jected challenges does suggest, however, that the doctrine applies only to standardless delegations of the most sweeping nature.

The Nature and Scope of Permissible Delegations

The early Court suggested alternative theories to justify sustaining delegations. The first theory is that Congress may legislate contingently, leaving to others the task of ascertaining the facts that bring its declared policy into operation.[82] Chief Justice Marshall alluded to a second theory in *Wayman v. Southard*.[83] There, he distinguished between "important" subjects, "which must be entirely regulated by the legislature itself," and subjects "of less interest, in which a general provision may be made, and power given to those who are to act under such general provisions, to fill up the details." While this latter distinction may now be lost, the theory of the power "to fill up the details" remains current.

Two distinct constitutional concerns have contributed to the development of the nondelegation doctrine: separation of powers and due process. In *J. W. Hampton, Jr. & Co. v. United States*,[84] Chief Justice Taft explained the importance of separation of powers to nondelegation. "The Federal Constitution . . . divide[s] the governmental power into three branches. . . . [I]n carrying out that constitutional division into three branches it is a breach of the National fundamental law if Congress gives up its legislative power and transfers it to the President, or to the Judicial branch, or if by law it attempts to invest itself or its members with either executive power or judicial power. This is not to say that the three branches are not co-ordinate parts of one government and that each in the field of its duties may not invoke the action of the two other branches in so far as the action invoked shall not be an assumption of the constitutional field of action of another branch. In determining what it may do in seeking assistance from another branch, the extent and character of that assistance must be fixed according to common sense and the inherent necessities of the governmental coordination."[85]

A rigid application of separation of powers, however, would prevent the lawmaking branch from effectively utilizing the resources and expertise of the other branches. Thus, for instance, the doc-

---

[82] *The Brig Aurora*, 11 U.S. (7 Cr.) 382 (1813).

[83] 23 U.S. (10 Wheat.) 1, 41 (1825).

[84] 276 U.S. 394 (1928).

[85] 276 U.S. at 406. Chief Justice Taft traced the separation-of-powers doctrine to the maxim, *Delegata potestas non potest delegari* (a delegated power may not be further delegated), 276 U.S. at 405, but the maxim does not help differentiate between permissible and impermissible delegations, and Court has not repeated this reference in later delegation cases.