

year, a year in which many pundits argued that nothing on trade would get done.

Well we proved them wrong. In fact, this has been one of the most active years on trade in the Senate in recent memory. I say, why stop now? We should continue our efforts to open foreign markets to U.S. exports. That is why I am calling on President Bush to send up the Central American Free Trade Agreement at the earliest opportunity.

The CAFTA is an important part of our continuing efforts to open foreign markets to U.S. goods and services. This market access is critical if we are going to continue to grow our exports to the world. For my home State of Iowa, the CAFTA brings important new market access opportunities for our soybean, corn, pork and beef as well as Iowa's manufacturers and service providers.

Under the current framework, many products from the CAFTA nations get access to our market but we do not get the same access to theirs. The CAFTA will change that. It will level the playing field for U.S. producers so they can compete in this growing market.

The CAFTA also sends a strong message to our Latin American neighbors. It shows our strong desire to reach out and form deeper and lasting bonds with the international community, particularly in Latin America. The agreement will help to lock in economic reform and increase transparency in the region. There is no doubt about it. The CAFTA can serve as a cornerstone of economic growth and democracy for the region which will enhance the standard of living for millions of our southern neighbors.

A free trade agreement with these nations represents a unique opportunity not only for U.S. farmers, ranchers, businesses and workers, but also for promoting development, security and prosperity in this region. It is a good agreement for the United States and for Central America. I will work closely with President Bush and my Senate colleagues to do all I can to lay the groundwork for a successful vote on CAFTA later this year.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the United States-Morocco Free-Trade Agreement, which was passed in the Senate yesterday by a vote of 85 to 31. Nearly a year and a half of negotiations were devoted to crafting this agreement by U.S. and Moroccan officials. I voted in support of the implementing legislation to this agreement, and it is my hope that both of our countries will soon move to adopt the agreement.

Every year, the United States exports roughly \$475 million worth of goods to Morocco. While this amount is not high when we compare it with U.S. exports to Australia—approximately \$13 billion in 2003—it is significant if we view it in the dual contexts of leveling the playing field for American exporters, and, second, development and

economic growth. The United States-Morocco FTA will ease the burden on Americans, who, according to the United States Trade Representative, currently face an average tariff of over 20 percent on products they export to Morocco.

Hopefully, this agreement will also spur domestic economic growth in Morocco and encourage that nation to raise its labor and environmental standards. Like all nations, Morocco seeks to develop and modernize its economy. If distributed equitably amongst a nation's citizens, economic modernization and prosperity are important tools in the fight against extremist ideologies that promote terrorism. I hope that will be the case in Morocco.

Indeed, prospects of a United States-Morocco FTA have already in the last year prompted that nation to reform its labor laws. Now it is important that Morocco take all necessary steps to enforce these laws. The U.S. should also encourage Morocco to pursue further labor and environmental reform and strengthen its domestic enforcement of international standards.

That is not to say that this agreement is perfect. No agreement will be perfect—although I still believe that the Jordan FTA, which passed the Senate just a few years ago by a vote of 100 to 0, should serve as a benchmark and guide for the crafting of free trade agreements. Few bills, especially free trade agreements, pass with such overwhelming support. I believe that support was a testament to the inherent quality of that agreement.

Despite my overall support for the pending agreement, I do have a significant concern here. First, as my colleagues are aware, the United States-Morocco FTA, like the United States-Australia FTA, includes language that would allow prescription drug manufacturers to prevent the reimportation of their products.

For a variety of reasons, we are unlikely to import drugs from Morocco in the near future. So as a practical matter, like the United States-Australia FTA, this provision will not affect drug prices in the U.S. And as the United States-Morocco FTA was negotiated around the same time as the United States-Australia FTA, it is not surprising that this provision appears in both agreements. But, in my view, this provision must not be viewed as a precedent by the Bush administration, and I would discourage its inclusion in any future trade agreements entered into by the U.S. Nor do I believe that it prevents us from adopting laws related to drug importation in the future.

JUST SEVEN LEGISLATIVE DAYS LEFT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this week is the last week that Congress is in session before the August recess and there is only one additional week to act before the Assault Weapons Ban expires

on September 13th. This past Monday, one of our former colleagues, Senator Howard Metzenbaum, wrote an op-ed for the Washington Post. In his article, Senator Metzenbaum highlights the broad support this law has among Americans, as well as the inconsistencies between the stated positions and the actions of President Bush on the reauthorization of this critical law.

