

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Moore, Powell: Files
Folder Title: Supreme Court - O'Connor - Press
Releases
Box: OA 3209

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

REPORT FROM UNITED STATES SENATOR JESSE HELMS
FOR WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1981 - #403

WASHINGTON--In mid-August, I flew down to Mocksville, in Davie County, where for 101 years the Masonic lodges and the ladies of the Eastern Star have sponsored an annual picnic to raise funds for Oxford Orphanage. I had been advised that a big crowd would be on hand, but I was not really prepared for the enormous turnout.

Countless thousands of dollars have been raised at this event during the past century. During my visit I thought of the thousands of children whose lives have been given direction as the result of this annual event. In this era of big government and bloated and wasteful federal welfare programs, the annual Mocksville picnic may seem, to some, to be a relic of an earlier age. If so, it is the kind of personal initiative and compassion that needs to be revived in our land.

I commend the Masons and the ladies of the Eastern Star for sponsoring this event. In a very real way, the spirit of America is on display at Mocksville every year.

O'CONNOR--Inasmuch as the Senate was in recess for most of August, I worked out of Raleigh. I had scheduled a number of appearances before national farm organizations around the country. Also, I was able to travel around our state--and was reminded of the great distance between our shores on the Atlantic and North Carolina's far western border high in the mountains--

SENATOR JESSE HELMS~
PAGE TWO

from Manteo to Murphy.

Almost everywhere I went, I was asked about President Reagan's nomination of the first woman to the U. S. Supreme Court, Sandra Day O'Connor. Judge O'Connor is now a member of the Arizona Court of Appeals.

Not many people appeared to know very much about Judge O'Connor. Nevertheless, almost everyone had an opinion as to whether the Senate should confirm her. I was surprised that the sentiment seemed to be fairly equally divided.

HEARINGS--The Senate Judiciary Committee will hold hearings on the O'Connor nomination in September. My guess is that she will be confirmed rather easily--but that will depend upon her testimony during the hearings.

Judge O'Connor visited me in July, and I found her to be a very impressive person. As we chatted, I brought up the subject of what I regard as improper activities by the U. S. Supreme Court during the past two or three decades. Many fine constitutional lawyers, including former Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., believe that the Supreme Court has arrogantly intruded into the constitutional authority and responsibility specifically reserved by the Constitution to Congress. In other words, the Supreme Court has been legislating instead of adjudicating--it has been making law instead of interpreting law.

- more -

SENATOR JESSE HELMS
PAGE THREE

JURISDICTION--On many occasions, and with some success, I have introduced legislation in the Senate to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. For example, I contend that the Supreme Court went overboard in its forced busing decisions, and in its decisions banning voluntary prayer from the schools. I have sought to make those and other issues off-limits for the Supreme Court.

There has been much criticism of my efforts. Liberal editors of big-city newspapers have declared that my efforts to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court are "unconstitutional."

The editors are wrong. They either have not read the U. S. Constitution, or they are trying to disregard it.

Interestingly enough, I read an article recently written by a judge whose name has been in the news frequently during the past few weeks. The judge said flatly that "...federal court jurisdiction can be shaped or removed by Congress."

The judge? None other than Sandra Day O'Connor, whom President Reagan has nominated to the Supreme Court.

O'Connor

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

July 7, 1981

BRIEFING

BY

ATTORNEY GENERAL WILLIAM FRENCH SMITH
FOLLOWING ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT
ON SUPREME COURT NOMINATION

The Briefing Room

10:50 A.M. EDT

Q The FBI checks have not been completed, is that correct, Mr. Attorney General?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: That's correct.

Q Do you think it was sound to make a nomination public before final FBI checks had gone into the background so thoroughly that you knew there wasn't any problem there?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: We have gone into her background quite thoroughly. We are well aware of the fact that there have been times in the past when the FBI check has been concluded before the nomination has been sent up. In this case, the President has announced his intention to nominate, of course, subject to the FBI check, and once that's completed, then the nomination will be sent up.

Q What about opposition of the right-to-life groups? There's been a great deal of that since Mrs. O'Connor's name has surfaced.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Well, as the President has stated, he is satisfied with her position and her record with respect to the right-to-life issue and her record in that respect is for all to see and I'm sure that that may be one of the aspects that will be considered during her confirmation hearing. But I want to emphasize the fact that there has not been a single-issue determination made in connection with this selection.

MORE

Mrs. O'Conner has been considered with respect to her overall qualifications and background and there has not been any effort to focus in on any one issue and judge her on that basis.

Q Well, you handpicked her because she is a conservative, have you not? I mean, you have a general tendency of what her feelings are and where she stands on the issues.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: She has been chosen because of her overall qualifications and background.

Q That has nothing to do with her political leanings?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: The only, if you want to call it "political leanings", that were taken into consideration was whether or not she fell generally within the President's overall judicial philosophy.

