

Minnesota
New York
Oregon
South Carolina
Texas
Wisconsin

Surely, no group of person could approach these decisions of the Supreme Court with more learning and erudition. Residents of the State of Maryland have taken particular pride in the fact that the Honorable Frederick W. Brune, now retired as Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, served as Chairman of this group.

Portions of the report of this Committee are worth the sober consideration of the people of the entire country :

“It is a part of our obligation to seek to uphold respect for law. We do not believe that this goes so far as to impose upon us an obligation of silence when we find ourselves unable to agree with pronouncements of the Supreme Court (even though we are bound by them), or when we see trends in decisions of that Court which we think will lead to unfortunate results. We hope that the expression of our views may have some value. They pertain to matters which directly affect the work of our state courts. In this report we urge the desirability of self-restraint on the part of the Supreme Court in the exercise of the vast powers committed to it. We endeavor not to be guilty ourselves of a lack of due restraint in expressing our observations which follows.

“The outstanding development in federal-state relations since the adoption of the national Constitution has been the expansion of the power of the national government and the consequent contraction of the powers of the state governments. To a large extent this is wholly unavoidable and indeed is a necessity, primarily because of improved transportation and communication of all kinds and because of mass production. On the other hand, our Constitution does envision federalism. The very name of our nation indicates that it is to be composed of states. The Supreme Court of a bygone day said in *Texas v. White*, 7 Wall. 700, 721 (1868): ‘The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union of indestructible States.’

“Second only to the increasing dominance of the national government has been the development of the immense power of the Supreme Court in both state and national affairs. It is not merely the final arbiter of the law; it is the maker of policy in many major social and economic fields. It is not subject to the restraints to which a legislative body is subject. There are points at which it is difficult to delineate precisely the line which should circumscribe the judicial function and separate it from that of policy-making. Thus, usually within narrow limits, a court may be called upon in the ordinary course of its duties to make what is actually a policy decision by choosing between two rules, either of which might be deemed applicable to the situation presented in a pending case.