

JUSTICE JOHN PAUL STEVENS

June 24, 2009

Location: Justice Stevens' Chambers

Host: Brian Lamb, C-SPAN

© National Cable Satellite Corporation, d/b/a C-SPAN

BRIAN LAMB, HOST, C-SPAN: Justice Stevens, what part of your chambers are we in right now?

JOHN PAUL STEVENS, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT:

We're in the office of two of my law clerks, Lindsay Powell (ph) and Damian (ph) are working here and I come in a lot and learn about the law from them.

LAMB: How many law clerks do you have?

STEVENS: Four. Two others are upstairs.

LAMB: And in this room we have some photographs on the wall, one of them in particular seems kind of interesting over here because you're the only person left on the Supreme Court that served with Warren Burger.

STEVENS: That's correct. That's – I think that was taken the day that Justice O'Connor was sworn in if I'm not mistaken and taken in the Conference Room that day.

LAMB: What's the difference between the Court then and the Court now?

STEVENS: Eight different justices make a difference. The eight that were in that picture were all succeeded by my present colleagues.

LAMB: Is there a difference in the way the Court operates today and is that determined by the chief justice?

STEVENS: Well, it's the – pretty much determined by how it's been operated over the years, where there's much more continuity in the way we do our work than there is change. And there is a change when the new chief justice is presiding at conference, each chief justice has his own ways of – method of handling – presiding at the conference and the present chief justice is doing an excellent job. There's some virtues that the others didn't have but that's pretty much follows the tradition that's been followed for many years.

LAMB: We understand that you do about 80 cases a year. Back in those days were there more? And if there were, why? And from your particular perspective, how many cases should you handle a year?

STEVENS: Well, I think that the number we handle a year now is probably about right, maybe we should be up to about 100. But there were well over 150 when I started and that was a very, very heavy workload and there are a number of reasons for the change, there – one of which is we no longer have the mandatory jurisdiction applied back when Chief Justice Burger was here, so we have more control over our docket than we did then and I think we do a better job, for the most part, in picking cases. Although I think we should take a few more than we do.

LAMB: What is your relationship with the people in this room? And over the years, have you ever counted how many clerks you've had?

STEVENS: Somebody knows, but I don't. I don't remember just what it is, but they play a very important role in really two or three different ways. One, they review all the *cert* petitions that come in, and prepare memos on those that they think I would be interested in – that really have a likelihood of granting and they also work on all the opinions that we produce. Our practice is I usually write a first draft, in fact I always write a first draft and then they convert it from a draft to an opinion. They make it much better than to start it out.

LAMB: Let's walk in this middle room...

STEVENS: OK.

LAMB: ... and tell us what this room is used for.

STEVENS: Well, this is the room where my secretary and assistant secretary both are in this office and room for visitors to sit and see what the place looks like.

LAMB: What kind of visitors do you get over the years and how easy is it to come see you?

STEVENS: Well, it's a lot easier – I probably shouldn't say this, but it isn't all that difficult but usually we're pretty busy and that schedule is governed pretty much by the availability of time. And it is a full time job so you spend an awful lot of time both preparing for

arguments, reading briefs ahead of time, and talking over the cases and of course the major work is in writing opinions and finishing those off.

LAMB: Did you ever total up how many hours a week you have to read?

STEVENS: I don't know just what it is, but it's a lot more than 40, I'll tell you that.

LAMB: How many hours a day do – what's your pattern on a given day?

STEVENS: Well, I'm an early morning person, so I do quite a bit of work early in the morning and I'm usually pretty well prepared when I get my – come downtown. And I have flexibility, on days in which we're not sitting, I can work at home we have – you know with what computers do for us, I can work at home on opinions and I can read at home and I sometimes do and sometimes I come down and it's a totally optional schedule.

LAMB: Where is this office located in the Court itself?

STEVENS: This is in the northwest corner of the building.

LAMB: Have you always been in this space?

STEVENS: No, I've been in four different chambers since I came. I started just down the hall a ways in chambers that are referred to as the retired chief justice's chambers. I was there for three or four years and then I moved into chambers that Justice O'Connor is now occupying and was there and that had been and then Lewis Powell's chambers when he

retired. And then after that I moved into chambers that Justice Scalia occupies now where – which had previously been occupied by Justice Stewart and I took over when he retired. And before that time Justice Black had been in those chambers. So there have only been three justices in those chambers when I was there now Nino has those chambers, they're on the other corner of the building.

