

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Revenue Sharing Reestablishment Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. REESTABLISHMENT OF REVENUE SHARING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary of the Treasury shall make payments to States and units of general local government in accordance with the provisions of chapter 67 of title 31, United States Code (formerly known as the "Revenue Sharing Act"), as in effect on April 6, 1986 (in this section referred to as "chapter 67").

(b) ENTITLEMENT PERIOD DEFINED.—Notwithstanding section 6701(a)(1) of chapter 67, for purposes of this section the term "entitlement period" (as used in chapter 67) means each fiscal year after fiscal year 1995.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Notwithstanding section 6703(b)(1) and (2) of chapter 67, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out this section \$5,000,000,000. For purposes of this section, amounts appropriated under this subsection shall be treated as amounts in the Trust Fund (as that term is used in chapter 67).

SEC. 3. REDUCTION OF AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED FOR FOREIGN AID.

The amount authorized to be appropriated for aid to foreign governments for fiscal years after fiscal year 1995 is reduced by \$5,000,000,000.

GERMAN PARLIAMENT DE-
NOUNCES SITUATION IN
CHECHNYA

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1995

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a very important document brought to my attention by my very good friend, Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski. Below is the text of a resolution unanimously passed by the Bundestag in Germany on January 20, 1995, regarding the Russian debacle in Chechnya. I commend the German Parliament for its principled stand and I urge my colleagues to carefully consider it as a model for our own policy.

The article follows:

GERMAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION ON
CHECHNYA, JANUARY 20, 1995

Begin informal translation:

The German Bundestag is deeply concerned and dismayed at the dangerous development of the situation in Chechnya. It does not contest the right of the Russian federation to preserve its territorial integrity within the legal framework provided for by the Russian constitution and in observance of international law and human rights, as well as OSCE principles and other rules with which it (the Russian Federation) had agreed to comply under a binding obligation. The Russian actions in Chechnya constitute, however, a grave violation of the principles of the OSCE, the provisions of the 1992/1994 Vienna Document on confidence and security building measures, and of the U.N. Human Rights Conventions. The acts of violence, the disregard of human rights, and the indiscriminate and unrestrained use of military

force are unacceptable. The military actions in Chechnya shake the confidence in the democratization process of the Russian Federation.

The German Bundestag deplores the appalling loss of human lives, the sacrifice and the suffering of the civilian population caused by the armed conflict in Chechnya.

The German Bundestag supports all efforts to call on Russia emphatically to continue the intensive dialogue started within the OSCE and to use all possibilities of the OSCE to solve the crisis.

The German Bundestag calls on the Russian Government and the Chechen fighters to stop the fighting immediately and unconditionally, to end the bloodshed and to seek a political solution of the conflict which takes into account the legitimate interests of Russia as well as those of the Chechen population.

Only such a solution can exclude dangers for the reform process, democratization and the stability of the whole region; only a democratic Russia will be able to remain a close partner of Germany, the EU and NATO.

The German Bundestag reaffirms its support for the Russian democrats who champion human rights and the rule of law.

Germany wants to remain Russia's partner and friend.

End informal translation.

Adopted unanimously by the Bundestag on January 20, 1995.

LEGISLATION TO REPEAL ANTI-TRUST EXEMPTION REGARDING MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL**HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1995

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to repeal the antitrust exemption under which Major League Baseball has operated since 1922.

I am doing this for two reasons. For the short term, I believe repealing the antitrust exemption will accelerate the end of the baseball shutdown, which threatens the livelihoods of thousands of Americans and the economies of cities and towns across the country.

For the long term, I believe repealing the antitrust exemption will restore fairness to the fragile relationship of labor and management in professional baseball. And in doing that we will help preserve the institution of baseball and protect the livelihoods of Americans for generations to come.

Although my own background has deep roots in the labor movement, I do not mean to take sides in the current struggle between the players and management. All I want to do is restore fairness to the negotiating process and allow the courts to help accelerate the negotiations where necessary.

As long as professional baseball enjoys its exemption from the antitrust statutes, management can impose its own salary structure free from constraints of the courts or the open market. I have no doubt that removing the antitrust exemption would drastically alter the escalating rate of ticket prices which are currently set by an unfettered cartel of 28 team owners.

Removing the antitrust exemption would put professional baseball in the real world of corporate America where it belongs. If we allow the free market to determine the cost of doing

business in professional baseball, the owners will discover they can discipline their business practices and the players will discover their real value on the open market.

We must recognize once and for all that professional baseball is a business, a big business. And if we can bring baseball's fiscal house in order, I have no doubt we can bring back fans to ballparks across the country and restore the game of baseball, not the business of baseball, and America's national pastime.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION**HON. KWEISI MFUME**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1995

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I was, unfortunately, detained in my congressional district in Baltimore earlier today and thus forced to miss a record vote. Specifically, I was not present to record my vote on rollcall vote No. 75, on the amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY of Oregon.

Had I been here I would have voted "no."

\$20,571.48 A YEAR FOR AN INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE POLICY**HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from a 59 year old self-employed realtor in California—a man who has no serious medical conditions. Several years ago, he was divorced and used COBRA to keep his wife's Prudential group rate policy of \$275.96 per month. At the end of his COBRA health continuation period, he asked Prudential to convert to an individual policy. As the gentleman wrote me, that's when Prudential "dropped a piece of the rock" on him. The monthly cost of a \$100 deductible policy was \$1,714.29—or \$20,571 a year. For a \$1,000 deductible, the monthly premium was \$1,030—or \$12,360 per year.

To help stop these outrageous overcharges, I urge the Congress to simply extend the COBRA health continuation time periods indefinitely. Once you are in a group policy, you should be able to stay in at the group rate plus an appropriate administrative fee.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION**HON. PHILIP M. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, after receiving assurances that we would not be voting on final passage of the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act tonight, I am keeping a commitment I made many months ago to travel back to Illinois to speak before the Barrington Chamber of Commerce. I regret that I may miss a number of votes relating to amendments to this legislation. However, regrettably, it has become clear from the proceedings of recent