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New York State has joined the 'national and international debate' over the right of same-sex couples to enter into state-sanctioned marriage, however, other states had been more in the forefront of this issue.

A recent newspaper article read that Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, R-Calif., announced that he would veto a bill that would have made California the first state to legalize same-sex marriage through legislation. He later did so. In a summary of the status of the law nationwide, it was noted that

Massachusetts is currently the only state in the United States that issues marriage licenses to same-sex couples. California, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Maine and New Jersey have domestic partnership laws that provide some limited rights to same-sex couples. Vermont licenses civil unions, which provide all of the state-level rights and responsibilities of marriage, but none of the more than 1,100 federal protections. Connecticut is now the most recent state to license civil unions.

If we look for guidance from the rest of the world, where do other countries stand on this issue? Canada, Belgium, Zurich and the Netherlands have legalized same-sex marriage. Likewise, the European Union's Parliament has required member states to grant same-sex marriage and domestic partnership rights, and Germany has adopted domestic partnership legislation.' Is our society ready for this ideological leap? Is New York State?

Those who speak to the issue of same-sex marriage often do so with great emotion. Opponents of same-sex marriage maintain that marriage should be limited to a man and a woman, only, based upon traditional notions of marriage. Proponents of gay and lesbian marriage contend, often, that to deny marriage licenses and access to civil marriage violates constitutional protections under the Due Process and Equal Protection clauses of the federal and New York State constitutions, which will be discussed more fully below. Some lawyer proponents are said to see their own activism as a 'continuum of the 1960s-era struggle for racial justice, a cause in which many of their parents were involved. In the middle ground, there are those who suggest that 'civil unions' should 'satisfy' gay couples, but that marriage should remain heterosexual. In an opinion letter of the corporation counsel of the city of New York to the city clerk, he advised the clerk to continue the current practice of denying marriage licenses to same-sex couples unless and until legislation changed the law or the courts ruled on the constitutionality of the law. Have social values changed? Does the law reflect current values? This article will provide an update on the current status of this debate in New York.

How prevalent are same-sex couples? According to the 2000 United States Census, there are 594,000 same-sex couples nationwide, and there are 46,490 in New York alone. It is said that these numbers may be undercounted by as much as 62 percent. Estimates suggest that same-sex couples nationwide are raising approximately 400,000 children, with 31,000 such children in New York. These statistics indicate that same-sex couples account for at
least 1 percent of all coupled households in the United States, and at least 1.3 percent of such households in New York.

What can become truly complicated in today's world is having courts adjudicate sexual identity to conform to the definition of marriage as 'a union between a man and a woman.' For instance, what should be done in the case of a transsexual—is that person defined by their pre- or post-operative sexual identity? What about intersex individuals—if a person's genitalia or chromosomes are ambiguous, are they male or female? What if the intersex individual is neither a man nor a woman? What is the 'opposite sex' of an intersex person for the purposes of marriage? It is because of all this confusion that some legal commentators have stated that the sex criterion for determining a legal marriage should be eliminated altogether. The converse argument is that those cases are extreme, account for a statistically insignificant portion of the population, and should not form the basis for policy on this issue.

The institution of marriage has been described as having two characteristics: 'the expressive legitimacy that comes from the public institution of marriage; and the panoply of material benefits, both economic and non-economic, that the marital relationship confers.'

The United States Supreme Court, in Loving v. Virginia, held that marriage is a fundamental right. In that case, the Court struck down a ban on interracial marriage, finding that it violated both the Equal Protection and Due Process clauses of the United States Constitution. Two other United States Supreme Court cases involved the right to marry. In Zablocki v. Redhail, the Court, invoking the Equal Protection Clause, struck down a Wisconsin law 'forbidding people under child support obligations to remarry unless they obtained a judicial determination that they had met those obligations and that their children were not likely to become public charges.' In Turner v. Saffley, the Court 'followed and extended Zablocki,' and struck down a prison regulation 'that prohibited inmates from marrying unless there were compelling reasons' for them to do so,' with 'compelling reasons' defined as including pregnancy or the birth of an illegitimate child. The issue then becomes whether the Supreme Court should similarly analyze laws against same-sex marriages.

