

at the Red Cross. He was a loving husband, proud father, and a new grandfather. And, of course, he loved the people of South Carolina—for whom he worked tirelessly throughout his career in public service, and to whom he chose to return when his work was done in the Senate.

Today, as I remember him, his life, and his legacy, I think of the Bible in the 25th Chapter of Matthew, when the Lord said, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant. . . . Enter thou into the joy of the Lord."

May God bless him and his family.

#### 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 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.

I would like to describe a series of terrible crimes that occurred in Ashton, MD. During September 2001, an Arab-American homemaker was attacked and her property vandalized by a female neighbor. The neighbor spread feces across the Arab Americans' porch three times, pelted the home with dead plants, and doused the woman with liquid. The neighbor doused the Arab-American woman a second time, this time with bleach, which burned the victim's skin and discolored her clothes.

I believe that 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.

#### JUDGES ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier this year, the House Republicans saddled the bipartisan, non-controversial AMBER Alert bill with numerous unrelated and ill-conceived provisions, collectively known as the "Feeney amendment," that effectively overturned the basic structure of the carefully crafted sentencing guideline system. At the time, we were warned by distinguished jurists that these provisions would irrevocably harm our sentencing system and compromise justice. For example, the Nation's Chief Justice warned that the Feeney amendment, if enacted, "would do serious harm to the basic structure of the sentencing guideline system and would seriously impair the ability of courts to impose just and responsible sentences." Despite such objections, and without any serious process in the House or Senate, these provisions were pushed through conference with minor changes and enacted.

We are now beginning to witness the far-reaching impact of this folly. Not only have we compromised the sentencing system, but we have alienated and minimized the effectiveness of our Federal judges, prompting at least one to announce early retirement.

As enacted, the Feeney amendment, substantially reversed provisions allowing Federal judges to depart from sentencing guidelines when justice requires. It also created a "black list" of judges who impose sentences that the Justice Department does not like, and limited the number of Federal judges who can serve on the Sentencing Commission, thus reducing the influence of practical judicial experience on sentencing decisions.

In response, in a June 24 op-ed in the New York Times, Republican-appointed district judge and former Federal prosecutor, John S. Martin, Jr., decried these provisions as "an assault on judicial independence," "at odds with the sentencing philosophy that has been a hallmark of the American system of justice," and tragically, the impetus for his decision to retire from the bench, rather than exercise his option to continue in a lifetime position with a reduced workload. "When I took my oath of office 13 years ago I never thought I would leave the Federal bench. . . . I no longer want to be part of our unjust criminal justice system."

It is shameful that we have allowed such half-baked, poorly-crafted legislation to lead to the loss of a judge that has dedicated his career to fighting crime and preserving justice. When he was appointed by the first President Bush in 1990, Judge Martin brought with him to the bench years of knowledge and experience as a Federal prosecutor, including 3 years as a U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York. As a former Federal prosecutor, he is no slouch on crime. He knows very well the importance of vigorously pursuing and punishing wrongdoers. But his experience has also taught him that these goals cannot trounce the equally-critical pursuit of justice and fairness.

Unless we reverse the damaging provisions in the Feeney amendment, we will continue to compromise justice, alienate Federal judges, and threaten the stability and integrity of our judicial system. That is why I joined Senators KENNEDY, FEINGOLD, and LAUTENBERG in introducing the Judicial Use of Discretion to Guarantee Equity in Sentencing Act of 2003, or the JUDGES Act. This bill would correct the Feeney amendment's far-reaching provisions by restoring judicial discretion and allowing judges to impose just and responsible sentences. In addition, the JUDGES Act would reverse the provisions limiting the number of Federal judges who can serve on the Sentencing Commission. Finally, the JUDGES Act would follow through on the advice of Chief Justice Rehnquist to engage in a "thorough and dispassionate inquiry" on the Federal sentencing structure by

directing the Sentencing Commission to conduct a comprehensive study on sentencing departures and report to Congress with 180 days.

In his New York Times op-ed, Judge Martin raised another important point: Limiting judicial discretion and involvement in sentencing practices also reduces the personal satisfaction that judges derive from knowing that they are integrally involved in promoting a more just society, and in doing so removes a powerful incentive that prompts potential judges to accept a judicial appointment, despite inadequate pay. "When I became a Federal judge, I accepted the fact that I would be paid much less than I could earn in private practice. . . . I believed I would be compensated by the satisfaction of serving the public good—the administration of justice. In recent years, however, this sense has been replaced by the distress I feel at being part of a sentencing system that is unnecessarily cruel and rigid."

We all know that judicial pay is a challenging issue. Indeed, this is why I introduced a bill, S. 787, to restore the many cost of living adjustments that Congress has failed to provide the judiciary, and have joined Chairman HATCH and many other members of the Judiciary Committee in sponsoring S. 1023 to increase the annual salaries of Federal judges and justices. I encourage my colleagues to support these efforts. But I ask them not to make the challenge of judicial pay worse by taking away the intangible compensation that is the satisfaction from serving the public good. Unfortunately, the Feeney amendment has done just that.

I again urge my colleagues to support the JUDGES Act, and I ask unanimous consent that Judge Martin's June 24 op-ed be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, June 24, 2003]

LET JUDGES DO THEIR JOBS

(By John S. Martin Jr.)

I have served as a federal judge for 13 years. Having reached retirement age, I now have the option of continuing to be a judge for the rest of my life, with a reduced workload, or returning to private practice. Although I find my work to be interesting and challenging, I have decided to join the growing number of federal judges who retire to join the private sector.

When I became a federal judge, I accepted the fact that I would be paid much less than I could earn in private practice; judges make less than second-year associates at many law firms, and substantially less than a senior Major League umpire. I believed I would be compensated by the satisfaction of serving the public good—the administration of justice. In recent years, however, this sense has been replaced by the distress I feel at being part of a sentencing system that is unnecessarily cruel and rigid.

For most of our history, our system of justice operated on the premise that justice in sentencing is best achieved by having a sentence imposed by a judge who, fully informed about the offense and the offender, has discretion to impose a sentence within the statutory limits. Although most judges and legal