LAMB: Let me ask you about this portrait over here on the wall. Who is that gentleman?

STEVENS: That's Wiley Rutledge, a great justice of the Court for whom I clerked in the 1947 term and he's one of my heroes.

LAMB: Who was he?

STEVENS: He was of course a justice of the Court here, and before that he had been a judge on the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit. And before that he'd been the dean of Iowa Law School, before that he'd been the dean of St. Louis University law school and he taught at other law schools during his career as well.

LAMB: What year did you clerk for him?

STEVENS: Nineteen forty-seven, '47/'48, '47 term.

LAMB: What did you learn from that experience that you still hold on to today?

STEVENS: I learned an awful lot, I have to tell you. I learned to take the time to write out your own draft opinion so you're sure you understand the case before you turn it over to someone else to work on. I learned to – really that every case is important, and not just where there's a lot of money involved and important public issues, that every case is important to the people who are involved in it.

LAMB: Back to the writing of the first draft that you do, is that unique to you?

STEVENS: No. I can't speak for my colleagues, I'm sure some of them – do some first draft but I'm not sure they all do. But one of the reasons I did that is that Justice Rutledge used to write them out on a yellow pad, now I type them on computers rather than the pad, but he would write out on his own long hand a full first draft and then the secretary would type it up and usually that was it. Usually we would – maybe supply some footnotes or suggestions, but he did the whole thing himself.

LAMB: What's been your philosophy of the length of an opinion that you would write and also the dissent that you write sometimes or the concurring opinion.

STEVENS: Well, the length depends on the case. I try to keep them as short as I can, but sometimes you take more pages than people think you should. And I use footnotes regularly because I think footnotes are optional reading. There are some things that should be in an opinion and I think people might gain from having the opportunity to read, but they don't always have to read it in order to understand the argument and opinions. So I'm one of those old timers who think footnotes perform a very useful function. Some of my colleagues think you should never use footnotes and a lot of scholars feel that way, too.

LAMB: Why do they feel that way do you think?

STEVENS: Well, they think if it's important enough to be included in the opinion, it ought to be worked into the text and if it isn't that – if it doesn't belong in the text you should save space by leaving it out.

LAMB: How does an opinion change in length from the first draft that you write to the time it's finished?

STEVENS: Well sometimes it doesn't change very much at all. Sometimes it becomes shorter and sometimes longer. I think probably more often it becomes a little longer, but I'm a fan of shorter opinions if it's possible, but you can't always do it.

LAMB: Over here in your wall is a number 22 baseball jersey, what's that from?

STEVENS: Well, that's – that was a gift from my law clerks a few years ago. Because they know I'm a Cub fan and kind of encouraged my continued interest in the Cubs.

LAMB: When did you throw out the first ball?

STEVENS: That was three or four – about three years ago, I guess. Do I have a picture of that here? No I don't do I – I think three years ago.

LAMB: What was that like?

STEVENS: That was the highlight of my career. I had all my grandchildren – not all of them, but most of them there and I can tell you I was a hero that day. It was much more important than my job.

LAMB: Want to know if you made it from the mound to the catcher?

STEVENS: Oh, absolutely. I threw it high and wide. I had to practice though to tell you the truth.

LAMB: More pictures over here on your wall are from what?

STEVENS: Well, there's a picture that, the first one is a picture that is the Gerald Ford's funeral that his family gave me, that I happened to have been just as the casket was passing by. And then there's a couple letters that he wrote to me that I'm very proud of. And this is a picture here that was taken at the swearing in of the vice president in January. And then I have a picture of my colleagues on the Court of Appeals for the seventh circuit and the one at the top is the Vinson Court for which I clerked.

LAMB: So you clerked for Wiley Rutledge during the Vinson Court of . . .

STEVENS: Right.

LAMB: ...1947. And if you come down the pictures then this court right here. . .

STEVENS: And I served on that court from 1970 to 1975. And then this is the Court I joined, the one at the bottom.

LAMB: Let me go back to the seventh circuit. Where is it located?

STEVENS: Well, it covers Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana and we always sit in Chicago.

LAMB: What was your learning experience on the – sitting on the seventh circuit?