What are the 'material benefits, economic and non-economic, that accompany the marital relationship'? Although state law varies, at least five major categories have been identified in the literature, to wit: tax benefits, entitlements, such as the Family and Medical Leave Act and Veterans benefits, inheritance and other death benefits (e.g., tenancy by the entirety), surrogate decision-making (e.g., guardianship) and evidentiary privileges.

It is thus argued by proponents of same-sex marriage that there is a lot to lose if they are not granted the right to marry. Note that in the case of Goodridge v. Department of Health, the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court determined that denying same-sex couples the right to marry violated the state constitution, but stayed entry of the ruling for six months, and ordered the Massachusetts Legislature to "take such action as it may deem appropriate in light of this opinion."

In September 2005, the Massachusetts attorney general approved a ballot initiative that would give voters an opportunity to overturn the Goodridge decision legalizing gay marriage. (This is the status as of the writing of this article).

Proponents of same-sex marriage argue that such couples should not be excluded from exercising the right to marry in New York, and, further, that New York should recognize same-sex marriages and civil unions entered into in other jurisdictions. Their legal arguments are well summarized in the 'Report on Marriage Rights for Same-Sex Couples in New York'.

These commentators maintain that the Domestic Relations Law, which governs marriage in New York, does not contain a requirement that marriage is 'limited to persons of
the opposite sex.' It is argued that New York's public policy supports permitting same-sex marriages, citing cases involving housing, adoption and funeral arrangements to illustrate a trend in the New York courts that 'long-standing, committed same-sex relationships deserve the protections that were previously afforded only more traditionally recognized relationships.

'It is argued, further, that the New York and federal Equal Protection clauses 'protect the fundamental right to marry for all citizens.'

Opponents of same-sex marriage frequently argue that there is no fundamental right to such a marriage, and that the question of 'whether to allow gay marriage is better suited to the Legislature than the courts.'

As of this writing, the Appellate Division, First Department has yet to rule upon the February State Supreme Court decision of Judge Doris Ling-Cohan that ruled it unconstitutional under the New York State Constitution for New York City to deny same-sex couples the right to marry in the case of Hernandez v. Robles (2005 LEXIS 752). Lambda Legal had filed the lawsuit last year. It represented five same-sex couples seeking marriage licenses in New York City. In a report by the New York Law Journal about the oral argument before the Appellate Division, it was maintained that the five-judge panel voiced 'skepticism' that a right to same-sex marriage exists.

On Oct. 17, 2005, the Appellate Division, Third Department, heard three cases challenging New York's 'refusal to recognize same-sex marriages--Samuels v. Department of Health, 98084, Kane v. Marsolais, 98151, and Seymour v. Holcomb, 98204.' The trial court had refused to recognize same-sex marriages in each case, and the same-sex couples (approximately 76 in total) argued that the ban 'cannot withstand state constitutional scrutiny.' The New York Law Journal reported that the Appellate Division, Third Department Justices 'seemed more skeptical of the state's argument.' The state relied on a 'rational basis' argument, and maintained that New York has 'a tradition of defining marriage as a union between a man and a woman, and an interest in maintaining unity with virtually every other state.'

In a recent case before the Appellate Division, Second Department, Langan v. St. Vincent's Hosp. of New York, a 3-2 majority ruled that same-sex partners cannot pursue a wrongful death action in New York. The case involved two men who had lived together in an 'exclusive intimate relationship.' They entered into a civil union in Vermont in 2000. In the words of the court, they returned to New York and remained in a 'close, loving, committed, monogamous relationship as a family unit in a manner indistinguishable from any traditional marital relationship.'

