sanctions come ''with a steep price tag for U.S. commercial interests.'' The coalition also uses reports from prominent think tanks such as the Cato Institute, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and the Center for the Study of American Business to arm itself with intellectual firepower. All have received funding from companies that belong to USA*Engage.

STEP 4—GET RELIGION, KILL THINE ENEMIES

Once USA*Engage had its research studies in hand, it figured it would have an easier time convincing Congress to lift trade sanctions. But then the coalition faced a new enemy, one that any economic analyst would have a tough time countering: The God Lobby.

In May 1997, Rep. Frank Wolf (R–Va.) and Sen. Arlen Specter (R–Pa.) introduced the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act, which would slap mild sanctions on nations that persecute religious groups as a matter of government policy. The bill boasted a remarkable lineup of organizations that testified on its behalf—from the Christian Coalition to Amnesty International—and had strong backing from the Republican leadership.

USA*Engage sprang into action. On August 29, 1997, Don Deline of Dallas-based Halliburton, a USA*Engage member and the world's second-largest oil field services company, sent a memo to coalition members outlining the group's strategy to defeat the Wolf-Specter bill.

The plan: fight fire with hellfire. According to the memo, Deline met with two officials at the State Department, Deputy Assistant Secretary Bill Ramsay and David Moran, the director of the Office of Economic Sanctions Policy, who both told him they didn't like the bill but were ''constrained for obvious reasons in how active they believe they can be in opposing them.'' Similarly, they suggested that business leaders would be unsuccessful opposing the bill publicly. Instead, they suggest, ''religious leaders and organizations should take the lead for best results.''

The resulting USA*Engage strategy matched members with key religious leaders. Specifically, Deline wrote, ''Boeing will contact Rev. Billy Graham; Marjorie Chorlins will contact Drew Christian,'' whose last name is actually Christiansen, and who represented the U.S. Catholic Conference, the Vatican's organizational arm in the United States.

When asked whether USA*Engage ever tried to get religious leaders to speak out against the Wolf-Specter bill, Deline admitted that the group had ''low-key'' conversations with religious leaders, but says that was it. ''Nobody that I know of is shoving religious leaders out front for their personal gain,'' he says. Chorlins, a lobbyist for Motorola, confirms that she did speak with Drew Christiansen about Wolf-Specter, but then adds her own, nearly identical qualifier: ''Business is not pushing religious leaders out there.''

Says Chorlins, ''I talk to different organizations and communities because I want dialogue, not to push them out front.''

Both Graham and Christiansen eventually did come out against the religious persecution act—just as planned in the memo. Graham traditionally has ignored human rights conditions in the countries, such as China, where he preaches. He also joined Boeing last year in urging Congress to extend China's Most Favored Nation trade status.

And two weeks after Deline's memo, Christiansen, speaking before a House International Relations Committee hearing on the bill, said the U.S. Catholic Conference recommended being ''cautious and deliberate in invoking [sanctions] as a remedy in public affairs.'' Christiansen then made two proposals that came straight out of USA*Engage's playbook: He suggested that the government require extensive public review before imposing sanctions, and advocated that the proposed presidential waiver included in the bill be extended.

Brian F. O'Connell of Interdev, a Seattle-area evangelical group, who also opposes Wolf-Specter, told Mother Jones that a Washington, D.C.-based business group—he won't say which but confirms that he talked to people from USA*Engage about Wolf-Specter—wanted to fly him to Washington to testify against the bill. O'Connell, however, declined the offer.

Gregg Wooding, a spokesman for the Billy Graham Evangelical Association, says Graham would not comment on this story because ''he's not a politician and doesn't like to talk about politics.'' Christiansen also declined to be interviewed.

Ultimately, Congress deferred further consideration of the bill, and it was eventually rewritten to narrow the chances of sanctions and broaden the presidential waiver. A report sent out from Wexler's office to coalition members in February boasted that ''USA*Engage is widely credited for the failure of [Wolf-Specter] to come to a vote in 1997.''

STEP 5—WRITE YOUR OWN BILL

Now, having at least temporarily dispatched Wolf-Specter, USA*Engage was ready to put together its very own sanctions ''reform'' bill. The coalition quickly signed up two Hoosier friends in Congress to sponsor the legislation: Republican Sen. Richard Lugar, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Democratic Rep. Lee Hamilton, the ranking Democrat on the House International Relations Committee.

When initially asked about her company's role in moving the legislation forward, Wexler replies, ''We don't lobby.'' When pressed, she concedes that her firm ''worked closely'' with members of Congress who worked on the legislation ''so I guess we do lobby.'' However, she says firmly, ''That bill was written on the Hill.''

But a USA*Engage lobbyist memo suggests that the role Hamilton and Lugar played in sponsoring the legislation was largely ceremonial, and that it was the lobbyists who drafted the bill. In a memo dated September 4, less than two months before the bill's introduction, the Wexler Group's Erika Moritsugu wrote Richard Lehmann, a lobbyist for coalition member IBM, telling him that he would be receiving more information from her as soon as ''we work to finalize the bill language.'' According to the memo, Wexler's people were also planning ''a target date for introducing the bill'' and even drafting the ''Dear Colleague'' letters that lawmakers send out to their peers to build support for legislation.

