



St. Louis Post-Dispatch

3/17/20 A8

**YOUR VIEWS • LETTERS FROM OUR READERS**

**Lawmakers must answer for pandemic response**

We are in the midst of a pandemic. This is a time for true leadership, which means leaders listen to doctors, let science dictate and not be taken away with xenophobic tin-foil-hat nuttery. Little of what President Donald Trump has said in his Wednesday night speech was true: Testing is not readily available; other countries are getting this under control; and it is rising here because of a lack of leadership and, for lack of a better word, brains. Again we are not leading the world, we are bringing up the tail end. I don't know what it will take for Sens. Roy Blunt, and Josh Hawley and Rep. William Lacy Clay all to stand up to Trump.



**Hawley**

Maybe my elected officials haven't lost enough money in the stock market for them to spring into action, and that is sad.

The constituents of Missouri will remember how their elected officials catastrophically fumbled this event when it is time for them to run for re-election.

**Chemia Moffatt • Northwoods**

**St. Louis has cooperated to battle the coronavirus**

I commend Mayor Lyda Krewson and all of the St. Louis institutions that are working together to prevent the

**Supreme Court justices also need a code of ethics**

Regarding "Roberts chides Schumer for 'dangerous' remarks on 2 justices" (March 4): Regardless of what Sen. Chuck Schumer said publicly, Chief Justice John Roberts should not have responded with: "... threatening statements of this sort from the highest levels of government are not only inappropriate, they are dangerous."

Such an extrajudicial statement is either improper or gives rise to the appearance of impropriety, because it renders an opinion on Sen. Schumer's statements when they were not properly before the Supreme Court. There was no due process. Part of a judge's adjudicative responsibilities is to allow for the right to be heard according to law. Thus, public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary is undermined.

However, one of the continuing mysteries of our democracy is that there is no ethical code of conduct for Supreme Court justices. Whereas, the vast majority of, if not all, other judges — state and federal — are bound by some ethical code. Had any other judge made such an extrajudicial statement, he or she could have been reprimanded and, consequently, disqualified from particular cases.

If we truly subscribe to the maxim that "no one is above the law," this would be an excellent opportunity for serious debate concerning a code of ethics for Supreme Court justices.

**Lou Horwitz • St. Peters**