

1958

Fire Insurance For Freedom

Clarence Emmett Manion
Notre Dame Law School

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.law.nd.edu/law_faculty_scholarship



Part of the [Constitutional Law Commons](#), [Insurance Law Commons](#), and the [Jurisprudence Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Clarence E. Manion, *Fire Insurance For Freedom*, 25 *Ins. Counsel J.* 414 (1958).
Available at: https://scholarship.law.nd.edu/law_faculty_scholarship/971

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the Publications at NDLScholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal Articles by an authorized administrator of NDLScholarship. For more information, please contact lawdr@nd.edu.

his very fine wife and family. He taught American history and government and was admitted to the bar in Indiana in 1922.

Beginning in 1952, he taught constitutional law. When I read that, I thought I was certainly presumptive to have discussed constitutional law in any phase here this morning.

He was Dean of the law school from 1942 to 1952. He taught corporations and has practiced corporation and insurance law since he left the Deanship of the college.

He is an author, having written, as many of you have read, "The Keys to Peace." He also wrote, "American History and Liberty," and, "The Police Powers."

One of the finest compliments, however, that I personally can think of, when I think back on Dean Manion, was that

when he spoke at the American Bar Association at Boston in 1953, he had just been appointed Chairman of the Intergovernmental Affairs Committee or Association for the United States. Very shortly after that, Dean Manion refused to pervert the integrity of his personal opinion—I believe it was his stand on the Bricker amendment—and he left the chairmanship rather than accede to the demands of certain people that he publicly withdraw his support of that amendment.

It is a man of this integrity, a man who is a great speaker and perhaps even a greater thinker in the field of freedom as it affects the United States of America, whom I introduce to you to speak on the subject, "Fire Insurance for Freedom," Dean Clarence E. Manion, former Dean of Notre Dame College of Law! (Applause)

Fire Insurance For Freedom

DEAN CLARENCE E. MANION
South Bend, Indiana

MR. PRESIDENT Betts, Mr. President-Elect, gentlemen of the International Association of Insurance Counsel and your lovely ladies: I am particularly grateful and edified to a very great extent by the intelligent interest of the advocates of the advocates—may I say that of your lovely wives—for their sustained interest in these legalisms that you have heard here this morning. It is very impressive, and it encourages me to say primarily to the ladies present that what I am ostensibly addressing to the gentlemen, I am really addressing to you.

I know, of course, that you are defense lawyers primarily, and I want to talk to you about the defense of a great many things.

However, I must say in passing that as I registered yesterday, I overheard one gentleman boast about the fact that he remained at home until he had heard of the \$75,000 which the jury returned in his favor. I drop this remark because you ought to know that you may be infiltrated by the opposition. (Laughter)

Looking at the clock, observing the program, seeing all that is in store for you

from now until Saturday morning, I recall something that happened back at Notre Dame a good many years ago. The time was a quarter of two in the morning; the occasion was what turned out to be an almost interminable football banquet. The speaker of the evening was just warming into his well prepared and obviously lengthy address at a quarter of two. At that point, my old friend, Knute Rockne, leaned over to me. He said, "Pat, I can forgive the public speaker who does not look at the clock. The guy I want to shoot, however, is the fellow who does not keep his eye on the calendar." (Laughter)

Now, I want to assure you that I know what day it is, and I solemnly promise, Mr. Betts, that I am going to complete this engagement on the day for which it was arranged. (Laughter). I shall even do better than that. I shall be clock conscious as well as calendar conscious and proceed bluntly, briefly and perhaps somewhat brutally to the point.

What I have to say to you, ladies and gentlemen, is unapologetically provocative. All that I say will be a footnote to what your President has already said, and so

beautifully documented. I do not mean to talk merely about the usurpations of the courts. I mean to speak about the usurpations of government in general, appropriately to the title of this address.