STEVENS: Well, I learned a great deal. I learned an awful lot about federal law of course, because I served with some awfully good judges and learned a lot from them just for example, in that picture Tom Fairchild was a chief judge for years and he was – I learned a lot from him and others of my colleagues.

LAMB: So what's the difference between a Circuit Court of Appeals and a Supreme Court?

STEVENS: Well, in the Circuit Court of Appeals you are more bound by precedent than you are in the court of appeals here. If there's a decision or even a dictum, in the opinion the Court of Appeals is really required to follow it. Whereas in this Court there are many more open questions that need – have not really been finally resolved and you have more of a duty to decide things for the first time that have not been faced before.

LAMB: Let's go into your main office here. You've been in a lot of different offices.

STEVENS: Right.

LAMB: Does the atmosphere you're working in matter to you much?

STEVENS: Actually it doesn't. I enjoy the office and I have a wonderful view of the Capitol that I can see from my desk. But the most important part of the office is the computer which is sitting right next to me and wherever you are you spend a lot of time reading and composing on the computer.

LAMB: Behind your desk are a number of pictures, can you just give us an overview of what's here.

STEVENS: Well tend to be – most of them are family or President Ford of course and Justice Rutledge and a picture of my two former law partners down in the lower left hand corner there.

LAMB: Who is this up here?

STEVENS: That's my wife. My wife, taken a few years ago and this is – these are my parents, and my three daughters and my wife in that picture.

LAMB: Give us some background on your parents.

STEVENS: Well, that's a long story they both lived a long time but they – probably most notable part of their career, my dad was responsible for building what is now the Conrad

Hilton in Chicago. It was then the Stevens' Hotel and he was in the hotel business and also he was a lawyer, he studied at Northwestern back in the days of Wigmore, way past.

LAMB: Now you were a Northwestern law graduate.

STEVENS: Yes.

LAMB: Not that usual to have somebody on the Court from Northwestern.

STEVENS: Well, Justice Goldberg was from Northwestern. And of course I went to law school at Northwestern and I did my undergraduate work at the University of Chicago.

LAMB: Is there any difference from going to a Midwestern school than we hear so many justices are from Stanford and Yale and Harvard.

STEVENS: Well, I think there is. Of course every school has its virtues and its strengths, but Northwestern really had a fine law school when I went to it and it still has a fine law school. And there are good law schools all over the country. I learned that from – in hiring law clerks. I've hired law clerks from many, many different schools. Who've done a magnificent job that even though they didn't – they're not from the Ivy League.

LAMB: I read that you were the top student in the history of the Northwestern law school. Is that still the case?

STEVENS: Well, it's – I've been told that was true. I've been told that was true, I don't know about the record since then, but I was told that that was the case.

LAMB: With all your experiences, Northwestern Law School, your job as a clerk here, service on the seventh circuit and a father that was an attorney, where along the way did you get your philosophy of the law?

STEVENS: Well, of course it's a combination of many, many things that combine to give you your views of what the law is. A lot of it's just a result of your reading; a lot of it's your experiences. I know for example that my experiences during World War II have shaped my thinking in some cases.

LAMB: You were in the Navy.

STEVENS: I was in the Navy, yes.

And my experiences as a practicing lawyer have had an impact on the work I've done and my experience on the seventh circuit that affect me here, there are an awful lot of things combined to affect your view of the law.

LAMB: When you're sitting up on the bench looking out at the Court during an oral argument, what do you think up there? What do you see that we don't see?

STEVENS: Well, one thing I often remember when I see is the first time I argued before the Court, I was really surprised at how close I was to the justices. And I think to myself

sometimes, he is thinking the same thing. He didn't expect to be quite as close to it – have it be quite as intimate an experience as it really is. You're right in the conversation with the people on the other side of the bench. And it's a very, very interesting experience.

LAMB: Have you been here long enough where the bench itself was straight?

STEVENS: No it was – Warren Burger made that change a year or two before I got here. So it's always been – since I've been a justice it's always been with an angle on the two sides. But when I was a law clerk it was straight – a straight bench.

LAMB: Where's your favorite spot in the whole Court, what room do you like the best?

STEVENS: Well, I haven't thought – I haven't really thought that through. I suppose that I enjoy the oral arguments, I like the courtroom. I really do. I enjoy my own office and I always think one of the most interesting places in the Court, actually is the spiral staircase. It's well worth seeing if you can.

