## 105TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

## S. RES. 146

Establishing an advisory role for the Senate in the selection of Supreme Court Justices.

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

NOVEMBER 7, 1997

Mr. Specter (for himself and Mr. Byrd) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

## RESOLUTION

Establishing an advisory role for the Senate in the selection of Supreme Court Justices.

- Whereas article II, section 2 of the United States Constitution authorizes the President to appoint Judges of the Supreme Court "by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate";
- Whereas the Senate has exercised its "Consent" function with due diligence through extensive hearings and deliberation prior to voting on nominees to the Court;
- Whereas the Senate has not historically exercised its "Advice" function with the exception of a limited consultation with the President on the selection of a nominee in advance of the President making such a nomination;

- Whereas there is no systematic method for selecting Supreme Court nominees, with the President having historically proceeded on an ad hoc basis to consider a limited number of individuals before making his nomination;
- Whereas there is an enormous pool of legal talent who could become Supreme Court nominees;
- Whereas in one case where the Senate exercised influence on the selection of a nominee, it was to replace Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes with Justice Benjamin Cardozo;
- Whereas the importance of having the best and brightest judges is reflected in the fact that the Supreme Court has decided numerous significant cases by a one-vote margin; and
- Whereas it would be useful to create a pool of recognized candidates of superior quality for consideration by the President; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate should better fulfill its "Advice" function under article II, section 2 by having the Senate Committee on the Judiciary establish a pool of possible Supreme Court nominees for the President to consider, based on suggestions from Federal and State judges, distinguished lawyers and law professors, and others with a similar level of insight into the suitability of individuals considered for appointment to the Supreme Court.