

The Final Round¹

Everett Rutan

ejrutan3@ctdebate.org

Coginchaug High School, February 3, 2024

THBT the Chevron deference should be overturned.

A Note about the Notes

These are my notes from the final round at Coginchaug High School. They are limited by how quickly I could write and how well I heard what was said. I apologize for any errors, but I hope debaters will appreciate this insight: what a judge hears may not be what the debater said or thinks they said.

There are two versions of the notes. The one below is chronological, reproducing each speech in the order in which the arguments were made. It shows how the debate was presented. The second is formatted to look more like my written flow chart, with each contention “flowed” across the page as the teams argued back and forth. It’s closer to the way I take notes during the debate.

The Final Round

The final round at Coginchaug was between the Warde team of Amogh Ganjikutta and Aryan Chitnis on the Government and Joel Barlow team of Owen Fellows and Siddharth Gupta on the Opposition. The debate was won by the Government team from Warde.

1) Prime Minister Constructive

- a) Introduction
- b) Statement of the motion
- c) Definition: “TH” as the US Supreme Court (“SC”²)
 - i) “Chevron deference” (“CD”) as courts deferring to gov’t agencies per the packet
 - ii) Framework: what is best for the US
- d) G1³: Motion would promote judicial and legislative power relative to the executive branch (“EB”)
 - i) Judiciary should act as independent check on EB
 - (1) Can’t with CD, this violates Constitution
 - ii) Agency decision process is hidden
 - iii) Reduces incentive for Congress to legislate
 - (1) Laws now vague, as CD reduced need for clarity
 - (2) CD concentrates power in EB
 - (3) 3500 new regulations each year
 - iv) Agencies abuse power
 - (1) E.g., Veterans Administration denied benefits for 3 years

¹ Copyright 2008 Everett Rutan. This document may be freely copied for non-profit, educational purposes.

² Defines “FD” as an abbreviation for “Fairness Doctrine.”

³ “G1” indicates the Government first contention, “O2” the Opposition second contention and so forth.

- (2) This is completely unacceptable
- e) G2: Enhance clarity and predictability in regulatory decisions
 - i) Court precedents provide clearer interpretation of statutes
 - ii) Agency decisions change with each administration
 - (1) Quality varies, e.g., Educ. Secretary DeVos
 - (2) Results unpredictable, lack clarity
 - iii) Rely on good will of EB
 - (1) Hope no abuse, but authoritarian risk present
 - (2) Confusion occurs between branches of same agency, e.g., EPA
- POI: *If chaos now, won't de-regulation be more chaotic?***
 - (3) EPA should enforce, judiciary/legislature create/interpret
- f) G3: Restore legislative initiative
 - i) CD permits Congress to write vague laws
- 2) Leader of the Opposition Constructive**
 - a) Intro/motion
 - b) Observation: Drug market safety due to FDA regulation under CD
 - i) No such protection on Gov
 - c) Accept definitions
 - i) Framework is vague; should weigh which side leads to best effective, enforced regulation
 - d) O1: US needs the administrative state
 - i) No CD, agencies lose autonomy, power
 - (1) Hard to regulate, e.g., EPA, FDA
 - ii) Agencies more knowledgeable than Courts
 - (1) E.g., water pollution, meat packing
 - iii) Need flexibility in a disaster
 - (1) E.g. COVID response took years in Congress
 - (2) Legislature is least productive in years
 - (3) Result will be more deaths
 - e) O2: De-regulation would be a disaster
 - i) Georgetown professor: increased uncertainty would destabilize healthcare
 - (1) E.g. children w/broken legs
 - (2) More deaths, especially among the poor
 - f) O3: Courts can't solve de-regulation
 - i) Agencies have '000's employees and regulations
 - ii) SC has only 9 Justices, hears 100 cases/year
 - POI: *Isn't the issue who interprets existing laws and statutes?***
 - Doesn't motion just change who does the interpreting?***
 - iii) No. Remove CD removes regulatory power
 - (1) Result is agencies can't regulate or act quickly
 - g) G1: Concentration of power in the EB is necessary
 - i) SC recognized this as far back as Marbury v Madison
 - h) G2: Recall our POI. Motion deregulates entire gov't
 - i) Resets the past 40 years
 - ii) Limits effectiveness of all agencies, e.g., FEMA, EPA, FDA
 - iii) Neuters EB

