

**National University of Ireland, Maynooth**

---

**From the Selected Works of Seth Barrett Tillman**

---

2005

Extract from Yvette Barksdale's Recent Articles of  
Interest in Administrative & Regulatory Law  
News citing the Lawson-Tillman exchange on  
Article I, Section 7, Clause 3

Seth Barrett Tillman



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/seth\\_barrett\\_tillman/64/](https://works.bepress.com/seth_barrett_tillman/64/)

**8. Finally, two articles gamely undertake daunting interpretive challenges.**

- a. In *A Textualist Defense of Article I, Section 7, Clause 3: Why Hollingsworth v. Virginia was Rightly Decided, and Why INS v. Chadha was Wrongly Reasoned*, 83 Tex. L. Rev. 1265 (2005), author **Seth Barrett Tillman** undertakes to rigorously prove that the Bicameralism and Presentment clause requires Presentment only, if such an option is legislatively authorized by Congress. In response, author Gary Lawson concludes that Tillman is correct, but only with regard to legislative subpoenas. See Gary Lawson, *Burning Down the House (and Senate): A Presentment Requirement for Legislative Subpoenas Under the Orders, Resolutions, and Votes Clause*, 83 TEXAS L. REV. \_\_\_\_ (2005) *Forthcoming*. In reply, Tillman disagrees with Lawson's reply and says why. See, *The Domain of Constitutional Delegations Under the Orders, Resolutions, and Votes Clause*, 83 Tex. L. Rev. \_\_\_\_ (2005) (*Forthcoming*).
- b. In *Discretion as Delegation: The "Proper" Understanding of the Nondelegation Doctrine*, 73 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 235 (2005), Author **Gary Lawson** undertakes his own daunting interpretive challenge, by explicitly seeking to rigorously prove that the non-delegation doctrine is properly rooted in the Constitution. No response yet from Eric Posner and Adrien Vermuele. ○

# ADMINISTRATIVE & REGULATORY LAW NEWS



**Section of Administrative Law & Regulatory Practice**

Vol 30, No. 4

American Bar Association

Summer 2005