

The law enforcement officials of the various cities and towns, assisted when necessary by the State Police, with their greater familiarity with conditions in any locality, are much more likely to arrive at the required answer to a problem than officers or officials sent in from outside the State. Even where criminal matters over-step State lines, the use of interstate compacts enables effective cooperation among the various States concerned. More and more of this will develop, I am confident, as the States continue to pool their resources for the common defense.

The principle of local and State self-government is deeply rooted in our governmental scheme. If it has involved some duplication and overlapping of activities and inefficiency in government, these are not necessary accompaniments and can be cured by more efficient administration of the State governments and more interstate cooperation through the use of interstate compacts or otherwise.

On the other hand, to the extent that it is abandoned, there is inevitable a concentration of power in the National Government which not only would render difficult the enforcement and administration of justice with a regard for the divergent need of the various parts of the Country, but would constitute a step in the direction of the governmental philosophy of the totalitarian countries.

And *any* step in the direction of such governmental philosophies, no matter how or why, should be shunned sedulously if we are to preserve intact the land of freedom that has been handed down to us.

It was the dream of those who founded our Republic that we should have a government of Law, not a government of men. There is an extension of that idea. It was found in that phrase of the Declaration of Independence which points out that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Add these two together and they give as sound a definition of Democracy as we are likely to find.

For it is a mistake to suppose that freedom is the absence of authority. Freedom is actually the *acceptance* of a *chosen* authority. Here in America we have set up a covenant amongst the States. We have embodied a set of principles and have called it Law. Begin with the Constitution which is the basic law of the land, go down to the smallest enactment of the smallest legislative body—what do we find? We find a coherence of principle, a unity of effort, a measured and thoughtful and deliberate attempt to achieve that most difficult balance—the balance between the security of society and the rights of the individual.

Law, as we know it in our statutes and our Constitution, is built entirely upon this one idea. Moreover the seeming conflict between security of the social state on the one hand and individual liberties on the other—this conflict, I say, is more apparent than it is real. Actually these two things do not pull against each other. They are mutually supporting; they are inseparably entwined. It is axiomatic that if the State collapses, there will be no individual freedom. And conversely, it is also true that if individual liberties