

---

Subject: Re: Still no coherent explanation of what legislating from the bench means  
Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 20:09:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I think their job is to see existing legislation, and events, and see if they agree with the meaning of the constitution. So, yes, they need to have a clear understanding of what the target legislation/event is, and what the constitution means. They then rule the legislation/event constitutional or not. So, if State A's legislature proposes a law, and the Supreme Court rules it unconstitutional, then the law is struck down. Similarly, if the Congress passes a law, and it is found to be unconstitutional, it is struck down. Unconstitutional would mean inconsistent with the laws in the constitution. A strict constructionist would interpret the constitution narrowly, while one who "legislates from the bench" would read all sorts of things in the constitution that are not there. I have no idea about the 3/5 of a person, I don't see that in the constitution. -akhilesh

---