But first of all, I want to say a word about you and the disposition that I have observed in the last 20 years for lawyers for the defense to become increasingly compromising. I want to tell you that I have benefited by that to some extent when we have represented plaintiffs. I detect what you undoubtedly have observed, namely, a disposition on the part of defense attorneys to compromise with plaintiffs for sums which everybody involved knows are excessive. Sometimes, they are very, very greatly excessive.

Now, why is it? It is an extension of the old legal aphorism that a good settlement is better than a poor law suit. I do not mean to question the judgment of any lawyer in any case who gets the plaintiff more than he is entitled to or who, because of the circumstances of a particular situation, decides that it is better to settle than to fight. I think the judgment in individual cases, perhaps, is nearly always good. What I decry is the general tendency not only on the part of the defense lawyers, but on the part of lawyers generally and on the part of our country, specifically, to compromise important issues—to become more and more compromising in our attitudes. It is the disposition to let well enough alone, the disposition to support the lesser of two evils at election time, the disposition to go along on the assumption that, well, it probably won't happen in my time; I will leave the curative job to the younger generation. Sure we need vigilance, sure we need activity, but, well, I am within a few years of retirement, and after all—!

Gentlemen, this compromising attitude in general is killing the country, cutting the Constitution to shreds and destroying the last vestiges of American freedom. It *will* happen in your time. Make no mistake about it!

I read in this week's United States News and World Reports a summary of recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court. I noticed that one of them protected an American suspected of moonshining in Georgia because the search for the still was made without proper warrants of search and authority. That is fine! I presume that he was represented by the

National Association for the Protection of Moonshiners, (laughter) and I am all for the restriction of the power of unauthorized search. Nevertheless, I remarked to myself, at the time, that it is too bad for the government that instead of searching for a still they were not searching for evidence of income tax violation because, in that case, the Fourth Amendment means nothing.

Not only the courts, but the Congress has authorized every income tax collector to search at will anywhere, anytime. He can examine wives, to find the guilt of their husbands. He may do everything, in short, that the Fourth Amendment prohibits. In other words, searches and seizures by general search warrant are now completely authorized by the tax law and practiced every day of our lives.

I think perhaps that we should have a National Association for the Protection of Taxpayers. It should be vigilant, it should be serviced and supported by able lawyers, and it should be active right now.

These decisions which Mr. Betts cited here this morning are evidence, not merely of the sociological tendencies of the courts, but they are evidence of the sociological tendencies of our time, and they are also evidence of the apathy of the American people in the face of these sociological incursions into our system of private property and personal liberty.

I recall that in 1765, a man by the name of James Otis had a job which was called "King's Counsel" in Massachusetts. Some of the uncharitable biographers of James Otis refer to him as being slightly mad. Of course, by modern standards, he was, because he had a good job on the King's payroll, which he surrendered rather than compromise his principles of justice. He was prospering as a bureaucrat, and there was no sane reason why he should have done what he did. Nobody does so today. But, nevertheless, in those pre-revolutionary days, principle was important. Parliament and the King in concert, sent their agents over to this country armed with what were called "Writs of Assistance."

The Writ of Assistance was a general search warrant which gave the bureaucrat the right to search any place that he pleased to find anybody that he might find or any property or any contraband that might be discovered in the search. Mind you, this was prior to the establishment of the

Constitution of the United States. Nevertheless, there was inherent in the natural law as it was so ably expounded by James Otis, a prohibition written in heaven against this sort of violation of personal rights.

When they handed to James Otis the Writs of Assistance and told him, as King's Counsel, to go ahead and enforce them, James Otis resigned, got himself off of the King's payroll and appeared as counsel for the people whom they were attempting to search and seize. That was the beginning of the American Revolution. It began in the militant spirit of one man and his devotion to the principles of personal freedom.

Now, there is a great bracket of time between 1765 and 1958. If you want to check the great change in public opinion and public reaction and public vigilance in the matter of private rights, let me recall what I said to you a moment ago: that the Congress has, by law, authorized every income tax collector in every state of this Union to make general searches of everybody, anywhere, anytime, merely by flashing the card which is his means of identification.

I know lawyers who have gotten out of bed at night to open buildings to income tax collectors, pursuant to the notification that they wanted to get in and look in the files now, not the next morning. But the lawyers have gone down and opened the building, sat there and helped the searchers while they went through their clients' files and papers.

That is what I point out as the spirit of compromise. That, gentlemen and friends of the legal fraternity, is a mark, it seems to me, of deterioration in the vigilance which is the price of liberty. All of us are busy. We have in these tempestuous times a terrible job to do in order to pay the expenses of our families and try by devious maneuvers, some of them Goldfine, and others not so fine (laughter) to live with the ICC and the FTC and the SOB, (laughter) There are hundreds of these isolated and congregated units of the vigilantes now bearing down upon the ordinary private citizens who pay the taxes for their upkeep.

Well, I know that there is great preoccupation in the need for a people to make a living. I think, nevertheless, the time has come to develop a few James

Otises, even though they are "slightly mad," in the cause of human freedom.

You gentlemen are interested in casualties and in casualty insurance. I want to call your attention this morning to the greatest insurance policy that was ever written—the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution of the United States was designed as written as a fire insurance policy—precisely that. After all, what is government?

George Washington had a phrase for it. I will never forget it because I had to write it 500 times when I was in the sixth grade. (Laughter) I do not know what I did in order to merit that kind of a penance, but I will never forget what I wrote. Here it is: "Government is like fire, a dangerous servant, a fearful master. George Washington." Five hundred times—try it once and look at it squarely. I wish my children had had to write it 5,000 times. I wish that every American could see it on billboards all over the country. I wish lawyers would use it over and over in public speeches, in pleadings to the courts everywhere, all the time—"government is like fire."

Government is exactly like fire, my friends. There is nothing so much like fire as government. George Washington was right! Fire is a very useful ingredient of civilization. Certainly, the world was a dark, dreary and unprepossessing place before the first fire was lighted. That is true. Fire is at the heart of all combustion. It is at the seat of our civilization. Without fire, we would not have anything as lovely as the electric light or as terrible as the atom bomb.

Yes, fire is necessary. But fire is also extremely dangerous, as the balance sheets of any fire insurance company will reveal. Wherever you see fire, therefore, whether it is in a cook stove or a blast furnace, you will see that fire surrounded by iron walls and watched carefully lest it leap out beyond the walls of its containment and spread itself into a destructive conflagration.

Fire is a thing that you need, but fire, in turn, needs to be watched and confined and contained and held under what you want to cook. It is not something to be neglected and trusted and allowed to sweep and expand at its own whimsical will. Anybody who has watched fire on the wing knows how whimsical and destructive fire can be. George Washington

said that government was like fire, that it was a useful servant, but a fearful master. That was the spirit in which the Constitution was written! That was the revolutionary spirit in which James Otis acted!

This fire of government which our forefathers lighted in the Declaration of Independence was put behind checks and balances, as Mr. Betts pointed out. They put a little bit of it in West Virginia, and therein they subdivided it a little bit in Charleston and a little bit in the county. They put a very little bit in a place called Washington, D.C., but wherever they put the fire of government, they put it behind barbed wire establishments, solid walls of fire-resisting constitutional prohibitions, so that that government would not aggregate itself to the center and burn the liberties of the people and their property and their rights which came from God, according to the Declaration of Independence—not burn those God given rights of the people to a crisp.

The Founding Fathers of this Republic had seen the fire of government do that at least once in every generation of human history. They knew the terrible fire with which they were playing when they set up the government of the United States and of its constituent states and subdivisions.

Now, unfortunately, we have forgotten that. The first job of all of the friends of freedom therefore, is to revive the consciousness of the fact that government is like fire. Many, many things are done, not logically, but psychologically. Observe that in legal recourse, in judicial decisions, in legislation, it is not the logical, it is the psychological that is attractive to the masses of America. The fact that government is like fire has a psychological impact upon the men whom you want to enlist in the cause of freedom. This psychological impact is necessary for the preservation of human liberty.

So much for government. Now, what is Liberty? Liberty is limited government. Of course, my egg-headed associates on the university faculties around the country would always accuse me of over-simplification when I said that, as I have been saying it for years. But for the practical purposes of practical men and women, there is no other working definition of liberty. Liberty is limited government.

Where government is limited, the people under it are free. Where government is unlimited, the people under it are slaves.

It is just as simple as that. Today we call it Communism—unlimited government in the hands of Godless gangsters. Unlimited government is the arbitrary right to sweep every person and thing that is in front of it.

Yesterday, it was Nazism and, in Italy, it was a thing called Fascism. But always and everywhere in human history, tyranny is what? Government on the loose, fire out of control, sweeping populations in front of it ruthlessly without rules and without restriction.

Liberty is limited government. This is the first civilization in human history that was able to understand that and that was able to keep government in its place. The language of the Constitution meant nothing unless that language was galvanized and implemented and strengthened by the consciousness of a people who knew the terrible force that was being contained by the Constitution.

Take a tiger. The nature of the tiger is not changed when it is caged. The tiger behind the bars is the same ravenous man-eater that roamed in the jungle. Government is not sanctified when it is located in Washington and presided over by some plausible popular fellow. Government in Washington is the same caged tiger that the Founding Fathers of this country corraled and put in its place and tied down. We must never let the tiger escape control.

Today, in spite of all our platitudes to the contrary, we lean to a government of men rather than a government of laws. It is so much more comfortable to find the king who is congenial and plausible to whom we can give a free hand so we can blissfully go ahead about our private business. We pick up the paper and take a snatch at the headlines to see what happened down there in Washington yesterday, and then get busy on the next lawsuit.

Well, the time has come, my friends, for the private property that you represent to have a better defense than you have given it or that I have given it or that we have recognized that it needs. I speak to you seriously when I say that we desperately need a National Association for the Activation and Protection of Taxpayers, an NAAPT. Whatever may be said about the accomplishments of N.A.A.C.P., to which Mr. Betts referred, every federal judge in this land knows that when he pushes one of the clients of N.A.A.C.P. around, he is going to get repercussions the next day

which will reverberate all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Let me remind you that this activity is in the courts—not in the legislatures, not in the Congress, not in political actions. This activity in the courts by lawyers on behalf of clients has effectively amended the Constitution of the United States two or three times. It goes so far that unless you are a client of N.A.A.C.P. or the Civil Liberties Union, you can hardly raise a constitutional question in the court anymore at all. (Applause) Try it sometime.

The power of government in this country to aggregate as well as expand itself is positively astounding. Let us go back to Mr. Goldfine and my old friend Sherman Adams. Goldfine, according to the accounts, bought a few presents, and nobody has ever yet said that it was not his own money that he was using. At least, it was private funds that he was scattering around to get or not to get influence. I am not prejudging his case at all, but ladies and gentlemen, let me just remind you of this: In the very same newspaper which reported that Bernard Goldfine had paid a \$2,000 hotel bill for Sherman Adams—in the very same newspaper—it was announced that President Eisenhower had given \$7,000 of public money to Eric Johnson to propagandize foreign aid.

Did you read it? Well, you had to be pretty selective in finding a newspaper that reported both the propositions. But it is a fact. Public money in one case; private in the other.

Then, there is another matter of public record. I do not know whether any of you followed the battle in the House of Representatives on the Trade Agreements Act extension. Well, the private poll that was taken on the Trade Agreements Act three weeks before the vote was taken actually in the House showed 288 representatives in favor of killing the administration's bill for extension of the Trade Agreements Act. This was 70 more than a majority of the House. As of that time the bill was a dead duck. That was three weeks before the vote was taken. When the vote was taken, three weeks later, the administration won by 317 to 98.

