

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 121—PART 30

DECEMBER 4, 1975 TO DECEMBER 10, 1975

(PAGES 38439 TO 39860)

"(1) delay for a period of not to exceed 90 days the implementation of any rate change, project, land acquisition, or other action of the board upon a determination that a delay is in the public interest and is necessary to provide time for the Commission to hold hearings and make its appropriate findings and recommendations;

"(2) make such presentations at any meeting of the board as the Commission finds are necessary to adequately inform the board of the opinion of the residents of the Tennessee Valley;

"(3) request the Federal Power Commission to make and submit to the Commission its findings and recommendations with respect to any change in rates which the board establishes for the sale and resale of surplus power.

"(e) (1) The Commission or any authorized subcommittee thereof may hold hearings and administer oaths for the purpose of taking evidence in any such hearings.

"(f) (1) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director and such other personnel as it deems necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The executive director shall receive compensation at a rate not in excess of that provided under level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

"(2) The Commission may procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

"(g) (1) Each member of the Commission who is an officer or employee of the United States shall serve without additional compensation, but shall continue to receive the salary of his regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(2) All other members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the maximum daily rate for GS-18 of the General Schedule for each day, including traveltime, they are engaged in the actual performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

"(3) All members of the Commission shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

"(h) (1) A board member or any officer or employee of the Corporation is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its duties under this Act.

"(2) Any individual who knowingly and willfully intimidates, threatens, coerces, commands, or influences, or attempts to intimidate, threaten, coerce, command or influence any individual for the purpose of interfering with the furnishing of information under this subsection shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than \$5,000 and if such individual is a board member or Corporation officer or employee, such individual shall be removed from office or employment."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 14 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 431m), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Federal Power Commission shall conduct an annual review of the rate structure of the Corporation with respect to the sale and resale of surplus power to determine if any change is necessary in such structure. Such review shall include, but not be limited to, an analysis of the efficiency of load factors and the relation of residential and indus-

trial rates to cost of service. The Federal Power Commission shall submit its findings and recommendations to the board and the Tennessee Valley Authority Citizen Review Commission. If the Federal Power Commission determines that information other than that provided under this section is necessary to conduct such review, it shall make a request to the board for such information and the board is authorized and directed to provide such information."

(b) The Federal Power Commission shall submit the first annual report required by the amendment made under subsection (a) of this section no later than one year following the date of enactment of the Tennessee Valley Citizen Review Act of 1975.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2741. A bill to establish a series of six regional presidential primaries at which the public may express its preference for the nomination of an individual for election to the office of President of the United States. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REGIONAL PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES ACT OF 1975

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, the way in which we select Presidential candidates is indisputably one of the most important processes in our entire political system, but it is also, unfortunately, one of the most irrational. It has evolved over nearly 200 years without design, structure or purpose into a complex maze of State laws, party regulations and unwritten traditions. No other major nation chooses its leaders in such a chaotic manner and the question is whether we should continue to do so.

In their only serious lack of foresight, the Founding Fathers believed that political parties would not and should not play a role in the American political system. They provided instead that every 4 years the States would choose electors who, being acknowledged leaders in their communities and therefore learned in such matters, would wisely select the most qualified man to be President of the United States. It took less than a decade for the much-feared "factions" to appear, however, and not much longer for political parties to weave themselves forever into the political fabric of the new republic.

After experimenting with congressional caucuses to select their Presidential nominees, the parties soon adopted the uniquely American institution of the national nominating convention to do the job, and they have been at the heart of the process ever since. Parties have come and gone but the conventions have remained; the major changes in the last century have had almost exclusively to do with the manner in which the convention delegates were to be chosen.

Since the delegates would in turn select the nominee, their own selection was obviously the pivotal point of the process. The States opted for a wide variety of delegate selection procedures, some choosing precinct caucuses and State conventions, others choosing some kind of popular primary, and still others choosing some combination of these systems; no two States were—or are—exactly alike. Only seldom was it seriously

argued that the Presidential nomination process was a national process that deserved a national design. It was viewed instead as a matter to be left exclusively to the States; to this day, neither the Congress nor the parties themselves have believed they could or should play more than a limited role in the process.

