sure of his great regard and reverence for the intent legislative bodies have expressed when enacting statutes, and we can expect his statutory interpretation to reflect this viewpoint.

I would predict that Mr. Rehnquist will become one of the great Justices of the Supreme Court. He is not only accomplished in the practice of the legal profession, but he is also a great human being with a fine sense of humor. He has a great feeling of respect and compassion for his fellow man and of reverence for our American institutions. It is my pleasure and honor to join my colleagues in the Arizona delegation to the Congress of the United States in recommending that this committee consider favorably the confirmation of William Rehnquist.

Mr. Chairman, I am authorized by Congressman Udall and Congressman Steiger to convey to the committee that they also recommend the confirmation.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you are speaking for the Congressional delegation from Arizona; is that correct?

Mr. RHODES. I am about to ask the chairman for the privilege for my colleagues to file their statements for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. The statement you have made as to the recommendation of confirmation is correct, but I would prefer that the individuals have the privilege of filing their own statements so that they can express their ideas in their own words.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be granted.

(The statements referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE MORRIS K. UDALL

Mr. Chairman, I released on October 27th in Arizona a statement with regard to the nomination of William H. Rehnquist to the Supreme Court. That statement follows:

It's natural to feel some pride when a man from one's state and from one's own professional group is nominated for a position carrying the awesome responsibility of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Thus, the President's selection of William Rehnquist stirs such pride.

At the same time, I must acknowledge that I would not have nominated Mr. Rehnquist had the choice been mine.

I say this though I can attest to his complete integrity and adherence to the highest ethical standards. In addition he has had excellent legal training and experience and possesses a clearly superior legal mind. He certainly meets the demanding professional standards for and would bring intellectual distinction to the Supreme Court.

Having said that, however, I must register my strong disagreement with Mr. Rehnquist's philosophy. I consider many of his publicly expressed views to be misguided and wrong.

Yet I believe that a President has the right to appoint judges of his own political and judicial philosophy and that his nominees should generally be confirmed when they meet ethical and professional standards, as Mr. Rehnquist obviously does.

Furthermore, we have learned that it is risky business to predict the course a lawyer will take when he leaves the political arena and begins a lifetime judicial appointment. And so I can be hopeful that as a Supreme Court justice Mr. Rehnquist will acquire different perspectives.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE SAM STEIGER

This is more than the normal, ritual endorsement of an executive appointment by a Member of Congress who resides in the appointee's State.

Bill Rehnquist, by temperament, training and character, will be a magnificent member of the Supreme Court. His intellectual ability, his honor and integrity, and his legal achievements have been attested to by his shrillest critics.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

It is incredible to me that this man, whose intellectual stature absolutely precludes bigotry, would be called racist, even by the most partisan practitioner. That Bill Rehnquist would be indifferent, or worse, to civil liberties would be laughable if these charges were not being mouthed by people who should know better. It is his total concern for the much maligned rights of the victims of organized crime that has led to his support of those carefully controlled devices necessary to the apprehension of those engaged in organized crime.

I have known Bill Rehnquist for a decade—both professionally and socially. In most of my dealings with public figures I have found my respect mitigated by tolerance after similar exposure. Not so in the case of Bill Rehnquist. I can say without hesitation that the more I know of him, the greater is my undiluted respect for him.

Mr. RHODES. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

The Chair would like to state that there has been a full field FBI investigation of the nominee, and also of Mr. Powell, the other nominee, and that the investigation showed them both clean, high-classed gentlemen. I cannot see any flaw in Mr. Rehnquist, or in Mr. Powell, as a result of the full field investigation.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST, NOMINEE TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rehnquist, you have an A.V. rating in Martindale's, do you not?

Mr. REHNQUIST. Yes, I did have at the time while I was practicing.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you get it?

Mr. REHNQUIST. As I recall, the minimum period in which you could get an A.V. rating at the time was a period of practice of 10 years. And it seems to me I got it in 1966, though I cannot be absolutely positive as to the date. It was very shortly after the expiration of the minimum period.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, that is the highest rating Martindale's Legal Directory can give a person?

Mr. REHNQUIST. Yes, I believe it is.

The CHAIRMAN. And you got it in 12 years.

Mr. REHNQUIST. That certainly—it was either 11 or 12 years, Mr. Chairman. I am not positive as to the exact date.

The CHAIRMAN. No one can get it under 10 years?

Mr. REHNQUIST. That is my understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator McClellan.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions, but I should like to ask the indulgence of the Chair and my colleagues with me while I make a brief statement regarding these nominations, a statement that I want to go into the record in full. Following this statement, I will have some questions premised upon the views that I express here.

A special genius of the American people has been a commitment to the rule of law, not of men, and a special focus of that commitment has always been on the Supreme Court of the United States. This committee, and ultimately the Senate, fulfills, therefore, a sacred duty in advising and consenting to the nominations submitted by the President for the Nation's highest court.

In considering these pending nominations, three issues face this committee, and will later face the Senate: