

March 9, 1976

morning. The U. S. Supreme Court is now made up of people who are considered to probably be in a majority who think more like Senator Murphy than those who think like I do but I am certain he would not want a super majority in the U. S. Supreme Court to be necessary to uphold the capital punishment statute. He would want five out of nine to be able to uphold that statute. He would want the smallest number necessary to get whatever it is that he wants. He feels, I think, from listening to his debates on the floor on the kind of issues that are close to his heart that a court would be more likely to be somewhere between his position and my position but he thinks the odds would favor him having more in the court who favor his way of thinking than there would be on the court favoring my way of thinking. So with that in mind, he wants to have not just the five that he would need but two more. When judges review an act by the Legislature, theoretically, all they do is take that law and using the Constitution of the state, and in some instances of the federal government, as a guide and you lay this law beside this measuring standard, and if the law is as straight as the measuring standard, the law passes muster. If it is crooked when it is supposed to be straight, then it is struck down. When a majority of the judiciary at the highest level in a state are of the opinion that a particular statute is violative of the Constitution, their view should prevail, not the fewer number, not the fewer number. What Senator Murphy is saying is that three judges should be able to overrule the judgment of six. If you require seven to rule a certain way on the constitutionality of a bill, you are placing the power in three judges, three judges. That doesn't make sense anywhere. What I wish Senator Murphy would do, if he wants to be consistent, since I am one out of forty-nine is accord forty-eight times as much weight to my vote as he does to everybody else so that I can have somewhat of a situation approaching parody in this body but he is not for that. What Senator Murphy is really trying to do in my opinion is delay the bill and hopefully try to get you to back off the vote you gave in favor of it. So you will remember what we are talking about, this is a proposed amendment to the State Constitution which would allow an increase in the number of judges on the State Supreme Court to nine, from seven. The Legislature would have to act to implement that provision of the Constitution, as you all know. At that point, if Senator Murphy would still be in the body, and he felt that there should not be nine judges, he could argue his point on the Legislature from his lonely position of one as I customarily have to do in this body. But Senator Murphy, we get strong by doing difficult things. I hope that you will defeat Senator Murphy's motion this morning. It is totally and absolutely without merit. It has nothing to do with the balance of power among the three branches of government. The