Please observe that the minds of 190 Congressmen were changed in three weeks. By whom? By the private lobbies, by the oil companies, by the cement lobby, by the importers' organizations, by all these

creatures who have to register and give financial statements and account for their presents here, there, and wherever all the time, according to law? No. Those minds were not changed by these private lobbies. One hundred ninety votes were changed by the pressures of the tax supported bureaucracy itself.

Ten votes were changed in this way: Ten congressmen were called into the office of the Secretary of the Interior—ten congressmen who were against the administration bill. The Secretary of the Interior told them that they should be for the bill. The congressmen told him they were against it. Whereupon the Secretary of the Interior then and there agreed to spend \$68,000,000 in the states of these ten congressmen to stockpile copper, which would reactivate the mines in their own communities and give them more benefits than they would ever get by the defeat of the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. So, the ten congressmen, unable to face their constituents after such an offer was made, voted for the other side.

Another congressman was called by someone who had nothing to do with the administration except that he was pretty close to the White House. He called the congressman and said to him, "Why are you against the Trade Agreements Extension? If you vote for it," he said, "I can get you an ammunition depot in your congressional district." This congressman, knowing that this would be publicized went back and voted the other way.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, what chance does the public have against any measure that is propelled by public money on the basis of \$6,000,000 per vote? If you divide \$60,000,000 by ten, you will find that each one of those Congressmen was given, in effect, \$6,000,000 to change his vote on that bill.

So it was through the 190 who were changed. This same thing can be and is regularly done for any measure which the government itself approves. Senator McClellan is on record as having said, "What is the Appropriations Committee of the Senate or the House going to do when the only people who come in to testify about these expenditures are bureaucrats who are going to spend the money. They can think of many, many reasons why they should have it." He said, "More often than not those against the appropriation, aside from a few special interests, do not

show up at all." He said, "Congress, then, of course, cuts it ten per cent and votes it through."

The result has been an amazing increase in the expenditure of public money. Here is a figure which insurance counsel can afford to pause and conjure with. I looked back and found out that in the last fiscal year before the Korean War, 1949-1950, the late lamented high tax, high spend, Harry Truman, who was supposed to be a scandalous spendthrift, High Tax Harry (laughter) spent \$39,500,000,000 in the course of the fiscal year 1949-1950.

When they were about to displace Mr. Truman in the fall of 1952, General Eisenhower, then, and the late Robert Taft met in New York before that campaign began. They gave out a statement which was supposed to rationalize the attack which the present administration was to make against the incumbents. Here is what they said jointly over their respective signatures: "The greatest threat to our liberty is internal from the constant growth of big government, through the constantly increasing power and spending of the federal government."

That is the most truthful statement ever made in current times. Increasing spending, big government, the menace to the United States is internal. It is not in the Middle East or the Far East, according to this joint statement by these two great men.

Now, let us see what happens. 1949 and 1950, Truman spent \$39,500,000,000. The fiscal year that has just ended, Eisenhower spent \$73,000,000,000 plus. Big government, getting bigger. That is an 85 per cent increase, my friends, in the expenditure of the federal government, not since Roosevelt or since George Washington or anything like that. This is an 85 per cent increase in the expenditures of the federal government between 1950 and 1958 fiscal years. That is 85 per cent increase in eight years.

Well, you say, the missiles and the defense and the cold war and all that sort of thing have caused that. No, that has not done it. When you get down to figuring, you will find that the non-defense expenditures have increased much faster than the defense expenditures. But, now, next year, hold your hats. We will spend next year 84 billion dollars. We are in that fiscal year right now. We are spending

approximately 25 million dollars a day more than we are taking in in Washington.

What is all of this appropriate to? Well, it is appropriate to this: Let us bring it down to cases.

A couple of years ago, we sat down to celebrate the organization anniversary of a bank which I had helped to organize in South Bend and which I have represented ever since. I recall that we gave the president of this new bank, back in 1939, \$7,400 a year, which we thought was pretty good.