In the memo, Moritsugu also thanked Lehmann for contacting Rep. Jim Kolbe (R–Ariz.). According to other memos, the Wexler Group sent out requests to coalition members asking them to fax in summaries on their progress finding co-sponsors for the legislation. Wexler used this ''Co-Sponsorship Meeting Response Form'' to keep track of how far USA*Engage's tentacles had spread throughout Congress. In the case of Lehmann, they went far: Kolbe signed on as a co-sponsor of the House bill.

On October 23, Hamilton introduced the Enhancement of Trade, Security, and Human Rights through Sanctions Reform Act in the House (Lugar followed suit in the Senate early the following month). The bill would protect overseas contracts signed at the time sanctions are imposed and would require that sanctions expire after two years unless specifically reauthorized.

The legislation also makes the process of imposing sanctions a bureaucratic nightmare while specifically exempting restrictions on the use of measures ''imposed to remedy unfair trade practices.'' In other words, says Mark Anderson, a union officer at the Food and Allied Service Trades who closely monitors USA*Engage, ''sanctions are just fine if the economic interests of a company are threatened by intellectual property theft or expropriation, but they should not be imposed if a dictatorship is killing its people or depriving workers of their rights.''

Meanwhile, the law firm Hogan & Hartson has been scheduling meetings between leading members of USA*Engage and congressional staffers. A series of three internal campaign memos from last fall urged key coalition members to attend engagements set up with a number of Capitol Hill offices, including the Senate Finance Committee.

STEP 6—SEIZE CONTROL

With Congress about to consider the bills, the future looks sunny for USA*Engage. The group mailed out a progress report to member companies stating that the coalition had ''surpassed its 1997 goals across the board.'' Furthermore, USA*Engage's ''continuous and aggressive media education effort'' has paid rich dividends. According to the report, of the 242 newspaper editorials written on the sanctions issue since USA*Engage's founding last year, 180 had been favorable to the coalition, 36 were neutral, and only 26 were hostile.

The progress report also urged supporters not to let up, mentioning that ''member companies are currently deeply involved'' in recruiting more co-sponsors for the Hamilton-Lugar legislation, which already boasts 10 senators and 14 House members.

There's also good news for one of USA*Engage's congressional partners. While Hamilton will retire at the end of his term, Lugar will be up for re-election in 2000 and is apparently tapping into USA*Engage's membership lists. A member of the coalition, who asked to remain anonymous, says that after joining USA*Engage he received an invitation charging a $1,000-a-head fee to a fundraiser for Lugar in March at Washington's exclusive Monocle restaurant.

Along with the sparks that will occur when Congress debates the legislation, coalition members can expect a howl from human rights advocates, such as Simon Billenness of Franklin Research & Development Corp., a progressive investment firm in Boston, who notes the importance economic sanctions played in ending South Africa's apartheid regime. ''If USA*Engage had succeeded with these tactics during the apartheid years, Nelson Mandela might still be in prison,'' he says.

But they can also expect support from sources higher up—and even more important than Billy Graham. The Clinton administration is highly sympathetic to USA*Engage's cause, especially the State Department's sanction review team, headed by Wexler contact Stuart Eizenstat.

As the anti-sanctions laws work their way through Congress, according to the progress report, USA*Engage will assist Eizenstat in dealing with any problems that might arise, such as the weak drug policies in Mexico and Colombia, and the upcoming Nigerian elections—rigged in advance by the country's generals. These cases, the report warns, ''may result in a call for sanctions.''

Not to worry. Eizenstat's sanctions review committee will have a strong say in such matters and, the report assures, ''USA*Engage has encouraged this effort from the outset and will provide private sector input as it unfolds.''

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Your bounty of blessings is with us, O God, and Your grace is Your free gift. From our beginnings, Your strong arm has strengthened us, and Your benedictions have given us hope. In response to Your favor toward us, we have not always answered with good works and noble deeds and have sometimes followed our own way of self-centeredness and personal advantage.

Help us, gracious God, to see more clearly the unity we share and teach us to work together for the common good. While every person differs on the particular road we should follow to accomplish our goals, yet let us in solidarity hold high those ideals and traditions and values that we hold dear and make us proud as we honor and respect each other in all we do. In Your name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM ACT

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Education is currently spending Federal tax dollars funding the closed captioning of the Jerry Springer Show. Unbelievable. Since when does this talk show have anything to do with teaching our kids basic math, reading, writing, science, or history?

Not only does the Jerry Springer show not improve American education, but over the past few months, it has done seven shows on premarital or adulterous relationships with titles such as ''I am Having Your Man's Baby''.

They have produced another seven shows on the Ku Klux Klan, such as ''I am a Breeder for the Klan'' and ''Christmas with the Klan''. They had eight shows on prostitution, such as ''I am a 13 Year Old Prostitute'' and ''My Wife wants to be a Call Girl''.