There are some people who believe that there is an accidental genius inherent in our present chaotic nominating process, that it provides a process of natural political selection which eliminates lesser candidates and which permits the more able and durable to survive. There may be something to this notion, but not much. It is a point usually made by those whose candidates have done well by the process and has thus crept into our political mythology. My own view is that it is often a mindless process from the candidates' perspective, too often a self-defeating one for the parties, and frequently an ineffective one for the Nation. A New York Times editorial summed it up this way:

It is fatuous to describe as participatory democracy a nominating system that involves a wretchedly small proportion of the electorate, that in some states encourages Democrats to help choose Republican candidates and vice versa, that grossly distorts the significance of the first few primary contests in an election year and rewards with money and inordinate publicity the states that hold them. It is a system that, as now constituted, allows candidates to run in states where they expect to do well and avoid those where they can't, that turns the whole process into a contest for psychological momentum and that subjects a Presidential hopeful to a crazy gulf of conflicting rules, forbidding costs and a physically staggering campaign schedule.

I have been amazed at how little thoughtful discussion and analysis has been devoted to the process of running for the Presidency. It is a process, after all, at the very core of our governmental system, and yet there is an inexplicable absence of experienced and sophisticated literature on the manner in which we encourage or discourage Presidential candidates, and the burdens we impose upon them and the hurdles we erect in the path of their nomination and election, and on the relevance of these and other factors to the kind of Presidents we ultimately elect.

Until November, 1974, I spent a full year actively seeking the Democratic Presidential nomination. In the process I concluded that the manner in which we nominate and elect Presidential candidates is badly in need of fundamental and comprehensive review.

There are, as I see it, essentially four basic elements in the Presidential nominating process: the State primary and convention delegate selection structure; party rules and procedures governing the selection of delegates; the financing of Presidential campaigns; and the relationship of the candidates to the media. Too often, unfortunately, recent efforts to resolve difficulties in some of these areas have resulted in creating unforeseen difficulties in others. The nominating process desperately needs a comprehensive approach, one which attempts to consider problems in all of these areas and their relationships to the others,

and which seeks to resolve them in a way that is most consistent with clearly defined and broadly agreed upon goals.

This process could be greatly assisted if President Ford, the first occupant of the White House whose Presidency has not been the product of an existing nominating process, would take the initiative. I would like to see him appoint, in consultation with the leadership of both parties, a broadly-based commission consisting of scholars, political figures and ordinary citizens to undertake an in-depth and comprehensive review of every aspect of our nominating process, to evaluate different alternatives, to explore the possibilities of widespread agreement on them, and to report back soon after the 1976 election. Without this kind of comprehensive national approach, I am convinced we will never achieve a rational and effective system. Nothing may come of such a commission, but I doubt it. Even if it proves impossible to agree on a new system, it is bound to produce a body of knowledge and experience which will tell us a great deal about what we have now and about how we might improve it. In any event, it is worth the effort, in my judgment, because the piecemeal, patchwork attempts at reform to date have not corrected the system's most serious shortcomings. I can think of no more worthy or appropriate undertaking in our Nation's 200th year as we celebrate the blessings of our democratic system than to begin a serious effort to improve one of the most important elements of that system.

It is in the interest of contributing to a national debate on this subject that I am today offering a proposal—which I realize cannot possibly be enacted for use in 1976—dealing with the structure of our Presidential primaries. Presidential candidates are confronted really with 55 different structures, each reflecting local biases and traditions and each unrelated to any comprehensible overall purpose or design. There is no rational basis for the schedule of primaries, for their timing, for the relationship of one to another, nor for the different statutory rules governing them. To complicate matters even more, the system is in a permanent state of flux.

