Process or Just Compensation Clauses as long as it serves the public interest and the rates as a whole yield just compensation.⁵¹⁸

Occasionally, however, regulatory action has been held invalid under the Due Process Clause. An order issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission relieving short line railroads from the obligation to pay the usual fixed sum per day rental for cars used on foreign roads for a space of two days was held to be arbitrary and invalid.⁵¹⁹ A retirement act that made eligible for pensions all persons who had been in the service of any railroad within one year prior to the adoption of the law, counted past unconnected service of an employee toward the requirement for a pension even if the employee had contributed nothing to the pension fund, and treated all carriers as a single employer and pooled their assets, without regard to their individual obligations, was held unconstitutional.⁵²⁰

Taxation.—In laying taxes, the Federal Government is less narrowly restricted by the Fifth Amendment than are the states by the Fourteenth. The Federal Government may tax property belonging to its citizens, even if such property is never situated within the jurisdiction of the United States, 521 and it may tax the income of a citizen resident abroad, which is derived from property located at his residence. 522 The difference is explained by the fact that protection of the Federal Government follows the citizen wherever he goes, whereas the benefits of state government accrue only to persons and property within the state's borders. The Supreme Court has said that, in the absence of an equal protection clause, "a claim of unreasonable classification or inequality in the incidence or application of a tax raises no question under the Fifth Amendment. . . . "523 It has sustained, over charges of unfair differentiation between persons, a graduated income tax, 524 a higher tax on oleomargarine than on butter,⁵²⁵ an excise tax on "puts" but not on "call," ⁵²⁶ a tax on the income of business operated by corporations but not on similar enterprises carried on by individuals,⁵²⁷ an income tax on foreign corporations, based on their income from sources within the United States, while domestic corporations were taxed on income from all

⁵¹⁸ Baltimore & Ohio R.R. v. United States, 345 U.S. 146 (1953).

 $^{^{519}}$ Chicago, R.I. & P. Ry. v. United States, 284 U.S. 80 (1931). 520 Railroad Retirement Bd. v. Alton R.R., 295 U.S. 330 (1935). $But\ cf.$ Usery v. Turner Elkhorn Mining Co., 428 U.S. 1, 19 (1976).

⁵²¹ United States v. Bennett, 232 U.S. 299, 307 (1914).

⁵²² Cook v. Tait, 265 U.S. 47 (1924).

⁵²³ Helvering v. Lerner Stores Co., 314 U.S. 463, 468 (1941). But see discussion of "Discrimination" supra.

⁵²⁴ Brushaber v. Union Pac. R.R, 240 U.S. 1, 24 (1916).

⁵²⁵ McCray v. United States, 195 U.S. 27, 61 (1904).

⁵²⁶ Treat v. White, 181 U.S. 264 (1901).

⁵²⁷ Flint v. Stone Tracy Co., 220 U.S. 107 (1911).