SUPREME COURT BAR PUBLISHES MEMORIALS TO WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

Following a time-honored tradition, a special session of the Supreme Court Bar and Officers of the Court was convened on June 15, 2006 to honor the memory of the late Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist. Following the meeting of the Bar, the resolutions adopted were presented in a special session of the Court itself. The Justice Department recently published and distributed the proceedings of those memorial sessions.

Under the direction of Solicitor General Paul Clement, Ron Tempas chaired the special session of the Supreme Court Bar. Mr. Tempas observed that the Committee had attempted to capture "... in an hour of remarks and a resolution, the life and work of a towering figure in American law." As lofty a goal as that was, the speakers also sought to describe the late Chief Justice as a person, considering the way he interacted in professional and personal roles. Commenting that Rehnquist's story was more than just the history of an important legal figure, Tempas said that "... William Rehnquist's life and work is also a quintessentially American story, one that reflects an optimism about our country and its possibilities. Raised in Wisconsin, William Rehnquist was no son of privilege. A war veteran who took advantage of the GI bill, a practitioner in what was, at the time, a relatively sleepy city in the southwest, Rehnquist through hard work and some natural inborn brilliance came to the attention of our national leadership. This resulted first in an appointment to a senior Justice Department post, and then to this Court.

He went on to serve as a Justice for 33 years and 8 months, the seventh-longest tenure of any Justice, with nearly 19 years as Chief. He authored nearly 1,000 opinions. He led the judiciary as an outspoken defender of the Court's important role in our constitutional scheme. Yet—for those gathered here today—his success as a husband, a father, mentor, colleague and friend, are at least as important as what will live on in the United States Reports."

The second speaker was Allen Snyder, a clerk to then-Associate Justice Rehnquist when he first joined the Court in 1971. Mr. Snyder focused his remarks on Rehnquist's "extraordinary personal qualities," commenting "than everyone who knew Bill Rehnquist quickly noted his remarkable combination of astonishing intellect with genuine humility and unpretentiousness. In a city filled with outsized egos... Chief Justice Rehnquist never took himself or others—too seriously... Bill Rehnquist genuinely liked to chat with people, regardless of their station in life or whether

James Rehnquist gave a tribute to his father at a session of the Supreme Court Bar. In this photo he stands in the front of his father's official portrait.

Continued on page 4
A Letter from the President

Many current members of the Supreme Court Historical Society know little about how the organization came into being. Perhaps a brief explanation will be of interest.

The Society was incorporated in November 1974 but the preparatory work began some three years earlier. Chief Justice Warren E. Burger was primarily responsible for the creation of the Society. He believed that there was a need for an organization to preserve the history of the Supreme Court and he assembled an Advisory Committee of legal scholars, historians, archivists, museum and gallery administrators, and interested laymen to provide advice and assistance.

The first book that was published was the Supreme Court Historical Society, 1976. In an introduction, Chief Justice Burger described the Society's development and outlined some of the goals and aspirations of the incorporators. He explained that the Society was designed along the lines of existing organizations devoted to the history and functioning of the White House and the Capitol. He noted that the Supreme Court Historical Society had a more difficult task because relatively few non-lawyer citizens had any clear understanding of what goes on in the courts generally, and in the Supreme Court in particular, as contrasted with the two other branches of government.

He stated: "...the courts, like the other branches of government, ultimately belong to the American people, serving the individual and the general public interest through time proven legal processes. An independent and disinterested judiciary need not be a mysterious area of government or appear to be an occult priesthood...." Many of the first efforts of the Society were associated with the newly-created office of the Curator of the Court. It was envisioned that these two entities would work closely together in the creation of exhibits, and the collection and care of artifacts and memorabilia related directly to the Court. Publications of the Society were foreseen as another important way to achieve the objective of interpreting the history of the branch of government, by publishing articles about pivotal cases, and providing interesting accounts of the Court's history and important individuals associated with the Court.

The Chief Justice observed that "as the Society grows in numbers and resources, other undertakings will doubtless become appropriate..." This has indeed been the case as increased membership and financial support have afforded us the opportunity to produce regular lecture series, to sponsor educational symposia and teacher training, and generally to broaden the mission of the Society.

