proved herself to be a healer of rifts among judges, as excellent negotiator, and a judicial moderate who has nonetheless maintained her intellectual integrity and her dedication to the ideals of equality before the law for all our people.

Perhaps it would not disturb the shade of Justice Bradley too much to know that Judge Ginsburg has also admirably fulfilled the only roles he would have permitted her to play: She is a devoted wife and mother and a treasured friend of all those

who have come to know her.

This Committee has had few nominees for appointment as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States who as richly deserve your votes for swift confirmation. Her appointment is a credit to the President. Her confirmation will be a credit to you, and she will be a credit to the Nation as Justice Ginsburg.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Judge.

Mr. Millstein.

STATEMENT OF IRA M. MILLSTEIN

Mr. MILLSTEIN. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I submitted a statement which I hope will be incorporated in the record, and I will try to be brief.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be.

Mr. MILLSTEIN. I have known Ruth and Martin Ginsburg since the summer of 1957 when Martin joined our firm as a summer associate. We were then about 20 lawyers located on 42nd Street in New York. And we are now about 650 in the same city, and in about nine different locations.

I have been their friend since 1957, even though we lost Marty as our partner in 1980, when Ruth came down to become a circuit court judge—a moment I remember as sort of bittersweet: sweet in being able to help her on that task, and a real loss to the firm in losing one of the very best tax lawyers in the United States when Martin's geography caused him to separate from the firm.

Ruth Ginsburg's moderate views on the interstitial role of the judiciary and the need for collegiality on the appellate benches has been demonstrated well in the last few days, and I don't intend to replicate or duplicate. You don't need to hear any more from me

on that subject.

I think something else of importance is happening for the bench and the bar, and I don't think we ought to let that moment pass without comment.

Having chosen as a candidate a lawyer/judge from a pool, a very small pool of very highly qualified people, I would like to think that President Clinton and soon you in the Senate have chosen with gender-blindness a person who just happens to be a woman. If perhaps that is an overstatement this time, maybe it won't be the next time.

I have practiced law now for about 45 years, and I have watched the bench and the bar become populated with women, but ever so

slowly and with a great deal of room for improvement.

Martin, Ruth, my wife Diane, also a professional woman, and I were friends when our children were small in the 1960's and 1970's. We saw each other and our children quite often. I watched with growing concern over the unfairness and indignities which were met by both of them, Ruth and Diane, and by the women lawyers whom we had begun to hire in our firm.

In those years, a person with Ruth's qualifications should have been fought over and sought for by law firms on graduation. It didn't happen. She should have had no trouble securing tenure on a faculty like Harvard, Yale, or Columbia, and that didn't happen either. And it is no wonder that in the 1970's Ruth turned her quality mind to gender issues under the Constitution of the United States and began to focus the whole profession's conscience on what we had been ignoring for such a long time.

The legal profession had not been great in making room for women and racial minorities. It is getting better, but we are not

there yet.

Now, how does our profession overcome this? Only by training and learning ourselves, sensitizing ourselves to the need to deal with gender and race in a diverse workplace, and then actually

making progress.

Now, the workplace for most of us is our partnership and the courtrooms. We lawyers normally behave ourselves in courtrooms, and sometimes we take that good behavior with us out of the courtroom. When it becomes commonplace for us to appear before highly qualified, diverse judges, gender and racial distinctions in our law firms will disappear further, especially as it becomes obvious, as it is here today, that a highly qualified person is being chosen who just happens to be a woman, not because she is a woman. Happily, this is becoming easier for most of us now because there are pools of highly qualified lawyers of diversity, so the choosing can be gender-blind. And maybe today, in Ruth, marks a beginning of gender-blindness for both the bench and the bar.

Senator Hatch deserves a very honorable mention in this respect, which I would like to talk about for just a minute. When President Carter nominated Ruth to the District of Columbia Circuit toward the end of his 4-year term, it seemed to us as though the appointment would languish until after the November 1980 election. In that event, the likelihood of Ruth's confirmation, we now know, would have been slim or none. Opposition to Ruth was largely based on the assertion that she was a single-issue lawyer—women's rights.

I knew Senator Hatch from some prior dealings; I have forgotten now about what, Senator. I personally knew him to be open-minded. We didn't often agree on substance, but I was always treated

courteously, and he heard me out.

