

governmental reason why that should not be so. I think that the restriction on publicizing certain aspects of juvenile proceedings is something that should be maintained. I definitely believe that our confidential phone calls should be maintained in confidentiality. But when it comes to the day-to-day operation of the Legislature we should be like an open book, which we are. Most of the time it's a book that most people don't choose to read but nevertheless here we are available. In this instance, I'm well aware that what I'm saying is for the record and I intend it for that purpose. Any time a bill of the kind that Senator Jones is bringing I shall fight it and I want to give a word to my young colleague, Senator Maurstad, young in years and young in seniority. I'm not going to ignore that document on which the Appropriations spent so much work, Senator Maurstad. I may not give it as much detailed attention but I'm not going to let you all's work go by the boards and be unappreciated. Sometimes though we may oppose something doesn't mean we don't appreciate it. It could mean we have such an appreciation for the issue that we understand it better than those who took a certain position and we want to rectify that to the extent possible. On this though we're talking about something being done legislatively that does not have to be done at all. There is no way that a federal agency or a state agency is going to take people's property without just and fair compensation. When you have a reactionary Supreme Court, well, it ranges from reactionary to archconservative on the liberal side, if you have a Supreme Court of that kind, it's foolish to say that they are not going to respect property rights, they worship at the altar of property rights. So that problem that Senator Jones thinks he is addressing is not going to occur. What I wish that court would do, in protecting its prerogatives in terms of being the final word on the law, that they will separate themselves from these narrow interests that many of the justices have so that they can protect the Supreme Court as an institution, so they will not behave in such a doctrinaire, dogmatic, anticitizen manner as to lose all respect on the part of the public toward the court. The court can function only while there is a willingness to accept its pronouncements. There was a president dealing with a national bank. People like to quote some general or somebody asking how many divisions does the Pope have. But there was a president, and I'm not going to tell you, I want you to be in great suspense, who said the Supreme Court has rendered its decision, let the Supreme Court carry it out or enforce it. We have two answers. One says Thomas Jefferson, the other one says Jackson.