

days after they lose their COBRA coverage. Eligibility for the program would expire only if they enroll in a private insurance plan or become eligible for Medicare.

The families of September 11 have shown great courage and extraordinary resilience. But we still have much more to do to help them on their long and arduous road to recovery, and I hope very much that we can pass this legislation this year. It will only affect a small number of families. But for them, it will make a world of a difference.

#### KEEP OUR PROMISE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, as the assault weapons ban expired last Monday, one of our Nation's law enforcement officers was recovering in a Miami, FL hospital from two gunshot wounds inflicted by an AK-47 rifle. According to the Brady Campaign, all models of this make of assault rifle were prohibited at the time of the attack, but are now legal due to the expiration of the assault weapons ban on September 13.

Last Monday, the Miami Herald reported that on September 12, 2004 Miami-Dade Police Officer Keenya Hubert was on a routine patrol when she heard gunshots fired in a nearby neighborhood. She spotted a suspicious vehicle leaving the area, called for backup, and pulled the vehicle over. Suddenly, the driver got out of his vehicle and fired nearly two-dozen bullets at Officer Hubert and her police car using an AK-47 assault rifle. One of those bullets struck Officer Hubert in the shoulder and another grazed her forehead. Later in the week a man was arrested in connection with this attack. Press reports indicate the man had been previously convicted of attacking two other police officers in 1997.

Unfortunately, assault rifles like the one reportedly used in the attack on Officer Hubert's life as well as many other similar assault weapons are once again being legally produced and sold as a result of the expiration of the assault weapons ban. The ban also included firearms that can accept detachable magazines and have more than one of several specific military features, such as a folding/telescoping stock, protruding pistol grip, bayonet mount, threaded muzzle or flash suppressor, barrel shroud or grenade launcher. Common sense tells us that there is no reason for civilians to have easy access to guns with these features.

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 ban for 10 years. Unfortunately, despite the overwhelming support of the law enforcement community, the ongoing threat of terrorism, and bipartisan support in the Senate, neither the President nor the Republican Congressional leadership acted to protect Americans

from assault weapons like the one used in the attack on Officer Hubert.

Last week, Sarah Brady, the wife of Jim Brady who was shot in John Hinckley's attempted assassination of President Reagan, issued an open letter to President Bush expressing disappointment in his decision to allow the assault weapons ban to expire.

Mr. President, I hope that in the remaining days of the 108th Congress the Republican leadership and the President will reverse course and act to extend the assault weapons ban.

I ask unanimous consent that Sarah Brady's letter to President Bush be printed in the RECORD.

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

SEPTEMBER 14, 2004.

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH: I cannot begin to express my disappointment in your decision to let the Assault Weapons Ban expire yesterday.

Four years ago you said you supported renewal of the assault weapons ban, though you made it clear that you were generally opposed to reasonable gun violence prevention laws. I was very happy to hear you say it then, because it was a sensible position, and one long supported by such conservative leaders as Ronald Reagan and Barry Goldwater. As a lifelong Republican, it gave me hope that my party would move away from the knee-jerk tendency to oppose whatever the gun lobby said Republicans should oppose.

Now, these guns, designed by military scientists to inflict the maximum level of damage to human beings, are back on our streets.

You have broken your promise to the American people and you should be ashamed. Jim and I loved Ronald Reagan, and one of the main reasons we loved him was that he was always, always, true to his word.

This law worked, and it saved lives. It saved the lives of police officers and children. You cast your support aside for a political endorsement. We all pay prices in life for our actions. I hope the American people will make you pay a price for this decision.

In your current campaign, you are pledging to keep America safe. But your conscious decision to let this ban expire has placed us all in jeopardy.

The expiration of this law is temporary. It will be renewed: It is only a matter of how long it will take to renew it. There is still time for you to show leadership, do the right thing, and restore this law. But know that Jim and I will continue our efforts to restore the ban, with or without your help. And we will succeed. Lives are hanging in the balance.

Mr. President, step forward and do the right thing.

Sincerely,

SARAH BRADY.

#### RELEASE OF YASER HAMDI

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, at a hearing Wednesday before the Judiciary Committee, I asked some tough questions about the record of the Department of Justice in prosecuting terrorism cases. Later that day, the Department announced the imminent release of Yaser Esam Hamdi, the so-called "enemy combatant" who has been held for nearly 3 years without

being formally charged with any crime. During this period, the Bush administration argued that it could deny Hamdi, a U.S. citizen, due process and detain him indefinitely. In June, the Supreme Court struck down the administration's assertion of unchecked executive power, ruling that Hamdi had the right to challenge his detention. Rather than proceed in court, the Justice Department now says that it will release Hamdi, who will renounce his U.S. citizenship and join his family in Saudi Arabia.

The Justice Department has claimed that Hamdi fought with the Taliban and posed a threat to our national security. Hamdi claimed that he was an innocent captured in Afghanistan by the Northern Alliance. We simply do not know the truth. But, as the Rutland Herald correctly points out in its editorial Thursday, that is what trials are for. If Hamdi was a combatant, or a civilian caught up in a combat zone, he should have been treated in accordance with the Geneva Conventions, which provide for the treatment of soldiers and civilians in wartime. If Hamdi committed a crime, he should have been charged and tried. The timing of his release is curious. Three months after the Supreme Court rejected the administration's refusal to grant Hamdi due process, the Justice Department suddenly determined that Hamdi no longer posed a threat. Now it will release a person it previously claimed was so dangerous that he had to be held for years in a military brig, mainly in solitary confinement.

The Attorney General relied on powerful rhetoric to defend the Department's record. He liked to say that no one had successfully challenged the Government's use of authority under the PATRIOT Act and that no court had found the Government had overreached. Since the Supreme Court decisions on Hamdi and related cases last summer, it has become harder for him to make such claims. Those Court decisions do not stand alone in defining the Department's level of success, however. The list of reversals of this Administration's policies and practices has become extensive. From the Department's involvement in rewriting our country's adherence to the Geneva Convention and the Convention Against Torture, which contributed to the breakdown at the Abu Ghraib prison and elsewhere, to the Supreme Court's rejection of the administration's Guantanamo practices, there is much that needs attention and correction.

Indeed, the Justice Department has accumulated one loss after another in terrorism cases. In recent weeks, we have witnessed the unraveling of the Department's first post-September 11 prosecution of a terrorist sleeper cell in Detroit. This followed on the heels of a growing list of losses and questionable cases, including the wrongful arrest of a Portland attorney based on a fingerprint mismatch; the acquittal of