



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, SUNDAY, MARCH 20, 2005

No. 35—Book II

House of Representatives

FOR THE RELIEF OF THE PARENTS OF THERESA MARIE SCHIAVO

(Continuation of Proceedings of
Sunday, March 20, 2005)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, we come here with a heavy heart. I urge the Members of this House to do our duty to pass the Schiavo Act. Its purpose is simple—to allow the Federal courts to review this matter in the light of Terri's constitutional rights. That's not a lot to ask.

Over the last few days, Members of both parties and chambers have worked tirelessly to reach this agreement. We hope that these efforts will help give Terri Schiavo new hope and a new chance at life.

We have heard very moving accounts of people close to Terri that she is indeed, very much alive. She laughs, she cries and she smiles with those around her. She is aware of her surroundings and is responsive to them. This is a woman who deserves a chance at life and not a death sentence of starvation and dehydration.

It is our hope that this bill will give Terri a new hope of life. It takes her case out of the Florida court system and puts it in the hands of the Federal court. There, her case will be tried anew where the judge can reevaluate and reassess Terri's medical condition.

Oddly enough, on this very day last year, the Pope addressed a group of participants in an international Congress on life-sustaining treatments. The Pope said a human being's value and personal dignity do not change no matter what his or her circumstances.

And I quote:

A man, even if seriously ill or disabled in the exercise of his highest functions, is and always will be a man, and he will never become a "vegetable" or an "animal."

I urge every Member of this people's House to carry these words in their hearts as we vote.

Today, we have the opportunity to give a woman another chance to live. It is our turn to fulfill the promises etched in the Declaration of Independence to make life more perfect for the pursuit of life.

I want to thank my colleagues Leader DELAY, Majority Whip BLUNT, Representative OBERSTAR, Chairman SENSENBRENNER and Dr. WELDON for helping us to get this life saving bill together.

I want the Schindler family to know that no matter what happens, our hearts and prayers will continue to be with you.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, as one of 203 Democrat and Republican Members of Congress who voted in favor of S. 686, a private bill for the Relief of the Parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo, I am pleased that President Bush signed this important piece of legislation that may result in the reinsertion of Ms. Schiavo's feeding tube. The bill empowers a Federal court to examine the Terri Schiavo case.

As I listened to my colleagues debating this issue on the House floor last night, I heard many emotional statements from Members on both sides of the aisle in support of and opposed to what this bill stands for. This is not about Democrats or Republicans, it is simply about protecting the rights of disabled individuals.

Unfortunately, after many years of dispute between Ms. Schiavo's husband and parents, a Florida State court ordered the removal of her feeding tubes and subsequent fate of death by starvation and dehydration. Due to the urgency of Ms. Schiavo's case, this bill was limited in considering just her life. However, there are many more people out there who also need help like this and I firmly believe that before we extinguish any life, we should allow that individual all legal and constitutional protections, so they can leave this world with dignity.

I feel so strongly about this that I was an original cosponsor of Congressman DAVE WELDON's recently introduced bill, H.R. 1151, that would have given legal representation to all incapacitated persons who are without written documentation as to their wishes and whose family is involved in a dispute as to the person's wishes.

S. 686, which we passed early this morning, allows Ms. Schiavo's parents to bring the case before the Federal court in Florida and they would be able to hear all evidence without

being prejudiced by any of the information from the Florida State case that led to the feeding tubes being removed. The bill also directs the Federal courts to rule on whether removing Ms. Schiavo's feeding tubes is a violation of her civil rights granted to her both by the Constitution and Federal laws.

I believe this bill is the right thing to do and I believe we should protect human life from its inception to a person's last breath.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address S. 686 for the Relief of the Parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo. Numerous courts have reviewed the tragic case of Terri Schiavo, and all have agreed that the right to make decisions about her care rests solely with her legal guardian: her husband, Michael Schiavo.

Even in cases where the patient has made it clear that she did not wish to persist in a catatonic state, families face excruciating decisions about how to proceed. Disagreement about the medical facts or the express wishes of the patient only add to the agony, and often lead to painful disputes within families.

We are a nation of laws, and as such we have a proper and unbiased way of resolving these difficult situations. The Schiavo case involves a family dispute over who has final decisionmaking regarding Terri Schiavo's medical care, and as such falls exclusively under jurisdiction of the State courts. Federal courts do not have any jurisdiction in this case; the U.S. Congress does not have any jurisdiction in this case; only the courts of the State of Florida have jurisdiction here.

But Republican leaders in Congress have decided they must get involved in this tragic story. Perhaps BILL FRIST sees a chance to score political points in advance of his 2008 presidential bid; perhaps TOM DELAY sees a way to distract from his ongoing ethics problems; perhaps they are motivated by more noble standards.

Regardless of their motivation, the GOP congressional leadership has pushed S. 686, legislation pushing an after-the-fact remedy by pre-empting State court jurisdiction. Foregoing even the pretense of federalism, and the notion of America as a nation of laws, S. 686 reflects the Republicans' belief that they may

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1731

pick and choose the jurisdiction of their choice, depending on the day and the case.

This bill places politics before the judgment of State judges, imposing Federal adjudication on a case that has been comprehensively reviewed and decided. S. 686 represents a gross abuse of legislative authority and a violation of the U.S. Constitution.

Michael Schiavo has wrestled with the agonizing decision of what to do for his wife. He has followed Terri's instructions in accordance with the laws of his State and this country. Congress has no business in this matter, which involves a family decision based on mutual agreement between a husband and wife.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been called upon to take emergency action to protect the rights and life of Terri Schiavo.

While I normally do not favor Federal government involvement in personal decisions, there are a number of aspects to the Schiavo case which disturb me and call for further investigation.

I am concerned about the lack of written evidence that Terri Schiavo did not want her life preserved, the fact that her husband waited years before telling anyone that his wife supposedly did not want to live, and also the fact that her husband is pushing for her feeding tube removal after he has become involved with another woman and had children.

Terri Schiavo is a living human being and every reasonable effort should be made to ensure that her constitutional rights have not been denied.

I encourage all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 686, to provide for the relief of Terri Schiavo's family. In 1990, Terri Schiavo suffered a heart attack and subsequent brain damage due to lack of oxygen. She is not in a coma, and with the exception of the feeding tube, requires no artificial life support to keep her alive. Removal of the feeding tube, as was done this past Friday, will result in Terri's death by starvation and dehydration. By some estimates, she could be left to suffer for up to a month. This is a drawn out and painful process and Terri can feel pain.

In a case like this one, where there is a clear dispute between Terri's parents and husband as to her wishes, the presumption should always be on the side of life. Every effort should be made to ensure that no mistakes have been made in this case. I urge support of this important legislation.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, S. 686, for the relief of the parents of Terri Schiavo. This deeply personal family matter has come to our attention and been acted upon by Congress when the State courts have already made their decisions and rightfully so as this matter is in their jurisdiction.

Now we find ourselves in the middle of a deeply personal battle between Terri's husband and her family. While we all understand the pain and tragedy of this family's struggle, we cannot overstep our boundaries in this heart-wrenching situation that many families have made and will have to make in the future. No one wants to witness the death of a family member; however, if that person stated their wish was not to be kept alive artificially, those wishes must be upheld.

In this case, the State courts of Florida have ruled that Terri's wishes were indeed to not be kept alive artificially if she were to ever fall into a persistent vegetative state. The idea that Congress would intervene in this case is indeed unsettling and does bring some disturbing questions of constitutionality to the table.

We are justified in sending this highly emotional case to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida even though Terri remains in this persistent, seemingly unrecoverable, state. The Federal courts should review Terri's case to determine if her constitutional rights have been violated because it is not the role of Congress to make such decisions regarding these issues.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I support S. 686, for the Relief of the Parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo.

While I continue to support the right of individuals (through living wills) and families (when no living will exists) to make such difficult decisions, this case is unusual in two ways. First, while most families are united in these judgments, this family is clearly divided. Second, Terri Schiavo is not unresponsive to those around her, as is typically the case when these decisions are made. According to her mother, Terri smiles, laughs, cries, and otherwise responds to the presence of her family and others.

S. 686 does not make medical decisions. It merely allows Terri Schiavo's family the right to have their case heard in Federal court—a right routinely accorded to death row inmates. That right certainly should be accorded to a disabled person.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, passage of S. 686 today reaffirms that our Nation is built on a foundation of reverence for life and a commitment to protect life.

Protection of life is at the core of our constitutional republic. Beyond issues of separation of powers and court jurisdiction, is the fundamental notion that our government—both State and Federal—was established to protect the lives of all citizens.

Extraordinary circumstances require us to defend the life of Theresa Marie Schiavo and her right to due process. Absent congressional action, those rights, and in fact, her life, will be forever extinguished.

I join the overwhelming bipartisan support for ensuring that Theresa Marie Schiavo has full due process and that we uphold our reverence for human life.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me an opportunity to voice my thoughts on this significant issue.

This Nation was founded to preserve the sacred rights of mankind: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Alexander Hamilton correctly noted that these rights were intrinsic and could "never be erased or obscured by mortal power."

Our Nation was premised on this notion, and our government built upon its foundation. Yet, more than 200 years after our founding, we are still fighting to realize this sacred vision. The fight to save the life of Terri Schiavo, a disabled Florida woman, is evidence of our struggle.

In cases like Terri's, when there is no living will and exact wishes are impossible to determine, we must err on the side of protecting innocent life. Without such guiding principles, how can we be sure that we have not for-

saken her rights and replaced them with a court-ordered death sentence based solely on hearsay?

It is not only mortal power that seeks to take the life of Terri Schiavo, but moral power overseen and blessed by government. If we allow this course to continue, and if we stand idly by as this human life expires as a result of government-ordered starvation, we will have lost the moral compass passed down to us by our forefathers.

If we cannot protect innocent life in these circumstances where there is no written evidence of the individual's wishes, the family is deeply divided, and death is neither imminent nor certain in the near future, we have failed to do our jobs of protecting her constitutional rights.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am outraged that the Republicans continue to lead the charge in legislating their personal beliefs on the American people.

There is no legal or moral justification for Congress to be meddling in the personal lives of any American. Further, it sets a terrible precedent. The Florida courts have repeatedly ruled that any action on the part of the legislature or governor is a violation of the separation of powers enshrined in the Constitution. Yet under the cover of darkness, the majority has made a national example out of a local, individual, and very personal issue.

It is my hope that, when the time arrives, these same "civil rights" advocates will fight with the same zeal for the rights to equality, education, health care and housing that all Americans deserve.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, there is no more difficult decision for a family than to remove a loved one from life support. My heart goes out to the Schiavo family in this very personal and difficult time. However, I believe this to be a private family matter to be decided based on their own faith and values, without the government's intervention.

The Schiavo case has been a long and difficult one for Ms. Schiavo's family and friends. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the multiple court decisions and the multiple court reviews were properly evaluated. Each time the evidence pointed to the same unbiased conclusion: Terri Schiavo's wishes were clear and convincing. Doctors who have examined Ms. Schiavo have consistently said that she is in a persistent vegetative state. The only ones who disagree are those who are deciding based on videotapes. In fact, the Florida State legislature has not overridden the decisions of their State courts.

There is no doubt that this is a family tragedy. But, there is no room for the Federal Government in this case or in any similar case. It is unfair that this family during their time of grief has become a political pawn in an ideological war the conservative leadership is inappropriately propelling.

Mr. Speaker, Congress intervening in this matter sets a bad precedent for our entire legal system. The Republican leadership has repeatedly made a point of calling for the removal of Federal court jurisdiction over issues, such as gay marriage or displaying the Ten Commandments in public buildings, when the Federal courts render a decision that does not meet with their political ideology. In fact, they have gone so far as to introduce several legislative initiatives to strip controversial religious and social issues from the jurisdiction of Federal courts. Now, ironically, when a State has

rendered a final decision that the Republican leadership disagrees with, they support reinstating the power of “activist judges” on the Federal level. The Republican leadership cannot have it both ways and should not interfere with the judicial process that has worked for over 200 years.

Instead we should be fighting to cover the 45 million Americans who are currently without health insurance and unable to get the services they need to live. We should be increasing scientific research funding to improve our medical procedures and help more people overcome the impossible.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here today to judge what is right or wrong in Ms. Schiavo’s particular case. Only her loved ones can truly know in their hearts what is right for her, even if they cannot agree. But, what I do know is that whether someone has the right to live or die is not a decision that the Federal Government, and Members of Congress should not make.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened over the pain and suffering of Ms. Schiavo and her family. This is a tragedy of great depth.

I cannot imagine the pain that Ms. Schiavo has endured. As a husband, I certainly can empathize with Mr. Schiavo. As a father, I can empathize with the feelings of Ms. Schiavo’s mother and father.

My feelings for the pain of this family are precisely the reason for my position on this bill. In the first instance, tragic choices such as those confronting this family should be made by the family itself. In a case such as this, in which the family cannot come to a consensus, the courts are the proper place for decisions to be made.

The Florida courts have examined this matter in great detail for a very long time. For any legislative body—least of all the Federal legislature—to impose its will is an abuse of its power.

Excruciating decisions such as this belong first to families, and only if there cannot be agreement within a family—in the courts. The political process is the least appropriate place for such a decision to be made.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, since February 1990, Terri Schiavo and her family have been coping with a tragic situation involving the most sensitive and difficult question imaginable. Congress and the American people should respect any person and their family dealing with an end of life decision. Over the past 15 years, 19 judges sitting on six different courts have ultimately determined that Terri Schiavo did not wish to be kept alive in a persistent vegetative state. Congress should respect her wish and stay out of the personal lives of families in tragic situations such as this. These heart-rending decisions are best made by the individual and family after discussions with treating physicians and clergy—not by Washington politicians.

At the time I received notice there would be a vote on the bill regarding Terri Schiavo, I went immediately to the airport but was not able to get a flight to Washington in time. Had I been present, I would have voted to respect the wishes of Terri Schiavo.

I hope every American will consider writing or revising a living will to clearly state their wishes regarding end of life decisions and keep a similar tragedy from happening in their family.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, as the elected representatives of the American people, we have no greater responsibility than defending the lives and liberties of the most vulnerable among us. Today, both the legislative and executive branches of the United States government are acting in concert to defend the life of one such human being, Terri Schiavo.

While the legal issues related to this case remain uncertain, the moral issues could not be more clear. Terri Schiavo is very much alive today. By all appearances, she is responsive to her family and still has the capacity to feel joy and pain, like the rest of us.

Terri Schiavo has a right to live, and we have a responsibility to help her. With such complex ethical questions that fall between interpreting the law and saving an innocent human life, we must always err on the side of life.

President Abraham Lincoln said, “I have been driven many times upon my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go.” This week, millions of Americans, many of my colleagues, and I found ourselves in a similar position.

Through this action, Congress is not only saving the life of Terri Schiavo, we are making a statement about the country we live in and the culture of life which we seek.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support of House leadership for working on our behalf to give Terri Schiavo her day in Federal court.

From our founding days, the Federal system we enjoy has reserved significant authority to the States to settle disputes. However, Federal courts have always been able to review possible violations of a citizen’s constitutional rights. The narrowly drawn language of S. 686 merely gives a Federal court the chance to review the unique circumstances of the Schiavo case in accordance with her Fourteenth Amendment guarantee: That no State shall deprive her of life without due process of law. In seeking this Federal review, Congress ensures that the basic protections available to all citizens are available to Terri Schiavo as well.

No federally guaranteed right is more sacred than this right to life. I applaud the authors of this legislation for crafting language allowing for a more thorough examination of Terri Schiavo’s rights under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, it was with heavy hearts and steady resolve that we came to the House chamber on Palm Sunday to pass S. 686, a carefully crafted bill with a singular purpose: To ensure that Terri Schiavo enjoys the same due process under the Constitution as any other citizen, and to guarantee that her right to life is fully protected.

This is an extraordinary situation, one that requires an extraordinary response. This is a life or death situation for this young woman. Terri’s parents should have the chance to have her case heard by a Federal judge, and now they will. If we make an error, we should err on the side of life.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, as someone who respects human life in all its stages, I wholeheartedly support S. 686 and efforts to save Terri Schiavo.

Terri is not in a coma, nor are extraordinary measures being taken to keep her alive. Terri may need feeding tubes to help her eat, but that doesn’t mean she doesn’t deserve the

constitutional protections afforded by our judicial system. That Terri’s life could be taken without such consideration is shocking to the conscience and contrary to notions of the rule of law and due process.

It is imperative that Congress act swiftly to enact this bipartisan legislation, without which Terri Schiavo would most certainly die without the legal redress she so rightfully deserves.

With that, I urge my colleagues to pass S. 686 and give Terri Schiavo and her family their day in Federal court.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S. 686, Relief for the Parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo.

I am very disturbed that this tragedy is being used for what seem to be political purposes.

I am concerned because this bill would set a dangerous precedent in dealing with a very serious and personal issue. This bill is an intrusion into a family’s medical decision and Congress should not play a role in a private family matter when it is being dealt with in the State courts.

As Congress, we should respect the sanctity of the judiciary and not use legislative powers to overturn court decisions when we disagree with such decisions.

I wish for Terri, her husband and family peace.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, my remarks today are to commend the United States House of Representatives for taking such swift and just action during the early hours of Monday, March 21st when this body passed S. 626 for the relief of the parents of Terri Schiavo. This bill will transfer the case regarding Terri Schiavo’s life to the review of a Federal court. Doing so staved off efforts to permanently remove Terri’s feeding tube, which would have slowly killed her by means of starvation and dehydration. Ms. Schiavo is neither brain-dead nor dependent on artificial life support; she simply needs a feeding tube to eat as do many incapacitated people.

As a cosponsor of the original House bill to save Ms. Schiavo’s life and a strong supporter of the Senate measure, I regret that I, along with numerous other members of Congress, was unable to return to Washington, D.C. in time to participate, due to the sudden and unexpected nature of the debate and vote. I am, however, committed to continuing my support of efforts aimed at saving Ms. Schiavo’s life.

While the case regarding Terri Schiavo is unique and tragic in many ways, it would be a much greater tragedy for those in power to do nothing to save an innocent woman from a slow, agonizing death. I am grateful that our efforts in Congress have assisted in staving off injustice and I am hopeful that new techniques and therapies may be applied to Terri for her benefit so that she may live out her life in the most productive and peaceful manner possible.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Congress typically writes laws with a broad application, but sometimes a special situation, such as this one, requires unusual legislative action. Life is sacred. Many across America have voiced support in an effort to keep Terri Schiavo alive. Nothing can diminish the importance of life.

Terri Schiavo suffered a heart attack 15 years ago and experienced brain damage. While in the hospital, tubes were inserted in her digestive system to provide nutrition and

hydration. Three years later, Terri was still talking when speech therapy was discontinued. Terri Schiavo is currently not terminally ill or in the process of dying. She is brain damaged, but she is otherwise healthy. Terri Schiavo is not on artificial life support. No extraordinary measures are being taken to keep her alive.

Ms. Schiavo is a living person. She is awake and aware of her surroundings. Many are galvanized by her cause because like me, they recognize that the right to life is one of our core fundamental human values.

The 14th Amendment states, "No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." In this special circumstance, we were left with a last legal recourse to help save her life by providing her with the opportunity to have her case heard before a Federal court. There is clear precedent for Federal review of life and death cases.

I strongly value the importance of States' rights. This case does not weaken my resolve to fight for States' rights. The State and Federal government should not take life, but by giving the Federal court an opportunity to hear the case, this allows one more opportunity for Terri Schiavo to live.

Judge Greer of the Pinellas-Pasco Circuit Court stated, "I see no cogent reason why the committee should be able to intervene into a case involving the decision of whether or not to remain on life support." He added, "I don't think that legislative agencies or bodies have business in court proceedings."

I respectfully disagree. The Constitution not only outlines a separation of powers but also a system of checks and balances. It is Congress's duty to hold the judicial branch accountable or to act itself within its powers when it believes it is necessary.

The driving force behind many people's efforts on behalf of Ms. Schiavo was plainly to save her life. Yet there have emerged a number of difficult and complicated issues. I applaud the efforts of those who fight for Ms. Schiavo to live. These issues resonate with many as some of us contemplate how we would like to die. I, however, focus on how Congress can protect Ms. Schiavo's life because that is of paramount importance.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides a clear lesson for the American public about how Congress and American politics operate today.

Make no mistake, this is not about what Terri Schiavo wants. It is clear from testimony of the family members who are fighting against Terri's husband that they would want the feeding tube reinserted no matter what Terri wants. TOM DELAY says he doesn't care what her husband wants. This is all about people who have chosen to use this poor woman as a political football. This legislative spectacle was an artful attempt to divert the public's attention.

But in your mind's eye, the face in the picture that you should be thinking about is not Terri Schiavo's: You should be worried about the face of you or your loved one in the middle of a media circus, or worse, denied the right to control your own fate.

This is not a narrow, specific bill about a single case. Their true intentions were revealed by H.R. 1332, the bill that TOM DELAY had the House pass last Wednesday. I led the debate against H.R. 1332 because it would

have effectively overruled Oregon's Death with Dignity Act with language so broad and sweeping that it would call into question every living will and end of life directive. Anybody who wanted to force the issue, whether business partner, estranged family member, or friend could drag your loved ones into Federal court.

Make no mistake, the goal is to take away your choice in making end of life decisions, just as their agenda is to control your choices at the beginning of life, whether regarding contraception or a woman's right to choose.

The Schiavo case has received unbelievable attention and scrutiny by politicians and judges at every level in the State of Florida. For years, the battle has raged in a State that is controlled by Republicans and is governed by the President's brother. This is not about due process and letting the system work. Rather it is about some zealots who do not agree with the verdicts of the courts and the professional opinions of medical experts.

The hypocrisy of TOM DELAY and the Republican leadership in Congress is breathtaking. The only time they trust the Federal courts is when they are using them as a political tactic. This fall they passed in the House of Representatives, bills that declared the Federal courts incompetent to rule on cases involving the pledge of allegiance and same-sex marriage.

In a statement released early this morning, President Bush said he will "continue to stand on the side of those defending life for all Americans." But the facts make it hard to believe that the President is standing on principle. In 1999, then Governor Bush signed a law that "allows hospitals to discontinue life sustaining care, even if patient family members disagree." Just days ago the law permitted Texas Children's Hospital to remove the breathing tube from a 6-month-old boy named Sun Hudson. The law may soon be used to remove life support from Spiro Nikolouzos, a 68-year-old man. The President has not commented on either case.

Because of this media circus, attention is being diverted away from the seniors that will suffer and die in this country as a result of the Republican leadership's budget proposal to shortchange Medicaid. The very financial sources that have kept Terri alive for 15 years, Medicaid and her malpractice settlement, are under attack by the President and TOM DELAY. For the time being, Republican leaders are succeeding in their effort to change the subject, and obscure this fact.

While Congress's involvement is another sad chapter in the fight against Terri's wishes, I'm glad that we forced them to narrow the reach of this bill, at least for the time being. It is still an unfortunate precedent of inappropriate Congressional intervention into a personal family matter.

In the final analysis, I'm pleased that the public was able to see what the stakes are and what some politicians and zealots are willing to do. Ultimately, it is this public awareness that will defeat efforts to take away the choice for each of us and of our families to control our own destinies.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, as members of Congress, we have a moral obligation to protect innocent life and not stand idly by while an activist judge seeks to use extreme measures to destroy the life of an innocent woman. By transferring this matter to a Federal court

we will ensure Terri is given every possible protection by allowing a Federal judge to see whether her constitutional rights have been violated.

Life is precious and I will always work to see that it is protected. With so much controversy surrounding Terri's final wishes and current physical condition, I believe it is imperative that a Federal court take a fresh look at this case.

I commend my colleagues from both the House and Senate for working around the clock to determine a legislative solution to ensure that Terri's life and her constitutional rights are protected.

Thomas Jefferson once wrote that, "[t]he care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government. I think Jefferson was right. I welcome this opportunity to join my colleagues in this effort to help defend and protect innocent human life.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we have just set a frightening precedent in the halls of Congress by interfering in the life of an individual. Yet we show little compassion for the scores of families who do not have the financial means or insurance to cover the expenses of individuals on life support or individuals who are sick in general.

There are 10,000 individuals on life-support throughout the country. The White House and Congress should find better ways to take care of all of these individuals and individuals who are in dire need of proper healthcare.

If we continue on this path, the President of the United States should be made guardian of all people on life support. Then perhaps we can find an amicable solution to the sadness that is the state of healthcare for Americans.

What are our priorities? If we care about saving lives, we should address the problem of 40 million Americans who do not have health care insurance. Eleven million children do not have basic health insurance. New York State ranked 33rd out of 50 states in quality of hospital care. And, 57,000 Americans die needlessly each year because the health care system failed to provide adequate care.

Congress must stand up and do what the voters elected them to do—focus on the critical issues facing everyone in this country.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I regret that Congress is being called in to this special session while official business requires me to be elsewhere at this time. However, I wish to insert these remarks for the RECORD in order to make public my views and position on the legislation before this body tonight, S. 686, that will provide for the Relief of the Parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo.

We are playing a dangerous game here as we try to act as Solomons when the nine Solomons of the U.S. Supreme Court have refused to review the case involving Ms. Schiavo. The arguments we have heard tonight both "pro" and "con" give testimony to the difficulty of the decision before us this evening, but it is a decision we should not be making. Issues of life and death should be determined personally, medically, legally, spiritually, morally—but not politically. Congress, the political body that it is, should not be involved in this sad debate tonight, and I strongly believe we will ultimately regret the precedent we are setting by our intrusion into this affair.

My heart goes out to the Schindlers this evening, and I share with them their concern

and love for their daughter. Nonetheless, I do not think we have all the information we need to act wisely in this matter.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Leadership in the House and Senate for working together for a rapid compromise on legislation to allow for the relief of the parents of Terri Schiavo, and I rise today to support the bill.

Terri Schiavo's struggle to live has been emotionally trying for anyone who has followed the case, let alone the incomprehensible emotions being faced by her family and caretakers who are directly involved. I, presumably like most Members of Congress, hoped to see the issue of Terri Schiavo resolved without Congressional intervention. While I do not feel it is the role of Congress to make medical decisions in the case of Terri Schiavo, I do feel it is our role to ensure her parents' opportunity to fight for their own daughter's life before a Federal court. Moreover, I feel whenever there is doubt and question and disagreement as to what a person in Terri's condition would want for herself, government must always protect one's right to live.

I continue to pray for Ms. Schiavo and her family, and for the strength they need to endure this emotional trauma. Every life is worthy of protection, and given the circumstances surrounding this case, I support the efforts being taken to save her life.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1311. A letter from the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Stamp Program: High Performance Bonuses (RIN: 0584-AD29) received February 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1312. A letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Establishment of Minimum Size and Maturity Requirements for Lightly Colored Sweet Cherries Varieties [Docket No. FV04-923-1 FR] received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1313. A letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2004-2005 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV04-985-2 IFR-A] received March 4,

2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1314. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Addition of Slovakia to the List of Countries Eligible To Export Meat Products to the United States [Docket No. 99-018F] received March 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1315. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy; Minimal-Risk Regions and Importation of Commodities; Partial Delay of Applicability [Docket No. 03-080-6] (RIN: 0579-AB73) received March 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1316. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Morehead City Harbor Channel, Morehead City, NC [CGD05-04-180] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1317. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Martin Lagoon, Middle River, MD [CGD05-04-183] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1318. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Regulated Navigation Areas, Security Zones, and Temporary Anchorage Areas; St. Johns River, Jacksonville, FL [CGD07-04-090] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1319. A letter from the Attorney, RSPA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazardous Materials: Availability of Information for Hazardous Materials Transported by Aircraft. [Docket No. RSPA-00-7762 (HM-206C)] (RIN: 2137-AD29) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1320. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standards for Development and Use of Processor-Based Signal and Train Control Systems [Docket No. FRA-2001-10160] (RIN: 2130-AA94) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Filed on Mar. 21 (Legislative day of Mar. 20), 2005]

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 181. A resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 109-27). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 182. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 686) for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo (Rept. 109-28). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1452. A bill for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTOS:

H.R. 1453. A bill to strengthen United States relations with Libya, to facilitate the integration of Libya into the international community, and to encourage positive change in Libyan society, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1454. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the credit for increasing research activities permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KLINE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. ROHR-ABACHER.

