

## Santa Clara Law Review

Volume 10 | Number 2 Article 1

1-1-1970

# Foreword

Richard H. Chambers

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/lawreview



Part of the Law Commons

#### **Recommended Citation**

Richard H. Chambers, Other, Foreword, 10 Santa Clara Lawyer 223 (1970).  $A vailable\ at: http://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/lawreview/vol10/iss2/1$ 

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Santa Clara Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Santa Clara Law Review by an authorized administrator of Santa Clara Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact sculawlibrarian@gmail.com.

#### **FOR EWORD**

### Richard H. Chambers\*

The Santa Clara Lawyer is a good law review, and in your Tenth Anniversary year, in behalf of the Judges of the Ninth Circuit, I congratulate you on its consistent excellence. It reflects a dedicated, able, editorial board and faculty.

You operate in an over-crowded field of college publications. So, it seems to have been an unusually happy choice over the years that you have pointed the Santa Clara Lawyer at California law. In the California field, your chosen ground, each one of your issues is very valuable.

You have recently lost a noble man, Dean Leo A. Huard. Beset, in his later years, by physical torment beyond the suffering capabilities of most of us, he never flagged in his devotion to the law or the school he loved. It seems a wonderful coincidence that the Santa Clara Lawyer, Volume 9, No. 2, published only a few months before his death, has his lead article on "The Roar, The Whine, The Boom and The Law: Some Legal Concerns About the SST." It exemplifies so well his spirit: That even in his personal bedevilment he never ceased to look forward.

You and I have lost a grand friend.

<sup>\*</sup> A.B., University of Arizona, 1929; LL.B., Stanford University, 1932. Member, American Bar Association, American Law Institute, and State Bar of Arizona. Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit.