

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.