

## National University of Ireland, Maynooth

---

From the Selected Works of Seth Barrett Tillman

---

May 1, 2008

Extract from United States Code Service, Section on Article I, Section 7, Clause 2, citing Tillman's A Textualist Defense and citing Tillman's Reply to Bruhl

Seth Barrett Tillman

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
ARTICLE I. LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT

*USCS Const. Art. I, § 7, Cl 2*

Sec. 7, Cl 2. Approval or veto of bills--Passage over veto.

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and Nays, and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten Days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return, in which Case it shall not be a Law.

Law Review Articles:

**Tillman. Colloquy: Reply Defending the (not so) Indefensible. 16 Cornell J L & Pub Pol'y 363, Spring 2007.**

Black. Some Thoughts On The Veto. 40 Law & Contemp Probs 87, Spring 1976.

Kesavan. Is the Electoral Count Act Unconstitutional? 80 NC L Rev 1653, June 2002.

**Tillman. 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, April 2005.**

Rappaport. The Selective Nondelegation Doctrine and the Line Item Veto: A New Approach to the Nondelegation Doctrine and Its Implications for Clinton v. City of New York. 76 Tul L Rev 265, December 2001.

Volokh. The Two Appointments Clauses: Statutory Qualifications for Federal Officers. 10 U Pa J Const L 745, May 2008.

Van Alstine. Executive Aggrandizement in Foreign Affairs Lawmaking. 54 UCLA L Rev 309, December 2006.

Lund. The Last Word? The Constitutional Implications of Presidential Signing Statements: Presidential Signing Statements in Perspective. 16 Wm & Mary Bill of Rts J 95, October 2007.