Q Tell us about the process of selection now? Exactly when was the decision made? Was it last night?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: The decision was made yesterday, but of course the process has been an extended one. It commenced really when we first learned of Justice Potter Stewart's determination to resign -- that was late last March. We had the intervening problem, of course, of the shooting incident which delayed matters a bit.

We also respected Judge Stewart's request that his resignation not be made public until June 18. Despite that fact, however, we did what was necessary within that constraint to develop candidates that we would present to the President for his consideration and that process was --

Q How many were there?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: It's a little hard to say at any one time. We had a rather extensive list of very highly qualified people. It's a little hard to put a number on it. I would say that during my first presentation to the President there may have been 20 or 25 names on the list.

Q When was that, sir?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: That would have been sometime, I believe, in early June.

Q You mentioned her overall qualifications. What are they? Can you be more specific about that?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: She has an outstanding academic record. She graduated from Stanford with highest honors when she was 20. She graduated from Stanford University Law School when she was

with a large number of people and we have heard nothing but good.

Q If I may follow up, what is her judicial philosophy?

Q We want to know about Helen Thomas' question here.

MR. SPEAKES: He'll be here for a few minutes, so let's go one at a time.

Q Yes, but let's just go back to Helen Thomas' question that it's the President's desire that he appoint someone who would interpret the law and not make it. Are you satisfied and will you expand on your answer as to whether this nominee fits that category?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: We think she definitely does.

Q Why?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: In other words, we're satisfied that she looks upon the judicial function as being one which is intended to interpret and apply the law and not to make it. We're satisfied, the President is satisfied that she recognizes that it is the elected representatives of the people who should be enacting the laws, and that it is the function of the judiciary to interpret and apply those laws -- and in reviewing her opinions alone, in addition to the responses that we've had from numerous inquiries, we're satisfied that that is what she has done.

Q When did she first become a candidate?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: She was on the original list which would go back two or three months.

Q You mentioned her judicial philosophy a minute ago. What did you mean by that?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Just what I just said. In other words, we're satisfied that she views the function of the judiciary to be to interpret and apply the law, not to make it. And of course, that accords with the President's judicial philosophy, which saying it another way is that it is the responsibility of the elected representatives of the people to enact laws and not that of the judicial --

Q Was she the best qualified woman candidate or the best qualified candidate?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: We were fortunate to have on the list a large number of very qualified people and she was one of those.

Q Is this the last woman that we're going to see this President nominate to the Supreme Court now that he has fulfilled that campaign commitment?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: I'm sure that in the future the President will do what he did this time. He will look at the overall list of candidates and from that list he will make a selection, and that could be a male or a female.

Q Would you like to be the next nominee? Your name has come up frequently.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Thank you, no.

Q Do you have any idea on what the President meant by saying he was satisfied with her views on abortion? Has she expressed them specifically to him and has she modified them in any way in recent times? Do you know what her views are?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: As far as we know, she has not modified her views. We have been satisfied that they have been consistent and that her record in this respect is satisfactory to the President.

Q When did she see the President? How long did the interview take place, and who else in the administration interviewed her, please?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: I don't want to get into the specifics as far as who was interviewed and how long. But I can say that the President did interview her and he --

Q Well, how long and when?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Well, it would have been on July 1st, when he had an extended discussion with her.

Q You say you have read her opinions on legalized abortion?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: I didn't say that she had any judicial opinions dealing with that subject. I said that she had a certain record in the Arizona legislature with respect to that, and that's open for all to see.

Q How long did the President meet with her, and where?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Well, he met with her, of course, in the Oval office. I can't tell you off-hand how long it was, but it was certainly sufficient for him to accomplish what was intended to be accomplished in such an interview.

Q Did you interview her, sir?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Oh yes. On various occasions.

Q One of the votes in the legislature, I understand,

the legislature in Arizona. That is a matter of public record, and it is, as I say, open for all to see and will undoubtedly be a subject of discussion later on.

Q Perhaps the fact that the FBI checks have not been completed and this is sort of a rushed announcement this morning, there are going to be many who are going to feel that she was named today because opposition has been mounting, particularly from right-to-life groups?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: This has not been a rushed procedure in any sense. It has been a very thoughtful procedure. It has commenced --

Q The announcement was rushed.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: The announcement was an announcement which was made when the announcement was intended to be made. If you can call that rushed I supposed that's rushed. Actually the whole process has been a very efficient, effective, orderly process. We're very satisfied with both the timing and the occasion.

Q Were outside groups consulted, like the ABA? Was Burger consulted, was Stewart?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: With respect to all of the candidates, there was a great in-depth review and discussion analysis, research, opinion reading. Everything that was done that was required, not only with respect to this candidate, but with respect to other candidates, to determine basic qualifications and talent, background and so on.