LAMB: Have you spent much time studying the history of this place or ...

STEVENS: I've picked up a good deal of history, but I haven't really made an independent study of it really the way some people have made it the White House, for example, that really some very interesting work done on the White House.

LAMB: What are those books behind you?

STEVENS: Those are the U.S. reports from – I forget just what -- but they're the last maybe 40 years of reports. And then over there I have reports from the beginning.

LAMB: What does it mean? What are U.S. reports? Why don't you walk around this desk and I'll meet you on the other side.

STEVENS: Well, they're the reports of the decisions by the Court and – which of course include all the majority opinions and all of the dissenting and separate opinions been written.

LAMB: We've read for years that you've figured out a way to spend part of your time here and part of your time in Florida. What's been your philosophy – when did you start spending a couple weeks a month in Florida and doing a lot of work down there?

STEVENS: Well, I've been doing that for – I don't know, at least 25 years and perhaps more. And part of that is the product of the computer. Continuing to be in communication with the office here even though you're working there. And of course, it's the kind of job that you don't have to be in the office to perform. You can read briefs and do other research without being in the office and you can write opinions without being in the office. So I am – do just as much work when I'm in Florida as I do here, except I don't hear any oral arguments. That – and sometimes I read briefs sitting on the beach and I can remember being – getting a kick out of the fact that I had the briefs on the bench one day and I shook the sand out of the briefs and found it made my neighbors a little jealous of the way I prepare.

LAMB: As you know, when you're around Washington, a Supreme Court justice is somebody that everybody knows and they – I'm sure you've found yourself in the supermarket and someone saying oh there's Justice Stevens.

STEVENS: Never.

LAMB: Never?

STEVENS: Never, never.

LAMB: Do you ever get this in Florida? I mean do they know who you are down there?

STEVENS: The only time that I can remember being recognized, just out – when I'm doing the shopping or something was in a – renting a video in a – I don't know what the name of the outfit was, but the guy who owned the store had been admitted to the bar a couple weeks earlier and he – he recognized me. Apparently he's both a lawyer and an entrepreneur. But I'm almost never recognized, which is nice. I just do the shopping and so forth and nobody knows who it is.

LAMB: Let's go back to the *cert* pool that we talk about. What's the correct way to pronounce *certiorari*?

STEVENS: *Certiorari*.

LAMB: *Certiorari*. What does that mean?

STEVENS: Well, that's a common law writ that is – that has become a statutory writ, but it's the writ that a party who lost in the lower court files in this – in this court he files a petition for a writ of *certiorari*, which is a request for this court to grant review of the case and set it down for argument. And that's, we get I don't know how many thousand *cert* petitions every year, but we – the cases we grant come out of the number that are filed.

LAMB: How many justices participate in this *cert* pool and what is it?

STEVENS: Well the – it has varied from over the years. When I joined the Court there were, I think six justices in it and I did not join it because having been a law clerk years earlier, I had some familiarity with the *cert* process and I thought I could handle cases more efficiently myself without participating in these memos prepared for the group of justices. So there were six then, and after I joined every justice to join the court has joined the *cert* pool since there. And so there have been eight. With this one exception that last year Justice Alito decided to do his *certs* independently, too. So now there are seven different justices who share their law clerks and share their memos as preparation for the *cert* conference.

LAMB: Why did you decide not to join the *cert* pool?

STEVENS: Well, because I thought I could handle the cases more efficiently independently than as part of the *cert* pool because the memos they prepare are very thorough and very carefully written but they're a lot longer than I thought was necessary in order to make a decision on whether to vote to grant or to deny.

LAMB: What does that do to your personal work load or your clerk's work load?

STEVENS: Well, you'd really have to ask them. I think it makes it a little less, but they go through every *cert* petition themselves and divide them up, but they don't have to write memoranda in every case. So they read more petitions but they write fewer memorandums. So it kind of cancels itself out.

LAMB: And then once a *cert* petition is accepted here, and by the way, how does that happen? Where does it happen?

STEVENS: Well, the once a week except when we recess then we'll miss a week. But we have a conference on Friday and we review all the *cert* petitions that have come in during – since the last conference and we vote on whether to grant or deny them and you need four justices to vote to grant, then the *cert* petition is granted.

LAMB: And what – physically where do you do that?

