

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 issues.

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

will do so with care and erudition. One can't ask for more from any Bench, or for any less from the Country's most important Bench.

But something even more important may be happening, and we shouldn't let the moment pass without comment. Having chosen as a candidate a lawyer/judge from a small pool of the very best quality available, I would like to think that President Clinton, and soon you and the Senate, have chosen, with gender-blindness, a person who happens to be a woman. If perhaps that is an overstatement this time, the day will soon come when it won't be.

Practicing now for almost 45 years I've watched the Bench and Bar become populated with women, but ever so slowly, and with a good deal of room for improvement. I serve with Cy Vance and others on a New York City Bar Association Committee on Diversity, which is a nice way of describing a Committee that is asking ourselves how we're doing with gender and race. The answer is: we're trying—but probably not hard enough—and there are ways we can improve.

Judge Ginsburg and my wife (also a professional woman) are among the reasons for my concern about diversity. Through both, and though the women who have become my partners at my firm, I've seen the indignities and unfairness which still exist; less than Ruth and my wife Diane grew up with—but far more than should still exist.

Marty, Ruth, Diane and I were friends when our children were small in the 60's and 70's. We saw each other and each other's children often. But then we all became busy on respective career paths in the 80's and 90's, and geography intervened. When we talk though—it's as if no time at all has passed.

In those early years, a person with Ruth's qualifications should have been fought over and sought by the law firms upon her graduation. It didn't happen. She should have had no trouble securing tenure on a Harvard, Yale or Columbia faculty. It didn't happen. I remember Marty's frustration and anger when Ruth was turned down for a professorship at a law school where we all thought we could help. I'm convinced that the only issue was gender on the faculty; and gender was still an issue in law partnerships around the country. It is no wonder that in the 70's Ruth Ginsburg turned her quality mind to gender issues under the United States Constitution and focused the profession's conscience on an issue the majority had been ignoring. The profession wasn't great in making room for women and racial minorities. I recall early on inviting a woman associate—our firm's first—to accompany me to a Bar Association lecture and reception—and being roundly ribbed and jabbed for doing so. I was embarrassed for us all. It's not so great—even now. I witnessed, just within the year, a small example. One of my women partners and I met a male who welcomed me warmly, and then invited us into his office—turning to my partner and saying, "C'mon honey, this way." I'm sure, it was said without thought or to denigrate, but nonetheless it was indicative of an attitude that hasn't died easily in our profession. My partner didn't flinch.

How does our profession overcome this? Only by training ourselves actively, and sensitizing ourselves to dealing with gender and race in a diverse workplace.

But actually making progress is even more important. And gender and racial diversity in our workplace becoming commonplace, is the single most important proof of progress in our profession. The workplaces for most of us are our partnerships, and the courtrooms. We lawyers normally behave ourselves in courtrooms, and sometimes take our good behavior with us out of the courtroom. When it becomes commonplace to appear before diverse judges, gender and racial distinctions will disappear further. The Bar's task is to make diversity acceptable and commonplace in our firms; the Executive and Legislative Branches should do likewise for the Judiciary. Happily, this is now becoming much easier for all of us. None of us can hide behind the old shibboleth that said: show me a dedicated and qualified woman and she'll make partner (or Judge, or Commissioner, or whatever). Of course, for years we defined "dedicated and qualified" to exclude 99 percent of those who applied. After a long struggle however, definitions have been clarified and there are now pools of highly qualified lawyers of diversity—so that choosing can be gender blind—and perhaps this day (and Ruth) should mark a beginning of gender blindness—for both the Bench and the Bar.

Senator Hatch deserves a very honorable mention in this process. When President Carter nominated Ruth to the D.C. Circuit towards the end of his four year term, it seemed as though the appointment would languish until after the election of November 1980. In that event, the likelihood of Ruth's confirmation, we now know, would have been slim to 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, the substance of which I now forget. But, of all the Republicans on this Committee, I thought I had the best relationship with him. 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 just listen and make up his mind on the evidence—not gossip and rumor. He agreed. We three met somewhere for lunch and then talked for quite some time. The talk ranged over cabbages and kings and lawyers and judges, and I can't recall specifically.

When we were done, the Senator apparently concluded that Ruth Ginsburg was a legal scholar from no ideological school—who indeed had strong ideas on the law relating to gender issues. As she recently pointed out to this Committee, her gender work in the 70's was toward \* \* \* “the advancement of equal opportunity and responsibility for women and men in all fields of human endeavor.” 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 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—that is true diversity in action.

So to repeat and conclude: This candidate is qualified—exceptionally 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 any regard to gender. It's a major event for the Bar and the Country. Let's pause for one moment and acknowledge it.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. I thank you all. Your words were eloquent. They obviously speak for themselves. I have no questions.

Senator Hatch.

Senator HATCH. I just want to welcome all of you here and thank you all for appearing. I think you made very good statements that everybody should be listening to.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Feinstein.

Senator FEINSTEIN. Just a small observation. As one who has usually in my prior life seen lawyers through the lens of an individual case, it is wonderful to see the breadth and the macro picture of the law. And I think it would lead every American to have a very great respect for the law. So I want to very sincerely thank you for coming, particularly Judge Hufstedler, whom I know. And I think we are going to see the glass ceiling shattered, and I must say I concur with your views 100 percent.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you all.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, since I am the only one that observed the 5 minutes, if I—[laughter].

The CHAIRMAN. No, Mr. Millstein observed the 5 minutes. Mr. Smith was close, and the judge, because she is a judge, is not bound by any rules. [Laughter.]

Judge HUFSTEDLER. Thank you.

Mr. COLEMAN. I just want to add my thanks to this committee that you would spend the three or four days airing this, although I am pretty sure after the first day everybody felt that in this case the nomination would be reported favorably. I think you have greatly educated the American people as to what the law is about, what this country is about, and how responsible politicians and judges try to meet the demands of the American people. And I thank you very much for taking the time and effort and providing the brains and brilliance in the way you conducted yourself.