Q Were you consulted?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Yes, certainly.

Q If the process was so orderly, Mr. Attorney General, why then were the FBI checks not made prior to this announcement this morning?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Well, we're quite satisfied from our own investigation of the background and the factual basis of this situation. And we are content that -- to announce an intent to nominate, subject to the FBI check. If something should develop there that we are not aware of then we will react to that situation. But we don't consider that to be a particularly unusual circumstance.

Q What specific opinions of her's manifested the philosophy that you were seeking?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Well I don't think I can get into the specifics here. The opinions did indicate that as an appellate judge, for example, she did not attempt to substitute her judgement for that of the trial court, but she reacted in accordance with the appropriate appellate restraint. There are specific examples of that and certainly enough to satisfy us that overall that, together with other factors, that she fits within the President's judicial philosophy.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Well, during this process we've discussed a whole category of issues, and once again, no single position, no single issue was in any way determinative. It was a matter of looking at the whole spectrum of her activities, background, viewpoints.

Q Who were the people in Washington who recommended her to you?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Well, I don't think it would be appropriate for me to discuss that aspect of it.

Q What effect do you think the opposition of these right-to-life groups and other groups would have on her confirmation?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Well, having gotten into her background to a substantial degree, we're satisfied that she will have no problem as far as confirmation is concerned. We're also satisfied that no single issue will dominate or determine as far as the confirmation process is concerned.

Q Why are you so certain of that?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Well, insofar as any Congressional hearing is concerned, I suppose one shouldn't be too certain about anything, but that certainly is our evaluation and conclusion at this point.

Q Were there other candidates interviewed by the President?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Well, I think it would not be appropriate for me, again, to get into the process as far as specifics are concerned.

Q It's a simple question, though. Did he meet with others?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: It's a simple question, but I don't think it's appropriate to respond because I think that it would do a disservice to other candidates for me to try to become specific as to who was interviewed, who was not interviewed, how many were interviewed.

Q We're just asking "whether", not "who" or "how many".

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Well, as I say, I don't think it would be appropriate for me to get into that.

Q When do you expect the formal nomination to be ready to be sent to the Senate?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Just as soon as possible and certainly would be at the conclusion of the FBI check and we would hope shorter than that. We would hope, for example, to expedite the FBI check.

Q When will hearings be scheduled, sir? Do you have any idea? Is it going to be the fall, after the August recess?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: Well, Senator Thurmond has been aware of various candidates. He was informed of the President's decision shortly after he made it. Which would have been, I believe, this morning.

Q Sir, now that you've examined her record, could you tell us what percentage of her opinions have subsequently been upheld or overturned by the Supreme Court?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SMITH: By the Arizona Supreme Court? No, I'm afraid I couldn't.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

11:15 A.M. EDT

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you regarding the matter of the...

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

O'Connor

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

July 7, 1981

The President today announced his intention to nominate Judge Sandra Day O'Connor to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, filling the vacancy created by the resignation of Justice Potter Stewart. Judge O'Connor presently serves on the Arizona Court of Appeals. The President will forward to the Senate his nomination of Judge O'Connor upon completion of the required background check by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Judge O'Connor, age 51, earned both her undergraduate and law degrees at Stanford University. She received her B.A. magna cum laude in 1950, and her LL.B. with high honors in 1952. She was a member of the Board of Editors of the Stanford Law Review and a member of the Order of the Coif. Judge O'Connor was admitted to the Bar of the State of California in the year of her graduation and to the Bar of the State of Arizona in 1957.

Judge O'Connor practiced law in Phoenix, Arizona, for a number of years. She served as Assistant Attorney General of Arizona from 1965 to 1969 and served in the Arizona State Senate from 1969 to 1975.

In 1974, Judge O'Connor was elected to the Superior Court for Maricopa County, Arizona. She served on that court until she was appointed to the Arizona Court of Appeals in 1979.

Judge O'Connor is married to John Hay O'Connor III. They have three children.

#

6 Connors

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

July 7, 1981

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
UPON ANNOUNCEMENT OF
SUPREME COURT NOMINEE

The Briefing Room

10:46 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Ladies and gentlemen, I have a statement to make and then following that statement, if there are any questions you might have, I shall refer you to the Attorney General.

As President of the United States, I have the honor and the privilege to pick thousands of appointees for positions in federal government. Each is important and deserves a great deal of care for each individual called upon to make his or her contribution, often a personal sacrifice, to shaping the policy of the nation. Thus each has an obligation to you and in varying degrees has an impact on your life.

In addition, as President, I have the privilege to make a certain number of nominations which have a more lasting influence on our lives, for they are the lifetime appointments of those men and women called upon to serve in the Judiciary in our federal district courts and courts of appeals. These individuals dispense justice and provide for us these most cherished guarantees of protections of our criminal and civil laws. But, without a doubt, the most awesome appointment is a guarantee to us of so many things because it is a president -- as a president, I can make an appointment to the United States Supreme Court.