I called the Senator and asked for an audience for Ruth, urging him to listen and make up his mind on the evidence, not on gossip and rumor. He agreed. We three met somewhere for lunch and talked for quite some time. I don't even remember the total substance.

When we were done, the Senator apparently concluded that Ruth Ginsburg was, indeed, a legal scholar from no ideological school, who quite certainly had some strong ideas on the laws relating to gender. But Ruth Ginsburg also demonstrated that she clearly had the makings of a judge before whom lawyers of all ideologies and persuasions would like to appear and have cases decided. The opposition thereafter seemed to have melted away.

And Ruth was confirmed and on her way to today. Senator Hatch and I recently reminisced about that day, as two proud colleagues. Coming as we do from our respective political philosophies, this is

true diversity in action.

So, to repeat and conclude, the candidate is well qualified, exceptionally well qualified. That the candidate is a woman truly is incidental. When she is confirmed, President Clinton and the Senate will have taken a large step in demonstrating that gender should be and is irrelevant. The eminently well-qualified Justice O'Connor was the first woman on the Court. There had to be a first. There always has to be a first. But now, hopefully, we may be over "firsts," and into quality without regard to gender. To me it is a major event for the bar and the country. And I think we ought to pause for just one moment and acknowledge it.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Millstein follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF IRA M. MILLSTEIN

I've known Ruth and Martin Ginsburg since the summer of 1957 when Martin joined our firm as a summer associate. We were then about 20 lawyers—all male in smallish quarters on 42nd Street in New York City; we are now 650-plus lawyers in about nine geographic locations, at last count. I've been their friend throughout, even though we lost Marty as our partner in 1980 when Ruth became a Judge on the District of Columbia Circuit Court—a moment I recall with some bitter-sweetness. Sweetness at Ruth's appointment, her confirmation, and at being able to assist Ruth in that process; disappointment at losing from my firm the best tax lawyer in the United States, when they moved to Washington, away from our home base

in New York City.

You've heard, and this morning no doubt will continue to hear, from Supreme Court scholars and practitioners about Ruth's talents and potential for being one of the great, not just good, Supreme Court Justices; surely you don't need still another exegesis on that subject. What may not have been emphasized enough is what I (and others such as Stanford Law School's outstanding Constitutional Scholar-Professor Gerald Gunther who is here today) perceive to be her greatest qualification— her non-ideological scholarship. She will be a Justice who applies the law carefully, analytically and with integrity in a clear and lean manner. She will not, however, operate in a vacuum, but, because she is who she is and has been, she will be ever mindful of the world she lives in and the men and women who inhabit it.

One recent decision, Roosevelt v. DuPont, 958 F.2d 416 (D.C. Cir. 1992), exemplifies my view of her judicial approach about as well as any decision of her's that I've read. It's meaningful to me because it deals with my practice area—business-related

There, Judge Ginsburg flexibly entertained an issue first raised on appeal—because the Supreme Court had earlier suggested that appellate courts not by-pass, on technicalities, "issues of importance to the administration of federal law." She concluded that in "exceptional circumstances" Courts of Appeal "are not rigidly limited" solely to issues raised below. Moving to the merits of an important proxy issue, her reasoning followed a model process of clarity and precision. Dealing with a federal statute—she first looked to Congressional intent, and found a delegation of authority to the SEC, with very modest guidance from Congress as to how that delegated authority should be exercised. She next turned to the SEC action at issue to see if it coincided with Congress' intent. She obviously considered relevant judicial precedents, and importantly looked to expectations built upon a rather consistent interpretation of the law. Again, showing regard for not wasting litigator and judicial time with remands, she accepted a public statement of facts not strictly within the record below, but necessary to the outcome. Her decision was widely acclaimed—but, to me, the key was her flexibility, the scope of her inquiry and reasoning, and the concise nature of an opinion that said a great deal in a very short compass. You are dealing with a quiet person who possesses a legal mind of enormous scope, who recognizes the role of the Judiciary as one branch of government that, while working with co-equal branches, must be ever mindful of individual rights. And, by now, you must know that.

Her moderate views on the interstitial role of the Judiciary, and the need for collegiality on the Appellate Benches, are nowhere better stated than in her own "Madison Lecture" of March 9, 1993.

So, let's pass her obvious talents and non-ideological—rather ideal—approach to judicial decision-making. You have in Judge Ginsburg a Judge—and soon I hope a Justice—who practitioners would conclude will not only give them a fair shake, but