

a cosponsor of S. 1860, a bill to reward the hard work and risk of individuals who choose to live in and help preserve America's small, rural towns, and for other purposes.

S. 1924

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1924, a bill to promote charitable giving, and for other purposes.

S. 1966

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1966, a bill to educate health professionals concerning substance abuse and addiction.

S. 1977

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1977, a bill to amend chapter 37 of title 28, United States Code, to provide for appointment of United States marshals by the Attorney General.

S. 1991

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1991, to establish a national rail passenger transportation system, reauthorize Amtrak, improve security and service on Amtrak, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 109

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 109, a resolution designating the second Sunday in the month of December as "National Children's Memorial Day" and the last Friday in the month of April as "Children's Memorial Flag Day."

S. CON. RES. 17

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 17, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that there should continue to be parity between the adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the adjustments in the compensation of civilian employees of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 2907

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2907 proposed to S. 565, a bill to establish the Commission on Voting Rights and Procedures to study and make recommendations regarding election technology, voting, and election administration, to establish a grant program under which the Office of Justice Programs and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice shall provide assistance to States and localities in improving election technology and the administration of Federal elections, to require States to meet uniform and nondiscrim-

inatory election technology and administration requirements for the 2004 Federal elections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3032

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3032 intended to be proposed to S. 517, a bill to authorize funding the Department of Energy to enhance its mission areas through technology transfer and partnerships for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2082. A bill to modify the application of the antitrust laws to permit collective development and implementation of a standard contract form for playwrights for the licensing of their plays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Playwrights' Licensing Relief Act of 2002. I thank Senator SCHUMER, my cosponsor on this bill, for his interest and leadership on this important legislation.

This bill is necessary both to ensure the continued vitality of American live theater and to protect the intellectual property and artistic rights of playwrights. When the theater is crowded and the curtain rises, it is easy to forget that the entire show began with one person: the lone playwright who put the pen to paper.

Playwrights and their voluntary peer membership organization, the Dramatists Guild, operate under the shadow of the antitrust laws, and substantially without the ability to coordinate their actions in protecting their interests. This has impeded playwrights' ability to act collectively in dealing with highly-organized and unionized groups, such as actors, directors, and choreographers, on the one hand, and the increasingly consolidated producers and investors on the other.

I am proud that this legislation enables playwrights to act collectively without violating the antitrust laws. It lets them develop standard form contracts as well as provisions ensuring that certain artists' rights are respected in the production of their plays. These steps will help support playwrights, especially young playwrights, as they enter this increasingly sophisticated and consolidated market. By helping playwrights in the way we encourage the continued vibrance of our American theater and culture.

I am pleased to introduce this bill and look forward to working with Senator SCHUMER on this important legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2082

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 "Playwrights Licensing Relief Act of 2002".

SEC. 2. NONAPPLICATION OF ANTITRUST LAWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), the antitrust laws shall not apply to any joint discussion, consideration, review, action, or agreement for the express purpose of, and limited to, the development of a standard form contract containing minimum terms of artistic protection and levels of compensation for playwrights by means of—

(1) meetings, discussions, and negotiations between or among playwrights or their representatives and producers or their representatives; or

(2) joint or collective voluntary actions for the limited purposes of developing a standard form contract by playwrights or their representatives.

(b) ADOPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION.—Subject to subsection (c), the antitrust laws shall not apply to any joint discussion, consideration, review, or action for the express purpose of, and limited to, reaching a collective agreement among playwrights adopting a standard form contract developed pursuant to subsection (a) as the participating playwrights sole and exclusive means by which participating playwrights shall license their plays to producers.

(c) AMENDMENT OF CONTRACT.—A standard form of contract developed and implemented under subsections (a) and (b) shall be subject to amendment by individual playwrights and producers consistent with the terms of the standard form contract.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ANTITRUST LAWS.—The term "antitrust laws" has the meaning given it in section (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12) except that such term includes section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to the extent that such section applies to unfair methods of competition.

(2) PLAYWRIGHT.—The term "playwright" means the author, composer, or lyricist of a dramatic or musical work intended to be performed on the speaking stage and shall include, where appropriate, the adapter of a work from another medium.

(3) PRODUCER.—The term "producer"—

(A) means any person who obtains the rights to present live stage productions of a play; and

(B) includes any person who presents a play as first class performances in major cities, as well as those who present plays in regional and not-for-profit theaters.

By Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 2083. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to educational organizations to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today with my friend and colleague from Ohio, Senator DEWINE, to introduce the Holocaust Education Assistance Act. This legislation provides for grants to support Holocaust education programs that teach the lessons that

the Holocaust provides for all people, including developing curriculum guides and providing training to help teachers incorporate those lessons in their classes. This bill is especially timely this week, as we observe the Holocaust Days of Remembrance. The Holocaust has always been a difficult issue to teach; the complexities and the sheer horror of what occurred in Nazi Germany can seem overwhelming. But, I am confident that this bill will help educators to undertake the difficult but vital task of helping this and future generations understand the meaning of the Holocaust.

In the wake of the events of September 11, it is more important than ever to understand the damage and suffering that acts of hatred and racism can reap. The Holocaust was one of history's darkest moments and it must be remembered in order to prevent its repetition. Indeed, we are constantly reminded of why we must be vigilant against ethnic hatred and violence. In the past 10 years, for example, we have seen ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. The old axiom remains true: "those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it."

Yet, even today, there are some who not only refuse to learn from the Holocaust, but who refuse even to accept that it happened. The Holocaust, of course, did happen. We saw the remains of the camps at Treblinka and Auschwitz; we read letters sent among Nazi leaders discussing the "final solution," and we hear the eloquent words of countless survivors such as Elie Wiesel and Primo Levi describing the atrocities they witnessed and were forced to endure. In the face of all that, it is our responsibility to educate ourselves and our children about the horrors of the Holocaust and help to build a world in which such events never happen again.

Knowledge is the most effective tool in breaking down the barriers between groups and creating more inclusive and tolerant societies. This legislation will help with the critical task of spreading such knowledge through education.

By Mr. BOND:

S. 2084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the exemption from tax for small property and casualty insurance companies; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that addresses an inequity facing an important segment of the small business community. This legislation is simple and straight forward, it adjusts the current tax exemption that has existed since 1942 for small property and casualty, (P&C), insurance companies so that it keeps pace with inflation.

As the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I have heard from many small P&C insurers in Missouri and across the Nation that they are having to consider raising their premiums simply because the tax laws have not

kept pace with inflation. Under current law, mutual and stock P&C insurance companies are exempt from Federal income taxes if the greater of their direct or net written premiums in a taxable year do not exceed \$350,000.

For companies that grow above the \$350,000 threshold, current law permits electing P&C insurance companies to be taxed only on their investment income, provided their premiums do not exceed \$1.2 million. Unfortunately, these thresholds, which were last updated in the Tax Reform Act of 1986, have not been adjusted for inflation.

This situation has created an unintended outcome. Take, for instance, a small P&C insurer in my State that started insuring the local farmers in the late 1980s. Over the ensuing years, the company's client base changed very little, but the insurance premiums increased gradually to keep pace with inflationary pressures. As a result, while the business itself has not grown, its premium base has and with it the loss of the tax exemption, (or the alternative tax on investment income).

For the farmers and ranchers covered by the small P&C insurer, this loss is certain to mean higher insurance premiums, leaving the client with the choice of cutting coverage or paying higher costs, neither of which is a real option. And for our agricultural community over the past few years, this choice is about the last thing they need.

The bill I introduce today would correct this problem by simply adjusting the \$350,000 and \$1.2 million thresholds to bring them up to the level they would have been this year if the 1986 tax code had included an inflation adjustment. Accordingly, the tax exemption would apply to P&C insurers with premiums that do not exceed \$551,000, and the alternative for taxation of investment income would apply to companies with premiums above \$551,000 but not more than \$1,890,000. The bill would apply for taxable years beginning in 2002 and would index both thresholds for inflation thereafter.

According to the National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, this legislation will help at least 652 small P&C insurance companies nationwide. In my State, at least 62 small insurance companies will continue to be covered under the current tax provisions, thereby enabling them to continue providing critical insurance coverage to small businesses across Missouri.

With this legislation, we have an opportunity to infuse some fairness into our tax code and at the same time help the thousands of farmers, ranchers, and entrepreneurs covered by small P&C insurers in this country. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation, and I look forward to working with the Finance Committee to see it enacted into law.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be provided in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2084

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

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF EXEMPTION FROM TAX FOR SMALL PROPERTY AND CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANIES.

(a) PREMIUM LIMITATIONS INCREASED TO REFLECT INFLATION SINCE FIRST IMPOSED.—

(1)(A) Subparagraph (A) of section 501(c)(15) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "\$350,000" and inserting "\$551,000".