Those who sit in the Supreme Court interpret the laws of our land and truly do leave their footprints on the sands of time -- long after the policies of presidents and senators and congressmen of any given era may have passed from public memory, they'll be remembered.

After very careful review and consideration, I have made the decision as to my nominee to fill the vacancy on the United States Supreme Court created by the resignation of Justice Stewart. Since I am aware of the great amount of speculation about this appointment, I want to share this very important decision with you as soon as possible. Needless to say, most of the speculation has centered on the question of whether I would consider a woman to fill this first vacancy. As the press has

Now, this is not to say that I would appoint a woman merely to do so. That would not be fair to women, nor to future generations of all Americans whose lives are so deeply affected by decisions of the Court. Rather I pledged to appoint a woman who meets the very high standards that I demand of all court appointees. I have identified such a person.

So today I am pleased to announce that upon completion of all the necessary checks by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I will send to the Senate the nomination of Judge Sandra Day O'Connor of Arizona Court of Appeals for confirmation as Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. She is truly a person for all seasons -- possessing those unique qualities of temperament, fairness, intellectual capacity and devotion to the public good, which have characterized the 101 brethren who have preceded her.

I commend her to you and I urge the Senate's swift bipartisan confirmation so that as soon as possible she may take her seat on the court and her place in history.

Q Do you agree with her position on abortion, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: I said that I was going to turn over all questions to the Attorney General here and let him answer the questions.

Q But the right-to-life people object. We just wonder if --

THE PRESIDENT: All those questions the Attorney General is prepared to answer.

Q Mr. President, you have such a firm position on that. Can you give us your feelings on her position?

THE PRESIDENT: I am completely satisfied.

Q On her right-to-life position?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

Q And did you interview her personally?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

END

10:50 EDT

Senator

Malcolm

See page 3

Wallop

Wyoming

NEWS

NEWS

NEWS

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
July 8, 1981

Contact: Karen Delle (202)224-0803

WASHINGTON--Following is a transcript of an interview Sen. Malcolm Wallop (R-Wyo.) held today with two Wyoming reporters, Terri Amrhein of KWIV Radio in Douglas and Carol Miller of the Sundance Times.

1. HOW MUCH PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE ON A NATIONAL WATER POLICY AND WHAT DOES IT ENTAIL FOR WYOMING?

"Carol, I'm not aware yet of the details of a national water policy. I've been engaged in several conversations with members of the administration trying to say that any policy which covers this country from one end to the other will fail on the face of it, because the water problems of the East or Florida are different than the water problems of Wyoming or Colorado, and they're different than the water problems of say Oregon and Washington state.

"What we have to do is tailor a policy regionally and not nationally so there is equity in all parts of the country; but the policies involved must recognize the forces of geography and climate."

2. THERE WAS A QUOTE TODAY MADE BY HOUSE SPEAKER TIP O'NEIL THAT WHEN IT COMES TO GIVING TAX BREAKS TO THE WEALTHY OF THIS COUNTRY, THE PRESIDENT HAS A HEART OF GOLD, BUT REAGAN IS LIKE SCROOGE WHEN IT COMES TO EVERYONE ELSE. AND EVEN FORMER PRESIDENT CARTER CAME FORWARD AFTER ALMOST SIX MONTHS OF SILENCE TO SAY THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED CUTS CONSTITUTE AN ABRUPT DEPARTURE FROM THE AMERICAN COMMITMENT TO THE POOR AND NEEDY. TIP O'NEIL'S TERM, "EVERYONE ELSE," CONCERNS JUST ABOUT TWO-THIRDS OF THIS COUNTRY'S CITIZENS. EXACTLY, WHAT WILL REAGAN'S THREE-YEAR TAX CUT PLAN DO FOR LOWER AND MIDDLE INCOME TAXPAYERS AND WHAT IS YOUR STAND ON THIS ISSUE?

"Let me first begin by rebutting what both former President Carter and Speaker O'Neil had to say. They're speaking solely from the point of demagogic politics and not from reality. Anybody who has studied the president's program and studied it in detail figures that people who are getting tax cuts get them uniformly on the basis of what they pay.

"The people who earn from \$5,000 to \$50,000...pay 67 percent of the taxes and 70 percent of the tax breaks go to that segment of the population. So they're actually coming out a little (better) than the wealthy. But any tax cut that is meaningful has to be designed around the people who pay taxes.

"I support the president's tax program, because I think that the American working man and woman simply has not been able to stay ahead of inflation. The standard of living has declined in each of the last four years. In no way will anyone benefit from inflation except the government. For every 10 percent of inflation, the government gets a 15 percent increase in its revenues, all based on taxes paid by working men and women. The president is committed to changing that and making it possible for Americans to stay ahead of (the inflation curve).