He was much older on this New Year's Day of 1956 and, of course, he had progressed and so had the bank. The bank was then paying him \$25,000 a year. This man's family situation had not changed. He had a wife in 1939, and he had a wife—the same wife, I might say (laughter)—in 1956. So his tax situation exemption-wise was not modified. Well, this is a pretty good increase over the years—\$7,400 to \$25,000. He had moved along. But had he?

After the second highball, we began to sharpen our pencils. Somebody thought of the income tax, and somebody else thought of the decreasing value of the dollar. The dollar in 1956 was worth fifty cents in terms of the 1939 dollar. It is worth much less than that now, but let us figure it at fifty cents.

Do you know—in other words, to make a long story short—just exactly how my friend the bank president had improved his purchasing power in the years between 1939 and 1956? The difference between his salary then and his salary now, after his income tax was deducted and after the dollar was properly adjusted into terms of the 1939 values, the difference between \$7,400 in 1939 and \$25,000 in 1956 for a man who was married then and now amounted to \$8.75 a month. (Laughter)

Now, I am looking at men, my dear wives of these erudite lawyers, some of whom are in approximately the same position. Of course, they all started out getting much more than \$7,400 in 1939, and they are all earning many, many times \$25,000 a year at the moment. But relatively, it is the same or worse, and so I commend this calculation to your attention, Mrs. Wife of Mr. Lawyer. Get out your pencils, look back at your 1939 records and see what has happened to your husband in terms of purchasing power and to you, of course, in the meantime. The dollar is be-

ing destroyed and that is the destruction of what you have cleared to leave to your children.

I addressed an association of life insurance lawyers in Chicago some months ago. I told them about the life insurance agent, who 15 years ago, when my boy was born, came in and sold me an insurance policy which would send him through Notre Dame. Of course, I had to plan to send him through Notre Dame; I was working there. It was unthinkable that I should send him anyplace else. But it is the same anywhere. He had the university catalogue with him, and he told me how much it would cost, which would be planning ahead for the baby, and so on. I could, without an appreciable bounce to my budget, get this insurance policy which would send this boy through Notre Dame for four years. Well, suffice it to say, it will send the boy through Notre Dame for practically the first semester of his freshman year, (laughter) and now he is only 15. (Laughter) He has several more years to go, and so does the dollar, incidentally. (Laughter)

Whenever I see the life insurance agent—he is still going strong—I say, “How about that education I bought from you for Dan?” “Oh,” he said, “Pat, you need some more insurance.” (Laughter)

Now, my friends, the government of these United States can do anything with that dollar that it pleases. It is worth precisely what the government says it is. It has no equivalents in metallic value anymore. I simply leave to your imagination what is going to happen to it in the next 12 months when we will spend 11 billion more than we take in. We are into deficit spending again in a way that Harry Truman never dreamed of. The present administration has already exceeded in five and one-half years the spending record that Harry Truman made in seven and one-half years, including the Korean War and what was left of World War II.

These are astounding computations, and to whom are they doing it and to what? They are doing it to you and to the estate which you fathers and mothers are striving to stash away and save for the security and advancement of your children. They are doing it to the 90 million savers, 90 million owners of savings accounts who are putting their money away, some of them year after year. We have some accounts in our bank that are ten years old. Some

of these people are hardly able to speak English. They come in religiously and add to those sums. I tell my board of directors that I cannot look those people in the face. Their accounts have been there ten years. What has happened to those accounts in ten years? Do we have any responsibility to tell these people what is happening to their dollars and why? Why do we not put a notice with the savings slips, “Reduce federal expenditures that are destroying these savings accounts?” Oh, we cannot do that because everybody would think there was something wrong with our bank. If all banks would do it, sure, that would be fine, but all banks are not going to do it. All lawyers are not going to make the speech that Mr. Betts made here this morning. Nobody is going to be as mad as I am today at noon and so come before you and tell you these things which will disturb your rest, I hope, and stir you into the kind of vigilance that is necessary in order to preserve our freedom.