H.R. 21: Mr. FILNER and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 567: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1001: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 1417: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 1424: Mr. LANTOS.

H. Res. 108: Mr. COX.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, SUNDAY, MARCH 20, 2005

No. 35—Book II

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MEL MARTINEZ, a Senator from the State of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be led by the guest Chaplain, the Reverend John Boyles, National Capital Presbytery, and former pastor of Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

O God of all that is, or is to be: take, we pray, Your power and reign, in majesty and wisdom, here in this Chamber, on this day which You have made, reigning in this body assembled here, that all here today would follow in their own faith a path of righteousness and justice, finding in conscience a concord and peace which passes our human understanding but rests in Your glory, laud and honor, O great Creator and Lord of all generations; may Your work and will be done on Earth today, we pray Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MEL MARTINEZ 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2005.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable MEL MARTINEZ, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair.

TED STEVENS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARTINEZ thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

TERRI SCHIAVO

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the Congress is continuing to work to pass legislation to give Terri Schiavo another chance at life. Let me update all of our colleagues on where we are right now.

On Saturday, yesterday, we reached a bipartisan, bicameral agreement on a legislative solution. At that point, we initiated a procedural process to act on the bill, a process which brought both the House of Representatives and the Senate back today to complete action on this critically important matter.

Shortly, we will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair. This action will allow the Senate to come back into session at a moment's notice to consider the legislation. The Senate will remain here throughout the afternoon and, if necessary, late into the evening in order to act immediately on this bill once it is ready.

Because Terri Schiavo is being denied lifesaving nutrition this very moment, time is of the essence.

Let me summarize again for everyone what the agreed-upon legislation does. Under this bill, Terri Schiavo will have another chance. She will have another opportunity to live. The bill allows Terri's case to be heard in Federal court. More specifically, it allows a Federal district judge to consider a claim on behalf of Terri Schiavo for al-

leged violations of constitutional rights or Federal laws relating to the withholding of food, water, or medical treatment necessary to sustain her life.

I am heartened by the way Congress is uniting in a bipartisan, bicameral way in this unique situation. Now is the time for us to act. Terri deserves it. I remain committed as leader to pass legislation to give Terri Schiavo one more chance at life.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:05 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 4:30 p.m. when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

THERESA MARIE SCHIAVO

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 686 introduced earlier today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
A bill (S. 686) for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

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

JUDICIAL DISCRETION UNDER THE SCHIAVO RELIEF BILL

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise to seek clarification from the majority leader about one aspect of this bill, the issue of whether Congress has mandated that a Federal court issue a stay pending determination of the case.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3099

Mr. FRIST. I would be pleased to help clarify this issue.

Mr. LEVIN. Section 5 of the original version of the Martinez bill conferred jurisdiction on a Federal court to hear a case like this, and then stated that the Federal court "shall" issue a stay of State court proceedings pending determination of the Federal case. I was opposed to that provision because I believe Congress should not mandate that a Federal judge issue a stay. Under longstanding law and practice, the decision to issue a stay is a matter of discretion for the Federal judge based on the facts of the case. The majority leader and the other bill sponsors accepted my suggestion that the word "shall" in section 5 be changed to "may."

The version of the bill we are now considering strikes section 5 altogether. Although nothing in the text of the new bill mandates a stay, the omission of this section, which in the earlier Senate-passed bill made a stay permissive, might be read to mean that Congress intends to mandate a stay. I believe that reading is incorrect. The absence of any state provision in the new bill simply means that Congress relies on current law. Under current law, a judge may decide whether or not a stay is appropriate.

Does the majority leader share my understanding of the bill?

Mr. FRIST. I share the understanding of the Senator from Michigan, as does the junior Senator from Florida who is the chief sponsor of this bill. Nothing in the current bill or its legislative history mandates a stay. I would assume, however, the Federal court would grant a stay based on the facts of this case because Mrs. Schiavo would need to be alive in order for the court to make its determination. Nevertheless, this bill does not change current law under which a stay is discretionary.

Mr. LEVIN. In light of that assurance, I do not object to the unanimous consent agreement under which the bill will be considered by the Senate. I do not make the same assumption as the majority leader makes about what a Federal court will do. Because the discretion of the Federal court is left unrestricted in this bill, I will not exercise my right to block its consideration.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the tenth amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

This is a principle of Federalism which, I believe, is not being followed by Congress in enacting this legislation.

That the misfortunes of life vested upon Theresa Marie Schiavo are a human tragedy, no one can deny. I said my prayers, as did many Americans, as we attended religious services this Palm Sunday.

I believe it unwise for the Congress to take from the State of Florida its constitutional responsibility to resolve the issues in this case.

The Florida State court system has adjudicated the issues to date. This bill, in effect, challenges the integrity and capabilities of the State courts in Florida.

That the Federal system of courts can move properly and fairly adjudicate the equities among the diverse parties in this particular case is a conclusion with which I cannot agree.

Greater wisdom is not always reposed in the branches of the Federal Government.

Apart from constitutional issues, I am concerned for the institution of the Senate, a body in which I have been privileged to serve for over a quarter of a century.

I view service in the Senate as that of a trustee—preserve this venerable body, its traditions and time-tested precedents, for future generations. It is one of a kind in their troubled world.

The drafters of this bill endeavored to write in provisions to prevent this unique law—a private relief bill is the term used in our procedures—from becoming a "precedent for future legislation" (section 7).

I do not believe the legislation can, or will, block further petitions from our citizens. Who can say there are not other tragic situations across our land today; who can predict what the future may inflict by way of personal hardship upon our citizens?

I fear the door has opened and Congress, which by constitutional mandate is entrusted to pass laws for the Nation, will again and again be petitioned to deal with personal situations which are the responsibility of the several States.

I respect the views of those who drafted and moved this bill swiftly, with limited debate, through the Senate. I value the sanctity of life no less fervently than they, for I had the great fortune of being the son of a doctor who devoted his entire life to healing and caring for the sick and injured. My father's principles have been my compass for my life.

It is not easy to be in opposition to this legislation, but I have a duty to state my views in keeping with my oath to support the Constitution as I interpret it.

IN DEFENSE OF SENATE TRADITION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, opponents of free speech and debate claim that, during my tenure as majority leader in the United States Senate, I established precedents that now justify a proposal for a misguided attempt to end debate on a judicial nomination by a simple majority vote, rather than by a three-fifths vote of all Senators duly chosen and sworn as required by paragraph two of Senate rule XXII. Their claims are false.

Proponents of the so-called nuclear option cite several instances in which they inaccurately allege that I "blazed a procedural path" toward an inappropriate change in Senate rules. They are dead wrong. Dead wrong. They draw analogies where none exist and create cock-eyed comparisons that fail to withstand even the slightest intellectual scrutiny.

Simply put, no action of mine ever denied a minority of the Senate a right to full debate on the final disposition of a measure or matter pending before the Senate. Not in 1977, not in 1979, not in 1980, or in 1987—the dates cited by critics as grounds for the nuclear op-

tion. The Congressional Research Service confirms that only six amendments have been adopted since the cloture rule was enacted in 1917, and "each of these changes was made within the framework of the existing or 'entrenched' rules of the Senate, including rule XXII."

In none of the instances cited by those who threaten to invoke the nuclear option did my participation in any action deny the minority in the Senate, regardless of party, its right to debate the real matter at hand.

Let us examine each of these so-called precedents in greater detail.

October 3, 1977—Enforcing Senate Rule XXII Against Improper Post-Cloture Delay: In 1977, the Senate invoked cloture on S. 2104, described as "a bill to establish a comprehensive natural gas policy." Shortly thereafter, two Senators began a postcloture "filibuster by amendment," after a supermajority of the Senate had already chosen to invoke cloture (under the Senate rules) and had made clear its desire to bring debate on the bill to close. Though the Senate had voted to invoke cloture by an overwhelming vote of 77 to 17, two Senators nonetheless continued to offer amendments, to request quorum calls, and to offer amendments to amendments to preserve and extend time on the bill post-cloture. Their efforts, as confirmed by the Chair, ran directly contrary to the purpose of rule XXII, which is to limit debate.

The tactics employed were sufficiently egregious that the Senate spent 13 days and 1 night debating the bill, which included 121 rollcalls and 34 live quorums. Cloture having been invoked by an overwhelming vote, I then made the point of order that:

when the Senate is operating under cloture, the Chair is required to take the initiative under rule XXII to rule out of order all amendments which are dilatory or which on their face are out of order.

Critics have alleged that my actions in this instance "cut off debate" and somehow constitute a precedent for ending a filibuster of a judicial nominee by 51 votes before cloture has been invoked. But that argument is erroneous.

The Senate was operating postcloture. The Senate had voted 77 to 17 to end debate. I didn't do that; the Senate took that action.

If anything, my actions clarified that rule XXII means what it says. The text of rule XXII provides explicitly that, once cloture is invoked, "no dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order." Therefore, once Members have voted to invoke cloture, dilatory amendments or actions are simply out of order. Senators still retain their hour of postcloture debate. Senators still have the right of appeal.

Some have falsely alleged that I even acted to impede debate on that appeal,

but they are mistaken yet again: Under the provisions of rule XXII, appeals from rulings of the Chair were not and are not debatable postcloture.

Nothing that was done in 1977 changed rule XXII or sent a shock wave through the Senate. Nothing that was done restricted the right of Senators to wage a filibuster against a nominee or legislation before cloture is invoked. No action taken affected the fundamental right of Senators to debate the natural gas deregulation bill; they had already debated the bill and, of their own volition, had decided to end their debate by an overwhelming vote. Instead, I sought to end dilatory tactics postcloture, when such tactics were, and remain today, prohibited by the plain text of paragraph two of rule XXII. I simply sought a ruling from the Chair to enforce Senate rule XXII.

In fact, when, in 1977, my point of order was sustained, the Chair in so doing noted that the point of order was consistent with the purpose of rule XXII, which "is to require action by the Senate on a pending measure following cloture within a period of reasonable dispatch." When the Chair's ruling in support of my point of order was thereafter appealed, that appeal was tabled in the Senate by another overwhelming vote of 79 to 14.

No Member of the minority in the Senate lost his right to debate the natural gas deregulation bill. Their ability to debate the bill was not tampered with or impeded in any way. Each Senator retained the right to debate, under the Senate rules, the bill both precloture and in the hour that was provided to each Senator under rule XXII postcloture.

Thus, contrary to current assertions, in 1977, a strong, bipartisan, supermajority of the Senate, supported by, among others, Minority Leader Howard Baker and myself, endorsed this necessary effort to halt postcloture dilatory tactics consistent with Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate. That is completely unlike the so-called nuclear option that is currently being discussed by some in the Senate. I sought to enforce rule XXII; not to destroy it.

January 15, 1979—Enforcing Rule XXII Against Improper Post-Cloture Delay: At the beginning of the new Congress in 1979, I, as Senate majority leader, introduced a resolution to make various changes to Senate rule XXII, the bulk of which addressed circumstances postcloture. Recently, on March 10, 2005, a Senator spoke on the Senate floor and stated that this resolution serves as a precedent for the nuclear option. However, my resolution served to enforce rule XXII, not to destroy it. My introduction of S. Res. 9 was influenced by the postcloture dilatory tactics that were suffered by the Senate during its consideration of the natural gas deregulation bill during the preceding Congress.

My efforts in that regard were supported, on a bipartisan basis, by Minority Leader Howard Baker who stated in

response to my introduction of S. Res. 9:

I point out, as I am sure most of our colleagues are aware and will recall, that in the case of the most recent post-cloture filibuster, it was the majority leader and the minority leader, with the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Vice President, in the chair at the time, who managed to establish a line and series of precedents that created the possibility to at least accelerate the disposition of the controversy and conflict.

The point of the matter is that this is not, nor has it been, a matter that is purely partisan in its character. . . .

He added:

I share with the majority leader the belief that the post-cloture filibuster, a creature of fairly young age and recent development, is one that the Senate has not focused on adequately. I am prepared to do that and I want to do that.

As the minority leader in the Senate recognized at the time, the text of rule XXII provides explicitly that, once cloture is invoked, "no dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order." Therefore, once Members vote to invoke cloture, dilatory amendments or actions are impermissible. No proposal of mine in 1979 restricted the right of Senators to filibuster a nominee or a piece of legislation prior to the invocation of cloture, consistent with Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate. And the position I took at the time enjoyed support on both sides of the aisle.

November 9, 1979—Strengthening Rule XVI Against Legislation on Appropriations Bills: Opponents of free speech and debate in the Senate cite a third event as a supposed basis for their proposed "nuclear option." In November 1979, during consideration of a Department of Defense Appropriations bill, Senator Stennis raised a point of order that an amendment to change the rate of pay for military personnel, which had been offered by Senator Armstrong, constituted legislation on an appropriations bill and was therefore out of order under the express terms of Senate rule XVI. Legislative amendments to appropriations bills violate Senate rule XVI. However, by precedent, the "defense of germaneness" arose. According to this practice, which evolved outside the text of rule XVI, if the House has acted first to "open the door" to legislate on an appropriations measure, a Senator could respond with a legislative amendment, provided that it is germane to some House legislative language. If a point of order were made that an amendment constituted legislation, a ruling by the Chair on that question would be preempted by a vote on the germaneness of the amendment to the House language. This practice was justified only if the House had included legislative language in its bill. But this practice made a mockery of the rule if the House had not included any legislative language.

When Senator Stennis raised the point of order that the Armstrong amendment constituted legislation on an appropriations bill, Senator Arm-

strong asserted the defense of germaneness, meaning that his amendment was germane because it was relevant to the House bill. At that point, I made the following point of order:

I make the point of order that this is a misuse of the precedents of the Senate, since there is no House language to which this amendment could be germane and that, therefore, the Chair is required to rule on the point of order as to its being legislation on an appropriation bill and cannot submit this question of germaneness to the Senate.

I was concerned that, as a threshold matter, the amendment should not be considered because there was no House language to which the proposed amendment could possibly be germane. The Chair noted that while this was a case of first impression, my point was "well taken," and he sustained my point of order. Senator Armstrong then appealed the ruling of the Chair, and I moved to table that appeal. My motion was adopted by the Senate.

Critics claim that my actions in this instance were contrary to the plain language of rule XVI, because rule XVI at paragraph four states, "all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate." But their assertion that I acted in a manner contrary to rule XVI is false.

My point of order went not to the issue of legislating on an appropriations bill, but to a different issue: The concept of "defense of germaneness." Nowhere in rule XVI is there a reference to the concept of "defense of germaneness." The source and subsequent application of defense of germaneness and its threshold test is not rooted in any Senate rule. Instead, it dates back to a precedent, which is identified by Riddick's Senate Procedure as a "theory," which was "enunciated" by Vice President Marshall in 1916, that, "Notwithstanding the rule of the Senate . . . when the House of Representatives opens the door and proceeds to enter upon a field of general legislation . . . the Chair is going to rule, but of course the Senate can reverse the ruling of the Chair, that the House having opened the door the Senate of the United States can walk through the door and pursue the field."

Second, my efforts were to avoid the misuse of precedent and thereby enforce the express provisions of Senate rule XVI, which prohibits legislation on an appropriations bill. It is only by precedent that germaneness justified a legislative amendment on an appropriations bill, and only if the House opened the door. My goal was to preserve proper precedent and strengthen rule XVI; not to weaken it, as the nuclear option would do to rule XXII. My actions did not establish any precedent to destroy the right of extended debate in the Senate. In fact, the Senate's action affected only the ability to offer certain amendments to particular legislation, and, even then, the Senate minority's rights to appeal a ruling of the Chair were fully preserved.

March 5, 1980—Enhancing the Right of Debate of Nominations on the Executive Calendar: Critics of extended debate also reference a motion I made in 1980 to proceed directly to a nomination on the Executive Calendar. They claim that this created a precedent making a motion to proceed to any nomination on the Executive Calendar nondebatable. It did no such thing.

At the time, a nondebatable motion to go into executive session automatically put the Senate on the first treaty on the Executive Calendar. This meant that moving to the Executive Calendar required consideration of treaties before nominations, simply because the Senate's Executive Calendar prints both treaties and nominations in the order in which they are reported out of their respective committees of jurisdiction, and treaties are then printed in the first section of the Calendar.

But the placement of treaties and nominations on the Senate Calendar was not and is not based on any great precedent or legal requirement that would elevate treaties to a position of prominence greater than nominations. Instead, the placement of treaties and nominations on the Senate Executive Calendar is simply the result of a clerical printing convention. There has never been a logical reason for the Senate to distinguish between a motion to proceed to a nomination and a motion to proceed to the first treaty. Because there is no substantive reason that the Senate should have to go to treaties before being able to consider a nomination, it seemed logical that the Senate should be able to proceed directly to a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

My motion to proceed directly to the first nomination, rather than a treaty, did not inhibit or frustrate Senate debate in any way. The Chair explicitly confirmed that it did not contravene any precedent or Standing Rule of the Senate. Moreover, it also did not restrict the ability of the Senate to filibuster the nomination itself. In fact, disposition of the nomination remained, as it is today, fully debatable in several respects. A nomination remains fully debatable when it comes before the Senate, and motions to proceed from one nomination to another are also fully debatable when the Senate is in executive session.

May 13, 1987—Enforcing Rule IV Against Improper Debate of a Motion To Approve the Journal: In 1987, a Republican minority led a filibuster seeking to prevent the Senate from considering a defense authorization bill. Prior to moving to the bill, I sought unanimous consent that the Journal of the preceding day "be approved to date," a routine request in the course of Senate business. The Journal is the official record of the proceedings of the Senate, and under Senate rule IV, the Journal of the preceding day must be read following the prayer by the Chaplain unless, by nondebatable motion, the reading of the Journal is waived.

In this instance, Senator Dole objected to my request that the Journal

be approved by unanimous consent, and the question of whether the Journal should be approved was put to a vote. Under Senate rule XII, if a Senator declines to vote during a rollcall, he or she must, at the time his or her name is called, give a reason for not voting. In an unusual occurrence, Senator Warner advised the Chair that he "decline[d] to vote for the reason that I have not read the Journal." Rule XII requires that if a Senator declines to vote, the Presiding Officer must put a nondebatable question to the Senate on whether it is "permissible for the Senator to decline his right to vote on the issue."

The Chair called for the vote to determine whether Senator Warner should be excused from voting on the Journal. However, before that vote was completed, Senator Dan Quayle stated that he, too, declined to vote, because he said, "I do not believe a Senator should be compelled to vote." The Chair asked the clerk to call the roll on whether to excuse Senator Quayle from voting, when Senator Symms stated that he, too, declined to vote for the same reason. At this point, there were four Senate votes pending, if additional Senators in the Chamber similarly chose to decline to vote, seriatim, the process could have continued forever.

Recognizing that, just a bit over a year previously, the Senate had deliberately amended rule IV to make the motion to approve the Journal a nondebatable motion, I made a point of order that the requests of the Senators to decline to vote were not in order. I stated:

that in amending rule IV, the Senate intended that a majority of the Senate could resolve the question of the reading of the Journal. I make my point of order that a request of a Senator to be excused from voting on a motion to approve the Journal is, therefore, out of order and that the Chair proceed immediately, without further delay, to announce the vote on the motion to approve the Journal.

Through a series of subsequent motions and votes, I prevailed in rectifying what I observed at the time was an extraordinary situation illustrated by a series of, in essence, "votes within a vote."

Contrary to erroneous allegations by some, my actions in this regard did not set a precedent that "changed Senate procedure to run contrary to the plain text of a Standing Senate Rule." In fact, the action I took achieved exactly the opposite result: It ensured that Senate procedure would conform more closely to both the intent and the plain text of Senate rule IV.

At the time, one Senator mistakenly stated that the Chair could not entertain a unanimous consent request to suspend the application of rule XII in this instance. But that is an incorrect understanding by a Senator who was referring to rule XII, paragraph 1—where Senators cannot seek to be added to a vote that they missed, and the Chair may not do it or entertain a

request to do so, a rule that was not in question and has always been strictly enforced by the Chair—not rule XII, paragraph 2, which was in dispute at the time.

Again, the actions I took were to enforce both rules IV and XII. Should I, instead, have endorsed a procedure whereby one Senator after another could simply decline to vote and put each Senator's reasons for declining to vote to another vote? Should Senators have been permitted, one after another, to decline to vote, then force a vote on each one's reason for not voting, on what is a nondebatable question in a nondebatable posture? Had I not raised a point of order against this abusive practice, it could have been used in innumerable future circumstances, and the Senate would not be able to complete a vote on any measure or matter, ever. It would, again, have made a mockery of the Senate's rules. Keep in mind that, if the tactic were ever legitimized, it could be employed to prevent a judicial nominee from ever receiving a vote.

It should be further noted that the point of order I made applies only to proceedings on motions to approve the Journal. Both the Presiding Officer and I confirmed this specifically in response to a question from Senator Alan Simpson. As I then stated:

where Senators decline to vote on other rollcall votes in other situations—this point of order does not go to those. This point of order only goes to the unusual situation, the extraordinary circumstances, in which the Senate found itself today, when it was trying to act on a motion to approve the Journal to date, and when three Senators in succession stood to say, "Mr. President, I decline to vote on this rollcall for the following reasons."

Elsewhere, I also expressly stated that, "for the legislative history," the precedential value of my point of order was "confined only to that situation in which the Senate is trying to complete a vote on a motion to approve the Journal to date . . . It is confined to that very narrow purpose."

The Senate's decision on that day was fully consistent with the text of rules IV and XII, which provides expressly that the question of whether a Senator could decline to vote, "shall be decided without debate." The decision, once again, further enforced the existing rules of the Senate. This stands in stark contrast to the proposed nuclear option, which would contravene, by a simple majority vote, the express text of rule XXII, which applies to "any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate," and which requires an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn.

Let me state, once again, that no action of mine cited by the proponents of the nuclear options has ever denied a minority in the Senate its right to full debate on the final disposition of a measure or matter pending before the Senate.

The steps discussed here have all gone toward strengthening or enforcing

Senate rules, or clarifying the application of Senate precedents—not undermining them. The Senate has been the last fortress of minority rights and freedom of speech in this Republic for more than two centuries. I pray that Senators will pause and reflect before ignoring that history and tradition in favor of the political priority of the movement.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to a vote on passage.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 686) was passed, as follows:

S. 686

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

SECTION 1. RELIEF OF THE PARENTS OF THERESA MARIE SCHIAVO.

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida shall have jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on a suit or claim by or on behalf of Theresa Marie Schiavo for the alleged violation of any right of Theresa Marie Schiavo under the Constitution or laws of the United States relating to the withholding or withdrawal of food, fluids, or medical treatment necessary to sustain her life.

SEC. 2. PROCEDURE.

Any parent of Theresa Marie Schiavo shall have standing to bring a suit under this Act. The suit may be brought against any other person who was a party to State court proceedings relating to the withholding or withdrawal of food, fluids, or medical treatment necessary to sustain the life of Theresa Marie Schiavo, or who may act pursuant to a State court order authorizing or directing the withholding or withdrawal of food, fluids, or medical treatment necessary to sustain her life. In such a suit, the District Court shall determine de novo any claim of a violation of any right of Theresa Marie Schiavo within the scope of this Act, notwithstanding any prior State court determination and regardless of whether such a claim has previously been raised, considered, or decided in State court proceedings. The District Court shall entertain and determine the suit without any delay or abstention in favor of State court proceedings, and regardless of whether remedies available in the State courts have been exhausted.

SEC. 3. RELIEF.

After a determination of the merits of a suit brought under this Act, the District Court shall issue such declaratory and injunctive relief as may be necessary to protect the rights of Theresa Marie Schiavo under the Constitution and laws of the United States relating to the withholding or withdrawal of food, fluids, or medical treatment necessary to sustain her life.

SEC. 4. TIME FOR FILING.

Notwithstanding any other time limitation, any suit or claim under this Act shall be timely if filed within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. NO CHANGE OF SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to create substantive rights not otherwise secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States or of the several States.

SEC. 6. NO EFFECT ON ASSISTING SUICIDE.

Nothing in this act shall be construed to confer additional jurisdiction on any court to consider any claim related—

- (1) to assisting suicide, or
- (2) a State law regarding assisting suicide.

SEC. 7. NO PRECEDENT FOR FUTURE LEGISLATION.

Nothing in this Act shall constitute a precedent with respect to future legislation, including the provision of private relief bills.

SEC. 8. NO EFFECT ON THE PATIENT SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 1990.

Nothing in this Act shall affect the rights of any person under the Patient Self-Determination Act of 1990.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.

It is the Sense of the Congress that the 109th Congress should consider policies regarding the status and legal rights of incapacitated individuals who are incapable of making decisions concerning the provision, withholding, or withdrawal of foods, fluid, or medical care.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the bill we just passed that will give Terri Schiavo another chance. The bill we passed this afternoon centers on the sanctity of human life. It is bipartisan; it is bicameral. The House of Representatives is considering the exact same bill today. After the Senate and House pass this legislation, the President will immediately sign it into law.

There has been a lot of discussion about what this bill actually does. Let me point out several things.

Simply put, it allows Terri's case to be held in Federal court. The legislation permits a Federal district judge to consider a claim on behalf of Terri for alleged violations of constitutional rights or Federal laws relating to the withholding of food, water, or medical treatment necessary to sustain life.

The bill guarantees a process to help Terri but does not guarantee a particular outcome. Once a new case is filed, a Federal district judge can issue a stay at any time 24 hours a day. A stay would allow Terri to be fed once again. The judge has discretion on that particular decision. However, I would expect that a Federal judge would grant the stay under these circumstances because Terri would need to live in order for the court to consider the case. If a new suit goes forward, the Federal judge must conduct what is called de novo review of the case. De novo review means the judge must look at the case anew. The judge need not rely on or defer to the decision of previous judges.

The judge also may make new findings of fact, and from a practical standpoint this means that in a new case the judge can reevaluate and reassess Terri's medical condition.

I would like to make a few other points about the bill.

First, it is a unique bill passed under unique circumstances that should not serve as a precedent for future legislation.

Second, this bill would not impede any State's existing laws regarding assisted suicide.

Finally, in this bill Congress acknowledges that we should take a closer look in the future at the legal rights of incapacitated individuals.

While this bill will create a new Federal cause of action, I still encourage the Florida Legislature to act on Terri's behalf. This new Federal law will help Terri, but it should not be her only remaining option.

Remember, Terri is alive. Terri is not in a coma. Although there is a range of opinions, neurologists who have examined her insist today that she is not in a persistent vegetative state. She breathes on her own just like you and me. She is not on a respirator. She is not on life support of any type. She does not have a terminal condition.

Moreover, she has a mom and a dad and siblings, her closest blood relatives, who love her, who say she is responsive to them, who want her to live, and who will financially support her. These are the facts.

We in the Senate recognize that it is extraordinary that we, as a body, act. But these are extraordinary circumstances that center on the most fundamental of human values and virtues—the sanctity of human life.

The level of cooperation and thoughtful consideration surrounding this legislative effort on behalf of my colleagues has truly been remarkable. I thank Senate minority leader HARRY REID for his leadership on this issue. He and I have been in close contact throughout this process. I also thank my Democratic colleagues who expressed their concerns but have allowed us to move forward. In particular, I thank Senators MEL MARTINEZ, RICK SANTORUM, TOM HARKIN, and KENT CONRAD for their dedication in shepherding this legislation. This is bipartisan, bicameral legislation.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 23, the adjournment resolution, which is at the desk. I further ask that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 23

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Sunday, March 20, 2005, through Sunday, April 3, 2005, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, April 4, 2005, or until such other time as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee

in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any day from Sunday, March 20, 2005, through Monday, April 4, 2005, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, April 5, 2005, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Minority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

ORDER FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the Senate's adjournment, the RECORD remain open for statements only on Monday, March 21, from 11 a.m. until 5 p.m.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE PASSING OF PAT OKURA

• Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, on January 30, 2005, America lost a pioneer and leader in civil rights, human rights and mental health. Among his many accomplishments, Mr. K. Patrick Okura served as president of the Japanese American Citizens League, JACL, between 1962 and 1964 and led the JACL into a new era of civil rights activism. Pat was also an active board member of the Asian Pacific American Heritage Council and dedicated himself to nurturing the growth of the Asian Pacific American community. In addition, Pat had a long and distinguished career in mental health and helped found the Asian American Psychological Association.

On February 11, 2005, a memorial service was held for Pat in Bethesda, MD. At this memorial service, an eloquent eulogy was presented by the current president of the JACL, Mr. John Tateishi, highlighting Pat's accomplishments, describing his character, and expressing sadness at his passing.

I feel much the same way as Mr. Tateishi does about Pat's passing. I would like to share his thoughts with you. Today, I ask that a copy of Mr. Tateishi's eulogy for Pat Okura to be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

EULOGY FOR K. PATRICK OKURA

If the true measure of a man is seen in his actions rather than in the words he speaks, then Pat Okura is a giant among us today. He was someone who believed passionately in equality and the rights of individuals, and more importantly, he spent a lifetime fighting for those things he believed in so strongly.

Some 30 years ago, when we were all so much younger, Pat and I talked long into the night at a JACL convention, and it was then that I first got to know something about this remarkable man. He told me about the things that had shaped his life: his days at UCLA, meeting and marrying his lovely wife Lily, those miserable days imprisoned and living as newlyweds in a horse stall at the Santa Anita race track, life at Boys Town in Omaha, and the post-war years. And apart from his life with Lily, he told me the one event that shaped his view of the world more than any other was the injustice of the internment. As a result, he spent the rest of his life fighting against racism and social injustice and always tried to ensure justice in this world, especially for those who were the least able to fight for themselves.

The one thing that is legendary about Pat was his love of mentoring young people. He would always tell the stories of his life, not to talk about himself, but to impart wisdom from those experiences, to use the stories of his life as a way to teach and guide the young people who came to him for his help. He loved to counsel, advise, to mentor the young, and he always, without hesitation, extended a helping hand. There are countless numbers of us who have benefited from his generosity and kindness. That was one of the hallmarks of his life.

In 1962, Pat was elected as the National President of JACL, and during his term of office, he led the JACL into a new era of civil rights. A year after winning election as the organization's president, he convened a meeting of the JACL's National Board in Washington D.C., the first time the Board had ever met anywhere other than at its national headquarters in its 64 year history. He did so to urge the JACL Board to support the now historic March on Washington, led by the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

In order to put that into context, it should be noted that in 1963, the notion of civil rights was not yet part of the popular lexicon of the American vernacular. At that time, it was viewed as a radical movement by upstart blacks and radical students from the north, and the idea of civil rights for non-whites created discomfort in the hearts of many in this country. Certainly, for the JACL, moderate at best, being part of the civil rights movement was a radical idea.

So in 1963, when Pat passionately cajoled the JACL National Board into supporting the march and proudly marched with Dr. King in the Nation's Capitol, he moved the JACL into a new era—from an organization that looked inward to its own community to one that reached out to any individuals or groups in this country victimized by social injustice.

We in the JACL have been fortunate to have known Pat as a friend, a colleague, and a leader. For a brief moment, he was given to us, and we are proud to have had him as one of us to have been a part of his life. He will be sorely missed, and his passing leaves a gaping void that cannot easily be filled. Legends among us are passing, and how do we possibly replace them? The likes of Patrick Okura simply cannot be replaced. He was too remarkable.

Lily, on this day of mourning, we thank you for sharing Pat with us. Our thoughts are with you as we celebrate the incredible life of a wonderful human being and a good friend.●

SENATE PASSAGE OF THE TERRI SCHIAVO BILL

• Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I believe in the dignity and value of life at all stages and I strongly supported the legislation to help Terri Schiavo. Doctors have said that Terri is not in a

persistent vegetative state and there is a lot of evidence that she would improve if she can get the care her family wants to give her.

It is not uncommon in cases where there has been a miscarriage of justice for the Congress to pass private bills. Our actions are consistent with the will of the people of Florida who have been repeatedly frustrated by the State courts. We have a chance to allow this young woman to live under the nurturing of her parents and to improve her condition.

On Sunday, March 20, the Senate passed the Terri Schiavo bill. The House passed the bill early on Monday, March 21, by a vote of 203-58 and President Bush signed the bill into law less than an hour later.

The legislation will allow Federal courts to hear a claim on behalf of Terri Schiavo by her parents, Robert and Mary Schindler, alleging a violation of their daughter's rights under the Constitution or Federal law relating to the withholding or withdrawal of food, fluids, or medical treatment necessary to sustain her life.●

TRIBUTE TO SIDNEY A. GOODMAN

• Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, it broke my heart to miss my good friend Sidney Goodman's birthday today. So I wanted to memorialize this great occasion in a way that would be remembered. As I told Sidney in a letter, if he hadn't made something out of me, I would be there to celebrate with him instead of working here in Washington.

Thomas Jefferson said that, "The test of every generation is giving a better world to its children than it got from its parents." By that standard, Sidney is one of the greatest of the Greatest Generation.

As you well know, it is not the years of life but the life in years that counts. Sidney has lived many years and lived them to the hilt. He has poured so much love and energy into those around him, including me. I hope he can receive all the richly deserved honor bestowed on him on this special day. He is 1 in 5 billion.

Sidney A. Goodman is the quintessential entrepreneur, with heart.

His charisma instantly draws people, and his expectations encourage them to become the very best they can be. His uncanny business sense makes him the consummate deal maker and natural leader. His honesty, integrity and warmth have cultivated thousands of business relationships that have become genuine friendships.

These abilities enabled him to set the foundation of what would become the Goodman Group, one of the Nation's most unique and innovative privately held companies, in which he is still actively involved today. The Goodman Group is made up of: Sage Company, which has communities in 11 States

and has been a national leader in developing and managing commercial properties, residential and senior living communities, and health care facilities since the 1970s. Sage is actually an acronym for Sidney Albert Goodman Enterprises; John B. Goodman Limited Partnership, a development and design company; Sage Travel, a full-service travel agency.

Sidney started this organization from a single real estate holding which he acquired in 1952. At that time, he had a Hamms beer distributorship, which was very successful. However, when Hamms was purchased in 1970, he preferred to run his own business. So, like any good entrepreneur, he sold it back to them and focused on developing his real estate business, Sage Company.

Through his business dealings, Sidney has been a mentor to hundreds of people over the years. He attentively listens to their challenges and offers guidance based on knowledge that can only be gained through experience. He does more than simply ask people to carry out an action; he explains why, based on wisdom that can only be attained from decades as a successful businessman.

Sidney is generous with his knowledge, the most valuable asset anyone can have, because he genuinely cares about people. Whether they are an assistant or a company president, he sincerely wants to know about their life, their hopes, and dreams. He loves to give people the opportunity to challenge themselves and expand their horizons. And when they think they can't succeed, he is there to tell them they can. And they do.

While Sidney is undoubtedly a very successful businessman, it is this concern for every individual that makes him an exceptional human being.

I am proud to be Sidney Goodman's friend and I wish him a happy and blessed birthday celebration.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:33 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its clerks, announced that it has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3. An act to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, the order of the House of January 4, 2005, and clause 10 of rule 1, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the United States Group of the North Atlantic Assembly: Mr. TANNER of Tennessee, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. CHANDLER of Kentucky, and Mrs. TAUSCHER of California.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1332. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the removal to Federal court of certain State court cases involving the rights of incapacitated persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. SANTORUM):

S. 686. A bill to provide for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo; considered and passed.

By Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. NELSON of Florida):

S. 687. A bill to regulate the unauthorized installation of computer software, to require clear disclosure to computer users of certain computer software features that may pose a threat to user privacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. Res. 92. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that judicial determinations regarding the meaning of the Constitution of the United States should not be based on judgments, laws, or pronouncements of foreign institutions unless such foreign judgments, laws, or pronouncements inform an understanding of the original meaning of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID):

S. Con. Res. 23. A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate, and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. KYL, Mr. BOND, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Con. Res. 24. A concurrent resolution expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the recent passage of the anti-secession law by the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. SANTORUM):

S. 686. A bill to provide for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo; considered and passed.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, 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. 686

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

SECTION 1. RELIEF OF THE PARENTS OF THERESA MARIE SCHIAVO

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida shall have jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on a suit or claim by or on behalf of Theresa Marie Schiavo for the alleged violation of any right of Theresa Marie Schiavo under the Constitution or laws of the United States relating to the withholding or withdrawal of food, fluids, or medical treatment necessary to sustain her life.

SEC. 2. PROCEDURE.

Any parent of Theresa Marie Schiavo shall have standing to bring a suit under this Act. The suit may be brought against any other person who was a party to State court proceedings relating to the withholding or withdrawal of food, fluids, or medical treatment necessary to sustain the life of Theresa Marie Schiavo, or who may act pursuant to a State court order authorizing or directing the withholding or withdrawal of food, fluids, or medical treatment necessary to sustain her life. In such a suit, the District Court shall determine de novo any claim of a violation of any right to Theresa Marie Schiavo within the scope of this Act, notwithstanding any prior State court determination and regardless of whether such a claim has previously been raised, considered, or decided in State court proceedings. The District Court shall entertain and determine the suit without any delay or abstention in favor of State court proceedings, and regardless of whether remedies available in the State courts have been exhausted.

SEC. 3. RELIEF.

After a determination of the merits of a suit brought under this Act, the District Court shall issue such declaratory and injunctive relief as may be necessary to protect the rights of Theresa Marie Schiavo under the Constitution and laws of the United States relating to the withholding or withdrawal of foods, fluids, or medical treatment necessary to sustain her life.

SEC. 4. TIME FOR FILING.

Notwithstanding any other time limitation, any suit or claim under this Act shall be timely if filed within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. NO CHANGE OF SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to create substantive rights not otherwise secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States or of the several States.

SEC. 6. NO EFFECT ON ASSISTING SUICIDE.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to confer additional jurisdiction on any court to consider any claim related—

- (1) to assisting suicide, or
- (2) a State law regarding assisting suicide.

SEC. 7. NO PRECEDENT FOR FUTURE LEGISLATION.

Nothing in this Act shall constitute a precedent with respect to future legislation, including the provision of private relief bills.

SEC. 8. NO EFFECT ON THE PATIENT SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 1990.

Nothing in this Act shall affect the rights of any person under the Patient Self-Determination Act of 1990.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.

It is the Sense of Congress that the 109th Congress should consider policies regarding the status and legal rights of incapacitated individuals who are incapable of making decisions concerning the provision, withholding, or withdrawal of foods, fluid, or medical care.

By Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. NELSON of Florida):

S. 687. A bill to regulate the unauthorized installation of computer software, to require clear disclosure to

computer users of certain computer software features that may pose a threat to user privacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the SPYBLOCK bill, along with my good friend Senator WYDEN of Oregon.

The SPYBLOCK bill will help reduce one of the most damaging practices in the online world today—spyware, or computer software downloaded onto a computer without the user's permission or awareness—that then is often used to illicitly gather personal information, assist in identity theft, track a user's keystrokes or monitor browsing behavior.

It is hard to overstate the potential damage that Spyware can do in cyberspace if it is allowed to grow unchecked. It could cripple e-commerce, because consumers would be afraid to make their financial or other personal data available on-line. It could damage the activities of businesses large and small, by making their data or computer systems vulnerable to attack and abuse. It could fuel the growth of whole new categories of cybercriminals. The recent data theft incidents at ChoicePoint, Bank of America, and others only underscore the need for a much more proactive policing of cyberspace.

The SPYBLOCK bill will give Federal enforcement authorities additional tools to curb spyware. It also bans adware programs that conceal their operation or purpose from users, because every consumer should have a reasonable opportunity to consent to the installation of software that generates pop-up ads on his or her computer.

We have worked hard on this bill, and consulted extensively with industry and consumer groups to ensure all perspectives on this growing problem were heard. The issues are not new to the members of the Commerce Committee either, as this bill is very similar to one we marked up toward the end of the last Congress.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Commerce Committee and the full Senate to ensure prompt passage of this important measure. I thank my colleague Senator WYDEN again for his work on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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. 687

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Software Principles Yielding Better Levels of Consumer Knowledge Act” or the “SPY BLOCK Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title.
- Sec. 2. Prohibited practices related to software installation in general.
- Sec. 3. Installing surreptitious information collection features on a user's computer.
- Sec. 4. Adware that conceals its operation.
- Sec. 5. Other practices that thwart user control of computer.
- Sec. 6. Limitations on liability.
- Sec. 7. FTC rulemaking authority.
- Sec. 8. Administration and enforcement.
- Sec. 9. Actions by States.
- Sec. 10. Effect on other laws.
- Sec. 11. Liability protections for anti-spyware software or services.
- Sec. 12. Penalties for certain unauthorized activities relating to computers.
- Sec. 13. Definitions.
- Sec. 14. Effective date.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITED PRACTICES RELATED TO SOFTWARE INSTALLATION IN GENERAL.