3. WHAT IS THE UPDATE ON AGRICULTURAL FINANCE COMMITTEE; A GENERAL SCOPING OF WHAT'S GOING ON?

"The Farm Bill will be proceeding through the Senate sometime in the next two weeks, before the August break, maybe three weeks. By and large, agricultural financing is in the same sort of circumstance that the rest of American financing is in. There are some cuts and some belt tightening going on and some great relaxation of the criteria and standards so the money that is delivered is delivered more efficiently.

"There is argument as to the extent and amount of dairy price supports. There are arguments as to the extent of several things, and I expect when it's all said and done that agriculture will be treated quite fairly. It is difficult, in a time of tight budgets, to give anybody an increase over what was previously in existence."

4. CONCERNING YOUR PROPOSED WORKSHOP ON FEDERAL LAND ACQUISITION POLICIES, YOUR ALTERNATIVES TO BUYING FEDERAL LAND INCLUDE SCENIC EASEMENTS AND LAND EXCHANGES. CAN YOU ELABORATE A LITTLE MORE ON THAT AND HOW, IF IN ANY WAY, IT WILL AFFECT WYOMING'S LAND?

"There are many areas in Wyoming which have national significance which are in private hands or are in other uses other than federal uses. The policy and the habit of the federal government in the past simply has been to acquire those assets in fee in many instances resulting in an absolute taking from the private owners. What I'm saying is that it isn't necessary to do an absolute "taking" in every instance. It even isn't in the national interest, if the value to be protected can be purchased of and by itself with an easement, for example. Or there can be land exchanges between the federal government seeking to protect an asset which it desires and identifies as worthy of national attention with some of the other lands that the federal government now possesses in a state like Wyoming.

"All we're trying to do is to say, again, in an era of tight budgets that in each and every instance the federal government's whole idea ought not be possessory. It could, indeed, just acquire the interest in order to protect it."

5. WITH THE INCREASED POSTAL RATES, THERE HAVE ALSO BEEN SOME CUTBACKS ON SOME OF THE SERVICES SUCH AS THE STAR ROUTE ROUTES. JUST HOW FAR ARE THE INCREASES ON THE RATES THAT ARE FOR THE LABOR GOING, WHEN WE'RE GETTING LESS SERVICE? WHAT IS THE POLICY ON THIS?

"The postal system in the country is a peculiar quasi-federal, quasi private institution. By and large there are no major federal subsidies for it. It's supposed to operate on its own. It's a victim, as is everything else in this country, of monetary and fiscal policies that created inflation.

"The Congress watches that and has an oversight capability on that. Basically, it amounts to what subsidy can be voted from the public purse to maintain services that are traditional, in competition with services for all the other competing interests--the human interests, the welfare interests and what have you."

6. REGARDING PRESIDENT REAGAN'S NOMINATION OF SANDRA O'CONNOR TO THE SUPREME COURT YESTERDAY, HOW DO YOU THINK THIS WILL AFFECT THE WOMEN HOLDING ANY OTHER PUBLIC OFFICIAL POSITIONS IN THE FUTURE?

"I don't think it will affect that one way or the other. It's a welcome nomination, as far as I'm concerned. Judge O'Connor is not simply a woman who has been appointed to the Supreme Court by the President of the United States, she's an extremely capable jurist. People who know her on all sides of the political fence have great admiration for her. I think the idea of President Reagan was not just to appoint a woman, but to appoint a thoroughly competent and capable lawyer and jurist. And that's what he's done.

"My guess is that other women who are as capable in other fields will have nominations by the President. And certainly women are increasingly represented in elected politics."

7. DOES THIS MORE OR LESS OPEN THE DOOR FOR ANY OTHER WOMEN IN GETTING PUBLIC OFFICIAL POSITIONS?

"I'm not certain it opens it or shuts it. It's a standard of the times that competence, male or female, is to be rewarded and is to the benefit of the country. It opens a door in terms that it is a precedent and it's first. It means that other women in other areas of the legal profession will be viewed in a brighter light perhaps by what has become a traditionally male-dominated world, and I think it's welcome from that stand point. But the real point here is to not view this as merely the appointment of a woman, but the appointment of genuine competence.

NEWS

U.S. SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER/ ARIZONA

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
July 10, 1981

GOLDWATER STATEMENT ON O'CONNOR'S PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

(Washington) -- In rising to the defense of Judge Sandra O'Connor, Senator Barry Goldwater today said that "With all the fuss over single-issue religious matters... (nobody) has written about her legal abilities." Senator Goldwater, having reviewed some 29 legal opinions written by Judge O'Connor, claimed that her opinions showed a "strict constructionist both of case law and statutory interpretation."