There is also the question of how representative primaries are as they now exist. Is New Hampshire really a social, economic and political microcosm of the Nation? No one very seriously argues that it is, and yet New Hampshire casts an inordinate influence on the nominating process every 4 years simply because it holds the first primary. To a lesser degree the same point can be made about Florida and a number of other States. Every 4 years, it seems, several States engage in a frantic and unseemly competition to see whose primary will be first, only to be resolved by the New Hampshire Legislature meeting in emergency session to protect its favored position. New Hampshire is a wonderful State and I always enjoyed campaigning there, but no single State is sufficiently representative of the rest of the Nation to warrant its playing such a large and

disproportionate role in the nomination process. The basic question is whether State boosterism and other equally irrelevant factors should continue to determine primary schedules, or whether there might not be a more rational national approach to the problem?

Despite the dramatic growth in the number of primaries, there are still many States which permit the selection of national delegates through individual participation in a combination of precinct caucuses and county, district and State conventions. This is the system we have had in Minnesota for many years and which has, all things considered, worked very well. It is one of the healthiest elements in our entire political process because it permits greater and more direct individual participation than any other system. If the current trend toward primaries continues, however, it may become an endangered political species.

Unfortunately, both the number and complexity of the rules imposed on these States by the Democratic Party are staggering. They are often also unfathomable. These rules largely accomplished their stated purpose of bringing greater openness and fairness to State delegate selection processes that badly needed both, but they have also regrettably prompted many States to opt for the relative simplicity of primaries and thereby hastened that unfortunate trend. As a result, the traditional blend of primary and convention States is becoming seriously out of balance.

It is much easier to criticize the present nominating system than it is to come up with an alternative which corrects its many faults. Because of the Constitutional nature of our political system and because every reform we attempt invariably brings with it unintended effects, it is impossible to devise a perfect system. It may even be impossible to devise a good system. But it should be possible to come up with a system that is far superior to the one we have at present.

Before looking at alternatives, however, it is necessary to consider what we want to achieve in a nominating process. Here are some of the things I would like to see it contain:

It should retain as its cornerstone the national nominating convention which has served effectively as a vehicle for national intra-party conciliation and for giving the parties whatever degree of national identity they now have.

It should offer the broadest possible range of candidates, and it should encourage or at least make possible the serious consideration of candidates who have neither the wealth nor the name recognition to be taken seriously at the outset.

It should encourage the broadest and most direct possible participation by those persons who seek to affect their parties' candidates and policies, but it should limit participation to those who choose to affiliate with that party.

It should structure State primaries and conventions in a way that recog-

nizes that candidates cannot contest for delegates in every State in the Nation, and yet which will permit and perhaps even require each candidate to contest for delegates in a representative number of States in all parts of the country.

It should provide a difficult but fair test of the candidates' judgment, appeal to different sections of the country, and even his stamina and ability to perform under pressure.

It should above all be a national design, which permits no single State or region to cast an undue influence on the outcome and which focuses the candidates' and the country's attention on national concerns.

The acceptance of these criteria would obviously preclude adoption of a national primary system, which some people believe is the answer to the problem. A national primary would seriously if not completely undermine the value of the national conventions. It would also, I fear, give an inordinate advantage to those candidates who are already well known and who have greater access to campaign funds; it would virtually preclude consideration of lesser known candidates. Too much would depend on a single roll of the dice, if you will, which presents a number of obvious dangers.

My own strong preference is for a series of regional primaries which would be modest in its approach and simple in its design. The bill I am introducing today would divide the States and territories of the United States into six regions, each of which would hold its Presidential primaries on one of six designated Tuesdays between late March and mid-June of Presidential election years. The six election dates, which are separated from one another by 2-week intervals, would be assigned by lot to the six regions by the Federal Elections Commission 5 months before the first primary, that is, in late October of the preceding year.

It would still be up to the States to determine whether or not to hold Presidential primaries, but if a State elected to hold one it must be held on the date assigned to that State's region by the FEC. States would retain the right to determine the particular type of primary they wish to have, how candidates qualify for inclusion on the ballot, whether the delegates elected would be legally bound to vote for a particular candidate and other matters traditionally left to the States, except that: First, voters in State Presidential primaries would only be allowed to participate in the party of their registered affiliation, and second, States would be prohibited from listing the names of delegate candidates on the primary ballot without indicating which Presidential candidate, if any, he or she is pledged to support.

Finally, each candidate for his or her party's Presidential nomination who has qualified for and intends to receive Federal matching funds must agree to have his or her name entered on the ballot of at least one State primary in each of the six regions.