- (a) **SURREPTITIOUS INSTALLATION.**—
- (1) **IN GENERAL.**—It is unlawful for a person who is not an authorized user of a protected computer to cause the installation of software on the computer in a manner that—
- (A) conceals from the user of the computer the fact that the software is being installed; or
- (B) prevents the user of the computer from having an opportunity to knowingly grant or withhold consent to the installation.
- (2) **EXCEPTION.**—This subsection does not apply to—
- (A) the installation of software that falls within the scope of a previous grant of authorization by an authorized user;
- (B) the installation of an upgrade to a software program that has already been installed on the computer with the authorization of an authorized user;
- (C) the installation of software before the first retail sale and delivery of the computer; or
- (D) the installation of software that ceases to operate when the user of the computer exits the software or service through which the user accesses the Internet, if the software so installed does not begin to operate again when the user accesses the Internet via that computer in the future.
- (b) **MISLEADING INDUCEMENTS TO INSTALL.**—It is unlawful for a person who is not an authorized user of a protected computer to induce an authorized user of the computer to consent to the installation of software on the computer by means of a materially false or misleading representation concerning—
- (1) the identity of an operator of an Internet website or online service at which the software is made available for download from the Internet;
- (2) the identity of the author, publisher, or authorized distributor of the software;
- (3) the nature or function of the software; or
- (4) the consequences of not installing the software.
- (c) **PREVENTING REASONABLE EFFORTS TO UNINSTALL.**—
- (1) **IN GENERAL.**—It is unlawful for a person who is not an authorized user of a protected computer to cause the installation of software on the computer if the software cannot subsequently be uninstalled or disabled by an authorized user through a program removal function that is usual and customary with the user's operating system, or otherwise as clearly and conspicuously disclosed to the user.
- (2) **LIMITATIONS.**—
- (A) **AUTHORITY TO UNINSTALL.**—Software that enables an authorized user of a computer, such as a parent, employer, or system administrator, to choose to prevent another

user of the same computer from uninstalling or disabling the software shall not be considered to prevent reasonable efforts to uninstall or disable the software within the meaning of this subsection if at least 1 authorized user retains the ability to uninstall or disable the software.

(B) **CONSTRUCTION.**—This subsection shall not be construed to require individual features or functions of a software program, upgrades to a previously installed software program, or software programs that were installed on a bundled basis with other software or with hardware to be capable of being uninstalled or disabled separately from such software or hardware.

SEC. 3. INSTALLING SURREPTITIOUS INFORMATION COLLECTION FEATURES ON A USER'S COMPUTER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—It is unlawful for a person who is not an authorized user of a protected computer to—

(1) cause the installation on that computer of software that includes a surreptitious information collection feature; or

(2) use software installed in violation of paragraph (1) to collect information about a user of the computer or the use of a protected computer by that user.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION STATUS.**—This section shall not be interpreted to prohibit a person from causing the installation of software that collects and transmits only information that is reasonably needed to determine whether or not the user of a protected computer is licensed or authorized to use the software.

(c) **SURREPTITIOUS INFORMATION COLLECTION FEATURE DEFINED.**—For purposes of this section, the term “surreptitious information collection feature” means a feature of software that—

(1) collects information about a user of a protected computer or the use of a protected computer by that user, and transmits such information to any other person or computer—

(A) on an automatic basis or at the direction of person other than an authorized user of the computer, such that no authorized user knowingly triggers or controls the collection and transmission;

(B) in a manner that is not transparent to an authorized user at or near the time of the collection and transmission, such that no authorized user is likely to be aware of it when information collection and transmission are occurring; and

(C) for purposes other than—

(i) facilitating the proper technical functioning of a capability, function, or service that an authorized user of the computer has knowingly used, executed, or enabled; or

(ii) enabling the provider of an online service knowingly used or subscribed to by an authorized user of the computer to monitor or record the user's usage of the service, or to customize or otherwise affect the provision of the service to the user based on such usage; and

(2) begins to collect and transmit such information without prior notification that—

(A) clearly and conspicuously discloses to an authorized user of the computer the type of information the software will collect and the types of ways the information may be used and distributed; and

(B) is provided at a time and in a manner such that an authorized user of the computer has an opportunity, after reviewing the information contained in the notice, to prevent either—

(i) the installation of the software; or

(ii) the beginning of the operation of the information collection and transmission capability described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 4. ADWARE THAT CONCEALS ITS OPERATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—It is unlawful for a person who is not an authorized user of a protected computer to cause the installation on that computer of software that causes advertisements to be displayed to the user without a label or other reasonable means of identifying to the user of the computer, each time such an advertisement is displayed, which software caused the advertisement's delivery.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—Software that causes advertisements to be displayed without a label or other reasonable means of identification shall not give rise to liability under subsection (a) if those advertisements are displayed to a user of the computer—

(1) only when a user is accessing an Internet website or online service—

(A) operated by the publisher of the software; or

(B) the operator of which has provided express consent to the display of such advertisements to users of the website or service; or

(2) only in a manner or at a time such that a reasonable user would understand which software caused the delivery of the advertisements.

SEC. 5. OTHER PRACTICES THAT THWART USER CONTROL OF COMPUTER.

It is unlawful for a person who is not an authorized user of a protected computer to engage in an unfair or deceptive act or practice that involves—

(1) utilizing the computer to send unsolicited information or material from the user's computer to other computers;

(2) diverting an authorized user's Internet browser away from the Internet website the user intended to view to 1 or more other websites, unless such diversion has been authorized by the website the user intended to view;

(3) displaying an advertisement, series of advertisements, or other content on the computer through windows in an Internet browser, in such a manner that the user of the computer cannot end the display of such advertisements or content without turning off the computer or terminating all sessions of the Internet browser (except that this paragraph shall not apply to the display of content related to the functionality or identity of the Internet browser);

(4) modifying settings relating to the use of the computer or to the computer's access to or use of the Internet, including—

(A) altering the default Web page that initially appears when a user of the computer launches an Internet browser;

(B) altering the default provider or Web proxy used to access or search the Internet;

(C) altering bookmarks used to store favorite Internet website addresses; or

(D) altering settings relating to security measures that protect the computer and the information stored on the computer against unauthorized access or use; or

(5) removing, disabling, or rendering inoperative a security or privacy protection technology installed on the computer.

SEC. 6. LIMITATIONS ON LIABILITY.

(a) **PASSIVE TRANSMISSION, HOSTING, OR LINKING.**—A person shall not be deemed to have violated any provision of this Act solely because the person provided—

(1) the Internet connection, telephone connection, or other transmission or routing function through which software was delivered to a protected computer for installation;

(2) the storage or hosting of software or of an Internet website through which software was made available for installation to a protected computer; or

(3) an information location tool, such as a directory, index, reference, pointer, or hypertext link, through which a user of a protected computer located software available for installation.

(b) **NETWORK SECURITY.**—It is not a violation of section 2, 3, or 5 for a provider of a network or online service used by an authorized user of a protected computer, or to which any authorized user of a protected computer subscribes, to monitor, interact with, or install software for the purpose of—

(1) protecting the security of the network, service, or computer;

(2) facilitating diagnostics, technical support, maintenance, network management, or repair; or

(3) preventing or detecting unauthorized, fraudulent, or otherwise unlawful uses of the network or service.

(c) **MANUFACTURER'S LIABILITY FOR THIRD-PARTY SOFTWARE.**—A manufacturer or retailer of a protected computer shall not be liable under any provision of this Act for causing the installation on the computer, prior to the first retail sale and delivery of the computer, of third-party branded software, unless the manufacturer or retailer—

(1) uses a surreptitious information collection feature included in the software to collect information about a user of the computer or the use of a protected computer by that user; or

(2) knows that the software will cause advertisements for the manufacturer or retailer to be displayed to a user of the computer.

(d) **INVESTIGATIONAL EXCEPTION.**—Nothing in this Act prohibits any lawfully authorized investigative, protective, or intelligence activity of a law enforcement agency of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, or of an intelligence agency of the United States.

(e) **SERVICES PROVIDED OVER MVPD SYSTEMS.**—It is not a violation of this Act for a multichannel video programming distributor (as defined in section 602(13) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 522(13)) to utilize a navigation device, or interact with such a device, or to install or use software on such a device, in connection with the provision of multichannel video programming or other services offered over a multichannel video programming system or the collection or disclosure of subscriber information, if the provision of such service or the collection or disclosure of such information is subject to section 338(i) or section 631 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 338(i) or 551).

SEC. 7. FTC RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the limitations of subsection (b), the Commission may issue such rules in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, as may be necessary to implement or clarify the provisions of this Act.

(b) **SAFE HARBORS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission may issue regulations establishing specific wordings or formats for—

(A) notification that is sufficient under section 3(c)(2) to prevent a software feature from being a surreptitious information collection feature (as defined in section 3(c)); or

(B) labels or other means of identification that are sufficient to avoid violation of section 4(a).

(2) **FUNCTION OF COMMISSION'S SUGGESTED WORDINGS OR FORMATS.**—

(A) **USAGE IS VOLUNTARY.**—The Commission may not require the use of any specific wording or format prescribed under paragraph (1) to meet the requirements of section 3 or 4.

(B) **OTHER MEANS OF COMPLIANCE.**—The use of a specific wording or format prescribed

under paragraph (1) shall not be the exclusive means of providing notification, labels, or other identification that meet the requirements of sections 3 and 4.

(c) **LIMITATIONS ON LIABILITY.**—In addition to the limitations on liability specified in section 6, the Commission may by regulation establish additional limitations or exceptions upon a finding that such limitations or exceptions are reasonably necessary to promote the public interest and are consistent with the purposes of this Act. No such additional limitation of liability may be made contingent upon the adoption of any specific wording or format specified in regulations under subsection (b)(1).

SEC. 8. ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act shall be enforced by the Commission as if a violation of this Act or of any regulation promulgated by the Commission under this Act were an unfair or deceptive act or practice proscribed under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(b) **ENFORCEMENT BY CERTAIN OTHER AGENCIES.**—Compliance with this Act shall be enforced under—

(1) section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818), in the case of—

(A) national banks, and Federal branches and Federal agencies of foreign banks, by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency;

(B) member banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), branches and agencies of foreign banks (other than Federal branches, Federal agencies, and insured State branches of foreign banks), commercial lending companies owned or controlled by foreign banks, and organizations operating under section 25 or 25A of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 601 and 611), by the Board; and

(C) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than members of the Federal Reserve System) and insured State branches of foreign banks, by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

(2) section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818), by the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, in the case of a savings association the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

(3) the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) by the National Credit Union Administration Board with respect to any Federal credit union;

(4) part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, by the Secretary of Transportation with respect to any air carrier or foreign air carrier subject to that part;

(5) the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) (except as provided in section 406 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 226, 227)), by the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to any activities subject to that Act; and

(6) the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.) by the Farm Credit Administration with respect to any Federal land bank, Federal land bank association, Federal intermediate credit bank, or production credit association.

(c) **EXERCISE OF CERTAIN POWERS.**—For the purpose of the exercise by any agency referred to in subsection (b) of its powers under any Act referred to in that subsection, a violation of this Act is deemed to be a violation of a requirement imposed under that Act. In addition to its powers under any provision of law specifically referred to in subsection (b), each of the agencies referred to in that subsection may exercise, for the purpose of enforcing compliance with any requirement imposed under this Act, any other authority conferred on it by law.

(d) **ACTIONS BY THE COMMISSION.**—The Commission shall prevent any person from violating this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this Act. Any entity that violates any provision of that section is subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, power, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of that section.

SEC. 9. ACTIONS BY STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) **CIVIL ACTIONS.**—In any case in which the attorney general of a State has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of that State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by the engagement of any person in a practice that this Act prohibits, the State, as *parens patriae*, may bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of the State in a district court of the United States of appropriate jurisdiction—

(A) to enjoin that practice;

(B) to enforce compliance with the rule;

(C) to obtain damage, restitution, or other compensation on behalf of residents of the State; or

(D) to obtain such other relief as the court may consider to be appropriate.

(2) NOTICE.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Before filing an action under paragraph (1), the attorney general of the State involved shall provide to the Commission—

(i) written notice of that action; and

(ii) a copy of the complaint for that action.

(B) EXEMPTION.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to the filing of an action by an attorney general of a State under this subsection, if the attorney general determines that it is not feasible to provide the notice described in that subparagraph before the filing of the action.

(ii) **NOTIFICATION.**—In an action described in clause (i), the attorney general of a State shall provide notice and a copy of the complaint to the Commission at the same time as the attorney general files the action.

(b) INTERVENTION.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—On receiving notice under subsection (a)(2), the Commission shall have the right to intervene in the action that is the subject of the notice.

(2) **EFFECT OF INTERVENTION.**—If the Commission intervenes in an action under subsection (a), it shall have the right—

(A) to be heard with respect to any matter that arises in that action; and

(B) to file a petition for appeal.

(c) **CONSTRUCTION.**—For purposes of bringing any civil action under subsection (a), nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to prevent an attorney general of a State from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general by the laws of that State to—

(1) conduct investigations;

(2) administer oaths or affirmations; or

(3) compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

(d) **ACTIONS BY THE COMMISSION.**—In any case in which an action is instituted by or on behalf of the Commission for violation of this Act, no State may, during the pendency of that action, institute an action under subsection (a) against any defendant named in the complaint in that action for violation of that section.

(e) VENUE; SERVICE OF PROCESS.—

(1) **VENUE.**—Any action brought under subsection (a) may be brought in the district court of the United States that meets applicable requirements relating to venue under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code.

(2) **SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—In an action brought under subsection (a), process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

(A) is an inhabitant; or

(B) may be found.

SEC. 10. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

(a) **FEDERAL LAW.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit or affect in any way the Commission's authority to bring enforcement actions or take any other measures under the Federal Trade Commission Act or any other provision of law.

(b) STATE LAW.—

(1) **STATE LAW CONCERNING INFORMATION COLLECTION SOFTWARE OR ADWARE.**—This Act supersedes any statute, regulation, or rule of a State or political subdivision of a State that expressly limits or restricts the installation or use of software on a protected computer to—

(A) collect information about the user of the computer or the user's Internet browsing behavior or other use of the computer; or

(B) cause advertisements to be delivered to the user of the computer,

except to the extent that any such statute, regulation, or rule prohibits deception in connection with the installation or use of such software.

(2) **STATE LAW CONCERNING NOTICE OF SOFTWARE INSTALLATION.**—This Act supersedes any statute, regulation, or rule of a State or political subdivision of a State that prescribes specific methods for providing notification before the installation of software on a computer.