One of the men was hit by a car, required hospitalization at St. Vincent's Hospital of New York, and after two surgeries died. The other man in the couple brought the wrongful death action. The defendant moved to dismiss the action on the basis that because this was a same-sex couple, they were incapable of being married, and therefore the plaintiff had no standing as a surviving spouse to institute the action. The Supreme Court, inter alia, denied that motion, and the appeal ensued. The plaintiff claimed that 'an application of the statute in such a manner as to preclude same-sex spouses as potential distributes is a violation of the Equal Protection Clauses of the Constitutions of the United States and the State of New York.' The Appellate Division reversed the Supreme Court's order, holding that there cannot be a 'judicial imprimatur' of same-sex marriages in that this would be a 'usurpation of powers expressly reserved by our Constitution to the Legislature.'

Commentators have noted that as a result of the Langan decision, it would seem that same-sex New York couples who have legally married elsewhere (e.g., in Massachusetts, Canada or Belgium) may not fare well in New York in terms of a recognition of those 'unions' or 'marriages.' Advocates for same-sex marriage are confident that 'this is not the
final word. It has been maintained by The Association of the Bar of the City of New York since the 2001 issuance of their report that ‘fundamental notions of full faith and credit and choice-of-law require New York to recognize same-sex marriages and civil unions entered into in sister states and internationally.’

Is New York ready to recognize same-sex marriages? Right now there is no definitive answer. We will have to see what occurs in the courts and in the Legislature. There is one ‘camp’ that maintains that the recognition of same-sex marriages is long in coming and that the courts and the Legislature must act immediately to rectify this failure to keep pace with societal trends. There is the other ‘camp’ that advocates a traditional concept of marriage only—and maintains with equal fervor that marriage involves solely a man and a woman. There is the group that would ‘settle’ for civil unions, such as Vermont has recognized since July 1, 2000, which gives eligible same-sex couples the opportunity to obtain the ‘same benefits, protections, and responsibilities afforded to married opposite-sex couples.’ It is most certainly a debate that will continue.

Part I: Single-Choice questions. Please think carefully and choose the right answer.

1. Based on the article, which state is currently the only state in the United States that issues marriage license to same-sex marriage? (5 points)
   A. California
   B. Hawaii
   C. Massachusetts
   D. Vermont

2. Which of the following statement is incorrect according to the article? (5 points)
   A. Canada has legalized same-sex marriage.
   B. The debate of same-sex marriage began since the struggle for racial justice in the 1960’s.
   C. Several same-sex couples tried to seek marriage licenses in New York City.
   D. European Union Parliament required member states to approve same-sex marriage and domestic partnership rights.

3. Which of the following statement is correct according to the article? (5 points)
   A. Loving v. Virginia involves the debate of same-sex marriage.
   B. In Zablock v. Redhair, the Supreme Court held a Wisconsin law that involved marriage regulation unconstitutional.
   C. The United State Supreme Court held that it is the state’s power to regulate domestic relations and the federal court cannot strike down such laws.
   D. New York’s public policy permits that same-sex marriage couples could enjoy tax benefits, entitlements, inheritance and other death benefits, surrogate decision-making, and evidentiary.

4. According to the article, proponent contend several reasons for same-sex marriage. Which of the following statement is NOT their argument? (5 points)
   A. Whether to allow same-sex marriage is an issue better suited to the legislature than the judiciary.
   B. The New York marriage law does not require that marriage should be limited to persons of the opposite sex.
   C. The exclusion of same-sex marriage violates people’s constitutional rights.
D. To institutionalize same-sex marriage, same-sex couple could get both economic and non-economic benefits.

5. According to the article, the New York courts have made several decisions involving same-sex marriage. Which of the following statement is NOT true? (5 points)
A. In *Langan v. St. Vincent’s Hospital*, the court denied that same-sex partner is capable of being a surviving spouse to pursue a wrongful death action.
B. The majority of the New York courts refused to recognize same-sex marriage.
C. In *Langan v. St. Vincent’s Hospital*, the court held that the power to regulate marriage is expressly reserved to the New York legislature.
D. *Hernández v. Robles* is a controversial case in which the Supreme Court was skeptical about the existence of “right to same-sex marriage”.