That is the bill in its entirety. Unlike

other regional and national Presidential primary proposals, the imposition on traditional State prerogatives is minimal. States have been left to devise their own primaries except for: First, their timing, second, limiting participation in them to party adherents and third, requiring the appearance of the Presidential candidates' names on the ballot. The bill is an attempt to blend traditional State procedures with those requirements which are essential if some degree of order, fairness and rationality are to be brought to the overall process.

There were three criteria used in assigning States to one region or another: population, even distribution of primaries among regions, and community of interest. Each of the regions has approximately the same number of electoral votes, ranging from 84 to 95. Each region contains at least four States currently offering Presidential primaries and no region contains more than six such States. Community of interest is more difficult to delineate, but here too an effort has been made to achieve balance. It is entirely possible that a better division of States and territories could be devised using these criteria, and if so I would be pleased to adapt my plan accordingly.

There are several advantages that would result from the adoption of this proposal, in my judgment.

It would eliminate the disproportionate and unfair advantage which a few States now hold in the Presidential nominating process by virtue of their being held either very early or very late in the process, and it would also eliminate the unseemly race every 4 years to determine which State will hold that year's first-in-the-Nation primary. However representative of the Nation a particular State may be and however virtuous and knowledgeable that State's voters may be, no single State deserves to exercise such extraordinary and continuing influence on the nominating process out of all proportion to its size as has been the case in recent years.

There is no proposal, of course, which can be guaranteed to give each State a degree of influence exactly proportionate to its size. The best that can be done is to eliminate the inequities as far as possible and leave the rest up to chance. That is why I propose that the Federal Elections Commission draw lots to determine the order of the regional primaries, because there is absolutely no other fair way to do so; each region is just as important as the others and therefore the drawing of lots seems the only equitable way of determining order.

Also, this plan will compress the entire primary period into a shorter period of time and it will conserve the candidates' energies and resources. It will shorten the present primary season by approximately 1 month and thus hopefully hold the Nation's interest and attention at a higher level during that important period.

And the shortened time period together with the regional breakdown will also allow the candidates to concentrate

their own time and funds more economically within each region. Although this benefit could be exaggerated, it will be welcomed by candidates and their traveling parties who all too often must spend inordinate amounts of time on transcontinental flights in order to campaign in primaries thousands of miles apart but on the same day. For example, on June 8, 1976, there will be primaries in four important States—Arkansas, California, New Jersey, and Ohio—in four separate regions of the country. Since there are four other scattered primaries 1 week earlier, it will be virtually impossible for any candidate to campaign effectively for more than one or two of the June 8 primaries.

This proposal will also offer a greater opportunity for public attention to be focused on the particular concerns of each region. For at least 2 weeks each region will have the media's and the Nation's undivided attention. Whether the issue is the use of water in the West, farm prices in the Midwest, or unemployment in the Northeast, the candidates' positions on legitimate regional concerns will have a greater chance to be heard and to be closely examined than is now possible.

There is great value also, I believe, in requiring each candidate who receives public campaign financing to have his name entered in at least one State primary in each region. There is no way to compel candidates to campaign actively in each region, of course, but at the very least each will be on record as agreeing to having his name entered in certain States and thus will have encouraged others to regard him as a serious candidate in those States.

Unlike a national primary and other regional primary plans, this proposal retains and hopefully strengthens the national convention as the cornerstone of the Presidential nominating process. I believe strongly that national conventions are essential for the reconciliation of regional and other differences and for the achievement of party unity once a nominee is selected. There is no guarantee a convention will bring about that result, of course, but without a convention there is very little hope indeed of bringing it about.

The convention as well as the nominating process as a whole will be immeasurably strengthened, in my judgment, by eliminating the possibility of crossover voting, that is, allowing registered Republicans to vote in Democratic primaries and vice versa. Even though only a few States permit this phenomenon, there is nothing perfidious and destructive of party responsibility in our nominating procedures. It is, simply, an invitation for mischief which can only distort the accuracy of a party's expressed preferences. There is absolutely no legal or other justification for crossover voting and it deserves to be eliminated altogether.