(3) **STATE LAW NOT SPECIFIC TO SOFTWARE.**—This Act shall not be construed to preempt the applicability of State criminal, trespass, contract, tort, or anti-fraud law.

SEC. 11. LIABILITY PROTECTIONS FOR ANTI-SOFTWARE SOFTWARE OR SERVICES.

No provider of computer software or of an interactive computer service may be held liable under this Act or any other provision of law for identifying, naming, removing, disabling, or otherwise affecting the operation or potential operation on a computer of computer software published by a third party, if—

(1) the provider's software or interactive computer service is intended to identify, prevent the installation or execution of, remove, or disable computer software that is or was installed in violation of section 2, 3, or 4 of this Act or used to violate section 5 of this Act;

(2) an authorized user of the computer has consented to the use of the provider's computer software or interactive computer service on the computer;

(3) the provider believes in good faith that the installation or operation of the third-party computer software involved or involves a violation of section 2, 3, 4, or 5 of this Act; and

(4) the provider either notifies and obtains the consent of an authorized user of the computer before taking any action to remove, disable, or otherwise affect the operation or potential operation of the third-party software on the computer, or has obtained prior authorization from an authorized user to take such action without providing such notice and consent.

SEC. 12. PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN UNAUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES RELATING TO COMPUTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1030 the following:

“§ 1030A. Illicit indirect use of protected computers

“(a) Whoever intentionally accesses a protected computer without authorization, or exceeds authorized access to a protected computer, by causing a computer program or code to be copied onto the protected computer, and intentionally uses that program or code in furtherance of another Federal criminal offense shall be fined under this title or imprisoned 5 years, or both.

“(b) Whoever intentionally accesses a protected computer without authorization, or exceeds authorized access to a protected computer, by causing a computer program or code to be copied onto the protected computer, and by means of that program or code intentionally impairs the security protection of the protected computer shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

“(c) A person shall not violate this section who solely provides—

“(1) an Internet connection, telephone connection, or other transmission or routing function through which software is delivered to a protected computer for installation;

“(2) the storage or hosting of software, or of an Internet website, through which software is made available for installation to a protected computer; or

“(3) an information location tool, such as a directory, index, reference, pointer, or hyper-text link, through which a user of a protected computer locates software available for installation.

“(d) A provider of a network or online service that an authorized user of a protected computer uses or subscribes to shall not violate this section by any monitoring of, interaction with, or installation of software for the purpose of—

“(1) protecting the security of the network, service, or computer;

“(2) facilitating diagnostics, technical support, maintenance, network management, or repair; or

“(3) preventing or detecting unauthorized, fraudulent, or otherwise unlawful uses of the network or service.

“(e) No person may bring a civil action under the law of any State if such action is premised in whole or in part upon the defendant's violating this section. For the purposes of this subsection, the term ‘State’ includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and any other territory or possession of the United States.”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1030 the following new item:

“1030A. Illicit indirect use of protected computers”

SEC. 13. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **AUTHORIZED USER.**—The term “authorized user”, when used with respect to a computer, means the owner or lessee of a computer, or someone using or accessing a computer with the actual or apparent authorization of the owner or lessee.

(2) **CAUSE THE INSTALLATION.**—The term “cause the installation” when used with respect to particular software, means to knowingly provide the technical means by which the software is installed, or to knowingly pay or provide other consideration to, or to knowingly induce or authorize, another person to do so.

(3) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the Federal Trade Commission.

(4) **COOKIE.**—The term “cookie” means a text file—

(A) that is placed on a computer by, or on behalf of, an Internet service provider, interactive computer service, or Internet website; and

(B) the sole function of which is to record information that can be read or recognized when the user of the computer subsequently accesses particular websites or online locations or services.

(5) **FIRST RETAIL SALE AND DELIVERY.**—The term “first retail sale and delivery” means the first sale, for a purpose other than resale, of a protected computer and the delivery of that computer to the purchaser or a recipient designated by the purchaser at the time of such first sale. For purposes of this paragraph, the lease of a computer shall be considered a sale of the computer for a purpose other than resale.

(6) **INSTALL.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “install” means—

(i) to write computer software to a computer’s persistent storage medium, such as the computer’s hard disk, in such a way that the computer software is retained on the computer after the computer is turned off and subsequently restarted; or

(ii) to write computer software to a computer’s temporary memory, such as random access memory, in such a way that the software is retained and continues to operate after the user of the computer turns off or exits the Internet service, interactive computer service, or Internet website from which the computer software was obtained.

(B) **EXCEPTION FOR TEMPORARY CACHE.**—The term “install” does not include the writing of software to an area of the persistent storage medium that is expressly reserved for the temporary retention of recently accessed or input data or information if the software retained in that area remains inoperative unless a user of the computer chooses to access that temporary retention area.

(7) **PERSON.**—The term “person” has the meaning given that term in section 3(32) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153(32)).

(8) **PROTECTED COMPUTER.**—The term “protected computer” has the meaning given that term in section 1030(e)(2)(B) of title 18, United States Code.

(9) **SOFTWARE.**—The term “software” means any program designed to cause a computer to perform a desired function or functions. Such term does not include any cookie.

(10) **UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACT OR PRACTICE.**—The term “unfair or deceptive act or practice” has the same meaning as when used in section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45).

(11) **UPGRADE.**—The term “upgrade”, when used with respect to a previously installed software program, means additional software that is issued by, or with the authorization of, the publisher or any successor to the publisher of the software program to improve, correct, repair, enhance, supplement, or otherwise modify the software program.

SEC. 14. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 92—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS REGARDING THE MEANING OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT BE BASED ON JUDGMENTS, LAWS, OR PRONOUNCEMENTS OF FOREIGN INSTITUTIONS UNLESS SUCH FOREIGN JUDGMENTS, LAWS, OR PRONOUNCEMENTS INFORM AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE ORIGINAL MEANING OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CORNYN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. RES. 92

Whereas the Declaration of Independence announced that one of the chief causes of the American Revolution was that King George had “combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws”;

Whereas the Supreme court has recently relied on the judgments, laws, or pronouncements of foreign institutions to support its interpretations of the laws of the United States, most recently in *Atkins v. Virginia*, 536 U.S. 304, 316 n.21 (2002), *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558, 573 (2003), and *Roper v. Simmons*, 125 S. Ct. 1183, 1198–99 (2005);

Whereas the Supreme Court has stated previously in *Printz v. United States*, 521 U.S. 898, 921 n.11 (1997), that “We think such comparative analysis inappropriate to the task of interpreting a constitution . . .”;

Whereas the ability of Americans to live their lives within clear legal boundaries is the foundation of the rule of law, and essential to freedom;

Whereas it is the appropriate judicial role to faithfully interpret the expression of the popular will through the Constitution and laws enacted by duly elected representatives of the American people and under our system of checks and balances;

Whereas Americans should not have to look for guidance on how to live their lives from the often contradictory decisions of any of hundreds of other foreign organizations; and

Whereas inappropriate judicial reliance on foreign judgments, laws, or pronouncements threatens the sovereignty of the United States, the separation of powers, and the President’s and the Senate’s treaty-making authority: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that judicial interpretations regarding the meaning of the Constitution of the United States should not be based in whole or in part on judgments, laws, or pronouncements of foreign institutions unless such foreign judgments, laws, or pronouncements inform an understanding of the original meaning of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I rise to express concern over a trend that some legal scholars and observers say may be developing in our courts—a trend regarding the potential influence of foreign governments and foreign courts in the application and enforcement of U.S. law.

If this trend is real, then I fear that, bit by bit, case by case, the American people may be slowly losing control over the meaning of our laws and of

our Constitution. If this trend continues, foreign governments may even begin to dictate what our laws and our Constitution mean, and what our policies in America should be.

In a series of cases over the past few years, our courts have begun to tell us that our criminal laws and criminal policies are informed, not only by our Constitution and by the policy preferences and legislative enactments of the American people through their elected representatives, but also by the rulings of foreign courts.

It is hard to believe—but in a series of recent cases, the U.S. Supreme Court has actually rejected its own prior precedents, in part because of a foreign government or court has expressed its disagreement with those precedents.

With your indulgence, I will offer just a few of the most recent examples.

Until recently, the U.S. Supreme Court had long held that the death penalty may be imposed on individuals regardless of their I.Q. The Court had traditionally left that issue untouched, as a question for the American people, in each of their States, to decide. That was what the Court said in a case called *Penry v. Lynaugh* (1989). Yet because some foreign governments have frowned upon that ruling, the U.S. Supreme Court has now seen fit to take that issue away from the American people. In 2002, in a case called *Atkins v. Virginia*, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the Commonwealth of Virginia could no longer apply its criminal justice system and its death penalty to an individual who had been duly convicted of abduction, armed robbery, and capital murder, because of testimony that the defendant was “mildly mentally retarded.” The reason given for the complete reversal in the Court’s position? In part because the Court was concerned about “the world community” and the views of the European Union.

Take another example. The U.S. Supreme Court has long held that the American people, in each of their States, have the discretion to decide whether certain kinds of conduct that has been considered immoral under our longstanding legal traditions should or should not remain illegal. In *Bowers v. Hardwick* (1986), the Court held that it is up to the American people to decide whether criminal laws against sodomy should be continued or abandoned. Yet once again, because some foreign governments have frowned upon that ruling, the U.S. Supreme Court has seen fit to take that issue away from the American people. In 2003, in a case called *Lawrence v. Texas*, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the State of Texas could no longer decide whether its criminal justice system may fully reflect the moral values of the people of Texas. The reason given for the complete reversal? This time, the Court explained, it was in part because it was concerned about the European Court of Human Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights.

Here's yet another example, from just a few weeks ago. Until this month, the U.S. Supreme Court had always held that 16- and 17-year-olds—like John Lee Malvo, the 17-year-old who terrorized the Washington area in a sniper spree that left 10 people dead—may be subject to the death penalty, if that is indeed the will of the people. The Court said as much in a case called *Stanford v. Kentucky* (1989). Yet because some foreign governments have frowned upon that ruling as well, the U.S. Supreme Court, on March 1 of this year, saw fit yet again to take this issue away from the American people. In *Roper v. Simmons*, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the State of Missouri could no longer apply its death penalty to 16- and 17-year-olds convicted of murder, no matter how brutal and depraved the act, and no matter how unrepentant the criminal. The reason given for this most recent complete reversal? In part because of treaties the U.S. has never even ratified, like the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, and because many foreign countries disagree with the people of Missouri.

The trend may be continuing. Next Monday, March 28, the U.S. Supreme Court will consider the question whether foreign nationals duly convicted of the most heinous crimes are nevertheless entitled to a new trial—for reasons that those individuals did not even bother to mention at their first trial. As in the previous examples, the Supreme Court has actually already answered this question. In *Breard v. Greene* (1998), the Court made clear that criminal defendants, like all parties in litigation, may not sit on their rights and then bring up those rights later to stall the imposition of their criminal sentences. That basic principle of our legal system, the Court explained, is not undermined just because the accused happens to be a foreign national subject to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. Even this basic principle of American law may soon be reversed, however. Many legal experts predict that, in the upcoming case of *Medellin v. Dretke*, the Court may overturn itself yet again, for no other reason than that the International Court of Justice happens to disagree with our longstanding laws and legal principles. That case involves the State of Texas, and I have filed an amicus brief asking the Court to respect its own precedents as well as the authority of the people of Texas to determine its criminal laws and policies consistent with our U.S. Constitution. There is a serious risk, however, that the Court will ignore Texas law, ignore U.S. law, and ignore the U.S. Constitution, and decide in effect that the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court can be overruled by the International Court of Justice.

There are still other examples, other decisions, where we see Supreme Court justices citing legal opinions from foreign courts all across the globe—from

India, Jamaica, Zimbabwe—the list goes on and on.

I am concerned about this trend. Step by step, with every case, the American people may be losing their ability to determine what their criminal laws shall be—losing control to the control of foreign courts and foreign governments. And if this can happen with criminal law, it can also spread to other areas of our government and of sovereignty. How about economic policy? Or foreign policy? Or our decisions about security and military strategy?

I think most Americans would be disturbed if we gave foreign governments the power to tell us what our Constitution means. Our Founding Fathers fought the Revolutionary War precisely to stop foreign governments from telling us what our laws say. In fact, ending foreign control over American law was one of the very reasons given for the Revolutionary War. The Declaration of Independence specifically complains that the American Revolution is justified because King George, and I quote, “has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws.” After a long and bloody revolution, we earned at last the right to be free of such foreign control. It was “We the People of the United States” who then ordained and established a Constitution of the United States, and our predecessors specifically included a mechanism by which only “We the People of the United States” could change it if necessary. And of course, every Federal judge and justice swears an oath to “faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me . . . under the Constitution and laws of the United States. So help me God.”

I am concerned about this trend. I am concerned that this trend may reflect a growing distrust amongst legal elites—not only a distrust of our constitutional democracy, but a distrust of America itself.

First, it reflects distrust of our constitutional democracy.

As every high school civics student learns, the job of a judge is pretty straightforward. Judges are supposed to follow the law, not rewrite it. Judges are supposed to enforce and apply political decisions, not make them. The job of a judge is to read and obey the words that are contained in our laws and in our judicial precedents—not the laws and precedents of foreign governments, which have no sovereign authority over our Nation.

I fear, though, that some judges simply don't like our laws, and they don't like the political decisions that are being made by the American people, through their elected representatives, about what our laws should be. So perhaps they would rather rewrite the law from the bench. What's especially disconcerting is that some judges today may be departing so far from American law, from American principles, and

from American traditions, that the only way they can justify their rulings from the bench is to cite the law of foreign countries, foreign governments, and foreign cultures—because there is nothing in this country left for them to cite for support.

Moreover, citing foreign law in order to overrule U.S. policy offends democracy, because foreign lawmaking is in no way accountable to the American people.