**Part II: Essay question.**

6.: Please read the question and answer in Chinese.

Same-sex marriage is a controversial issue that raises national and international debates. Do you support the view that courts should be involved in this debate and apply judicial power to review the marriage law? Or, do you support the view that this issue should be reserved to the legislature and let the Congress make the decision? (15 points)
第二大題(35分)
Jun 1991- About 200 members of Taiwan's Aboriginal tribes, some wearing colorful traditional dress, demonstrated outside Parliament to demand government aid and greater political power. "Our language is vanishing, our culture is fading away and our natural resources are being systematically plundered", the leaders of Aboriginal civic groups asserted in a letter presented to the cabinet office. They called on the government to improve employment and educational opportunities in Aboriginal villages and to create a committee overseeing Aboriginal affairs in which the tribes would have representation. There are about 335,000 aborigines among Taiwan's 20 million people. Scholars say the tribes, which may be related to Pacific Islanders, arrived in Taiwan long before the first big influx of Chinese settlers some 400 years ago. Many aborigines say they suffer racial discrimination and have benefited little from Taiwan's rapid economic growth during the past four decades. One major tribal grievance is the government's storage of nuclear waste on Orchid Island, just off southeastern Taiwan; it is the home of one of the tribes (Reuters, 6/6/91).

May 1992- About 30 Aboriginal students clashed with police during a demonstration in Taipei on the second anniversary of President Lee Teng-Hui's inauguration. They were demonstrating outside the ruling Kuomintang (KMT) party headquarters, where Lee was chairing a meeting. The slogan-chanting students were forcibly removed by the police. The aborigines have called on Lee to make it compulsory to refer to them by what they consider the correct term, "original inhabitants." They said "aborigine" was discriminatory and used by the government to refer to their backwardness and poverty. The KMT had earlier proposed that the aborigines be called "early inhabitants", but they insisted that they be called "original inhabitants". The tribals maintain that they are the original residents of Taiwan and have accused the KMT of seizing their rich lands and driving them to mountain areas. They plan a march on the National Assembly to demand changes in the Constitution that would protect their rights and benefits (Agence France Press, 5/20/92).

Jun 1992- Taiwan's native tribes are being tapped as a rich tourism resource, but more enlightened planning is needed to ensure that tourism will not harm their development. Although the danger of tourism to native culture is undeniable, it is also true that tourism can do much to help preserve it. In fact, much of the active preservation work that has taken place in recent years has been, either directly or indirectly, for the purpose of promoting tourism. However, "VILLAGES" that have been purposely built to attract tourists may actually serve to divert attention from the attractions of genuine settlements. There is currently an on-going project of the East Coast National Scenic Area Administration of Taiwan's Tourism Bureau, which is planning and developing the entire coastline between Hualien in the central part of the coast and Taitung in the south. This is the homeland of Taiwan's largest indigenous group, the Ami tribe, which totals about 123,000 members. Fewer than 40,000, however, continue to live in the east coast area. Mr. C. T. Su, Director of the East Coast National Scenic Area Administration, says, "We hope to preserve the traditional culture of the Amis. First, we want them to continue holding their harvest festivals in July and August, and we'll subsidize those festivals. Second, we're organizing workshops to teach traditional handicrafts cloth and bamboo weaving, pottery, and clothes-making. Third, we're commissioning Academia Sinica to study and plan a means of cultural expression that will allow visitors to see living Ami culture". An Ami Cultural Consulting Committee has been organized to meet every three months to discuss ways of involving tribes' people. Willi Boe, a long-time resident of Taiwan who works as a correspondent for a Swiss newspaper, suggests that tribes people
should be provided with funding and be allowed to develop tourist activities themselves, since they know how best to meld such activities into their village life (The Strait Times, 6/16/92).