The same could be said of State laws which permit voters to cast their ballots for delegate candidates without any printed indication on the ballot of which Presidential candidate the delegate can-

didate supports. This practice can only be regarded as a subversion of the representative purpose of Presidential primaries and, although it is not widespread, it ought to be prohibited. Simply stated, people deserve to know which Presidential candidate they are really voting for.

Perhaps the greatest benefit offered by this proposal, however, is the degree of order and rationality it will bring to the Presidential nominating process. Selecting a nominee for President is, after all, a national process; it deserves a national structure. At present there is no structure whatsoever. There are instead 55 separate structures, each unrelated to the others and often seemingly unrelated to the ostensible goal of selecting the party's best candidate as its nominee.

I do not suggest that a regional primary system such as this is a perfect structure. It is not. But I believe it is vastly preferable to the irrational and chaotic system we now have and also vastly preferable to the other regional and national primary plans I have seen, most of which eliminate or at least weaken the role of the national convention.

I would not be disappointed if the adoption of this proposal resulted in a reduction of the number of States electing to hold primaries, because there are already too many of them in my judgment. If the proliferation of primaries continues, we will soon have a fragmented form of national primary without ever having adopted it as a matter of national policy.

It is my own belief that our national nominating process should be a blend of States holding preferential primaries and States using the caucus/convention system of electing convention delegates such as my own State of Minnesota. But this combination is now seriously out of balance and it shows no sign of getting any better. I would hope, however, that the adoption of a plan such as this would move some States which have recently enacted primary laws to reconsider and revert to the caucus/convention system. Since no single primary State would be allowed under this plan to stand uniquely apart from other States, but would be compelled instead to share with them the commercial, publicity and other benefits that they have previously enjoyed, perhaps the idea of holding a primary will be less attractive. This is not one of the primary purposes of the bill, but I would be pleased if it were one of its effects.

Happily, there will be an opportunity in 1976 to observe a regional primary on a very limited basis. The States of Oregon, Idaho, and Nevada have all agreed to hold their Presidential primaries on May 25 in order to further the concept of regional primaries. Although it would be a mistake to expect too much from such a limited experiment, hopefully it will add significantly to our experience and knowledge, as well as add impetus to what I sense is a steadily growing demand for a regional primary system that encompasses the whole country.

For 200 years, Mr. President, we have

avoided making a national decision on the question of how to select our Presidential nominees. I cannot think of any process more important to the Nation, and therefore I am at a loss to understand how we can continue to leave it in a continually changing state of chaos, disorder, and irrationality. I cannot guarantee that this bill, if adopted, will result in better Presidents being elected, but I believe it is worth the effort. If order, fairness, and rationality are qualities we strive to bring to other elements of our national life, then why not to this one as well? If we do, I believe we will do no worse than we have done up till now and hopefully do much better.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2741

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Regional Presidential Primaries Act of 1975".*

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) the numerous elections held by States for the expression of a preference for the nomination of individuals for election to the office of the President of the United States are conducted without any semblance of order,

(2) the conventions held by national political parties for the purpose of nominating candidates for election to the offices of the President and the Vice President are vital to the process of selecting such candidates for national office, and

(3) in order to preserve the effectiveness of the presidential election process and to provide for the public welfare of the Nation, Congress must regulate certain parts of the process for selecting candidates to the office of President.

SEC. 3. (a) No State shall conduct a presidential primary except in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(b) Six regional presidential primaries shall be held during each presidential election year. The first regional primary shall be held on the last Tuesday in March, and the remaining five regional primaries shall be held on the second and fourth Tuesdays in April and May, and on the second Tuesday in June, respectively. On the last Tuesday in October in each year immediately preceding a presidential election year, the Commission shall determine by lot the date on which each regional presidential primary is to be held. A State may not hold a presidential primary on a date other than the date assigned by the Commission to the region in which such State is located.