There is an important role for international law to play in our system here in the United States, to be sure. But it is a role that belongs to the American people, through the political branches of the United States—to the Congress and to the President, to decide what role international law shall play in our legal system. It is emphatically not a role that is given to our courts. Article I of the Constitution gives Congress, not the courts, the authority to enact laws punishing “Offenses against the Law of Nations.” And Article II of the Constitution gives the President the power to ratify treaties, subject to the advice and consent and the approval of two-thirds of the Senate. Yet our courts are overruling U.S. law by citing foreign law decisions in which the U.S. Congress has had no role, and citing treaties that the U.S. President and the U.S. Senate have refused to approve.

To those who might say there is nothing wrong with simply trying to bring U.S. law into consistency with other nations, I say this: This is not a good faith effort to bring U.S. law into global harmony. I fear that this is simply an effort to further a particular ideological agenda. Because the record suggest that this sudden interest in foreign law is political, not legal; it seems selective, not principled. U.S. courts are following foreign law inconsistently—only when needed to achieve a particular outcome that a judge or justice happens to desire, but that is flatly inconsistent with U.S. law and precedent. Many countries, for example, provide no exclusionary rule to suppress evidence that is otherwise useful and necessary to convict criminal defendants—yet our courts have not abandoned our constitutional rule on that topic. Very few countries provide for abortion on demand—yet our courts have not abandoned our Nation's constitutional jurisprudence on that subject. Four justices of the Supreme Court believe that school choice programs to benefit poor urban communities are unconstitutional if parochial schools are eligible, even though many other countries directly fund religious schools.

Even more disconcerting than this distrust of our constitutional democracy is the distrust of America itself.

I would hope that no American would ever believe that the citizens of foreign countries are always right, and that Americans are always wrong. Yet I worry that some judges may become more and more interested in impressing foreign governments, and less and

less interested in simply following American law. Indeed, at least one Supreme Court justice has stated publicly that following foreign rulings, rather than U.S. rulings, and I quote, “may create that all important good impression,” and therefore, and I quote, “over time we will rely increasingly . . . on international and foreign courts in examining domestic issues.”

This attitude is especially disturbing today. The brave men and women of our Armed Forces are putting their lives on the line in order to champion freedom and democracy not just for the American people, but for people all around the world. America today is the world’s leading champion of freedom and democracy. Meanwhile, the United Nations is rife with corruption, and the United Nations Human Rights Commission is chaired by Libya.

I am disturbed by this trend, and I hope that the American people will have a chance to speak out. I believe that the American people do not want their courts to make political decisions; they want their courts to follow and apply the law as it is written. The American people do not want their courts to follow the precedents of foreign courts; they want their courts to follow U.S. law and the precedents of U.S. courts. The American people do not want their laws controlled by foreign governments; they want their laws controlled by the American government, which serves the American people. The American people do not want to see American law and American policy outsourced to foreign governments and foreign courts.

So today, I submit a sense of the Senate resolution, to give this body the opportunity to state for the record that this trend in our courts is wrong, and that American law should never be reversed or rejected simply because a foreign government or foreign court may disagree with it. This resolution is nearly identical to one that has been introduced by my colleague in the House of Representatives, Congressman TOM FEENEY. I applaud his leadership and his efforts in this area, and I hope that both the House and the Senate will come together and follow in the footsteps of our Founding Fathers, to once again defend our right as Americans to dictate the policies of our government—informed, but never dictated, by the preferences of any foreign government or tribunal. And I ask that the text of the resolution be included at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23—PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE, AND A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 23

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Sunday, March 20, 2005, through Sunday, April 3, 2005, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, April 4, 2005, or until such other time as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any day from Sunday, March 20, 2005, through Monday, April 4, 2005, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, April 5, 2005, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24—EXPRESSING THE GRAVE CONCERN OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE RECENT PASSAGE OF THE ANTI-SECESSION LAW BY THE NATIONAL PEOPLE’S CONGRESS OF THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. KYL, Mr. BOND, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 24

Whereas, on December 9, 2003, President George W. Bush stated it is the policy of the United States to “oppose any unilateral decision, by either China or Taiwan, to change the status quo” in the region;

Whereas, in the past few years, the United States Government has urged both Taiwan and the People’s Republic of China to maintain restraint;

Whereas the National People’s Congress of the People’s Republic of China passed an anti-secession law on March 14, 2005, which constitutes a unilateral change to the status quo in the Taiwan Strait;

Whereas the passage of China’s anti-secession law escalates tensions between Taiwan and the People’s Republic of China and is an impediment to cross-strait dialogue;

Whereas the purpose of China’s anti-secession law is to create a legal framework for possible use of force against Taiwan and mandates Chinese military action under certain circumstances, including when “possibilities for a peaceful reunification should be completely exhausted”;

Whereas the Department of Defense’s Report on the Military Power of the People’s Republic of China for Fiscal Year 2004 documents that, as of 2003, the Government of the People’s Republic of China had deployed approximately 500 short-range ballistic missiles against Taiwan;

Whereas the escalating arms buildup of missiles and other offensive weapons by the

People’s Republic of China in areas adjacent to the Taiwan Strait is a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area;

Whereas, given the recent positive developments in cross-strait relations, including the Lunar New Year charter flights and new proposals for cross-strait exchanges, it is particularly unfortunate that the National People’s Congress adopted this legislation;

Whereas, since its enactment in 1979, the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.), which codified in law the basis for continued commercial, cultural, and other relations between the people of the United States and the people of Taiwan, has been instrumental in maintaining peace, security, and stability in the Taiwan Strait;

Whereas section 2(b)(2) of the Taiwan Relations Act declares that “peace and stability in the area are in the political, security, and economic interests of the United States, and are matters of international concern”;

Whereas, at the time the Taiwan Relations Act was enacted into law, section 2(b)(3) of such Act made clear that the United States decision to establish diplomatic relations with the People’s Republic of China rested upon the expectation that the future of Taiwan would be determined by peaceful means;

Whereas section 2(b)(4) of the Taiwan Relations Act declares it the policy of the United States “to consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means, including by boycotts or embargoes, a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States”;

Whereas section 2(b)(6) of the Taiwan Relations Act declares it the policy of the United States “to maintain the capacity of the United States to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people on Taiwan”;

Whereas any attempt to determine Taiwan’s future by other than peaceful means and other than with the express consent of the people of Taiwan would be considered of grave concern to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

(1) the anti-secession law of the People’s Republic of China provides a legal justification for the use of force against Taiwan, altering the status quo in the region, and thus is of grave concern to the United States;

(2) the President should direct all appropriate officials of the United States Government to convey to their counterpart officials in the Government of the People’s Republic of China the grave concern with which the United States views the passage of China’s anti-secession law in particular, and the growing Chinese military threats to Taiwan in general;

(3) the United States Government should reaffirm its policy that the future of Taiwan should be resolved by peaceful means and with the consent of the people of Taiwan; and

(4) the United States Government should continue to encourage dialogue between Taiwan and the People’s Republic of China.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 21, 2005

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, the Senate stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Monday, March 21, unless the House adopts S. Con. Res. 23, at which time the Senate will then be in adjournment under the provisions of the

concurrent resolution until 2 p.m. on Monday, April 4, 2005. I further ask that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we are hopeful that the House of Representatives will be able to act soon on the Schiavo bill we have just passed. If they are able to pass that legislation in the form received and then pass the adjournment resolution, it would not be necessary for this body, the Senate, to return.

We will then have completed our work and will adjourn for the Easter break. If the House is unable to act and, therefore, does not adopt the adjournment resolution, then the Senate

would automatically return to business tomorrow morning. I am hopeful that the House will be able to accept this bipartisan and bicameral agreement.

I thank many Members on both sides of the aisle for expediting this legislation through the Senate. First and foremost, I need to thank, once again, the Senator from Florida, the current occupant of the chair. We will now wait and monitor, over the course of the afternoon and evening, House action. In all likelihood, it will be a long evening, but we are prepared to be here as long as it takes to see that this important bill passes so it can be sent to the President immediately for his signature. Time is of the essence.

If the Senate does not need to return, I alert Members that we will have a busy legislative session after adjournment. There are a number of important matters to consider, including the supplemental appropriations that we will turn to when it becomes available.

I announced previously that no votes will occur on April 4, and therefore

there is the possibility of votes on Tuesday, April 5.

Mr. President, for the record, I note that a colloquy that was printed earlier in the RECORD was between Senator LEVIN and myself. It is an important colloquy that expresses the views to which we have agreed. I should mention that many such conversations have gone on between and among all Senators on both sides of the aisle.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the provisions of the adjournment resolution or under the previous order, if necessary.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:40 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 21, 2005, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM GIBBONS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 20, 2005

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to explain how I would have voted on March 20, 2005 during rollcall vote 90, which was on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 686, for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo.

If present, I would have voted "yes" on this rollcall vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 20, 2005

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on official business and missed rollcall 90. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 20, 2005

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 90 on Monday, March 21, 2005, I would have voted "yea." Like a number of our colleagues, I was unable to attend this emergency session due to the unavailability of commercial air travel within the time constraints.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 20, 2005

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to vote on rollcall 90. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on this measure.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 20, 2005

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 2005, I was unavoidably detained and missed

rollcall vote number 90. Rollcall vote 90 was on S. 686, a private bill to provide for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo.

Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote 90.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 20, 2005

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 21, 2005, I was on official business. Therefore, I was unable to make rollcall vote 90. Had I been here, I would have voted "no" for rollcall No. 90.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 20, 2005

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, due to travel delays from my district, I was unable to vote during the following rollcall vote, No. 90. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 20, 2005

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, due to the short notice provided to Members with respect to rollcall 90, S. 686, relating to relief for the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo, I was unable to return to Washington, DC from the West Coast in time for today's vote. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN N. HOSTETTLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 20, 2005

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, my flight to Washington, DC, in the early morning hours of March 21, 2005 was delayed due to circumstances beyond my control. Consequently, I arrived shortly after the vote on S. 686 closed. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of S. 686, for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Shiavo.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 20, 2005

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 2005 I missed rollcall vote no. 90. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on S. 686, a bill regarding Ms. Terri Schiavo.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 20, 2005

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, had I not been detained by official travel, I would have voted against S. 686.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 20, 2005

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, had I been present this evening, I would have voted "no" on S. 686.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 20, 2005

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 20, I was tending to official business and was not present for rollcall vote No. 90. The vote was on S. 686. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the measure.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 20, 2005

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall 90, the vote on S. 686, because I had made a promise to my family that I would be present with them in Florida for a very important occasion in the life of my 10-year-old daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS:

Senate passed S. 686, Private Relief.

Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 23, Adjournment Resolution.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3099–S3112

Measures Introduced: Two bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 686–687, S. Res. 92, and S. Con. Res. 23–24. **Page S3105**

Measures Passed

Private Relief: Senate passed S. 686, for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo.

Pages S3099–S3103

Adjournment Resolution: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 23, providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate, and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

Pages S3103–04

Congressional Record—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, the Congressional Record remain open for statements

only on Monday, March 21, 2005, from 11 am until 5 p.m. **Page S3104**

Messages From the House: **Page S3105**

Measures Referred: **Page S3105**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3105–11**

Additional Statements **Pages S3104–05**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2 p.m., and adjourned at 4:40 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Monday, March 21, 2005, unless the House of Representatives adopts S. Con. Res. 23, Adjournment Resolution, at which time the Senate will then be in adjournment until 2 p.m., on Monday, April 4, 2005. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3112.)

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Measures Introduced: 3 public bills, H.R. 1452–1454, were introduced. **Page H1729, H1735**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H1729, H1735**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 181, waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to the same day consideration of certain resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules (H. Rept. 109–27); and

H. Res. 182, providing for consideration of S. 686, for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo (H. Rept. 109–28). **Page H1729, H1735**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered today by Rev. Dr. Ronald F. Christian, Pastor, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in Fairfax, Virginia. **Page H1699**

Clerk Messages: Read letters from the Clerk notifying the House that he received messages from the Senate. **Page H1699**

Notification of Reassembly: Read the text of the formal notification sent to Members on Saturday, March 19, 2005, of the reassembling of the House.

Page H1699

Recess: The House recessed at 1:04 p.m. and reconvened at 5:05 p.m.

Pages H1699–H1700

Consideration of Suspensions: Agreed by unanimous consent that the Speaker may decline to entertain a motion to adjourn until after disposition of the motion to suspend the rules described in this order; that it be in order at any time on Sunday, March 20, for the Speaker to entertain a motion that the House suspend the rules with respect to S. 686; and that such motion be debatable for three hours.

Page H1700

Recess: The House recessed at 5:10 p.m. and reconvened at 9 p.m.

Page H1700

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

For the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo: S. 686, for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 203 yeas to 58 nays, Roll No. 90—clearing the measure for the President.

Pages H1700–28, H1731–35

District Work Period: The House agreed to S. Con. Res. 23, providing for a conditional adjournment of the House and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

Pages H1728–29

Senate Referral: S. 653 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Page H1729

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on page H1728. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 1 p.m. and at 12:46 a.m. on Monday, March 21, pursuant to the

provisions of S. Con. Res. 23, it stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, April 5, 2005.

Committee Meetings

SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule waiving clause 6(a) of rule XIII (requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same date it is reported from the Rules Committee) against certain resolutions reported by the Rules Committee. The rule applies the waiver to any special rule on or before the legislative day of April 5, 2005, providing for consideration of a bill relating to the rights of an incapacitated person or persons.

FOR THE RELIEF OF THE PARENTS OF THERESA MARIE SCHIAVO

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a closed rule providing ten minutes of debate in the House on S. 686, for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 21, 2005

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearing scheduled.

House

No meeting/hearings scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, April 4

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Tuesday, April 5

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E519
Gibbons, Jim, Nev., E519
Green, Gene, Tex., E519
Hostettler, John N., Ind., E519

Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E519
Kilpatrick, Carolyn C., Mich., E519
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E519
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E519
Mica, John L., Fla., E519
Ortiz, Solomon P., Tex., E519

Rogers, Harold, Ky., E519
Stearns, Cliff, Fla., E519
Walden, Greg, Ore., E519
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E519



Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202-512-1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1-888-293-6498 (toll-free), 202-512-1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202-512-1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$252.00 for six months, \$503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, \$10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, \$21.00; greater than 400 pages, \$31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$146.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.