



The General Welfare Clause

A Constitutional Misinterpretation

Abstract

This white paper examines the contemporary interpretation of the "general welfare" clause in the U.S. Constitution, contrasting it with the original intent of the Founding Fathers. Through a detailed analysis of historical texts and quotes from the framers of the Constitution, this paper argues for a more restrictive interpretation to preserve the principles of limited government and state sovereignty.

Introduction

In modern legislative practice, Congress frequently invokes the "general welfare" clause to justify a broad range of laws, from social programs to economic regulations. This broad application starkly contrasts with the original intent of the Founding Fathers. By examining the founders' words and their intent, we can understand how today's interpretation deviates from the constitutional design.

The Modern Usage of the General Welfare Clause

Today, the "general welfare" clause serves as a justification for various federal initiatives, including Social Security, Medicare, and numerous welfare programs. This expansive interpretation extends Congress's reach far beyond the enumerated powers, fundamentally altering the balance of federal and state authority envisioned by the founders.

The Founders' Intent: A Narrow Interpretation

James Madison's Perspective

James Madison, in Federalist No. 41, expressed his concern about a broad interpretation of the "general welfare" clause:



"Some, who have not denied the necessity of the power of taxation, have grounded a very fierce attack against the Constitution, on the language in which it is defined. It has been urged and echoed, that the power 'to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States,' amounts to an unlimited commission to exercise every power which may be alleged to be necessary for the common defence or general welfare."

Madison emphasized that the clause was not intended to grant unlimited legislative power but was instead a summary of the specific powers enumerated in the Constitution.

Madison's restrictive interpretation of the clause was further evidenced in his argument against a congressional appropriation for refugees. In a debate in the House of Representatives on January 10, 1794, he argued:

"I cannot undertake to lay my finger on that article of the Constitution which granted a right to Congress of expending, on objects of benevolence, the money of their constituents."

This statement highlights Madison's strict view that federal spending should be limited to the powers explicitly enumerated in the Constitution.

Madison emphasized that the clause was not intended to grant unlimited legislative power but was instead a summary of the specific powers enumerated in the Constitution. He further reinforced this view in his 1792 argument against the Codfish industry bailout, stating:

"If Congress can apply money indefinitely to the general welfare, and are the sole and supreme judges of the general welfare, they may take the care of religion into their own hands; they may appoint teachers in every state, county and parish and pay them out of their public treasury; they may take into their own hands the education of children, establishing in like manner schools throughout the union; they may assume the provision of the poor; they may undertake the regulation of all roads other than post-roads; in short, every thing, from the highest object of state legislation down to the most minute object of police, would be thrown under the power of Congress ... were the power of Congress to be established in the latitude contended for, it would subvert the very foundation, and transmute the very nature of the limited Government established by the people of America ..."

This statement was meant as a warning against the expanded interpretation of the general welfare.



Thomas Jefferson's View

Thomas Jefferson echoed Madison's concerns, advocating for a limited interpretation to prevent federal overreach. In a letter to Albert Gallatin in 1817, Jefferson wrote:

"Congress had not unlimited powers to provide for the general welfare, but were restrained to those specifically enumerated; and... it was never meant they should provide for that welfare but by the exercise of the enumerated powers."

Jefferson's words highlight the importance of adhering to the enumerated powers and avoiding an expansive reading of the clause.

Jefferson also expressed his views in his opinion on the constitutionality of a national bank in 1791:

"To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specially drawn around the powers of Congress is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition."

This statement underscores his belief that any broad interpretation of the "general welfare" clause would lead to an overreach of federal power.

Alexander Hamilton's Consistent View

Although Alexander Hamilton is often cited for his broader interpretation of federal powers, he also argued against a broad interpretation of the "general welfare" clause in Federalist No. 83:

"This specification of particulars evidently excludes all pretension to a general legislative authority, because an affirmative grant of special powers would be absurd, as well as useless, if a general authority was intended."

Hamilton's argument underscores that the enumeration of specific powers was meant to limit federal authority, not to provide a blanket justification for all legislative action.



Anti-Federalist Warnings

Patrick Henry's Alarm

Patrick Henry, known for his fervent defense of individual liberties, warned about the potential dangers of an expansive federal government. At the Virginia Ratifying Convention, he stated:

"The Constitution is not an instrument for the government to restrain the people, it is an instrument for the people to restrain the government — lest it come to dominate our lives and interests."

Henry's cautionary words serve as a reminder of the founders' intent to limit federal power and protect individual freedoms.

Richard Henry Lee's Concerns

In his "Letters from the Federal Farmer," Richard Henry Lee expressed his fear that general phrases like the "general welfare" clause could be misused:

"It must be admitted, that, although the powers of Congress, under the new Constitution, are limited, and, in part, only enumerated, yet, to judge of the extent of these powers, we must recur to the general phrases, and then pursue the evident intent of the whole, as marked by the entire Constitution."

Lee's argument underscores the need for a careful and narrow interpretation of the clause to prevent federal overreach.

Luther Martin's Warnings

Luther Martin, a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, vehemently opposed the broad interpretation of the "general welfare" clause. In his "Genuine Information" letters, he wrote:

"By declaring that the Congress shall have power to provide for the common defense and general welfare, they are to be the sole judges of what is necessary to promote the general welfare; consequently, the government is possessed of every power, without limitation."

Martin's warning highlights the risk of interpreting the clause too broadly, leading to an unchecked expansion of federal power.



Additional Founders on Limited Government

Samuel Adams

Samuel Adams, a strong advocate for individual liberties and limited government, argued that the Constitution should be interpreted in a way that restricts the powers of the federal government. He believed that the general welfare clause should not be used to justify an expansion of federal authority beyond the enumerated powers.

"The liberties of our country, the freedom of our civil constitution, are worth defending at all hazards; and it is our duty to defend them against all attacks."

Adams emphasized that the Constitution was meant to protect individual liberties by limiting governmental powers.

Conclusion

The contemporary use of the "general welfare" clause to justify a wide range of federal laws stands in stark contrast to the founders' original intent. By examining the words of Madison, Jefferson, Hamilton, Henry, Lee, and Martin, it is clear that the clause was intended to be a summary of the enumerated powers, not a blanket authorization for unlimited legislative action. Returning to a strict interpretation of the clause is essential to preserving the constitutional balance of power and safeguarding individual liberties. The founders' wisdom reminds us that vigilance is necessary to maintain a government that serves the people without overstepping its bounds.

References

- Madison, James. Federalist No. 41.
- Madison, James. "Debate on Appropriations for Refugees." House of Representatives, January 10, 1794.
- Madison, James. statement concerning the "Cod Fishery Bill", dated Feb. 6, 1792
- Jefferson, Thomas. Letter to Albert Gallatin, 1817.
- Jefferson, Thomas. "Opinion on the Constitutionality of a National Bank," 1791.
- Hamilton, Alexander. Federalist No. 83.
- Henry, Patrick. Speech at the Virginia Ratifying Convention, 1788.
- Lee, Richard Henry. Letters from the Federal Farmer.
- Martin, Luther. "Genuine Information," 1788.



- Adams, Samuel. Letter to James Warren, 1776.

For more in-depth content on the U.S. Constitution and to learn how you can protect and promote constitutional principles, visit Liberty Lighthouse at [Liberty-Lighthouse.com](https://liberty-lighthouse.com)