I appreciate the fact that as I sat here the last several minutes, Mr. Rehnquist has answered in greater detail, in my judgment, some of the difficult questions that he had appeared to be more reluctant to answer earlier.

I am anxious to have a chance to study them because I think most of this information is the type of information we are looking for, and I personally appreciate that.

The CHAIRMAN. John Bingham Hurlbut, law professor; Martin F. Richman, former law clerk to Chief Justice Warren, former Deputy Assistant Attorney General; Howard Karman, president of the Arizona Bar Association. Will you gentlemen stand.

You are here to testify in behalf of Mr. Rehnquist. We will give you the opportunity to put your statements in the record, please.

(The material referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF JOHN BINGHAM HURLBUT

By way of identifying myself, which I understand is appropriate, I am John Bingham Hurlbut, Jackson Eli Reynolds Professor of Law, Emeritus as of 31 August 1972, Stanford University.

My remarks in support of the nomination of William Rehnquist will be brief, adding perhaps only a small addendum of footnote to the testimony already before the committee. I speak as one of his law school instructors of two dedades ago and more, of my observation of him at that time, of my estimate of him at that time and of my estimate of him at the present time.

Mr. Rehnquist is the product of the Stanford Law School, a member of one of those remarkable and very competent post-war classes, composed largely of veterans, eager to exploit what the law school had to offer in the pursuit of a solid foundation for a professional career in private practice and in public service, and for satisfying those heavy obligations of a lawyer citizen. And on the other side of the platform a strong, demanding, dedicated faculty including such names as Phil Neal (now law dean at Chicago), Sam Thurman (now law dean at Utah), Harold Shepherd (former dean at Duke), and Paul Freund (visiting professor from Harvard for a term). In this setting he was graduated first in his class—and as one of my former colleagues at Stanford has put it, "He was the outstanding student of his law school generation."

I can, I think, speak with some authority on William Rehnquist the student. He was a member of my classes in criminal law in his first year and evidence in his third year. For a while he was my research assistant. We had a common interest in intercollegiate athletics as well as the law. So I saw a great deal of him in the classroom, in my office, and in my home.

As a student he was nothing short of brilliant, determined to achieve excellenec, and persistent in his expectation of excellence on the other side of the podium. In the give and take of the classroom he was sharp, forthright, courageous, and objective—precise and deep in his analysis of difficult problems—insistent that a problem be turned over and over to expose all of its facets before its solution—and always a gentleman.

Since 1952 we have kept in touch with each other. While our association has been more casual and less frequent than I would have liked, I have followed his career enough to be quite sure that the hallmark of excellence which characterized him as a student has characterized his professional life.

In my opinion he is highly qualified to be a Justice of the Supreme Court. He combines great intellectual power with complete intellectual and personal integrity and with wisdom and common sense. And he has that all important capacity for steady continual growth which he demonstrated as a student and has demonstrated in his professional life. In my opinion he has those ingredients which guarantee that he will have a distinguished career as he goes about fullfilling the responsibilities of a Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Thank you for this opportunity to appear before you.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO