



Supreme Court Nominations During Years with a Closely Divided Senate

February 18, 2022

This Insight provides information and data related to Supreme Court nominations during years with a closely divided Senate. For the purpose of this Insight, a "closely divided" Senate is defined as one for which the margin that determined majority control of the chamber was two or fewer seats. Under such circumstances, there have been 17 Supreme Court nominations submitted to the Senate during years when it was closely divided—these 17 nominations represent 10% of the 164 Supreme Court nominations submitted to the Senate since 1789.

With Justice Stephen Breyer announcing, on January 27, 2022, his intention to retire, and President Joe Biden stating, on the same date, his intention to announce a nominee by the end of February 2022 for the anticipated vacancy on the Court, a nomination submitted this year to the Senate, with its present party division, would be the 18th Supreme Court nomination submitted to a closely divided Senate (under the definition provided above).

Nominations Submitted During Past Presidencies

The first Supreme Court nomination submitted to a closely divided Senate occurred during the 3rd Congress in 1793, when a political faction of Senators that supported the Washington Administration ("Pro-Administration") held 16 seats and a faction that opposed the Administration ("Anti-Administration") held 14 seats. As shown by **Figure 1**, the nominee, William Paterson, was confirmed without a roll call vote.

Of the 17 nominations included in the figure, 10 (59%) occurred prior to the 20th century—including 3 nominations submitted during the presidency of Andrew Jackson and 3 submitted during the presidency of Chester Arthur. Two nominees were also submitted to a closely divided Senate during the first term (1885-1889) of President Grover Cleveland.

Of the 7 Supreme Court nominations that were submitted to a closely divided Senate since 1900, 5 were submitted during the presidency of Dwight Eisenhower, when—during the 83rd, 84th, and 85th Congresses (1953 to 1959)—each party held between 47 and 49 of the chamber's 96 seats. The most recent Supreme Court nomination submitted to a closely divided Senate occurred during the 115th Congress, with the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh in 2018.

Congressional Research Service

https://crsreports.congress.gov IN11862

PRESIDENT		CONGRESS	SENATE PARTY COMPOSITION			YEAR OF FINAL SENATE	CONFIRMED BY Voice vote or unanimous consent		
				rty* (#Seats)		ACTION	📕 Aye 📕 Nay	Label =Ta	lly
Washington	Paterson, W.	3rd	AA (14)	PA (16)		1793			
Jackson	Baldwin, H.	21st	J (25)	AJ (23)		1830	41		2
Jackson	Taney, R.	24th	J (26)	AJ (24)	N(2)	1836	29		15
Jackson	Barbour, P.	24th	J (26)	AJ (24)	N(2)	1836	30		11
Garfield	Matthews, S.	47th	D (37)	R (37)	I(1) RE	1) 1881	24		23
Arthur	Gray, H.	47th	D (37)	R (37)	I(1) RE	1) 1881	51		5
Arthur	Conkling, R.	47th	D (37)	R (37)	I(1) RE	1) 1882	39		12
Arthur	Blatchford, S.	47th	D (37)	R (37)	I(1) RE(1) 1882			
Cleveland	Lamar, L.	50th	D (37)	R (39)		1888	32		28
Cleveland	Fuller, M.	50th	D (37)	R (39)		1888	41		20
Hoover	Cardozo, B.	72nd	D (47)	R (48)	FL(1)	1932			
Eisenhower	Warren, E.	83rd	D (47)	R (48)	I(1)	1954			
Eisenhower	Harlan, J.	83rd	D (47)	R (48)	I(1)	1954	No action; ro following year		d
Eisenhower	Harlan, J.	84th	D (48)	R (47)	I(1)	1955	71		11
Eisenhower	Brennan, W.	85th	D (49)	R (47)		1957			
Eisenhower	Whittaker, C.	85th	D (49)	R (47)		1957			
Trump	Kavanaugh, B.	. 115th	D (47)	R (51)	I(2)	2018	50		48
Biden	TBD	117th	D (48)	R (50)	I(2)	TBD	-	_	
				i	100%			1	100

Figure 1. U.S. Supreme Court Nominations During Years with a Closely Divided Senate (1790-2022)

Source: Congressional Research Service.

Note: For the purpose of this Insight, a closely divided Senate is defined as one for which the margin that determined majority control of the chamber was two or fewer seats.

Final Senate Action on Past Nominations

Figure 1 provides the year of final action on each of the past nominations to the Court when there was a closely divided Senate and also indicates whether they were approved by the Senate. Of the 17 past Supreme Court *nominations* submitted to a closely divided Senate, 16 were confirmed by the Senate (Roscoe Conkling declined the appointment after his nomination was approved).

One nomination to the Court, that of John Harlan in November 1954, was not acted upon by the Senate before it adjourned in December 1954. President Eisenhower subsequently renominated Harlan to the same vacancy in January 1955 and it was approved a few months later by the Senate. Overall, of the 16 *nominees* who had nominations submitted to a closely divided Senate, all were ultimately confirmed.

A number of well-known past Justices had their nominations to the Court approved by a closely divided Senate, including Chief Justice Roger B. Taney in 1836; Chief Justice Earl Warren in 1954; Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo in 1932; and Justice William J. Brennan, Jr. in 1957.

Senate Vote Margin on Past Nominations

As shown by **Figure 1**, 10 (62%) of the 16 Supreme Court nominations approved during years with a closely divided Senate were confirmed by roll call vote and 6 (38%) were confirmed without a roll call vote. Of the 10 nominations approved by roll call vote, 7 were confirmed by a margin of at least 14

votes—with the nomination of John Harlan during the 84th Congress being approved by the greatest vote margin (60 votes).

The 3 nominations confirmed by the smallest margins during years with a closely divided Senate include the nominations of Stanley Matthews, confirmed during the 47th Congress by a margin of one vote (the smallest margin of the 10 nominations approved by roll call vote); Lucius Lamar, confirmed during the 50th Congress by a margin of four votes; and Brett Kavanaugh, confirmed during the 115th Congress by a margin of two votes.

In terms of the percentage of Senators voting on a nomination who also voted to approve it, 7 of the 10 nominations were confirmed with the support of at least 66% of Senators who voted on the nomination. The nomination of Henry Baldwin during the 21st Congress received the greatest percentage of support (41 of 43, or 95%, of Senators voted to confirm him) whereas the nominations of Brett Kavanaugh and Stanley Matthews had the smallest percentage of Senators voting to confirm them (each receiving 51% of the support of Senators who voted).

Cross-Party Support for Past Nominations

This particular information is not provided in **Figure 1** but, despite the narrow margin of majority control in each of the years with a closely divided Senate, each nomination received at least one vote, and often at least several more, in support of the nomination from Senators *not* belonging to the same political party (or political faction) as the nominating President.

Specifically, 21 Anti-Jacksonians voted to approve the Baldwin nomination; 5 Anti-Jacksonians voted to approve the Taney nomination, as did 5 for the Barbour nomination; 14 Democrats voted to confirm Matthews; 21 Democrats voted to confirm Gray; 13 Democrats voted to confirm Conkling; 3 Republicans voted to confirm Lamar; 10 Republicans voted to confirm Fuller; 31 Democrats voted to confirm Harlan; and 1 Democrat voted to confirm Kavanaugh.

Author Information

Barry J. McMillion Analyst in American National Government

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.