Subject: None of Clinton's judge nominations were filibustered...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 25 May 2005 12:18:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I would dispute the 60 figure you quote. Anyone can come on and state supposed facts. But lets assume your figures are correct. Please keep in mind that Clinton's party didn't have control of the House and Senate. This means that he would have less nominees get appointed than say Bush who's party does have control of both houses. I can also show you web sites that claim that Clinton actually had many more judges, percentage wise, appointed than Bush. Who has had more nominees blocked by the other party is up for debate and doesn't really matter. What matters is which party has decided to block judges by an unprecedented stretch of rules and block TEN qualified judges. Based not on the fact they they are unqualified, but because they don't agree with their political leanings. The Fact is this. The law says that it only takes a majority of Senators to appoint a judge (51). It doesn't say it takes 60 or more. Using this tactic of the Democrats it would always take 60 votes and not the 51 because the other side could simply filibuster any judge they didn't like. So then why would the law say only a simple majority? I have nothing against one side using the rules to block judges. But to stretch the rules (which the Democrats seem to do well) is not acceptable IMO. Now if you are going to say that the law allows for a minority to filibuster judges and even though it was never used, they are following the law. Well then the law also says that the Senate can change these rules with a simple majority vote. So the Republicans are also following the law (In fact the rules for filibustering have been changed many times in the past. For instance the law used to say that a Senator actually had to filibuster by standing up and reading stuff. If he left to go to the bathroom or have lunch the filibuster was over. The rules have since been changed to allow a filibuster to be just threatened and not actually done). So both sides are doing nothing wrong. The problem occurs when the Democrats threaten to shut down the senate if they lose. This takes things too far and IMO is quite childish.Your comment about Fox News is also off the mark. This is just a disguised insult against me. Let's stick to facts. By the way I don't find Fox News to be Conservative or Liberal. I find them Fair and Balanced