

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