3) Member of Government Constructive

- a) Intro
- b) O1: Need? Chaos? De-regulation? Not true!
 - i) Congress can work w/agencies on more targeted legislation
 - (1) No agencies are closed by the motion
 - POI: Congress passes <20 bills/year, vs 4000 regs/year?**
 - ii) Wheel will turn slower but safer than EB concentration of power
 - (1) Policies change yearly in EB
- c) O2: EB handling of emergencies?
 - i) Congress gives EB power to act
 - (1) E.g. Heros Act provision used for Student Loans
 - (2) Gov't can react
- d) O3: Courts overwhelmed?
 - i) We can expand the courts
 - (1) Not just the SC, Federal District Courts
 - ii) Motion gives parties right to challenge agencies
 - (1) Farmers, truckers, small businesses now at their mercy
 - (2) Deserve their day in court
 - iii) Disaster?
 - (1) Now agencies are not esteemed
 - (a) Heads change, e.g., de Vos
 - (b) Forced to trust politicians/officials
 - (c) Each party appoints its own donors
- POI: Didn't SC shift with Trump appointees?**
 - (2) Not the same. No power to fire existing justices. Done per Constitution
 - (3) Now, new Administration, new agency heads
 - (4) SC decision not always ideological
 - (5) E.g., on border control, over-ruled conservative Texas governor 5-4
 - (6) Trust SC over unelected bureaucrats
- e) G1: Better to trust my congressman
 - i) Vs vague bill interpreted by EB
 - ii) Congress and agencies, vs agencies alone
- f) G2: Now laws purposely vague so EB can interpret
 - i) Need clear laws and guidelines
- g) G3: Legislature is the most powerful branch
 - i) Elected directly by people

4) Member of the Opposition Constructive

- a) Intro/motion
- b) Agree with definitions and weighing
- c) G1: Is the Legislature greater than the EB under Constitution?
 - i) Judiciary is not powerless
 - ii) EB has gathered power; SC has reduced it
 - (1) E.g., EPA powers restricted
 - iii) Decades of CD have seen more efficient regulation than before
 - iv) Congress can still scrutinize actions
 - (1) E.g., FBI

- (2) Process balances EB seizing power
- POI: Is efficiency more important than democracy?***
- (3) No, but “wheels moving slowly” would be harmful
- (4) Democracy is majority rule
- (5) Policy in charge will support its ideology
- v) How will courts handle 3500 regs/year?
 - (1) SC only hears 100 cases
 - (2) Expand court? Still take months/years to act
 - (3) EB acts in days or weeks
 - (4) E.g., VA denied benefits for 3 years?
 - (a) Can sue if wronged, no loss of balance
- d) G2: Clarity? Agency heads change?
 - i) Heads nominated/approved as a result of election
 - ii) Vs SC appointed for life
 - (1) Confidence in SC at all time low
 - (2) Congress appoints, need not trust
- e) G3: Legislative Intent?
 - i) SC recognized shortcomings, established CD
 - ii) Clarification by Congress extremely inefficient
- f) O1: Congress direct agencies?
 - i) Unrealistic given least productive Congress in years
 - (1) E.g., debt ceiling issue
- g) O2/O3: Gov’t put into crisis
 - i) E.g., FEMA/EPA no power to act
- 5) Leader of Opposition Rebuttal**
 - a) What would you say to those harmed in a disaster?
 - b) Why do we need a strong EB?
 - i) Opp agrees wheels turn slowly otherwise
 - (1) Millions of issues, no services
 - (2) Need strong EB in crisis
 - (3) Legislature incompetent/biased
 - (4) SC slow
 - ii) Bias in legislature/SC
 - (1) No better than bias in EB/agencies
 - (2) EB has experts, centuries of knowledge
 - (3) Implies better regulations
 - c) Administrative State?
 - i) Opp: worries about imbalance
 - ii) Gov: Marbury decision lets courts delegate
 - (1) Courts don’t want power
 - iii) G2/G3 claim result will be confusion
 - (1) Not compared to policies made by uneducated legislature
 - (2) Result?
 - (a) Incompetent programs
 - (b) EB can’t carry out laws
- 6) Prime Minister Rebuttal**

- a) Intro
- b) O1: Gov agrees we need agencies
 - i) Motion doesn't eliminate any agency
 - ii) Same powers, but better subject to law and court review
 - iii) Opp claims of harm simply not true
 - iv) Gov just shifts power
- c) O2: De-regulation?
 - i) Court system can be expanded
 - (1) Specific regulation can continue
 - ii) Need to abide by Constitution
 - (1) Add resources if CD overturned
- d) O3: Basically same argument as O2
 - i) Expand the courts to prevent disaster, set bounds
 - ii) No deregulation occurs if CD overturned
 - (1) Same regulations, different process of interpretation
- e) Issue is democracy vs appointed officials
 - i) E.g., Ag. Dept. coverup
 - ii) SC can rule against a President
- f) Gov: Promote judicial/legislative power
 - i) Better than '000's of unrepresentative appointees
 - ii) Clarity/predictability enhanced by court review
 - iii) Opp never replied to our point that this will lead to better legislation