STEVENS: We do it in the Conference Room of the Court and – all the justices are present at the conference and no one else is present, the deliberations are entirely off the record.

LAMB: What's the Conference Room like?

STEVENS: Well, it's a nice big room with a big table in it and nine chairs around the table and then when we get through sometimes they have coffee sent in and a sweet roll or cookie or something too, but ...

LAMB: How formal is that – the meeting?

STEVENS: Well, its informal in the sense that everybody is congenial and there's a certain amount of conversation, but most of it's business and then we are fairly rigid in our rules that we talk in the order of seniority about the case we go around and vote in turn that – and sometimes after we've discussed the case for a *cert* petition we'll talk about it a little further, but usually it's through after one go round the table.

LAMB: Now you're senior.

STEVENS: Well, second senior. I'm senior in age and years in service, but the chief justice of course speaks first.

LAMB: When you came on this court did you ever think that you'd be here in 34 years?

STEVENS: No. In fact, I had a law clerk named Stewart Baker that was with me in my second or third year here and I asked him to prepare a memorandum for me on the ages of retirement of all my predecessors and to suggest the age I should plan on retiring and I thought then and I still sometimes you're not the best judge of when you should retire and I thought it would be helpful to have that kind of guidance. Well, I didn't follow that recommendation.

LAMB: When did he suggest?

STEVENS: I can't remember exactly what it was but the year has long gone by.

LAMB: Now you're very close to being the longest servicing justice in history or the oldest justice in history. Does any of that enter your thinking right now?

STEVENS: No, I'm not out to break any records, I can assure you of that. I just enjoy the work and each year I've thought about it I've decided that I could continue to enjoy it and continue to make a contribution.

LAMB: What do you do at age 89 to stay as healthy as you are?

STEVENS: Well, I play a lot of tennis. I play – I don't play as much golf as I used to because my fore swing is not the same as it use to be. But when I'm in Florida I go swimming every day and play tennis probably three times a week.

LAMB: Is that painting over the mantle there of any significance?

STEVENS: No, that's Queen Victoria as a young lady and apparently that's a portrait that's in a number of the schools in England.

LAMB: Why don't you sit over here at your desk so we can ...

STEVENS: OK.

LAMB: ...get you a little bit more comfortable. And right out that window is the Capitol.

STEVENS: That's right.

LAMB: Put the Court, for a moment, in perspective for the public in a town like this where we have a president and the Capitol and now this building across the street. What's its role?

STEVENS: Well, it's an independent branch of the government. It has to decide cases of controversies that raise federal questions and have to do it in the best ability that it can.

LAMB: Does it do it the way you want it do it?

STEVENS: Sometimes. Sometimes not. Sometimes I, it's been true while I've been here and really throughout the history of the Court that there are cases that are very difficult in which there was a difference of judgment by different members of the Court and so when you're not in the majority you wish they had decided it the other way and you think the world would have been better off if they decided the other way, but if you don't have the votes you can't do anything about it.

LAMB: In your 34 years are there cases that really mattered more to you than others?

STEVENS: Oh, I'm sure there are, but if you're going to ask me which one is the most significant, I'm going to have to say the ones I'm working on currently are always the most significant and that changes from time to time.

LAMB: Which one over the years had the most reaction or the biggest, you know sensation in the country and I'm – you sit here, you write these opinions and they pop out and all of a sudden they're all over the news, do you pay any attention to that?

STEVENS: Well, you read the papers, of course. I read the papers both about our work and the work of other courts. But you have to let others decide on which are the most significant.

LAMB: Do you plan when you retire that your papers eventually will be released for public perusal?

STEVENS: Yes, I think I'm going to send them over to the Library of Congress.

LAMB: And how long after that – I know in case of Justice Marshall they were released fairly early.

STEVENS: That was by – I don't remember the exact date that I've arranged for.

LAMB: So, go back to Wiley Rutledge who was the justice that you served as clerk. Were there other justices in history that made a difference to you?

STEVENS: Yes, indeed.

LAMB: Why?

STEVENS: Well, because the quality of their work. There have been some really, truly great justices that sat on the Court.

LAMB: Some you can mention?

STEVENS: Well Brandeis, and Cardozo are the ones we often mention. Of course Justice Holmes was an exceptional justice and my good friends Potter Stewart and Byron White were great justices too. There have been a number of great men that have sat on the Court.