(B) Paragraph (15) of section 501(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(E) In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2001, the \$551,000 amount set forth in subparagraph (A) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

"(i) \$551,000, multiplied by
 "(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year by substituting 'calendar year 2000' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

If the amount as adjusted under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of \$1,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$1,000."

(2)(A) Clause (i) of section 831(b)(2)(A) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(i) the net written premiums (or, if greater, direct written premiums) for the taxable year exceed the amount applicable under section 501(c)(15)(A) but do not exceed \$1,890,000, and"

(B) Paragraph (2) of section 831(b) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2001, the \$1,890,000 amount set forth in subparagraph (A) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

"(i) \$1,890,000, multiplied by
 "(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year by substituting 'calendar year 2000' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

If the amount as adjusted under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of \$1,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$1,000."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. BOND, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

S. 2085. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to clarify the definition of homebound with respect to home health services under the medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today legislation that is cosponsored by Senators CLELAND, BOND, and HUTCHINSON, that would modernize the current outdated homebound requirement that has impeded access to needed home health care services for far too many of our Nation's frail, elderly, and disabled Medicare beneficiaries. I thank former Senator Bob Dole, one of our Nation's

leading advocates, on behalf of individuals with disabilities, for bringing this issue to my attention.

The highly skilled and often technically complex care that our home health care agencies provide has enabled millions of our most vulnerable older and disabled citizens to receive health care just where they want to be: in the security, comfort, and privacy of their own homes.

Under current law, a Medicare patient must be considered homebound to be eligible for home health services. While an individual is not actually required to be bedridden in order to qualify, his or her condition must be such that "there exists a normal inability to leave home." Moreover, leaving home must require "a considerable and taxing effort by the individual." The law does allow for absences from the home of "infrequent" or "relatively short duration."

Unfortunately, the law does not define precisely what this means. It leaves it to the fiscal intermediaries to interpret just how many absences qualify as "frequent" and just how short these absences must be. The result is that interpretations of the law vary widely from region to region. As a consequence, there have been far too many instances where an overzealous or arbitrary interpretation of the definition has turned elderly or disabled Medicare beneficiaries who are dependent on Medicare home health services and medical equipment into virtual prisoners in their own homes. We have heard disturbing accounts of individuals on Medicare who have had their home health care benefits terminated for leaving their homes briefly to visit a hospitalized spouse or to attend a major family gathering, including in one case, to attend the funeral of their own child.

Another mother did not attend the funeral of her own child out of fear that by doing so, she would jeopardize her home health benefits. This does not make sense, and it is just cruel.

The current homebound requirement is particularly hard on younger, disabled Medicare patients. For example, *People* magazine reported a story last year about a Georgia resident, David Jayne, a 40-year-old man with Lou Gehrig's disease, who was confined to a wheelchair and could not swallow, speak, or even breathe on his own. Obviously, he needed skilled nursing visits several times per week in order for him to remain at home and not at an inpatient facility.

Despite his disability, however, Mr. Jayne meets frequently with youth and church groups. He is an inspirational person. He speaks using a computerized voice synthesizer and gives inspirational talks about how the human spirit can endure and even overcome great hardship.

The Atlantic Journal Constitution ran a feature article on Mr. Jayne and his activities, including a report about how he had, with great effort and help

from his family and friends, attended a football game to root for the University of Georgia Bulldogs.

A few days later, unbelievably, at the direction of the fiscal intermediary, his home health agency—which had been sending a home health nurse to his home for 2 hours, 4 mornings a week— notified him that he was no longer considered homebound and terminated his benefits. His benefits were subsequently reinstated due to the enormous amount of media attention to this case, but this experience motivated him to launch a crusade to modernize the homebound definition and led him to found the National Coalition to Amend the Medicare Homebound Restriction.

So even out of this terrible experience, once again this inspirational individual who is suffering so greatly from Lou Gehrig's disease has managed to launch a crusade to try to prevent what happened to him from happening to other severely disabled individuals who are dependent on home health care.

The fact is, the current requirement that Medicare beneficiaries be homebound in order to be eligible for home health benefits reflects an outmoded view of life for persons who are elderly or live with disabilities. The legislation I am introducing attempts to correct this problem. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting it.

I hope we can make this change, which will make a real difference for millions of disabled and elderly Medicare beneficiaries.

The homebound criteria for home health may have made sense thirty years ago, when an elderly or disabled person might expect to live in the confines of their home, perhaps cared for by an extended family. The current definition, however, fails to reflect the technological and medical advances that have been made in supporting individuals with significant disabilities and mobility challenges. It also fails to reflect advances in treatment for seriously ill individuals—like Mr. Jayne—which allows them brief periods of relative wellness. It also fails to recognize that an individual's mental acuity and physical stamina can only be maintained by use, and that the use of the body and mind is encouraged by social interactions outside the four walls of a home.

The legislation that we are introducing today will amend the homebound definition to base eligibility for the home health benefit on the patient's functional limitations and clinical condition, rather than on an arbitrary limitation on absences from the home. It would retain the requirements in current law that the individual must have either a condition, due to illness or injury, that restricts the ability of the individual to leave his or her home except with the assistance of another individual or the aid of a supportive device; or a condition such that leaving his or her home is medically contraindicated.

In addition, the condition of the individual must still be such that "there exists a normal inability to leave home" and that "leaving home requires a considerable and taxing effort." Under our legislation, however, the current arbitrary requirement that patients be allowed "only infrequent absences of short duration" from the home would be dropped. Our legislation builds upon major improvements in the definition of homebound that were initiated in the last Congress by Senator Jeffords, Reed and others which specifically allow Medicare patients to leave the home to attend religious services and participate in adult day care.

Our proposal is supported by the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations, the National Association for Home Care, and the Visiting Nurses Association of America. It is also consistent with President Bush's "New Freedom Initiative," which has, as its goal, the removal of barriers that impede opportunities for those with disabilities to integrate more fully into the community. By allowing reasonable absences from the home, our legislation will bring the Medicare home health benefit into the 21st century, and we encourage all of our colleagues to join us as cosponsors.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2087. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for the provision of independent investment advice to employees; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague from Maine, Senator COLLINS, to introduce legislation that will facilitate the flow of investment advice by providing businesses with a Federal income tax credit for small businesses of up to \$30 per participant, \$20 for larger businesses, for providing qualified independent investment advice. This legislation is a continuation of our efforts to help 401(k) participants better understand their investment options and enable them to make sound financial decisions. Last year, Senator COLLINS and I introduced S. 1677, "The Independent Investment Advice Act of 2001" that will create a safe harbor for employers to relieve them of liability for the selection and monitoring of qualified independent investment advisers. Combined, these pieces of legislation will facilitate the flow of investment advice to all plan participants regardless of their income or net worth.

As introduced, this legislation will provide small businesses, as defined as having 50 employees or less, with a 60 percent tax credit on the first \$50 of the cost associated with providing qualified independent investment advice. All other employers will be eligible for a 40 percent credit on the same amount of expenses. This legislation will limit the benefit for any plan sponsor to a total of \$50,000 of credits per year under this provision.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in advancing this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2087

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

SECTION 1. EMPLOYER-PROVIDED INDEPENDENT INVESTMENT ADVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to business-related credits) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 45G. EMPLOYER-PROVIDED INDEPENDENT INVESTMENT ADVICE.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of section 38, the employer-provided independent investment advice credit determined under this section for the taxable year is an amount equal to 40 percent (60 percent in the case any small employer (as defined in section 220(c)(4))) of the qualified independent investment advice services paid for by the taxpayer in such taxable year.

“(b) LIMITATIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) SERVICES TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT PER EMPLOYEE.—The amount of qualified independent investment advice services which may be taken into account for any taxable year with respect to each employee shall not exceed \$50.

“(2) TOTAL CREDIT ALLOWED PER TAXPAYER.—The amount of the employer-provided independent investment advice credit which is allowable under subsection (a) in any taxable year (when added to such credits allowed for all preceding taxable years) may not exceed \$50,000.

“(b) QUALIFIED INDEPENDENT INVESTMENT ADVICE SERVICES.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified independent investment advice services’ means, with respect to any employee, individualized independent investment advice services provided by an independent investment adviser who certifies to the taxpayer that such employee received such services.

“(2) NONDISCRIMINATION.—Independent investment advice services shall not be treated as qualified unless the provision of such services (or the eligibility to receive such services) does not discriminate in favor of employees of the taxpayer who are highly compensated employees (within the meaning of section 414(q)).

“(c) APPLICATION OF RULES.—For purposes of this section, the rules of section 45F(e) shall apply.”.

(b) CREDIT MADE PART OF GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—Subsection (b) of section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “plus” at the end of paragraph (14), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting “, plus”, and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(16) the employer-provided independent investment advice credit determined under section 45G(a).”.