As my colleagues know, in addition to banning 19 specific weapons, the existing ban makes it illegal to "manufacture, transfer, or possess a semi-automatic" firearm that can accept a detachable magazine and has more than one of several specific military features, such as folding/telescoping stocks, protruding pistol grips, bayonet mounts, threaded muzzles or flash suppressors, barrel shrouds or grenade launchers. These weapons are dangerous and they should not be on America's streets.

In April of this year, the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence joined hundreds of local elected officials and senior law enforcement officials to urge President Bush to push for reauthorization of this critical piece of gun safety legislation. Since then, the support for this important law has grown exponentially. In addition to former Presidents Ford, Carter, and Clinton, nearly every major law enforcement organization in the country, gun safety organizations, a bipartisan majority of the Senate, and countless local leaders have added their names to the list of supporters. I commend them for their efforts in support of this commonsense gun safety legislation.

In 1994, I voted for the assault weapons ban and in March of this year I joined a bipartisan majority of the Senate in voting to extend the assault weapons ban for 10 years. Unfortunately, despite Senate passage of the amendment, it appears that this important gun safety law will be allowed to expire. The House Republican leadership opposes reauthorizing the law and President Bush, though he has said he supports it, has done little to help keep the law alive.

I ask unanimous consent that the op-ed from Senator Metzenbaum be printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement. I also ask that the list of organizations in support of this critical piece of gun safety legislation be printed in the RECORD following Senator Metzenbaum's op-ed.

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

AMERICA WANTS THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN
(By Howard M. Metzenbaum)

A decade ago I was privileged to lead a fight with Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) on what for me has become a deeply personal issue: the federal ban on assault weapons. These killing machines had no place on our streets in 1994 and they have no place now. Yet as the days pass, it is becoming clear that many members of Congress are content to skip through the summer months doing nothing while awaiting this fall's

greatest prize—not the elections, but the sunset of the assault weapons ban.

Ten years after that great victory we are facing the extinction of an important public safety law that was an unusual piece of bipartisan lawmaking. In 1994 I had the support of two men whom I would rarely call my allies, Republican icons Ronald Reagan and Rudy Giuliani. As a result, Congress was able to put public safety ahead of special-interest politics.

What's going on these days, by contrast, is typical political doublespeak. The president speaks publicly in support of the assault weapons ban but refuses to lobby actively for it. The House majority leader, Tom DeLay of Texas, says the president never told him personally that he wants the assault weapons ban renewed, so DeLay isn't going to pass it.

There you have it. The president says he supports the assault weapons ban but refuses to lift a finger for it. And the powerful House majority leader—who does not support the ban—is pretending that all it would take to pass it is a word from the president.

This is a tragic development for many reasons, not the least of which is that the public wants this legislation. A new study, "Unconventional Wisdom," by the Consumer Federation of America and the Educational Fund to Stop Gun Violence, found that a substantial majority of likely voters in 10 states support renewing and strengthening the federal assault weapons ban, as do most gun owners and National Rifle Association supporters. The survey found that:

Voters in Midwestern states supported renewing the assault weapons ban slightly more than those in Southwestern states. Midwestern states (Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan and Missouri) averaged 72 percent support for renewal. Southwestern states (Arizona and New Mexico) averaged 67 percent. In Florida, 81 percent of likely voters support renewing the ban.

Rural states, traditionally seen as very conservative on gun issues, strongly favored renewing the ban. Sixty-eight percent of voters in South Dakota and West Virginia support renewal.

Majorities of gun owners in all but two states favored renewing the ban. Even in those two states, Missouri and Ohio, only slightly less than 50 percent of gun owners and NRA supporters favored renewing the ban.

In nine of 10 states surveyed, union households supported renewing the ban by at least 60 percent. In Pennsylvania, 80 percent of union households supported renewing the ban and 73 percent supported strengthening it.

At least 60 percent of current and former military members and military families supported renewing the ban in all states surveyed. In Wisconsin, more than three-fourths, 77 percent, of current and former military members and military families support renewing the ban.