Mar 1993- China may soon agree to accept from Taiwan hundreds of tons of radioactive waste in exchange for financial backing for a high-tech dumpsite to be shared by both governments. The facility, to be located either in northwestern China or on an island in the South China Sea, would be large enough to accommodate Taipei's 150,000 drums of accumulated radioactive material plus the low-level waste produced by both nations for the next three decades. "We have numerous contacts with China's atomic energy experts", stated a high-ranking Taiwanese official, speaking on condition of anonymity (UPI, 08/03/93). He also indicated that "in many ways Beijing has been very encouraging". The dumpsite, with an estimated price tag of $1 billion, could be agreed upon in principle within a year and be in use by 1997. Taiwan, which put its first nuclear power plant on line in the early 1980s, currently operates six reactors, accounting for about 40% of the island's total electricity output. Most of the waste produced by the plants is temporarily stored on Orchid Island, 170 miles southeast of Taipei, the ancestral home of Taiwan's Aboriginal minority. But under pressure from islanders, the government has agreed to halt dumping by 2002.

Jul 1994- About 100 members of the Rukai tribe, one of nine Aboriginal groups in Taiwan, danced silently in front of a local government building in Taipei. The Rukai were protesting against the government's plan to build a reservoir on the birthplace of their culture. The Rukai would then be moved to a tourist-oriented village. The government contends that the reservoir will ease the water shortages of the Aboriginals; however, the tribe says that it wants to be left alone and does not want the "better" life promised by the government (Deutsche Presse-Agentur, 07/28/94).

Oct 1994- Waving banners and shouting slogans, around 1000 members of the Atayal tribe demonstrated in east Taiwan. The Atayal are demanding the return of 92,000 hectares of land that the government has defined as a national park. In the interim, the tribe wants to be able to hunt, fell trees, and mine minerals -- their traditional occupations -- in parts of the protected park area (Deutsche Presse-Agentur, 10/17/94).

Jan 1995- Taiwan's National Assembly conceded to native claims last year by changing the official name for Aboriginals from Shanpao (mountain compatriots) to Yuanchumin (indigenous inhabitants). However, the national assembly rejected a proposed constitutional amendment that would have allowed indigenous self-rule and would have granted full land rights to Aboriginal groups. The indigenous peoples are also seeking greater political and economic autonomy including control over education and the formation of a cabinet-level agency responsible for Aboriginal affairs (Financial Times, 01/04/95).

Mar 1995- The US State Department's 1994 Report on Human Rights Practices in Taiwan indicates that while the indigenous people do not face official discrimination, they are unable to exert an impact on significant decisions that affect their lands, culture, traditions, and the distribution of their natural resources. Further, the average income of Aboriginals is less than half the national average. Social problems in the indigenous community include widespread alcoholism and the sale of Aboriginal girls into prostitution (03/95).
Dec 3, 1998- Aboriginal labor activists and their supporters lashed out at the large-scale employment of foreigners in Taiwan, saying that they were keeping Aboriginal workers out of work. They also said that collaboration between legislators and Schive Chi of the Council of Economic Planning and Development has led to a situation that is both exploitative of foreign laborers and detrimental to the economy as a whole. The group also complained that Aboriginal politicians are a "bunch of lazy legislators" who have done nothing to protect their constituents. An amendment to the Aboriginal Labor Law from 1997 has extended the period of time foreign laborers are allowed to work in Taiwan and has helped deprive Aboriginals of jobs. (China News)

Aug 2, 1999- On the occasion of the announcement of Taiwan as a separate state President Lee Teng-hui emphasized the significance of the Aboriginal culture for the building of Taiwanese history as separate and different from the Chinese one. Taiwan history began not 5,000 years ago on the mainland but with the Australasian tribes that already inhabited Taiwan when Chinese migrants began arriving 400 years ago, said the president. A number of recent events indicate that Taiwanese separatist ambitions and Taiwanese official policy emphasis on the differences distinguishing Taiwanese from Chinese culture favor the nine Aboriginal tribes and promise to improve their status. Among these events are, the Taiwan Museum featuring of an exhibit called "tayal facial tattoos", a government-sponsored Aboriginal troop world tour, and a hot-selling of CD documenting the songs of each Aboriginal tribe. (Newsweek)

