The Law School records its deep sense of loss in the sudden death on February 1, 1933, of Harvey Lantz who, in his twenty-seven years of faithful and fruitful service as professor of law, contributed so largely to the success of this school. His death marks the passing of a truly great teacher and scholar whose clarity of mind and directness of expression, savored with a rare wit, left on those with whom he came in contact, an impress that shall always endure.

He had a genius for teaching and inspiring his students, which justly won for him their intense devotion and affection and which placed him in that small group of truly great teachers. He was a loyal colleague whose finely balanced judgments and wise counsel were of immeasureable helpfulness. We have lost a remarkable teacher and a friend.

JOHN T. CONDON HALL

With appropriate ceremonies, John T. Condon Hall, the new home of the Law School of the University of Washington, was dedicated on Friday evening, January 6, 1933. It marked the culmination of a dream of its revered and beloved founder and first dean, John T. Condon, whose twenty-seven years of able and conscientious effort, combined with his commanding leadership and devotion, gave shape and substance to a work which has been ably forwarded by his successors. It is eminently fitting that the new structure should be named in his honor.

President M. Lyle Spencer, as the official representative of the University administration, presided and made the presentation speech. Dean Harold Shepherd, in acknowledgment of the presentation, spoke on “Legal Education in a Modern State University,” in which he discussed the viewpoints and functions of the modern law school. Speaking as the representative of the legal profession, Judge George Donworth explained the responsibility of
the profession in a changing world. Judge Robert S. Macfarlane, as the representative of the Law Alumni, spoke on "Liberalism and the Law," emphasizing that law through enlightened liberalism will sustain and further our national life.

The new structure completes the liberal arts quadrangle, formed by the buildings housing the departments of home economics, education, commerce, and philosophy, and in design and material is uniform with them. Built of tapestry brick, in the collegiate Gothic manner which has been adopted for the newer buildings of the University, trimmed in warm terra cotta, in appearance and arrangement it compares favorably with the most modern educational buildings in the country. Indirect lighting, forced ventilation and heating system, tiled halls and corridors, illuminated blackboards, acoustical treatment of all class rooms, an individual lighting system for the reading room tables, and built-in desks with chairs of the fixed swivel type in the class rooms, combine with superbly planned and executed architectural details to produce a building second to none of comparable size in beauty and utility.

On the first floor are three class rooms of medium size, men's and women's lounges and locker rooms, and the moot court room. Done in panelled oak with a beamed ceiling, the moot court duplicates, on a smaller scale, the superior court rooms in use in the city of Seattle, and is one of the most effective rooms in the building. The men's lounge, designed to provide a gathering place for informal discussions, is furnished comfortably with davenports, floor lamps, chairs, and reading and writing tables harmonizing with the beamed ceiling and decorative walls.

The second floor, in addition to a large class room with 126 seats arranged in tiers, a seminar room, quarters for The Washington Law Review, and administrative offices, contains in its arrangement of the faculty office group a feature found only in a few of the newest law school buildings. Reached either by means of a private stairway leading to the outside of the building, or through a door from the main corridor, the faculty quarters form a self-contained unit. Twelve pleasant and comfortably furnished offices are provided, six on the second floor and six on a mezzanine floor above, there is a faculty meeting room, and adjoining it the faculty library, with stack space for over seven thousand volumes and direct access to the main stacks. A complete working library of reports, state statutes, digests, law reviews, and texts is provided for exclusive faculty use.

From the lobby at the head of the stairs on the third floor, doors to the right lead into the center of the auditorium, two stories high and built after the fashion of an amphitheatre, seating 250, to the left, leaded glass doors give access to the library reading room. One hundred and eight feet long, fifty-four feet wide, with an arched and panelled ceiling, high windows of cathedral glass, and high woodwork, the room is unsurpassed in beauty. Twenty-two specially built oak tables with sloping tops, equipped with unique individual lamps, will accommodate 250 students at one time. Around the walls, built-in bookcases with a capacity of 6,500 vol-
umes contain the working library for the students, and 2,000 more volumes are available in the reserve stacks reached through the delivery desk, which is situated in the center of the back wall. In one corner of the reading room arches lead to the browsing room, fitted with floor lamps and comfortable chairs, and stocked with current legal periodicals, newspapers, special collections, and books for recreational reading of a semi-professional type.

The delivery desk furnishes direct access to the library stack wing, in addition to the librarian's office, work room, cataloguing room, students' typing room, and a room especially located and equipped for the convenience of visiting attorneys who desire to use the facilities of the library. There are five tiers of stacks, with a total capacity of approximately 160,000 volumes, leaving ample room for expansion of the present library of 60,000. A full size automatic elevator, an electric book lift, and inter-stack phones insure efficient page service in the delivery of volumes.

Built to accommodate years of growth and expansion, the building affords a permanent home which incorportes the latest ideas and facilities to be found in the best of approved law schools.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

PROVABILITY OF CLAIMS FOR FUTURE RENT OR DAMAGES AGAINST THE TRUSTEE IN BANKRUPTCY OR A RECEIVER OF AN INSOLVENT TENANT UPON ABANDONMENT OF THE LEASED PREMISES, MEASURE OF DAMAGES IN FEDERAL COURT RECEIVERSHIPS. After publication of the article1 appearing under the above title in the November issue of the Law Review, a decision2 was handed down by the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, Northern Division, which justifies this supplemental note written at the request of the Law Review

1 (a) The title in the November issue of the Review should read as it appears above—"Provability of Claims for Future Rent or Damages * * *" instead of "for Damages"—(b) The quotation from the case of Hines Yellow Pine Trustees v. Martin, 268 U. S. 458, 69 L. Ed. 1050 (1925) appearing in footnote 15, p. 310, is incomplete, the proper quotation being as follows:

"Both the meaning of statutes of a state and the rules of the unwritten law of a state affecting property within the state are peculiarly questions of local law, to be ascertained and established by the state courts. For that reason Federal courts ordinarily hold themselves bound by the interpretation of state statutes by the state courts. * * *

"When questions affected by the interpretation of a state statute or a local rule of property arise in a Federal court, that court has the same authority and duty to decide them as it has to decide any other questions which arise in a cause; and where state decisions are in conflict, or do not clearly establish what the local law is, the Federal court may exercise an independent judgment and determine the law of the case. * * *"

2 Republic Supply Company of California v. Richfield Oil Company of California, Cause No. 793, decision by Judge Jeremiah Neterer, District Judge, on exceptions to a Special Master's findings and conclusions on proof of claims based upon disaffirmance of leases, decision filed December 14, 1932.