(c) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—Section 280C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) CREDIT FOR EMPLOYER-PROVIDED INDEPENDENT INVESTMENT ADVICE.—No deduction shall be allowed for that portion of the expenses otherwise allowable as a deduction for

the taxable year which is equal to the amount of the credit determined for the taxable year under section 45G(a).”.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 45G. Employer-provided independent investment advice.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to expenses paid or incurred in the taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

STATEMENTS ON SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 234—REITERATING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IS A PRIORITY OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE IN THE BILATERAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, INCLUDING WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE JACKSON-VANIK AMENDMENT

Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. REID, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. RES. 234

Whereas religious freedom and minority rights have always been a priority of the United States Congress and the American people;

Whereas the Russian Federation has experienced a miraculous revival of religious life since the Soviet collapse ten years ago, especially with respect to the historically persecuted Russian Jewish community;

Whereas the Russian Government has publicly welcomed the participation of faith communities in national life;

Whereas the Department of State’s International Religious Freedom Report (October 2001), submitted to Congress in compliance with Section 102(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act (IRFA) of 1998, details numerous and widespread restrictions upon minority faiths under Russia’s 1997 Religion Law;

Whereas Deputy Prime Minister Valentina Matvienko said on 23 October that the Russian government is working on amendments to the Religion Law to further restrict still the activities of foreign religious groups on Russian territory;

Whereas the International Religious Freedom Report also details a series of Russian Government actions during the past year that have interfered with the functioning of Jewish community institutions;

Whereas “Izvestiya” reported on 6 November that no one in Russia’s Federal Security Service (FSB) is assigned to handle extremist and racist movements, while nationalist and anti-Semitic extremists continue to spread propaganda and incite violence in incidents across Russia;

Whereas Russia has accepted international obligations, including those specified in the 1990 Copenhagen Document of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, to allow ethnic and religious minorities “to establish and maintain their own educational, cultural and religious institutions, organizations or associations”;

Whereas 98 Senators wrote to President Vladimir Putin of the Russian Federation on 3 August 2001, recognizing individual instances of progress but expressing concern over the anti-Semitic rhetoric heard at both the national and local levels of Russian society and politics;

Whereas, on 24 October 2001, by Unanimous Consent, the Senate passed Amendment SA 1948 to the Foreign Operations FY 2002 Appropriations Bill (H.R. 2506), instructing that funds for the Government of the Russian Federation be conditioned upon the President’s certification to Congress that the Russian Government “has not implemented any statute, executive order, regulation, or other similar government action that would discriminate, or would have as its principal effect discrimination, against religious groups or religious communities in the Russian Federation in violation of accepted international agreements on human rights and religious freedoms to which the Russian Federation is a party”;

Whereas the Congress passed Title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (“the Jackson-Vanik Amendment”) “to assure the continued dedication of the United States to fundamental human rights”;

Whereas the Jackson-Vanik Amendment focuses on free emigration as a condition for granting Normal Trade Relations to non-market economies, including authority for the President to waive this restriction upon certifying that a country was permitting free emigration;

Whereas the President stated on 13 November 2001, that Russia has made important strides on emigration and the protection of religious and ethnic minorities, “including Russia’s Jewish community. On this issue, Russia is in a fundamentally different place than it was during the Soviet era. President Putin told me that these gains for freedom will be protected and expanded;”

Whereas the President further stated: “Our Foreign Ministers have sealed this understanding in an exchange of letters. Because of this progress, my administration will work with Congress to end the application of Jackson-Vanik Amendment to Russia;”

Whereas the exchange of letters between the Secretary of State and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia underscored Russian and U.S. commitments on human rights and religious freedoms, including restitution of communal properties seized during the Soviet era, the revival of minority communities, and combating xenophobia and anti-Semitism;

Whereas, in meeting with Senate leadership on 13 November 2001, President Putin reiterated his commitment to working with the United States and with the Congress on advancing civil society and human rights in this country;

Whereas the President of the United States issued a “Religious Freedom Day 2002” Proclamation on 16 January 2002, saying, “I encourage all Americans to renew their commitment to protecting the liberties that make our country a beacon of hope for people around the world who seek the free exercise of religious beliefs and other freedoms;”

Whereas the Russian Federation has proven to be a critical ally in the war on international terrorism in which the civilized world is currently engaged; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That it is the sense of the Senate that—