I. 選擇題

7. Which of the following is the most appropriate title for the series reports? (5 points)
A) Discrimination against original Taiwanese inhabitants
B) Grievances of original Taiwanese inhabitants against government and society.
C) Chronology for original Taiwanese inhabitants in Taiwan
D) Development of original Taiwanese inhabitants

8. Which original Taiwanese inhabitants group is the largest one in Taiwan? (5 points)
A) Ami tribe
B) Atayal tribe
C) Rukai tribe
D) Bunun tribe

9. Which two of the following statements are NOT true? (5 points)
A) Widespread alcoholism and sale of girls into prostitution has constituted serious social problems in the original Taiwanese inhabitant community.
B) The US Human Rights Report indicated that the original Taiwanese inhabitants face official discriminations.
C) Storage of the nuclear waste on Orchid Island caused the major grievance of one tribe.
D) Australasian tribes inhabited Taiwan earlier than Chinese migrants did.
E) Taiwanese original inhabitants have been granted full land rights and self-rule by means of a constitutional amendment.

10. Which one of the following shall have different interpretation according to the reports? (5 points)
A) native
11. According to the reports, how many original inhabitant tribes are there in Taiwan? (5 points)
A) Eight
B) Nine
C) Ten
D) Eleven

II. 翻譯題
12. The following paragraph is the definition of one type of sexual harassment. Please translate this paragraph into Chinese (10 points):

“(ii) Hostile environment sexual harassment occurs when unwelcome sexual conduct unreasonably interferes with an individual's job performance or creates a hostile, intimidating or offensive work environment even though the harassment may not result in tangible or economic job consequences, that is, the person may not lose pay or a promotion. Employers, supervisors, coworkers, customers, or clients can create a hostile work environment.”
Supreme Court Affirms N.H. Abortion Limits

WASHINGTON - The Supreme Court ruled unanimously Wednesday that a lower court was wrong to strike down New Hampshire abortion restrictions, but steered clear of a major ruling on the volatile issue.

The opinion was written by retiring Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, a key swing voter at the court on abortion whose retirement could start soon if the Senate confirms nominee Samuel Alito.

The New Hampshire case had been expected to be much closer at the high court.

But instead, justices ruled narrowly. They said a lower court went too far by permanently blocking the law that requires a parent to be told before a daughter ends her pregnancy.

An appeals court must now reconsider the law, which requires that a parent be informed 48 hours before a minor child has an abortion but makes no exception for a medical emergency that threatens the youth's health.

In what may be O'Connor's last ruling, she said "in this case, the courts below chose the most blunt remedy." She did say, "Under our cases it would be unconstitutional to apply the act in a manner that subjects minors to significant health risks."

The court had been asked to consider whether the 2003 law put an "undue burden" on a woman in choosing to end a pregnancy. O'Connor is an architect of the undue burden standard, and was the deciding vote in the last abortion case five years ago, when the justices ruled that a Nebraska law banning a type of late-term abortion was too burdensome. That law did not have an exception to protect the mother's health.

Instead, justices did not deal directly with that question.

The opinion, just a brief 10 pages, was a victory for New Hampshire and had been closely watched by other states with restrictions. Justices had been told that 24 states mandate a parent's approval and 19, including New Hampshire, demand parental notice.

"In the case that is before us ... the lower courts need not have invalidated the law wholesale," O'Connor wrote. "Only a few applications of New Hampshire's parental notification statute would present a constitutional problem. So long as they are faithful to legislative intent, then, in this case, the lower courts can issue a declaratory judgment and an injunction prohibiting the statute's unconstitutional application."

No other justices wrote separately.

The case returns to the 1st U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Boston.

Supreme Court Upholds Oregon Suicide Law

After more than a decade of legal battles over assisted suicide, a Supreme Court ruling affirming that states have the authority to regulate medical treatment of the terminally ill may help turn an Oregon law into a national model.