LAMB: In your opinion, what makes a justice great?

STEVENS: The quality of his work is a major, main thing I think. You judge justices I guess by the work product that they produce when they're on the Court.

LAMB: But what's quality in your opinion. What makes quality? What makes good writing?

STEVENS: Well, I don't know. I don't think I can give a lesson in English grammar and all the rest, but you have to be able to write clearly, and accurately, and honestly about what the issues are.

LAMB: Go back to what we were talking about earlier, in the Court and things when you disagree with them here. What is your option if you're sitting in a conference and they vote not your way. What role does your dissenting opinion play, do you think, in the law?

STEVENS: Sometimes it becomes persuasive later on, sometimes it doesn't. But I don't write dissents trying to change the law. I just think it's part of the job of the justice to explain his or her vote in the case. That I think the process is an open process in the sense that this is one institution that explains in a public way what it decides and what it does and I think that when there's difference within the Court on how a case should be decided. It's appropriate for those who disagree to explain why they thought the other side had the better of the argument.

LAMB: You've been active in oral argument. We run an argument a week on our radio station and I listen to them and I hear you, what is your philosophy of participation during the actual oral argument.

STEVENS: Well my philosophy is to ask questions when I think the answer might give me a little help in deciding a case.

I don't view the participation of a justice as an opportunity for the justice to advocate one point of view. I think rather, the questioning should be designed to help understand what the arguments on both sides are in order to enable the justice to reach a decision on his or her own views.

LAMB: How often do you change your mind on a case after the oral argument?

STEVENS: Sometimes, I can't tell you the number, but it has happened. It's – it has happened when I've been writing an opinion, for example. And that's one reason I think it important for the justice to do the first draft is when you try to write something out you

sometimes learn things about the case that you didn't fully appreciate or understand before. And there've been more than one case on which I have changed my views when I was writing the opinion.

LAMB: So a young man comes – or a woman comes into your office and they're 17 years old and they say to you, 'I want to be like you. I want to be a justice someday.' What advice do you give them along the way as to which – and is it possible that you can decide at a young age that you want to be a Supreme Court justice?

STEVENS: Well, I don't know. I certainly didn't decide at the age of 17 and I don't think – I can't remember talking to anyone age 17 who asked me for that advice. I haven't had to give that...

LAMB: Move ahead though, you're in college maybe and you start to think about it.

STEVENS: Well, the basic rule of course is to study hard and to do the best job you can at understanding what you can learn in college.

LAMB: Can – do you think in the future this is a Court that has every member history of serving on the Circuit Court of Appeals. They're all circuit court veterans. Is that something that is going to be expected, do you think, from now on for justices?

STEVENS: That's something that future presidents are going to have to decide. I think it's healthy for the Court to have members with different backgrounds. I think actually, I saw a television program recently when somebody said there should always be someone who had

served in the armed forces on the Court. And I think there should always be someone who has had practical experience in litigation. And I think experience in other branches of the government such as the legislature would be very, very helpful. I think – for example Justice O’Connor had experience as a legislator and I think she made a very significant contribution to deliberations because of that experience. And in my own case, the experience I had as a staff attorney on a legislative committee taught me a great deal about legislation that I know has affected my work in trying to interpret statutes. So I think differing backgrounds is a plus.

LAMB: What year did you serve on that judiciary subcommittee?

STEVENS: I think it was 1951.

LAMB: Who was there at the time? Who was the chairman, do you remember?

STEVENS: Manny Celler was the chairman, he was a democrat from Brooklyn and this Chauncey Reed was the senior minority member and he was a republican from DuPage County Illinois. I was hired by Chauncey Reed.

LAMB: Last question on that, what role does the legislative history, not the law play in your – when you think about a case, that comes to you?

STEVENS: I think it’s always significant and I – because I think our job is to try and figure out what Congress intended to do in enacting a statute. And I can remember being asked by members of the committee about rather tricky questions that might be presented in the case, I

remember explaining to one Congressman some of the difficulties that I saw in a case, he answered we'll let the judges figure that one out, cause it's a cooperative venture. Congress expects the judges to help fill in the holes in statutes as it goes along and realizing it is not just trying to read words on a sterile piece of paper is important for a judge, I think.

LAMB: Thank you Justice Stevens.

END