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HAVE THE FEDERAL COURTS FUNCTIONED AS THE FRAMERS INTENDED

Second Circuit Judicial Conference Workshop
Hershey, Pennsylvania
October 17, 1987
9:30 A.M.

Have the Federal Courts functioned as the Framers intended? The question before us this morning really is a threefold one: First, what role did the Framers foresee for the federal courts when they drafted Article III of the Constitution 200 years ago? What was their vision? Second, what significant functions have the Federal Courts in fact performed during the life of the Republic? And third, does the performance square with the vision?

This topic should not involve us in a discussion of the jurisprudence of original intent to any great degree. The purposes of the Framers in regard to the functioning of the Judiciary, at least as far as this discussion is concerned, are ascertainable. They may be found in the Federalist Papers, in other writings and in the Constitution itself. Our frame of reference, therefore, is fairly well defined.

The nation is, of course, much different from what it was 200 years ago. Thirteen colonies in a wilderness with a population of under 4,000,000, have grown to a continent of 50
states populated by a citizenry of nearly 230 million. Hamilton considered that it would be "highly expedient and useful to divide the United States into four or five or half a dozen districts, and to institute a federal court in each district," but we now have 94 United States District Courts. He envisioned that the Judiciary would be the weakest of the three departments of power, without sword or purse as he put it, but it seems clear that the judicial department today holds the confidence of the people more than any other.

While the Framers contemplated a very limited role for the national government in general, federal regulation now reaches into almost every phase of human activity. The Bill of Rights, the Civil War Amendments, congressional legislation under the Commerce Clause, expansive statutory and constitutional interpretations by the Supreme Court, all have contributed to the development of judicial duties unknown to the Framers. Federal Courts have been assigned, or have undertaken, some tasks of a kind never even remotely contemplated by the Framers. It therefore follows that our inquiry must be concerned to some extent with the evolution and the changing emphasis in the work of the federal courts.

Yet, despite the additional tasks to which the judiciary has fallen heir, much of the Hamiltonian vision endures. There is his prediction that the courts would function as "an intermediate body between the people and the legislature in order . . . to
keep the latter within the limits of their authority." There is his statement on the duty of the Judiciary "to declare all acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the Constitution void." There is his assertion that "[t]he interpretation of the laws is the proper and peculiar province of the courts." Hamilton also foresaw the need for the federal courts "to over-rule such [state laws] as might be in contravention of the articles of union." In No. 78 of that amazing series of persuasive essays known as the Federalist Papers, Hamilton envisioned the courts of justice as "bulwarks of a limited constitution," "mitigating the severity, and confining the operation" of "unjust and partial laws."

Hamilton's sense of the judicial function does not, of course, represent the entire spectrum of the Framers' viewpoints on the Judiciary. It does, however, exemplify the depth and richness of their thought in relation to the operation of the judicial branch. It provides important insights into the system of courts they envisioned. And so, after almost two centuries of experience, we turn to an examination of the functioning of the federal judiciary, informed by the perceptions and ideas of those who wrote the Constitution.

What part did the Framers expect the Courts to play, and have the Courts played that part?
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