The 6-3 ruling Tuesday was considered a rebuke to the Bush administration and former Attorney General John Ashcroft. The court said they improperly threatened to use a federal drug law against Oregon doctors who prescribe lethal doses of medicine to dying patients who request it.

"The favorable ruling by the Supreme Court now permits other states to move forward in replicating Oregon's landmark law," said Peg Sandeen, executive director of the Death with Dignity National Center.

At least six other states have proposed, or are considering, some form of an assisted suicide law, with bills currently in the legislatures of California and Vermont.
The Oregon law was passed by initiative in 1994 and affirmed by an even larger majority of voters in 1997, within weeks of another Supreme Court ruling in a Washington state case that also backed states as the final authority for regulating medical practice.

A total of 208 people — mostly cancer patients — have taken the lethal prescription from 1998 through 2004, according to figures collected by Oregon health officials tracking how often the law is used.

"There's a lot of people out there who would love to have that law," said Charlene Andrews, a 68-year-old retired teacher who lives in Salem and is suffering from terminal breast cancer. She has not asked her doctor to prescribe a fatal dose of medication, but said she was glad the court upheld the law.

The issue remains thorny among physicians, who offer differing opinions.

Although the Supreme Court ruling will make it easier for other states to craft their own laws, political opposition in many states is high, said Eli Stuttsman, a Portland attorney who has defended the law since 1994.

The head of the Roman Catholic Church in Oregon was among the longtime opponents who harshly criticized the ruling.

"The failure of our governmental structures to prevent doctors from violating medicine's historic ethical prohibition, 'Do no harm,' is a tragic error of immense proportion and significance," said Archbishop John Vlazny, head of the Archdiocese of Portland.

California state Assemblyman Lloyd Levine, a Democrat who co-authored his state's proposed assisted suicide law, said various polls have shown broad support in California across demographic groups, both political and religious.

Polls in Vermont also showed broad support for an assisted suicide law based on the Oregon model, said Michael Sirotkin, spokesman for Death with Dignity Vermont and End of Life Choices Vermont.

"It's incredible the number of personal stories that you hear that identify with the issue," Sirotkin said. "You start talking about it and it's amazing how many people have stories to tell."

單選題 (Choose only one answer from each question. 5 points for each question.)

13. Which of the following is correct?
A) The courts may sometimes strike down a law that requires informing a parent.
B) Justice O'Connor said that the lower courts chose a very bold ruling.
C) The Nebraska law had imposed an undue burden because its prohibition per se.
D) All justices agreed that the New Hampshire law imposed an undue burden on pregnant teenagers.

14. Which of the following is correct?
A) The fate of the New Hampshire law was not openly watched by other states with similar restrictions.
B) The Supreme Court thought the lower courts ruled too broadly on the New Hampshire statute.
C) Had the lower courts maintained the retail law, the Supreme Court would have agreed with them.
D) The Supreme Court surmised that many applications of the New Hampshire law will trigger constitutional issues.

15. Which of the following is correct?
A) The Supreme Court rejected the President's concurrence with the Oregon law.
B) The Supreme Court's ruling will prompt other states to replace Oregon's landmark law.
C) Peg Sandeen is the executioner of the Death with Dignity National Center.
D) California legislators will likely to consider whether to pass an assisted-suicide law or not.

16. Which of the following is correct?
A) At the time when Oregon voters passed the law, the Supreme Court was backing away from assigning states as the final authority for regulating medical practice.
B) 208 people will take the lethal prescription, according to Oregon health officials.
C) Charlene Andrews, though at the current stage having no intention to use this law, nonetheless showed her condemnation of the law.
D) Physicians are still troubled by the issue of assisted-suicide for lack of consensus on this issue.

17. Which of the following is correct?
A) Archbishop Vlazny thought aberration from the historical prohibition “do no harm” is a tragic error.
B) Polls in California show the assisted suicide law is supported by political groups but not religious groups.
C) Lloyd Levine, a Democrat from California, works on the assembly line.
D) Sirotkin linked the support of the bill in Vermont to stories regarding personal identity.