In summarizing eight of the 29 opinions, "It is quite clear," said Goldwater, "That her decisions are unusually thorough, reasoned, detailed and logical. In addition, Sandra O'Connor reveals an understanding of what ordinary citizens face in the real world. I would emphasize that she is not only a brilliant technician with a quick mind, but a jurist who is able to blend strict respect for the law with human qualities. Justice and fair play are what we see in her decisions."

Senator Goldwater also stated that he will continue to bring Judge O'Connor's record before the public since, "her decisions are entirely compatible with the Administration's philosophy and the Supreme Court's philosophy of judicial restraint."

Contact: Kathy Grammer

(202) 224-7139

Senator Jake Garn

Utah

For further information contact:
Curt Burnett (202) 224-1337 or
Laurie Snow (202) 224-1336

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
JULY 8, 1981

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAKE GARN (R-UTAH) ON THE NOMINATION OF JUDGE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

The nomination of Judge Sandra Day O'Connor to the Supreme Court of the United States is of critical importance to the nation, and the Senate has an obligation to ensure that she is qualified for that high position, regardless of gender or political considerations. I am concerned about some of her reported actions as a Arizona legislator on the Equal Rights Amendment and abortion. However, I am philosophically opposed to "single-issue politics" -- judging a person on the basis of a single issue -- and that extends to the selection of a Supreme Court justice.

I will monitor the confirmation hearings very closely for evidence of the strong personal and professional qualities which prompted President Reagan to nominate Judge O'Connor. My overriding concern is that she understands the proper role of the court as an interpreter of the law and will render reasoned decisions on the wide range of issues which will confront the court during her tenure.

#####

NEWS



FROM THE OFFICE OF STEVE SYMMS U.S. SENATE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
TUESDAY, JULY 7, 1981
CONTACT: ROBIN ROLLINSON
(202) 224-6142

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STEVE SYMMS

WASHINGTON, D.C.--The Constitution places on the President the weighty responsibility of appointing Supreme Court justices. It is his choice alone to make, and of course it is the duty of the Senate to advise and consent.

Today, the President called and personally discussed his nomination with me. I told him that I appreciated his call and expressed my confidence in his ability to select an individual capable of carrying on the tradition of the Supreme Court and American jurisprudence. I also expressed to him that I would, of course, follow the confirmation hearings carefully.

From the little I know about Judge O'Connor, the President has chosen a respected jurist. No single individual can probably fulfill all of our expectations for the high office of Supreme Court justice. It remains to be seen how Judge O'Connor responds to the many tests that will be forthcoming in the Senate's confirmation process.

#

NEWS



FROM THE OFFICE OF STEVE SYMMS U.S. SENATE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
TUESDAY, JULY 7, 1981
CONTACT: ROBIN ROLLINSON
(202) 224-6142

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STEVE SYMMS

WASHINGTON, D.C.--The Constitution places on the President the weighty responsibility of appointing Supreme Court justices. It is his choice alone to make, and of course it is the duty of the Senate to advise and consent.

Today, the President called and personally discussed his nomination with me. I told him that I appreciated his call and expressed my confidence in his ability to select an individual capable of carrying on the tradition of the Supreme Court and American jurisprudence. I also expressed to him that I would, of course, follow the confirmation hearings carefully.

From the little I know about Judge O'Connor, the President has chosen a respected jurist. No single individual can probably fulfill all of our expectations for the high office of Supreme Court justice. It remains to be seen how Judge O'Connor responds to the many tests that will be forthcoming in the Senate's confirmation process.

###



ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20530

*Hay. file
O'Connor*

July 13, 1981

Sherrie Cooksey
Legislative Counsel
Office of Legislative Affairs
The White House

Dear Sherrie:

Pursuant to our telephone conversation on Friday, please find enclosed a xerox copy of Senator Hayakawa's press release regarding the nomination of Sandra O'Connor.

Very best personal regards.

Yours sincerely,

Robert A. McConnell
Assistant Attorney General

Enclosure



U.S. Senator S. I. Hayakawa

California

81:77

HAYAKAWA PRAISES PRESIDENT REAGAN'S SUPREME COURT APPOINTMENT

WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 7, 1981 -- U.S. Senator S. I. Hayakawa of California responds to President Reagan's appointment of Judge Sandra Day O'Connor to the Supreme Court.

"I am pleased and delighted that this country has finally progressed to the point that a woman has been named to the Supreme Court. For over 200 years, we as men have not given women credit for their ability and intelligence to serve in positions of great responsibility. This appointment is long past due and I am proud of President Reagan for being wise enough to choose a well qualified woman to sit on the Supreme Court of our land.

"Judge O'Connor's qualifications and outstanding judicial record are in keeping with the high standards required of Supreme Court Judges. My congratulations to Judge Sandra Day O'Connor on this great honor and achievement," Hayakawa said.