The Society has made great strides in fulfilling the objectives and aspirations that were contemplated in 1974. In a successor article in the next issue of The Quarterly, I will pay tribute to some of the individuals who have been most responsible for what has been accomplished.
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SOCIETY TO HELP PRESERVE CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN MARSHALL'S ROBE

The Supreme Court Historical Society is proud to announce that it will make a contribution from funds generated by the sale of the John Marshall Commemorative Coin to support a very important project: the preservation of the judicial robe of Chief Justice John Marshall. The robe is the second oldest Supreme Court robe known to exist, after those of John Jay held by the Smithsonian Institution.

Marshall's robe is on view at the John Marshall House in Richmond, Virginia, for many decades and shows the strain of this long-term exhibition. The robe and its contents are owned by APVA Preservation Virginia which has contracted with Loreen Finklestein of The Textile and Costume Conservatory, LLC, to make the necessary repairs. Ms. Finklestein has done conservation work for institutions such as the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Mount Vernon, and Monticello and will perform all conservation work including:
- completely documenting the robe, both its original state and all previous conservation work performed on it
- creating a silk lining for the robe to support the original fabric and prevent further losses
- designing and fabricating a conservation-safe passive support system that will provide a permanent home for the robe and allow limited display and study without further handling and damage

Catherine E. Dean, Curator of Collections for APVA Preservation Virginia, will oversee all other aspects of this project, while Mark Hutter, Tailor at the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, will use his years of expertise studying and reproducing 18th century clothing to pattern and reproduce the robe using appropriate materials and methods for the period. Reproductions of the robe will be made for the APVA, Colonial Williamsburg, and the Society.

As one can imagine, a project of this nature is a costly undertaking, and the APVA has estimated that it will take approximately $65,000 to complete. They have initiated a fund-raising campaign targeted solely for this project. Should interested Society members wish to contribute to this worthwhile project, please contact Catherine Dean at the APVA by calling 804-648-1889 x313 or e-mailing cdean@apva.org.

The effort to preserve John Marshall's robe for future generations has led the Court Curator's staff to renew its efforts to identify how many robes of the early Justices have survived. Over twenty Justices joined the nation's highest court between 1789 and 1836, but only the robes of Jay and Marshall are documented. While the naves of time may have claimed some of these robes, the staff hopes to locate, or determine what happened to, as many as possible. Anyone with any information about the location of early judicial robes is encouraged to contact Associate Curator Matthew Elliott at curator@supremecourt.gov or 202-479-3298.

Of course, information on robes from later periods would also be welcome.
Puppies with his suit and tie, but I soon learned that he was unassuming, relaxed, and not at all the bit concerned that others might regard his footage or his philosophy as unfashionable. He was an independent thinker. 

"... As an advocate, I saw a Chief Justice who presided over arguments with legendary efficiency, withering questions, and witty quips. When asked by a reporter whether he supported the view of the people to sit down when the argument elapsed, he replied, 'I assume they are all nervous—they should be.' Ms. Mahoney referred to Rehnquist's strict limitations on time for counsel preparation and oral argument, but said that it was not motivated by a desire to embarrass or to exert authority, but rather that in 'the Chief's view, if counsel could not make a point within 30 minutes, it simply was not worth hearing.' 

Ms. Mahoney commented on Rehnquist's publishing endeavors observing that he also had a highly gifted intellectual dedicated to the study of our Nation's history, saying that he used our heritage as a cornerstone of his jurisprudence. 

The Chief Justice repeatedly turned to our history and traditions to give content to the meaning of the Constitution so that judges could not simply impose their own moral codes on the Constitution. That was not to say that he did not use the powers that came with his position. He did. He did his strongest power was the authority to assign the opinions when he voted with the majority. The Chief was both utterly fair and astute in exercising that prerogative. My colleagues and I spent hours predicting who would be assigned which opinion. We were never right, but we always concluded that the Chief's decisions made perfect sense in retrospect. He did not give his colleagues substantially more of the pleasant cases than he gave to each of the others. When he did give an opinion to an attorney, it was often because he thought the authorship was the best way to ensure an opinion for the Court. He certainly did not assign good cases as a reward or bad cases as a reprimand—although he once joked that any Justice who had assigned the Court's confidential deliberations would be writing tax cases for the next 20 years. The Chief Justice believed that the Supreme Court works best when its members get along..."
Representing Chief Justice Rehnquist were his children James, Nancy, and Janet, and their children. The Rehnquist family had not all been to Arizona together since their father was named Assistant U.S. Attorney General and moved the family to Washington, D.C. in 1969. Justice O'Connor attended with her husband John O'Connor, their children Scott, Brian and Jay and their grandchildren.

