

This question requires you to compare a Supreme Court case you studied in class with one you have not studied in class. A summary of the Supreme Court case you did not study in class is presented and provides all of the information you need to know about this case to answer the prompts.

Wickard v. Filburn (1942)

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 was a law passed by Congress during the Great Depression. The purpose of the federal law was to regulate the production of wheat to stabilize the economy and the nation's food supply. The law limited the amount of wheat that farmers could grow on their farms. Roscoe Filburn, a farmer in Ohio, grew more wheat than the amount allowed under the Agricultural Adjustment Act. When Filburn was penalized under the law, he sued.

Filburn argued that the excess wheat grown on his farm was for personal use and therefore did not fall under the wheat limit established by the law. Filburn also argued that the law was unconstitutional because Congress did not have the authority to regulate how much wheat a farmer could grow for personal consumption or use.

A unanimous Supreme Court held that the power of Congress granted by Article I of the Constitution includes the authority to regulate activities in a single state when they have even an indirect effect on the economy of other states. That meant that the Agricultural Adjustment Act applied to Filburn's wheat sold at market and his wheat grown for personal use.

3. Respond to parts A, B, and C.

- A.** Identify the constitutional clause that is common to both *United States v. Lopez* (1995) and *Wickard v. Filburn* (1942).
- B.** Explain how the facts in *United States v. Lopez* and *Wickard v. Filburn* led to different holdings.
- C.** Explain how the holding in *Wickard v. Filburn* reflects the concept of federalism.