In March the Senate passed a renewed ban as an amendment to a gun industry immunity bill, which was the NRA's top legislative priority. President Bush issued a statement of administration policy calling the assault weapons ban amendment "unacceptable." The amendment passed on a bipartisan vote, 52 to 47, but the underlying bill was defeated. It was a stunning loss for the gun lobby. The NRA opposes even a straight renewal of the ban. It maintains that most Americans don't want the ban renewed, let alone strengthened, and that Congress should let the ban expire. Not true.

The gun industry is licking its chops waiting for the ban to expire. In an upcoming report from the Consumer Federation of America, "Back in Business," one assault weapon manufacturer's sales and marketing director

told us, "When the AWB sunsets, which I fully expect it to do, we will be manufacturing pre-ban style weapons and shipping them to the general public through distribution systems and dealers the very next day without doubt. . . . We look forward to Sept. 14th with great enthusiasm."

After 19 years in the Senate, I understand differences of opinions, ideologies and constituencies. What I cannot understand is why congressional leaders and the administration think that the American public won't notice that the ban expired. We'll notice, and they'll be sorry.

Reauthorizing the assault weapons ban is supported by:

Fraternal Order of Police
International Association of Chiefs of Police
Major City Chiefs
National Association of Police Organizations
National Organization of Black Police Officials
International Brotherhood of Police Officers
Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association
American Probation and Parole Association
National League of Cities
US Conference of Mayors
National Association of Counties
US Conference of Catholic Bishops
National Education Association
American Bar Association
NAACP
Americans for Gun Safety
Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence
United with the Million Mom March
Church Women United
Episcopal Church, USA
American Academy of Family Physicians
American Public Health Association
Family Violence Prevention Fund
National Coalition Against Domestic Violence
National Network to End Domestic Violence
National Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems
National Association of Social Workers
Physicians for a Violence Free Society
American Association of Suicidology
Mothers Against Violence in America
Child Welfare League of America
Alliance for Justice

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

On August 12, 2002, Stephanie (Wilbur) Thomas, age 19, was driving her friend Ukea (Deon) Davis, age 18, home in southeast Washington, DC. The two young transgendered women were members of Transgender Health Empowerment, an African-American transgender support group. A car drove up beside them, and a gunman fired shots from an automatic weapon. The gunfire killed Ukea Davis and critically wounded Stephanie Thomas. The gunman then got out of the car and fired additional shots into Thomas'

car. Though police have not determined if they will file this as a hate crime, the additional shots fired at Thomas after the initial shooting seem to indicate an overkill factor common in many murders of transgendered people in the U.S.

I believe that the Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I regret that the President and the Republican leadership in the Senate continue to choose division over cooperation and confrontation over consensus on the Presidents' most controversial judicial nominees. Senators can work together, Republicans and Democrats. The conflict we are experiencing on the Senate floor, which has the collateral consequence of disrupting important and unfinished work of the Senate, is by Republican partisan design. It is bad for the Senate and the country.

Earlier this morning I was at the White House for the signing of the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act. Senator CAMPBELL and I were the lead sponsors in the Senate on this successful effort, which we know as the "Steve Young Act" to honor an outstanding law enforcement officer.

Another example of our bipartisan cooperation is the resolution the Senate passed unanimously last night regarding with the consequences of the Supreme Court's decision in the *Blakely* case and the need to clarify Federal criminal sentencing law, S. Con. Res. 130. The Senate has now said, consistent with the record we developed at our recent Judiciary Committee hearing, that the Supreme Court should expeditiously clarify the status of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals urged expedited consideration. The Department of Justice is bringing cases to the Supreme Court and should seek expedited consideration to afford the opportunity needed to obtain that necessary guidance.

There are scores of other measures on the Senate Calendar of Business on which we should be acting and could have been acting this week. We still need to enact the Satellite Home Viewer Improvement Act, S. 2013; the Ag Workers bill, S. 1645; the Dream Act, S. 1545; the judicial pay raise, S. 1023, the Anti-Atrocity Act, S. 710; the authorization for mental health courts, S. 2107; and other needed legislation on which there is so much bipartisan agreement.

With all this to do, with the 13 appropriations bills as yet unfinished, without a budget, without serious oversight of significant problems, it is incredible