

Fourteenth Amendment and of the first ten amendments, provisions in the Bill of Rights are applicable to the states as well as to the federal government. This doctrine has been successively extended during a series of cases involving one or another of the provisions in the Bill of Rights.

Obviously, when the Bill of Rights was adopted in the early 1790's, the people of this country had no remote idea that there would ever be a Fourteenth Amendment as adopted in the late 1860's.

Just as obviously, as one may determine from the debate on the Fourteenth Amendment prior to its adoption in the late 1860's, the people at that latter time had no intention of thus construing together the newly-adopted Fourteenth Amendment and the earlier Bill of Rights.

It remained for the Supreme Court in its wisdom beginning in the 1920's thus to amend the Constitution of the United States.

This General Assembly repeats with respect to the series of cases which in effect deny any official cognizance in our public proceedings of the existence of Deity, that the issue is *not* whether there is a Supreme Being. The issue is *not* whether reference to a Supreme Being will improve our sense of religion. The issue is *not* whether prayers in a public school will benefit children. The issue is *not* whether a juror who attests to his belief in God is a better juror than one who does not make this attestation.

The simple issue is that in adopting the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States the people meant only that the Congress of the United States should not adopt any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

As a corollary to this issue, there is the further issue that the sovereign people in adopting their Constitution provided a means whereby it may be amended. They did not provide that amendments be made by the Supreme Court of the United States, and it is a debasement and defilement of the rights of a democratic people under a republic form of government that we should thus be ruled by judicial fiat through an oligarchic group not responsible to the electorate.

The infringement upon the rights and processes of democracy made in this series of cases involving the First Amendment has been accompanied by cases in other areas of the law, and in totality, these decisions of the Supreme Court have troubled millions of our people.

The concern of the American people for these recent trends in the Supreme Court has nowhere been expressed better than by the Committee on Federal-State Relationships of the Conference of Chief Justices. The membership of this Committee included the Chief Justice in the highest court in the States of :

Georgia

Maryland

Massachusetts

Michigan