

What is the Original Intent and True Meaning of the “Commerce Clause”?

Consider the following parts of the “ORDER GRANTING SUMMARY JUDGMENT” by Judge Roger Vinson, of the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA, PENSACOLA DIVISION, in Case No.: 3:10-cv-91-RV/EMT – Jan. 31, 2011.

[We encourage you to read the entire opinion and the referenced documents cited therein.]

Judge Vinson’s Analysis starts on page 19 and continues through page 37 of 78 in his Order.

... “The Commerce Clause is a mere sixteen words long, and it provides that Congress shall have the power:

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes. U.S. Const. art I, § 8, cl. 3. ...

There is considerable historical evidence that in the early years of the Union, the word “commerce” was understood to encompass trade, and the intercourse, traffic, or exchange of goods; in short, “the activities of buying and selling that come after production and before the goods come to rest.” ...

In a frequently cited law review article, one Constitutional scholar has painstakingly tallied each appearance of the word “commerce” in Madison’s notes on the Constitutional Convention and in *The Federalist [Papers]*, and discovered that in none of the ninety-seven appearances of that term is it ever used to refer unambiguously to activity beyond trade or exchange. ... (further examining each and every use of the word that appeared in the state ratification convention reports and finding “the term was uniformly used to refer to trade or exchange”). Even a Constitutional scholar who has argued for an expansive interpretation of the Commerce Clause (and, in fact, has been cited to, and relied on, by the defendants in this case) has acknowledged that when the Constitution was drafted and ratified, commerce “was the practical equivalent of the word ‘trade.’” See Robert L. Stern, *That Commerce Which Concerns More States than One*, 47 *Harv. L. Rev.* 1335, 1346 (1934) (“Stern”).

The Supreme Court’s first description of commerce (and still the most widely accepted) is from *Gibbons v. Ogden*, [22 *U.S. (9 Wheat.) 1 (1824)*], which involved a New York law that sought to limit the navigable waters within the jurisdiction of that state. In holding that “commerce” comprehended navigation, and thus it fell within the reach of the Commerce Clause, Chief Justice Marshall explained that “Commerce, undoubtedly, is traffic, but it is something more: it is intercourse. It describes the commercial intercourse between nations, and parts of nations, in all its branches, and is regulated by prescribing rules for carrying on that intercourse.” 22 *U.S.* at 72. This definition is consistent with accepted dictionary definitions of the Founders’ time. See 1 Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* (4th ed. 1773) (commerce defined as “Intercourse; exchange of one thing for another; interchange of any thing; trade; traffick”). And it remained a good definition of the Supreme Court’s Commerce Clause interpretation throughout the Nineteenth Century. See, e.g., *Kidd v. Pearson*, 128 *U.S.* 1, 20-21, 9 *S. Ct.* 6, 32 *L. Ed.* 346 (1888) (“The legal definition of the term [commerce] . . . consists in intercourse and traffic, including in these terms navigation and the transportation and transit of persons and property, as well as the purchase, sale, and exchange of commodities”).

As Alexander Hamilton intimated in *The Federalist*, however, it did not at that time encompass manufacturing or agriculture. See *The Federalist [Papers]* No. 34, at 212-13 (noting that the

“encouragement of agriculture and manufactures” was to remain an object of state expenditure). This interpretation of commerce as being primarily concerned with the commercial intercourse associated with the trade or exchange of goods and commodities is consistent with the original purpose of the Commerce Clause (discussed immediately below), which is entitled to “great influence in [its] construction.” See *Gibbons*, supra, at 188-89 ¹¹

[Note; the original “foot note 11” is presented in full at the end of this paper and is incorporated herein by reference.]

There is no doubt historically that the primary purpose behind the Commerce Clause was to give Congress power to regulate commerce so that it could eliminate the trade restrictions and barriers by and between the states that had existed under the Articles of Confederation. Such obstructions to commerce were destructive to the Union and believed to be precursors to war.

The Supreme Court has explained this rationale:

“When victory relieved the Colonies from the pressure for solidarity that war had exerted, a drift toward anarchy and commercial warfare between states began . . . [E]ach state would legislate according to its estimate of its own interests, the importance of its own products, and the local advantages or disadvantages of its position in a political or commercial view. This came to threaten at once the peace and safety of the Union. The sole purpose for which Virginia initiated the movement which ultimately produced the Constitution was to take into consideration the trade of the United States; to examine the relative situations and trade of the said states; to consider how far a uniform system in their commercial regulation may be necessary to their common interest and their permanent harmony and for that purpose the General Assembly of Virginia in January of 1786 named commissioners and proposed their meeting with those from other states.

The desire of the Forefathers to federalize regulation of foreign and interstate commerce stands in sharp contrast to their jealous preservation of power over their internal affairs. No other federal power was so universally assumed to be necessary, no other state power was so readily relin[qu]ished. There was no desire to authorize federal interference with social conditions or legal institutions of the states. Even the Bill of Rights amendments were framed only as a limitation upon the powers of Congress. The states were quite content with their several and diverse controls over most matters but, as Madison has indicated, “want of a general power over Commerce led to an exercise of this power separately, by the States, which not only proved abortive, but engendered rival, conflicting and angry regulations.”

H.P. Hood & Sons, Inc. v. Du Mond, 336 U.S. 525, 533-34, 69 S. Ct. 657, 93 L. Ed. 865 (1949) (citations and quotations omitted). The foregoing is a frequently repeated history lesson from the Supreme Court. In his concurring opinion in the landmark 1824 case of *Gibbons v. Ogden*, supra, for example, Justice Johnson provided a similar historical summary:

For a century the States [as British colonies] had submitted, with murmurs, to the commercial restrictions imposed by the parent State; and now, finding themselves in the unlimited possession of those powers over their own commerce, which they had so long been deprived of, and so earnestly coveted, that selfish principle which, well controlled, is so salutary, and which, unrestricted, is so unjust and tyrannical, guided by inexperience and jealousy, began to show itself in iniquitous laws and impolitic measures, from which grew up a conflict of commercial regulations, destructive to the harmony of the States, and fatal to their commercial interests abroad. This was the immediate cause that led to the forming of a convention. *Gibbons*, supra, 22 U.S. at 224. In the Supreme Court’s 1888 decision in *Kidd v. Pearson*, Justice Lamar noted that “it is a matter of public history that the object of vesting in congress

the power to regulate commerce . . . among the several states was to insure uniformity for regulation against conflicting and discriminatory state legislation.” See Kidd, *supra*, 128 U.S. at 21. More recently, Justice Stevens has advised that when “construing the scope of the power granted to Congress by the Commerce Clause . . . [i]t is important to remember that this clause was the Framers’ response to the central problem that gave rise to the Constitution itself,” that is, the Founders had “set out only to find a way to reduce trade restrictions.” See *EEOC v. Wyoming*, 460 U.S. 226, 244-45, 103 S. Ct. 1054, 75 L. Ed. 2d 18 (1983) (Stevens, J., concurring). The foregoing history is so “widely shared,” [see *id.* at 245 n.1], that Constitutional scholars with opposing views on the Commerce Clause readily agree on this point. Compare Stern, *supra*, at 1344 (“There can be no question, of course, that in 1787 [when] the framers and ratifiers of the Constitution . . . considered the need for regulating ‘commerce with foreign nations and among the several states,’ they were thinking only in terms of . . . the removal of barriers obstructing the physical movements of goods across state lines.”), with Bork & Troy, *supra*, at 858, 865 (“One thing is certain: the Founders turned to a federal commerce power to carve stability out of this commercial anarchy” and “keep the States from treating one another as hostile foreign powers”; in short, “the Clause was drafted to grant Congress the power to craft a coherent national trade policy, to restore and maintain viable trade among the states, and to prevent interstate war.”). Hamilton and Madison both shared this concern that conflicting and discriminatory state trade legislation “would naturally lead to outrages, and these to reprisals and wars.” The Federalist [*Papers*] No. 7, at 37 (Hamilton); see also The Federalist No. 42, at 282 (Madison) (referencing the “unceasing animosities” and “serious interruptions of the public tranquility” that would inevitably flow from the lack of national commerce power).

To acknowledge the foregoing historical facts is not necessarily to say that the power under the Commerce Clause was intended to (and must) remain limited to the trade or exchange of goods, and be confined to the task of eliminating trade barriers erected by and between the states. The drafters of the Constitution were aware that they were preparing an instrument for the ages, not one suited only for the exigencies of that particular time. See, e.g., *McCulloch*, *supra*, 17 U.S. at 415 (the Constitution was “intended to endure for ages to come” and “to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs”) (Marshall, C.J.); *Weems v. United States*, 217 U.S. 349, 373, 30 S. Ct. 544, 54 L. Ed. 793 (1910)

“11 As an historical aside, I note that pursuant to this original understanding and interpretation of “commerce,” insurance contracts did not qualify because “[i]ssuing a policy of insurance is not a transaction of commerce.” *Paul v. Virginia*, 75 U.S. (8 Wall.) 168, 183, 19 L. Ed. 357 (1868) (further explaining that insurance contracts “are not articles of commerce in any proper meaning of the word” as they are not objects “of trade and barter,” nor are they “commodities to be shipped or forwarded from one State to another, and then put up for sale”). That changed in 1944, when the Supreme Court held that Congress could regulate the insurance business under the Commerce Clause. *United States v. South-Eastern Underwriters Assoc.*, 322 U.S. 533, 64 S. Ct. 1162, 88 L. Ed. 1440 (1944). “Concerned that [this] decision might undermine state efforts to regulate insurance, Congress in 1945 enacted the McCarran-Ferguson Act. Section 1 of the Act provides that ‘continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest,’ and that ‘silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States.’” *Humana Inc. v. Forsyth*, 525 U.S. 299, 306, 119 S. Ct. 710, 142 L. Ed.2d 753 (1999) (quoting 15 U.S.C. § 1011). Thus, ever since passage of the McCarran-Ferguson Act, the insurance business has continued to be regulated almost exclusively by the states.”

It is well past time for those in Pennsylvania’s government to nullify Obamacare. Please do it Now!