

Amy Coney Barrett Supreme Court nomination / Barrett should be confirmed

< Amy Coney Barrett Supreme Court nomination

The printable version is no longer supported and may have rendering errors. Please update your browser bookmarks and please use the default browser print function instead.

Position: Barrett should be confirmed

This position addresses the topic Amy Coney Barrett Supreme Court nomination.

For this position

“ Ruth Bader Ginsburg’s death left the court with just eight votes, raising the possibility of deadlocks, even as a wave of litigation over mail-in voting makes it more likely the court will have to decide election-related cases. As Ginsburg, a liberal hero, herself argued, “Eight is not a good number for a collegial body that sometimes disagrees.” ”

From Justice Amy Coney Barrett will be a boon to the nation, by New York Post editorial board (*New York Post*, October 26, 2020) ([view](#))

“ We are a long way from a Senate Judiciary Committee of dignity and deference. We are a long way from a moment like the one during Ruth Bader Ginsburg’s confirmation hearings when conservative Republican Orrin Hatch told then-Judge Ginsburg, “I admire you.” But we could get back to a serious process, based on goodwill and the probing of different judicial philosophies, if we wanted to. ”

From Amy Coney Barrett and the confirmation process, by Pittsburgh Post-Gazette editorial board (*Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, October 19, 2020) ([view](#))

“ In two days of Senate hearings, Amy Coney Barrett has already shown she has the right temperament — and legal chops — to serve on the Supreme Court: She isn’t ruffled or distracted by hostile questions but sticks like glue to the facts and the law. At the same time, Democrats have shown they have no good reason to reject her: Their toughest line of attack has been to suggest she might not vote the way they’d like on an ObamaCare case or if the election comes before the high court. ”

From Amy Coney Barrett truly shines under fire in Senate hearings, by New York Post editorial board (*New York Post*, October 13, 2020) ([view](#))

Against this position

“ Asked about Trump's refusal to commit to leaving office should he lose, she responded, "To the extent that this is a political controversy right now, as a judge, I want to stay out of it and I don't want to express a view." Sorry, judge, it's exactly your duty to have an opinion on such an extreme and reckless thought. Vacuous caution has no place in answering such a basic question. ”

From An evasive high court nominee inches toward Senate confirmation, by San Francisco Chronicle editorial board (*San Francisco Chronicle*, October 23, 2020) (view)

“ Clearly, Barrett is deeply conservative and despite her vow to keep her personal views apart from her analysis of cases, it's more than likely she will work to eviscerate the legal underpinnings of these landmark civil rights cases. To do so would undercut the legitimacy and credibility of the court, which must mirror public opinion and not swing extremely in any one direction. ”

From Court's legitimacy in the balance, by Newsday editorial board (*Newsday*, October 17, 2020) (view)

“ In another universe, her qualifications might incline us to support her nomination despite our concerns that she might vote to undermine the right to abortion or make it harder for Congress and the states to deal with the proliferation of firearms. But the circumstances in which Barrett has been nominated by President Trump make discussion of her credentials or her judicial philosophy irrelevant. Confirming her now could politicize the Supreme Court beyond the possibility of repair. ”

From Judge Barrett showed she was learned in the law; that's not enough, by Los Angeles Times editorial board (*Los Angeles Times*, October 16, 2020) (view)

“ The U.S. Senate is within its rights to consider Barrett, who has been deemed "well-qualified" by the American Bar Association, the group's highest rating, and came across in her testimony as brilliant, thoughtful and well-tempered. But when it comes to whether to confirm Barrett as the next justice, senators of both parties should delay a decision until after the Nov. 3 election. This isn't about Barrett or Senate prerogatives or presidential powers. It is about the good of a nation that has been torn apart by partisan political maneuvering and is even now in the process of choosing a president and a Congress that will be sworn into office in just 96 days. As we've said before, ramming through a Supreme Court nomination, the latest ever considered in a presidential election year, will only further damage our nation's democratic mores and values that have been trampled by the president and a complicit Republican Party. ”

From Delay the Senate vote on Supreme Court nomination of Amy Coney Barrett, by Houston Chronicle editorial board (*Houston Chronicle*, October 16, 2020) (view)

Mixed on this position

No results

"https://discourse.db.org/w/index.php?title=Amy_Coney_Barrett_Supreme_Court_nomination/_Barrett_should_be_confirmed&oldid=32088"

This page was last edited on October 26, 2020, at 23:36.

All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License.