

# **The Daily Item**

*More for You!*

## **The truth about Garland**

Ruth Schaffer

April 17, 2016

In Ruth Marcus' article of March 18 titled "Meet Merrick Garland," you would think she would tell what, where, when and why he should be named to the Supreme Court. In more than 600 words the only reason I could find was her sentence, "He is the most moderate nominee Republicans could reasonably expect."

His downside was his age, which she didn't give.

Webster says moderate is mediocre, temperate and not excessive — not very good attributes for a judge.

The last two long paragraphs told of her meeting him 30 years before. The rest was centered on criticizing Republicans to get Garland confirmed and put pressure on the senators up for re-election.

This is typical of a progressive Democrat. When they can't debate, and when they don't have good viewpoints, they criticize, saying Republicans blunder, etc. Even the editorial that day stated about the appointments clause and the president has the power, with the advise and consent of the Senate, to appoint ambassadors, judges of the Supreme Court and so on.

But nobody points out that a Supreme Court judge should be a strict constitutionalist because he is interpreting the constitution.

Merrick Garland always favored contested environmental regulations when they were challenged by industry.

He is proven to be deferential to the government in 10 to 14 criminal cases siding with prosecutors even when a colleague disagreed with him.

He is a candidate who had support of Republicans in the past but would always move the court in a progressive direction.

Much like Democrat Kathleen Kane, who two months after taking the oath to honor the laws of Pennsylvania, said she didn't believe in the Defense of Marriage Act so she wasn't enforcing it.

Trevor Burrus of the Cato Institute wrote that libertarians and conservatives should be concerned about Garland's stance on gun rights.

Stonewalling was OK when conservative nominees were facing confirmation. On President George H.W. Bush's 1992 nomination: "President Bush should consider and not name a nominee until after the November election," said Sen. Joe Biden. On President George W. Bush's 2006 nomination of Samuel Alito, 25 senators voted to support a filibuster, including Sen. Barack Obama, Sen. Biden, Sen. Hillary Clinton, Sen.

Chuck Schumer and Sen. Harry Reid. On President George W.

Bush's 2007 potential nominations, "I will recommend to my colleagues that we should not confirm a Supreme Court nominee," said Sen. Schumer.

The shoe is on the other foot now, and the Democrats can't take it.