If you don't regularly receive my reports, request a free subscription at <u>steve_bakke@comcast.net</u>! Follow me on Twitter at <u>http://twitter.com/@BakkeSteve</u> and receive links to my posts and more! Visit my website at <u>http://www.myslantonthings.com</u> !

TODAY'S "QUICK HIT": BLOCKING SUPREME COURT NOMINEES – SOME HISTORY!



By Stephen L. Bakke 🏁 April 11, 2017

Here's what provoked me:

Flip-flopping and hypocrisy is often what politics is all about. In this case, one of the most extreme I have ever come across, happens to be related to the confirmation of Trump's nominee for the Supreme Court, Neil Gorsuch. The democrats admit this is at least partly "payback" for not permitting consideration of Merrick Garland, Obama's 2016 nominee for this same Supreme Court opening.

Here's my response:

Blocking Supreme Court Nominees - Some History!

Republicans decided to "go nuclear" to assure a vote for Supreme Court nominee Gorsuch. This prevented democrats from blocking, via filibuster, an up or down vote on the Senate floor. A majority vote is required for confirmation.

Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer would have blocked a vote by using the filibuster. He claims this "stonewalling" started in 2016 when the republicans refused to have a vote on Obama's nominee Merrick Garland. A review of history corrects that falsehood:

- In 1987 Robert Bork, a Reagan nominee, was denied confirmation. His reputation was brutally pilloried.
- In 1992, then-Senator Biden clearly outlined the reasons why the Senate wouldn't consider a George H.W. Bush nomination in Bush's last year in office.
- In 2001 during George W. Bush's administration, Senator Schumer and others changed the ground rules for systematically using the filibuster to block Supreme Court nominees.
- In 2006, then-Senator Obama publicly supported a filibuster to block confirmation of Justice Alito.
- In 2007, 19 months before the end of "'W's" term, Senator Schumer declared that the lame-duck President would get no nominees through the Democratic Senate, "except in extraordinary circumstances."

However silly you consider this process, Republicans didn't start this foolish "food fight"!