



## **Republican Kelly Ayotte to meet with Supreme Court nominee**

April 15, 2016

Under Democrats' timeline, the Judiciary Committee should start its hearings later this month and give Garland a vote before the full Senate by Memorial Day. Such a resolution, which could attract support from both liberal and conservative justices, could enable the court to sidestep the potentially divisive details over immigration and avoid a 4-4 tie following Justice Antonin Scalia's death in February. "Now it's time for Republicans to do their job by holding public hearings on the President's nominee, considering his nomination in good faith, and giving Chief Judge Garland an up-or-down vote".

Crapo and Risch said Idaho's federal judgeship and the Supreme Court vacancy shouldn't be compared. The current record dates back to 1844 when a Whig-controlled Senate refused to confirm a nominee for 841 days, more than two years.

His reply was a load of nonsense about why this "blockade" fulfills the Senate's constitutional mandate to provide checks and balances on the executive branch. They most certainly have no duty or obligation to consent to that nominee.

"I have to remain an optimist in this business", he said.

Roger Pilon, founder and director of Center for Constitutional Studies at the libertarian-leaning Cato Institute, agrees that McConnell and Grassley are interpreting their constitutional prerogatives correctly.

"We got our first request from the White House late in the afternoon yesterday and are working on a time to arrange the meeting", she said. "Nothing will come of it". "Because of this, Senator Gardner will not be meeting with Judge Garland", said Gardner spokesman Alex Siciliano in a statement.

A nonprofit group associated with a Democratic super PAC is launching a series of online video ads targeting several Republican senators up for reelection who are opposed to considering Merrick Garland for the open Supreme Court seat. The Senate would not hear any nominee from Obama.

"They are not involved in being an architect of the culture of our country, which is what a U.S. Supreme Court judge does", Risch said.

Garland is considered a moderate choice. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., called Estrada's withdrawal "a victory for the Constitution".

Earnest said, however, that he believed such a stand will have political repercussions in the fall. "Well, the truth is our founding fathers intended a justice system that insulated the Supreme Court and the federal judiciary from day-to-day politics".

But, Sanders has a very specific litmus test for Supreme Court justices and in his opinion, Garland is not up to snuff on Citizens United. After a committee vote, he said, he'd be willing to meet with Garland: "And I will explain to him clearly and concisely why I will not vote for him". "We're not going to have a hearing". Susan Collins of ME and Mark Kirk of IL —have called for hearings and a vote. "Because he is thoughtful, thorough, and well-respected across the political spectrum, obstructing a fair process, much less refusing to meet with him, makes no sense". Of course, the issue is very partisan; some may argue entirely partisan as Garland has been lauded as an excellent judge from many quarters.