

RESPONSE

Sandra Day O'Connor*

It is not fair to have to follow a speaker as eloquent as Justice Kennedy. And I am not going to try to bend your ears for long. I am very touched by his comments. It was wonderful that you had a chance to hear him talk about our former colleague, William Rehnquist, as well as some remarks about me.

Our Stanford alums have lost two members of the Court who belong to Stanford and who belong to the West. We used to take a lot of pride in how we just needed one more to have a majority on the Court from Stanford. Now I guess the chances of a Court majority from Stanford are not so good.

When I started at Stanford Law School back in the Dark Ages, the Law School was in the inner quad. And it was a funny little part of the inner quad—the law library was quite old and musty and we had an owl that lived in the stacks. I used to do homework in that library, and I'd always watch and see where the owl was sitting that day.

Bill Rehnquist was my classmate, and I often sat next to him. I would look over and see what kind of notes he took. I took copious notes. I tried to write down everything the professors had to say. But he ended up each hour with a perfect outline, and he just captured exactly the essence of what was presented. He did a great job. He could have made a fortune on those notes had he chosen to do so.

The Law School then moved into nicer quarters. It was on the outer quad, over near the Business School facing Palm Drive. We thought we were in high cotton when we got there. And I met my husband thanks to the *Stanford Law Review*. In those days I think people were asked to join the *Law Review* based on their first year's grades. I doubt that is still the practice, but it may play a part in it—I don't know. Anyway, both Bill Rehnquist and I were invited to join the *Law Review* after our first year. And my husband John was in the next year's class, and he was invited to join the *Law Review* after his first year.

My husband and I were assigned to cite-check some *Law Review* article together, and we did that up in the law library. After a couple of hours John said maybe we'd better finish the job down the highway at Dinah's Shack,

* Associate Justice, United States Supreme Court, 1981-2006. These remarks were delivered on March 17, 2006, at the *Stanford Law Review* Symposium, "Looking Backward, Looking Forward: The Legacy of Chief Justice Rehnquist and Justice O'Connor."

which was a local pub on El Camino. So we did, and by about forty days later we were engaged to be married. So *Stanford Law Review* played a very important role in my life, and I hope in yours too.

Now the Court has lost most of its western members, as Justice Kennedy pointed out. That is a pretty big loss. I remember when Justice Byron White decided to retire. I was very concerned because on all the western water law cases where we had to appoint a special master and resolve certain issues, he was very careful to follow every step of the way. He would stay in touch with the special master and give us reports on how things were doing.

When he retired I worried about that. I noticed that as we got Justices who had just gone to Harvard Law School and who were from the Northeast they didn't understand western water law at all. Now we have lost two more westerners who knew a little bit about western water law. So I hope the Court doesn't have too many more cases involving western water law—I don't know where the Court would end up in future cases.

Justice Kennedy mentioned Wallace Stegner, whom I quoted in the memoir my brother and I wrote in *Lazy B*. I took a class from Wallace Stegner here at Stanford in creative writing. It was such an interesting experience. My classmates for the most part were men who had served in World War II. Wallace Stegner would make us write frequent little stories and then circulate them to the other members of the class. I suffered in that class because I didn't think my experiences on the Lazy B measured up to the experiences of those hardened veterans from World War II with real life-and-death experiences during the War. But I'm glad I had that class from Wallace Stegner.

Now, I'm not going to keep you here because I am the only thing between you and dinner, and that's a dangerous place to be. But I will tell you that Bill Rehnquist was a wonderful Chief Justice. I happened to like Warren Burger very much. He loved American history and he had some wonderful qualities, and I liked him. But I think Bill Rehnquist was a terrific Chief Justice because he, in true western fashion and as has already been pointed out, acted in a very humble fashion at the Court. He put on no airs at all, and he held no grudges. He had strong views about things, and you can see that in all of his opinions. He tried to assign cases in a way that he thought would best serve the Court. If his views didn't carry the day, he never held it against the member of the Court who opposed him. Life went on.

I thought that was a great characteristic for a Chief Justice. He handled things so well at the Court, and it was a great privilege to have been there for so many years while he served as Chief Justice. He did the job nicely for the nation, and certainly for his colleagues on the Court.

The Court is still in good hands with Justices like Justice Kennedy, and we have a highly qualified new Chief Justice who may be there a great many years—he's young: 51. We have a lot to look forward to, I'm sure.

Thank you for putting on this Symposium. It's a little like attending your own funeral. But it's great to be here. Thank you.