Now, this saturnalia of self perpetuating big government spending is going on in Washington right now. The bureaucracy is telling Congress why and how it should spend more, and it is using the public's money to buy the votes. Whatever Goldfine has done, it is not half as bad as what the Secretary of the Interior did when he deliberately bought the votes of ten congressmen with the people's money and changed their minds with the money of the American taxpayer. You will never get a tax reduction from this bureaucracy. The only hope ever expressed of the balanced budget is that you will make some more money so the government will collect more taxes to spend here and in foreign lands.

Just try and question the constitutionality of this foreign aid, you wise lawyers. Do you not remember that there was a Governor of Utah a couple of years ago, like the Governor of West Virginia, an important man. He said that he did not believe that the government had any right to spend the taxpayer's money for foreign aid. He proposed to test the constitutionality of those expenditures. He announced to everybody that he was not trying to dodge his tax. He said, “I put it over here in the X bank. This is what I owe, but I am going to make the government sue me for it, and then I am going to raise the constitutional questions that they have no right to spend my money, any taxpayer's

money, for the general welfare of any place except the United States of America." Everybody watched and waited, but the government did not watch and wait. When he designated where the money was, the government went and took it. (Laughter) That was the end of the law suit, and that was the end of the Governor's protest.

Yet we talk about having constitutional restraints against such high-handed, self-perpetuating, bureaucratic attitudes as that, and the Congress has deliberately authorized the bureaucrats to do that sort of thing. The Congress of the United States has told you that you cannot bring an injunction suit to prevent the collection of a tax. Why not? Why can't the government be enjoined from doing an unconstitutional thing, from collecting a tax unlawfully? I wonder what James Otis would think about that? I wonder what the people who threw the tea into Boston harbor would think now if they looked in on life in the United States this morning.

Yet, at this moment while we are faced with an 11 billion dollar deficit, the administration and the Democratic Congress are moving heaven and earth to appropriate more than three billion dollars for foreign aid to more foreign countries. Where is that money going to come from? It is coming out of the value of the dollar that you have left after you have paid the highest taxes ever paid in human history. How can anybody in good conscience and logically defend a deficit program of this type to relieve foreign governments under these circumstances?

Do you know what they do with some of the money? I saw the other day where one of the assistant secretaries, Mr. Dillon, I think, said that we must not cut the Development Loan Fund. Oh, that would be suicidal, that would shake the security of the free world. Well, do you know what they do with the Development Loan Fund?

Here is one thing they will do with it. This is true. If any of you get sick of the United States and want to move away, here is a business chance for you. The State Department has advertised it. Suppose you are an American manufacturer and you find it hard going. You cannot make the grade. You are tired of income taxes; the CIO has you across the barrel, and you go winging down to Washington for tax relief. You will not get the tax relief, but you will meet a suave gentleman who will

tell you, "Listen, why don't you move your factory to Ceylon or Indonesia? We will pay all of the traveling expenses, transport all of the machinery, lend you all of this money on low interest rates, on slow notes. If there are no power plants there, we will build them. If there is no transportation to outlying districts, we will take care of that at our expense. We will insure you" listen to this, insurance lawyers—"We will insure you against expropriation by bad governments, and we will insure you against all kinds of political convulsions and upturns. Just get out of the country with your factory, please. Here is the money." (Laughter)

Do you think that this is an exaggeration? I have it documented in a letter from the State Department, which I will be glad to send to any one of you who asks me. The whole purpose, my friends, is to do what Karl Marx said we should do—Karl Marx, the arch Communist. We should level off the peak of our prosperity and spread it around the world. We should destroy the independence of the United States and establish the interdependence of the world, and we should do it with American money at the expense of the American taxpayer. "From each according to his abilities to each according to his needs." That is the theory of foreign aid; that is the theory of the destruction of American independence and those are the words of Karl Marx. It has no other purpose except to level off the peak of our achievement in an attempt to lift up the valleys around the world.