#

CONTACT: Maxine Jeffries
(703) 671-0040

PRESS PHONES: (202) 224-9637
224-9657

RECEIVED

JUL 9 1981

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

7/14

Max:

FYI

Priz

COPY OF PRESS RELEASE ISSUED 7/13/81
BY MEMBERS OF ARIZONA STATE LEGISLATURE
ON THE NOMINATION OF SANDRA D. O'CONNOR TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

TODAY TWENTY-SIX REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRAT MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SIGNED LETTERS TO SENATORS STROM THURMOND, HOWARD BAKER, ORRIN HATCH AND JESSE HELMS WHICH GIVE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT:

"The undersigned members of the Arizona House of Representatives have consistently supported the Right To Life Constitutional Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

We wholeheartedly endorse the Honorable Sandra D. O'Connor for the nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court. Because of her integrity, morality and knowledge we believe Sandra D. O'Connor will be an asset to the U.S. Supreme Court."

WE BRING THIS TO THE ATTENTION OF THE MEDIA AND THE NATION AS WE FEEL THERE HAVE BEEN A LOT OF UNFOUNDED RUMORS AND INNEUNDOES IN REGARD TO THIS NOMINATION.

Pete Corpstein
State Representative

July 8, 1981

COPY

The Honorable Strom Thurmond
Chairman, U.S. Judiciary Committee
Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Thurmond:

The undersigned members of the Arizona House of Representatives have consistently supported the Right To Life Constitutional Convention Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

We wholeheartedly endorse the Honorable Sandra D. O'Connor for the nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court. Because of her integrity, morality and knowledge, we believe Sandra D. O'Connor will be an asset to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Sincerely,

(S)

Mack Mattingly of Georgia

Contact Richard Moore, Press Secretary

UNITED STATES SENATE

DATE: July 8, 1981

(202) 224-8049

STATEMENT ON NOMINATION OF JUDGE SANDRA O'CONNOR

I believe Judge O'Connor is fully qualified by both her judicial experience and her record as a conservative. Her nomination is consistent with the Republican Platform and is philosophically the right thing to do.

Judge O'Connor has met the high standards the President set for his nominee and I believe he has made a good choice. When cleared by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I expect rapid United States Senate confirmation.

#

NEWS



FROM THE OFFICE OF STEVE SYMMS U.S. SENATE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
TUESDAY, JULY 7, 1981
CONTACT: ROBIN ROLLINSON
(202) 224-6142

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STEVE SYMMS

WASHINGTON, D.C.--The Constitution places on the President the weighty responsibility of appointing Supreme Court justices. It is his choice alone to make, and of course it is the duty of the Senate to advise and consent.

Today, the President called and personally discussed his nomination with me. I told him that I appreciated his call and expressed my confidence in his ability to select an individual capable of carrying on the tradition of the Supreme Court and American jurisprudence. I also expressed to him that I would, of course, follow the confirmation hearings carefully.

From the little I know about Judge O'Connor, the President has chosen a respected jurist. No single individual can probably fulfill all of our expectations for the high office of Supreme Court justice. It remains to be seen how Judge O'Connor responds to the many tests that will be forthcoming in the Senate's confirmation process.

#

that unless something further is done, we've got to vote another tax. Now that has to stop somewhere. I propose that since this is a trust fund and it is a trust fund, it be set aside separate from the Treasury, that that money not be used for any other purpose but invest it in a constructive way, and then gradually adjust the benefits to fit the income, building that income up all the time, and get it on that independent basis, separate from the government entirely, and then only will it be settled and will be dependable and worthy. I'll go any extent to put it on a sound basis. But, frankly, until it is properly financed, I just can't cut for any more benefits and I'm not going to. I've voted against a good many of the benefits because the money wasn't there to pay for them. I knew it would cause trouble. That's my position and I'm going to stick to it.

ANNOUNCER: Senator Stennis, are you pleased with the nomination of Mrs. O'Connor to be a member of the Supreme Court?