More than 500 judges, elected officials, lawyers, educators, family and friends attended the dinner.

Governor Napolitano was quick to point out that when she argued a case in front of the U.S. Supreme Court as Arizona's Attorney General she may have lost the case, but Chief Justice Rehnquist and Justice O'Connor were the only dissenters (Ring v. Arizona).

United States District Court Judge David Campbell, who clerked for Chief Justice Rehnquist in 1981, shared some of his memories working for the late Justice before introducing her.

John O'Connor accompanied his wife Sandra Day O'Connor to the dinner honoring her outstanding judicial career. His memories working for the late Justice before introducing a tribute video and the Rehnquist children who spoke of their father.

In the video Rehnquist's daughter Janet said, "(My father) had a reserved public persona. He didn't lead by personality, yet out of public view he was fun, witty, charming and interested in many, many things."

Arizona Supreme Court Chief Justice McGregor, who clerked for Justice O'Connor during that historic first term in 1981, reflected on her past with Justice O'Connor, her longtime mentor and friend. She also introduced a video that showed an overview of Justice O'Connor's life and then introduced the Rehnquist children who spoke of their father.

The evening ended just as Chief Justice Rehnquist would have liked it, with a sing-a-long of "America the Beautiful" led by Justice O'Connor and State Historian Marshall Trimble.

*Ms Gerchick is the Communications Director of the Arizona Supreme Court

The Rehnquist children, (left to right) Nancy, James, and Janet, represented the late Chief Justice Rehnquist at the tribute dinner honoring his service to the Court.

On May 16, 2007, the Supreme Court Historical Society cosponsored a Roundtable Discussion of Supreme Court Clerks who served during the October Term 1951. The program was sponsored jointly by the Supreme Court Historical Society, the Robert H. Jackson Center and Chattauqua Institution.

The session was held in an auditorium at the Chattauqua Institute and featured former Supreme Court clerks participating in the program. Among the panel participants were: Professor John Q. Whelan, Professor J. Blaine Gordon, and Professor James N. Paul.

Moderators for the discussion were Professor John Q. Whelan of St. John's University and Professor James N. Paul of Duquesne University.

The program was cosponsored with the Robert Jackson Center, and the second that included participation by former clerks to the Supreme Court Justices. Previous programs included the first, a lecture given by Senator Christopher Dodd discussing his father's experiences with Justice Jackson at Nuremberg, and a panel discussion focusing on the landmark case, Barnette v. West Virginia. Articles on past programs appear in previous issues of the Quarterly.
was no federal bankruptcy law and state laws usually provided relief only for small debtors, the threat of debtors’ prison loomed. When James Iredell arrived in Philadelphia for the February 1797 sitting of the Supreme Court, he reported to his wife, "The misfortunes of Judge Wilson throw an unfortunate gloom over his house, though I have been there two or three times, and have experienced all their former kindness."

Wilson had already failed to attend a circuit in Burlington, New Jersey, a town that he apparently had simply been attempting to pass through. In early September 1797 Wilson wrote to Bird from the Burlington, expressing his "astonishment" that his son had not yet come to bail him out, and instructing him to bring along "some Shirts and Stockings—I want them exceedingly."

Wilson’s disgrace was becoming ever more public. A Philadelphia lawyer named Thomas Hornblow’s diary, "What shall we come? When he rode circuit. Hornblow’s Tavern (where Wilson died) stood to the left, what is going on? Whatever doubts she may have had behind her. She wrote to Iredell, "Mr. Wilson was kind, sensitive, and concerned for her welfare, all of which Mrs. Wilson. "She was very well," he wrote to Mrs. Iredell, "but extremely affected in seeing me, and finding Mr. Wilson was not coming, she burst into tears." Among other things, she may have been concerned that Wilson’s continuing neglect of his judicial duties would result in impeachment and the loss of his salary. And Wilson’s nonappearance certainly signaled that he was not yet ready to come to the kind of settlement that his creditors would have accepted—a settlement that would have required him to turn over all of his lands to them. It was beginning to seem that there was no way out of the mess into which the family had sunk.

For instance, there had not yet, Mrs. Wilson, traveling in the company of Mr. Iredell, decided to leave the rest of the family and join her husband in Edenton. Iredell may have told Mrs. Wilson was ill—a contemporary reported that Wilson’s "poor body is giving out, and certainly his letters reflect a mind that was losing touch with reality. Perhaps Mrs. Wilson felt pangs of guilt for her distracted husband; perhaps she felt only a sense of duty; perhaps it was some combination, or something in between."

What is clear is that she was distraught and in the winter journey that would easily have taken two weeks, maybe more—was kind, sensitive, and concerned for her welfare, all the things her own husband was not. Who can say what might have happened between Philadelphia and Edenton, when these two attractive people (who, as their later correspondence shows, were clearly fond of one another) were thrown together against a background of intense emotional distress? It’s not hard to imagine a scene in which a sobbing Mrs. Wilson bums her head on Mr. Iredell’s sympathetic shoulder, and one thing leads to another.

That’s not so, however, that they lost their heads and fell madly, and permanently, in love with each other. Mrs. Wilson allowed herself a moment’s fantasy of what life would have been like if she’d married a relatively modest and relatively type like Mr. Iredell instead of a great man who lusted after wealth and glory and who was now, as a slabs and near delusional shadow of his former self. And maybe, Mr. Iredell wistfully imagined himself with a wife who sparkled in a crowd instead of shrinking. But when they reached Edenton, the travelers returned to their respective spouses. Iredell was presumably as glad to see his family as...

Continued on page 10
ever—he was sometimes so agitated at parting from them that he felt physically ill—although one wonders if Mrs. Iredell was less than thrilled to see young, beautiful Mrs. Wilson leaning delicately on Mrs. Iredell's arm. Did she suspect that something had transpired between them on the journey?

As for Mrs. Wilson, she might well have been shocked to see the transformation in a husband from whom she'd been parted for six or more months. And, despite the comforting presence of Mr. Iredell, life in Edenton was no picnic. The Wilsons' room and board at the Horahbol's tavern, a modest establishment just down the street from the Iredells, was expensive, their clothes were growing threadbare, and, as spring turned into summer, the coastal climate became hot and humid. Mrs. Wilson's letters to Bird show that she was homesick, that she worried about the gossip back in Philadelphia. "Write me what she wrote to Bird, "harassed and perplexed, that it was more than he could possibly bear."

Not only was Mrs. Wilson's grief genuine, her devotion to her husband was superhuman. "When he was sensible he took so much pleasure in seeing me by him," she wrote to Bird, "and requested me to stay long at Edenton for some days previous to the unfortunate event [Wilson's death] of anxiety, torture [handwriting unclear], and distress, I believe no language could paint."

What accounts for this display of wifely self-sacrifice? People say to not coming home, you need not be afraid of distressing me, as I can always hear nothing worse than I expect," and that there was no deception resulting from her unsuccessful attempts to convince Wilson to compromise with his creditors. "It is a subject that he never wishes to hear (n mentioned, he says that he knows his own affairs best!"

Perhaps, as well, Mrs. Wilson detected a certain coolness, even hostility, on the part of the taciturn Mrs. Iredell. It's certainly understandable that when Mr. Iredell prepared to depart for Philadelphia in late July for the August sitting of the Supreme Court, at which point she accompanied him. Let's assume out of our story, that this return trip was an entirely chaste one, now that emotions were more subdued and Mrs. Wilson had formed a bond of mutual respect with Mrs. Iredell. And yet the two of them, Mrs. Wilson and Mr. Iredell, clearly remained close friends. Iredell stayed in the Philadelphia area until late May, holding various circuit courts, and his letters indicate that he saw Mrs. Wilson frequently—she even chose some muslin that Mr. Iredell brought back for his wife. He also made Mrs. Wilson a present of a book of poems—James Thomson's Seasons—writing in an accompanying note that he hoped that "it may sometimes be the means of recalling to your recollection the person who presented it." He added, rather charmingly, "You will, I flatter myself, forgive this selfish motive . . . in consideration of the earnest wish I naturally feel to live with some esteem in your memory as long as I possibly can." Mrs. Wilson—apparently staying not with her stepchildren, who seem to have dropped out of the picture, but with some wealthy friends—wrote him at least two letters that were long and chatty, "(I am writing as with talking," she wrote gaily at the end of one of them, "when a woman once begins, she never knows when to leave off.") She also expressed her extreme disappointment that Mr. Iredell did not attend the August 1799 sitting of the Supreme Court because he was ill. This may have been the reason for some distance between them. James Iredell died in Edenton two months later.

Hannah Grey Wilson was only 19 when she married James Wilson, aged 51. Following his death, she became Mrs. Thomas Bartlett. She and her husband lived in England until her premature death at the age of 34.

"He watched with me night and day," Mrs. Wilson wrote to Bird, "and did not leave him, that was her husband's solicitude toward their guest? Was she suffered and reassured by Mrs. Wilson's presence, or was there something else on her mind?" Mrs. Iredell's retreat to London, then, has been kind beyond every wish. James Iredell did not attend the August 1799 sitting of the Supreme Court, at which point she accompanied him. Let's assume out of our story, that this return trip was an entirely chaste one, now that emotions were more subdued and Mrs. Wilson had formed a bond of mutual respect with Mrs. Iredell. And yet the two of them, Mrs. Wilson and Mr. Iredell, clearly remained close friends. Iredell stayed in the Philadelphia area until late May, holding various circuit courts, and his letters indicate that he saw Mrs. Wilson frequently—she even chose some muslin that Mr. Iredell brought back for his wife. He also made Mrs. Wilson a present of a book of poems—James Thomson's Seasons—writing in an accompanying note that he hoped that "it may sometimes be the means of recalling to your recollection the person who presented it.

"You will, I flatter myself, forgive this selfish motive . . . in consideration of the earnest wish I naturally feel to live with some esteem in your memory as long as I possibly can." Mrs. Wilson—apparently staying not with her stepchildren, who seem to have dropped out of the picture, but with some wealthy friends—wrote him at least two letters that were long and chatty, "(I am writing as with talking," she wrote gaily at the end of one of them, "when a woman once begins, she never knows when to leave off.") She also expressed her extreme disappointment that Mr. Iredell did not attend the August 1799 sitting of the Supreme Court because he was ill. This may have been the reason for some distance between them. James Iredell died in Edenton two months later.

Hannah Grey Wilson was only 19 when she married James Wilson, aged 51. Following his death, she became Mrs. Thomas Bartlett. She and her husband lived in England until her premature death at the age of 34. Perhaps she kept Thomson's Seasons with her to the end; perhaps from time to time, she would leaf through it and, as Mr. Iredell had hoped, fondly remember the man who had given it to her. Perhaps without realizing it, she smiled, and her second husband wondered why.

It's quite possible, of course, that things didn't unfold exactly as Mr. Iredell wished. Perhaps, in the end, what Mrs. Wilson wrote to Bird Wilson was true: "Whenever the time arrives when Mrs. Iredell must part with [Mrs. Wilson] she will regret it most painfully."

Mrs. Wilson remained with the Iredells until it was time for Mr. Iredell to travel back to Philadelphia for the February sitting of the Supreme Court, at which point she accompanied him. Let's assume out of our story, that this return trip was an entirely chaste one, now that emotions were more subdued and Mrs. Wilson had formed a bond of mutual respect with Mrs. Iredell. And yet the two of them, Mrs. Wilson and Mr. Iredell, clearly remained close friends. Iredell stayed in the Philadelphia area until late May, holding various circuit courts, and his letters indicate that he saw Mrs. Wilson frequently—she even chose some muslin that Mr. Iredell brought back for his wife. He also made Mrs. Wilson a present of a book of poems—James Thomson's Seasons—writing in an accompanying note that he hoped that "it may sometimes be the means of recalling to your recollection the person who presented it.

"You will, I flatter myself, forgive this selfish motive . . . in consideration of the earnest wish I naturally feel to live with some esteem in your memory as long as I possibly can." Mrs. Wilson—apparently staying not with her stepchildren, who seem to have dropped out of the picture, but with some wealthy friends—wrote him at least two letters that were long and chatty, "(I am writing as with talking," she wrote gaily at the end of one of them, "when a woman once begins, she never knows when to leave off.") She also expressed her extreme disappointment that Mr. Iredell did not attend the August 1799 sitting of the Supreme Court because he was ill. This may have been the reason for some distance between them. James Iredell died in Edenton two months later.

Hannah Grey Wilson was only 19 when she married James Wilson, aged 51. Following his death, she became Mrs. Thomas Bartlett. She and her husband lived in England until her premature death at the age of 34.
IN MEMORIAM:
PETER KNOWLES AND HIS JOURNEY INTO AFRICA

Editor's Note: When we originally planned this article, it was intended to be an update on life-after Trusteeship for the Society. However, as events transpired, it is now a Memoriam to Peter Knowles who passed away in late October. We express our sympathy to his family and mourn the loss of a dedicated colleague.

By profession, Peter A. Knowles was a banker. Through his work at a prominent Washington area bank, he developed an association with Vincent C. Burke II who served as legal counsel for the bank. Mr. Burke was also one of the original Trustees of the Society and served as its Treasurer for a period before serving as a Vice President, and now as a Trustee Emeritus. While working for the bank, Mr. Burke introduced Mr. Knowles to the Society, enlisting his assistance as the Assistant Treasurer. When Mr. Burke became a Vice President of the Society, Mr. Knowles became Treasurer of the Society, a position he held for 16 years.

Upon retirement from his professional career, Peter and his wife Christina moved to Naples, Florida. Sadly, they did not enjoy the retirement years together they had planned as Mrs. Knowles became ill with cancer shortly after their arrival. Following her death, Peter embarked upon a new phase of his life when at the age of 75 he climbed Mount Kilimanjaro.

With three volcanic cones, Kilimanjaro is defined by scientists as a strato-volcano, and though inactive, gas is emitted from fumaroles on the main summit of Kibo. Approximately 24 miles wide, rising some 15,100 feet from the plains of Africa. It includes the highest peak in Africa, Uhuru Peak, at an elevation of 19,340 feet. Ernest Hemingway wrote that Kilimanjaro was “as wide as all the world, great, high, and unbelievably white in the sun.” Because the mountain is located near the equator with such an immense elevation, climbers experience virtually every climate type known on our planet.

Another triumph occurred last September when a similar project was completed for a second school in Kikwi. The tiny school housed 187 children. Prior to the construction of the tank, the nearest source of fresh water had been half a mile away. When HHH successfully completed the project adjacent to the school, the celebration was televised nationally.

In a conversation with Knowles in early 2007, he indicated he planned to travel out to Africa again in the summer. The organization’s mission of education and improvement projects has now been expanded to include the creation of seed banks—perhaps a logical development for an organization started by a banker. In spite of significant health challenges and age, Knowles did not plan to slow down. “I feel almost guilty, it’s so much satisfaction,” he said. “It’s my life’s calling.”

Knowles reiterated that feeling of dedication and commitment to “Hearts” in a conversation he held with Society staff in the late spring of 2007. He spoke lovingly of his trips to Tanzania, describing the excitement of his young grandson experiencing and discovering Africa with his grandfather. Mr. Knowles died on October 23, 2007. His foundation continues to provide desperately needed assistance to the people on the slopes of Mount Kilimanjaro where his compassion and concern will be remembered and honored for many years to come.

Peter A. Knowles was photographed in his living room in early 2007. On the wall behind him is artwork he collected in Africa.

1. How much water was turned around to benefit the stroke center of the hospital in Naples where his wife had received treatments.
2. What was the highest peak in Africa?
3. What is the original group of families served by HHH?
4. Who is Hearts Helping Hands (HHH)?
5. What was the sweetest water Peter Knowles ever tasted?

WANTED

In the interest of preserving the valuable history of the highest court, The Supreme Court Historical Society would like to locate persons who might be able to assist the Society’s Acquisitions Committee. The Society is endeavoring to acquire artifacts, memorabilia, literature and other materials related to the history of the Court and its members. These items are often used in exhibits by the Court Curator’s Office. If any of our members, or others, have anything they would care to share with us, please contact the Acquisitions Committee at the Society’s headquarters, 224 East Capital Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20003 or call (202) 543-0400. Donations to the Acquisitions fund would be welcome. You may also reach the Society through its website at www.supremecourthistory.org.
JOHN MARSHALL FAMILY DESCENDANT DONATES HISTORIC PHOTO OF THE SUPREME COURT BUILDING

Although the building was constructed long after the death of his famous ancestor Chief Justice John Marshall, Nelson A. Marshall had a sense of connection when he photographed the newly constructed Supreme Court Building in 1936. Everett W. Oliver, Nelson Marshall's grandson, discovered the photograph tucked away in a box and decided that after 70 years it deserved to have a little more visibility.

The photograph was taken on August 5, 1936 when Nelson and Catherine Marshall toured Washington. Their son Jack reported that he and his parents started to go up into or onto the dome of the US Capitol Building. But he and his mother were afraid of heights, so Mr. Marshall ascended to the dome alone. The lower portion of the photograph is obscured by the edge of a marble railing the camera was placed on when the photo was taken, making it appear that the building is set on the edge of a river, but it is only an illusion.

We are indebted to the Oliver and Marshall families for this fascinating addition to our collection.
The final speaker was James C. Duff who served as Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice. Mr. Duff commented on Rehnquist’s contributions as Chief Justice of the United States and his administration of the federal judiciary. He observed that Rehnquist “... was a masterful manager of time. He had a great sense of what was important and what did not require as much attention. He made significant improvements in the operation of the Judicial Conference of the United States.” One extremely significant change involved the committees of the conference in substantive decision-making, assigning more work of the Conference to its Committees. These changes decreased the amount of time needed for the conferences, and by rotating the membership on the Committees, allowed the judges to make greater contributions and to feel more sense of connection.

Duff further observed that “[h]e was a careful steward of the Third Branch’s independence... He was straightforward and honest with the other branches of government. He enjoyed returning unused funds from the Court to the U.S. Treasury at the end of each year. He did not hesitate to admonish the Senate—regardless of which party was in the majority or in the White House—when it delayed voting on nominees to the Judiciary. ... He in turn, respected their roles. ... “[W]hen he was called upon to fulfill his Constitutional role as the presiding officer of a Presidential impeachment trial, he thus entered the trial well regarded by members of the Senate and left the trial all the more so afterward... At the end of trial, he was praised by both parties for the manner in which he presided over it.”

Duff related a story the Chief Justice liked to tell about a time when he had been in New Orleans on business. He attended church there. It was the custom of the minister in the church to ask visitors about themselves. In response to the minister’s questions about his identity, the Chief Justice responded that he was “Bill Rehnquist from Washington, DC.” When asked what he did in Washington, he said, “I’m a government lawyer.” Duff observed that his final visit to the Chief Justice came only a week and a half before his death. Rehnquist was busily engaged in his routine work, his mind and focus sharp and disciplined. Duff concluded that “[h]e was an extraordinary public servant. He served our country—a government lawyer—to his dying day.”

At the conclusion of the proceedings, the Bar adopted formal Resolutions prepared by a special Committee tasked with commemorating the career of William Rehnquist. In a special session, the Resolutions were presented by Solicitor General Paul Clement, where they were officially accepted by the Court. The text of the Memorial Resolutions are now a part of the official records of the Court. Assistant Deputy Attorney General McNulty presented comments on behalf of the Justice Department, after which Chief Justice John Roberts made a statement honoring the career and contributions of his predecessor. The text of his remarks will appear in entirety in the next issue of the Quarterly and appears on the Society’s website, supremecourthistory.org.