The irony of it is that the CIO and the AF of L go along with all these things, regardless of what is going to happen to wage scales when the levelling off process is achieved, regardless of the fact that the people in Japan get one-tenth of the wages that they do in Detroit. Notwithstanding that fact, American labor, for some reason, supports the administration and so does the Democratic leadership, so does practically everybody except mad men like me. But I ask you to look at the facts and ask yourselves, "Where is the money going to come from?"

I ask you to take out your pencil and remember that government is like fire. Remember please, that this is the only place on earth where that fire was ever successfully contained. Remember that the Constitution of the United States is being shredded to death by the same philo-

sophy that we repudiated in 1776. Don't be mistaken, it is not an eagerness to protect this Constitution that motivates those decisions that Mr. Betts has talked about. No, those decisions are all a part of the same socialistic piece. It is all a part of the same socializing campaign that induces the court to protect every Communist that comes before it, to protect every Socialist who appears within its bailiwick. This is synchronized part of the same general pressure. The Constitution is being used to destroy itself. The cage is being used as an excuse to liberate the tiger from behind the bars, and that is what it amounts to, my dear lawyers.

I have looked at this Constitution carefully and critically for the 25 years that I taught it, and I say advisably that it has disintegrated and disappeared in that same period of time. It was a distressing thing to me to see a work so noble, so outstanding, as limitations upon the power of government that could be enforced, to see them destroyed, discredited and disintegrated.

Months ago, I saw in the newspaper an account of some people who had just flown over the ocean from Spain. They landed at Idlewild. All of them told the Associated Press that down in the clear waters of the Atlantic near the Azores, they had seen the towers and the temples of the Lost Continent of Atlantis. They were sure they had seen it and described it at great length. It extended for miles across the bottom of the ocean.

Well, I am sure all of you have heard about Atlantis. Atlantis was the legendary continent that Plato wrote about and other prehistoric writers described in detail. Atlantis was the extensive, happy continent of beautiful, wealthy, long-lived people. They were the toast of the entire world; they had sucked all of the secrets from the stars and sun. The whole world looked to Atlantis hopefully and enviously and looked for the day when the secrets of Atlantis would be disseminated to all mankind.

All of a sudden, according to the accounts, the whole continent of Atlantis sank into the sea, which now bears its name, the Atlantic. There Atlantis lies, according to the legend.

Whenever I hear about Atlantis, I think about the United States. Atlantis was a legend; maybe it never existed. But the

United States is not a legend, my friends. The United States is a fact. It is a fact that in this country where limited government has prevailed, we have mastered the arts of civilized living, and we have created the highest material standards of life ever seen in the world. It is not legendary; it is a fact that the whole world looks to the United States today in hope and envy. In the hope that our secrets may be disseminated, that the whole world may profit by our example.

What, I ask you, will happen to the world when the United States sinks into the sea? If we should disappear from the face of the earth tonight, all the rest of mankind would be subjected to a torture and terror so indescribably painful that the people who survived it would envy us who did not live to see it. That is what the continuity of the independent, solvent, progressive United States means to humanity.

Remember, however, that we can disappear without sinking into the sea because the thing that makes us great is our formula for the limitation of government embodied in the constitutional restraints that we have lived by for 150 years and which we have discarded for the last 25. When this formula for freedom goes, when the value of the American dollar is swept away in national bankruptcy and the United States is insolvent financially and destroyed politically, then, we will have suffered the fate of Atlantis and then, indeed, will Communism have triumphed over the world.

One thing we can do for mankind. Just one thing,—the only thing we have any power to do for human nature everywhere is to preserve the solvency, the national independence and the constitutional government of this country. In God's name, and for the sake of your children, go to work on it! (Standing applause)

REPRINTS of Dean Manion's address will be available, in reasonable quantities—at no charge—if sufficient requests are received prior to November 15, 1958. Please send your requests to the Editorial Office, Insurance Counsel Journal, 150 East Broad Street, Columbus 15, Ohio.