SENATOR: I very carefully looked into that nomination. The Supreme Court is so important and by the way, I come right by that Supreme Court building every morning on my way to breakfast at the Senate Restaurant, a happy reminder of that branch of our government. It has over 200 years of history that as a whole is mighty good. It has never had a lady on the Court. There haven't been many lady lawyers in that 200 years. But, I'm entirely pleased overall with this lady. First, she is a lady. She's a seasoned lawyer which means one who's been seasoned in actually practicing law in addition to having the knowledge through study. She is a seasoned office-holder. You never know how a person is going to react to office power or public position until you try it out. Well, she's served in a legislative capacity and she's served as a trial judge, then as a Superior Judge and they all call her well versed in the law and knows how to carry responsibilities of leadership. Another thing, her philosophy of government, of being a judge, she has proven that she doesn't think she's a legislator when she's sitting as a judge, she's a judge with power only to interpret and apply the law and the Constitution. She's not in power to make the law. That's the trouble with a number of judges, even members of the Supreme Court. I think she measures up and I never knew nor heard of her until the name came in, so I'm impartial, but furthermore, she's a wife and mother and the mother of three almost grown sons. That goes a long way with me, she has that wonderful family. Her husband is also a lawyer by the way and I think she is capable, experienced, and capable of doing an excellent job, which I predict that she will. So, unless I learn some additional facts that are against her, I'm going to vote to support her. One other point, of all these things I've said about public life and everything, she is still a lady. You can tell it from what she says and the way she looks, still a lady and that's what I like most of all. Because that is her primary mission in life.

ANNOUNCER: Senator Stennis, real quickly, it appears to have been a very busy year here in the Senate with far-ranging issues of all types coming up. Has it seemed busier to you or does it just appear that way?

SENATOR: No, no. This is the busiest year I've ever had here, in spite of the fact that I've held hearings day and night many, many years here, but we are not having to pass on more matters, take roll call votes, and really far-reaching policy questions, more than we've ever had at one time. Now, the first year I was here, we had 73 roll call votes recorded. Last year we had 703 recorded roll call votes. That's one of the ways of gauging the volume of work that you have to do. But I like it, I love it. I always have. I don't want to turn away from it, I want to contribute everything I can.

ANNOUNCER: Thank you Senator Stennis. This has been DATELINE WASHINGTON, Senator John C. Stennis discussing the issues and Congress. Listen again next week for DATELINE WASHINGTON.

DATELINE WASHINGTON
JULY 12 - 18, 1981

DATELINE WASHINGTON-Senator John C. Stennis discussing the issues and Congress.

ANNOUNCER: Senator Stennis, you testified before a Senate Subcommittee recently about the need to retain airline subsidies. What is your position on this issue and what would it mean to Mississippi?

SENATOR: Well, air travel in Mississippi is growing alright. But, we do have a subsidy for small cities, relatively small cities, that cannot generate say an average of 100 passengers per day. There's a small subsidy that applies to insure that travel and it happens to cover all of east Mississippi, except down on the Coast. It covers Hattiesburg and Meridian and on up through Columbus and Tupelo and also Greenville, where that traffic is not quite up. Now if they cut that out, the airlines will just rather soon discontinue the large planes, the jet planes, and go back to the small ones with very limited numbers of seats available. It will be most difficult to get a reservation. Anyway, we really put it up to them that there was an understanding when deregulation was voted on three years ago, that this program would continue until 1985, giving these places time to build up their traffic. Now this proposal is just arbitrarily cutting it off at the end of this year. I think that we can get that straightened out and avoid it. Anyway it was very well presented up here this week to the Committees. Senator Cochran and I appeared before the Committee. Mr. Smith and Mr. Dean of Mississippi were excellent witnesses. So I feel rather good about that now.

ANNOUNCER: Senator Stennis, what is your opinion of the so-called All-Savers Certificates which would exempt interest earnings from taxation?

SENATOR: Well, that is tied in with this talk about reducing taxes. We all like to reduce taxes, but for over two years I've been working on the idea that this was an exemption of a certain amount of earned money, that is earned interest, that we would not tax it away but just let each saver, each couple that would save or an individual, up to \$1,000 and \$2,000 if it was a couple. You would promise them at the beginning of the year, if you'll save and earn that much in the way of interest, we'll exempt all of it from taxation. And, that's what this has finally worked into. What they call a user's certificate. It would be the law and you buy these at a bank or savings and loan associations, places of that kind. It puts the money in circulation and this will be dedicated to home building. The person then that wants to save and does save will keep all that money and it will become a nestegg. I like it very much and I think this is where we've got to change our tax system and give a reward for those that will save their money rather than blow it in. It helps them later and it puts money in circulation here where people can borrow it and that'll help run down the rate of interest finally maybe, some. It will help inflation. I'm strongly backing it and I believe we are going to get it passed.

ANNOUNCER: Thank you Senator Stennis, we'll return to DATELINE WASHINGTON in a moment.

5-second pause

ANNOUNCER: Senator Stennis, every report that comes out on Social Security seems to be worse than the last. Do you believe that the Social Security program can be salvaged and made sound again?

SENATOR: Well, I suppose you mean worse than the last, you mean the financial condition of the Social Security? The idea of a proper Social Security program, I think, is rather sound. Again, it permits a saver to lay aside for the future. The industry pays its part, but we've taken this and added the relief items in it and added certain so-called benefits that have just overtaxed the money available and it's going to be in a bankrupt situation. Now I voted for a large tax not too long ago to keep it from going broke and now they say