

Case	Facts of the Case	Ruling (Include relevant Clause/Amendment)	State/National Power Increased?
McCulloch v. Maryland (1819)	National bank in Maryland. Maryland wanted to tax the bank.	Protected under the Necessary and Proper Clause, tied to Taxing and Spending (General Welfare Clause). Supremacy of national government.	National
Gibbons v. Ogden (1824)	Steamboat monopoly permit from New York challenged.	National government has the <i>exclusive</i> right to regulate the waterway under the Interstate Commerce Clause.	National
Hammer v. Dagenhart (1917)	Keating-Owen Act was an effort to regulate Interstate Commerce by limiting child labor.	Manufacture of goods is not commerce, so the national government cannot regulate child labor within a state. (10th Amend.)	State (Note: federal gov. can't just do what's 'good.')
N.L.R.B. v. Jones (1937)	NLRB was discriminating against union members.	Labor relations had a significant enough impact on interstate commerce that the national government could regulate it.	National
U.S. v. Darby Lumber Co. (1941)	Fair Labor Standards Act sought to regulate employment conditions.	Commerce includes manufacturing, so the national government can regulate it. <u>Overturns Hammer v. Dagenhart</u>	National
Wickard v. Filburn (1942)	Filburn grew more than his allotment of wheat allowed by the Agricultural Adjustment Act, but argued it was for his own use, so it shouldn't be regulated.	Even intrastate commerce that <i>impacts</i> interstate commerce is fair game for the national government. <u>Significantly</u> expands the Commerce Clause.	National
Heart of Atlanta Motel v. U.S. (1964)	The motel wanted to refuse minority customers, but that violated the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title II).	National government can regulate companies that impact interstate commerce under the Commerce Clause.	National
South Dakota v. Dole (1986)	Congress sought to withhold 5% of federal highway funds from states that did not raise the drinking age.	The regulation served to "promote the General Welfare" and was not unduly coercive.	National
United States v. Lopez (1994)	Federal Gun-Free School Zones Act cited in the prosecution of Alphonzo Lopez, who brought a firearm to school.	Federal government exceeded its power under the Commerce Clause. Guns in school zones are not interstate commerce. (10th Amend.) Worth noting that Congress later added a commerce "hook" and re-passed the law.	State
Printz v. United States (1997)	The Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act required local law enforcement to carry out background checks on behalf of the national government.	Local governments are not required to carry out federal laws, so the Elastic Clause and Commerce Clause do not apply. (10th Amend.)	State
U.S. v. Morrison (2000)	Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act, which was used to prosecute two Va. Tech football players who allegedly raped her.	Rape is not an activity that impacts interstate commerce, so it is up to the state to prosecute such crimes. (10th Amend.)	State
Gonzales v. Raich (2004)	Voters in California passed the Compassionate Use Act which conflicted with the federal Controlled Substances Act.	Congress' commerce clause allows regulation of local activities that have a substantial effect on interstate commerce. Local use affected supply and demand in the national marijuana market, making the regulation of intrastate use "essential" to regulating the drug's national market. <u>Note: In recent years, the national government has chosen not to enforce their federal laws, and allowed states to act on marijuana.</u>	National