(c) A State which conducts a presidential primary shall conduct that primary in accordance with laws of the State with the following exceptions:

(1) Each voter shall be eligible to vote only for a candidate for nomination by the party of that voter's registered affiliation, or if a State provides for registration as an independent, a voter registered as an independent may vote only for one candidate for nomination by a party with which such voter is not affiliated. If the law of any State makes no provision for the registration of voters by party affiliation, voters in that State shall register their party affiliation in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Attorney General in consultation with the Federal Elections Commission.

(2) Each ballot in an election for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a national political party shall indicate the candidate of such party, if any, for whom each individual seeking the position of delegate is committed to vote at such convention. If an individual seeking the position of delegate is not committed to vote for any candidate, the ballot shall indicate that such individual is uncommitted.

(d) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that a State is holding a presidential primary in violation of the provisions of this section, he may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court for such relief as may be appropriate, including injunctive relief.

SEC. 4. In order to be eligible to receive any payments under section 9037 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, a candidate of a political party in a presidential primary shall, in writing—

(1) agree to have his name entered on the ballot of at least one State primary in each of the six regions established by this Act; and

(2) notify the Commission, not later than the last presidential primary filing date within a particular region, which primary he intends to enter within that region.

SEC. 5. For purposes of this Act, the term—

(1) "candidate" means an individual who seeks nomination for election to be President of the United States;

(2) "Commission" means the Federal Election Commission;

(3) "presidential primary" means an election for the expression of a preference for the nomination of individuals for election to the office of President of the United States or for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party;

(4) "region" means any of the following six regions:

(A) Region 1 comprises Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

(B) Region 2 comprises Delaware, District of Columbia, Indiana, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

(C) Region 3 comprises Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Puerto Rico, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and Virgin Islands.

(D) Region 4 comprises Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

(E) Region 5 comprises Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

(F) Region 6 comprises Alaska, Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Oregon, Nevada, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

(5) "State" means the 50 States of the United States and the District of Columbia and the territories of the Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

By Mr. EAGLETON (for himself,  
Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 2742. A bill to dedicate the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park to Justice William O. Douglas in grateful recognition of his contributions to the people of the United States. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, Senators MAGNUSON, JACKSON and I today introduce a bill to dedicate the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Histori-

cal Park to retired Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court William O. Douglas.

This bill will require that the words "Dedicated to Justice William O. Douglas" be prominently displayed on all existing and future signs bearing the name "Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park" or any abbreviation thereof. It also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to take such other appropriate actions as may be necessary to call to the attention of the public the fact that the canal park has been dedicated to Justice Douglas.

Justice Douglas was appointed to the Supreme Court by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on April 17, 1938. When he retired on November 12 of this year he had been sitting on the Supreme Court for 36 years—the longest tenure in the history of this country.

Preceding his appointment to the Court, William O. Douglas acted as a valued confidant of President Roosevelt. He was one of the bright young people who came to Washington in the 1930's who were collectively known as New Dealers.

Justice Douglas' career on the bench was but one aspect of his life as a public servant. From 1937 to 1939 he was Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Prior to his Chairmanship Justice Douglas served as a member of the Commission and also as the staff director of a Commission study.

At the age of 26 Justice Douglas became a faculty member of the Columbia Law School, where he taught for 4 years. He was also a member of the faculty at the Yale Law School for 8 years.

Justice Douglas is a prolific writer who has published over 30 books and numerous magazine articles. His travels around the world frequently became the subjects of his writing.

The day after his retirement from the Court, when asked how he would like to be remembered, he replied:

I hope to be remembered as someone who made the Earth a little more beautiful.

His work as conservationist was, apparently, his most prized accomplishment.

Since his boyhood hikes in the Cascade Mountains in his home State of Washington, Justice Douglas has maintained a deep attachment to the land. At the age of 28 he turned down the offer of a substantial position with a top Wall Street law firm—passing up a certain wealth. In his autobiography he explains his decision by saying:

I looked around at the older men in my profession and I knew I didn't want to be like any of them. They couldn't climb a mountain, couldn't tie a dry fly; they knew nothing about the world that was closest to me, the real world, the natural world.

Justice Douglas devoted a considerable part of his life to the preservation of the environment. He spoke, wrote and became involved in many crusades to save rivers, lakes and trees across the country. In Hartford, Wash., he helped form a protest group to stop a dam which