

## Editorial Section

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr>

---

### Recommended Citation

*Editorial Section*, 23 Md. L. Rev. 50 (1963)

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr/vol23/iss1/4>

This Editorial Section is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Journals at DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maryland Law Review by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. For more information, please contact [smccarty@law.umaryland.edu](mailto:smccarty@law.umaryland.edu).

# Maryland Law Review

---

Published Winter, Spring, Summer, and Fall by Maryland Law Review, Inc.

© Copyright by Maryland Law Review, Inc., 1962

\$3.00 Per Current Volume

\$1.00 Per Number

Member, National Conference of Law Reviews  
Conference of Southern Law Reviews

---

## STUDENT EDITORIAL BOARD

WILLIAM H. PRICE II, *Editor*

LAURENCE M. KATZ, *Casenote Editor*

DONALD E. SHARPE, *Recent Decisions Editor*

MONA SAYLOR LAMBIRD

WILBUR E. SIMMONS, JR.

JOHN JOSEPH

} *Assistant Editors*

---

Robert W. Baker  
David H. Clark  
David S. Cordish  
Arthur K. Crocker

J. Harlan Livezey  
Abel J. Merrill  
Louis B. Price  
Allen L. Schwart

J. Frederick Sharer  
Berryl A. Speert  
H. Rutherford Turnbull III

---

G. KENNETH REIBLICH, *Faculty Advisor*

LEWIS D. ASPEB, *Ass't Faculty Advisor*

---

## THE EDITOR'S PAGE

This issue of the REVIEW presents two specific areas of the law suggesting legislative consideration. Professor John M. Brumbaugh, who teaches criminal law and evidence at the Law School, and who is a member of the committee of the Maryland Bar Association considering revision of our criminal code, writes his views on that subject in a suasive and interesting manner. At the outset he details the present law and exposes its inadequacies and absurdities. He then attempts to meet specific objections to the adoption of a new code, and suggests how we might best proceed to formulate one. The reader is apt to be surprised and is surely to be enlightened. The introductory note to Doctor Jonas R. Rappeport's article explains the purpose in bringing it to our readers. If you have read Mr. Baldwin's article concerning the physician-patient privilege [22 Md. L. Rev. 181 (1962)], you will want to learn of the psychiatrists' views as expressed by Doctor Rappeport.

The REVIEW is pleased to announce the selection of Mr. John Joseph as an assistant editor to fill the vacancy created when Mr. John O. Dyrud graduated in February. Mr. Joseph's primary responsibility will be to coordinate the work of the evening school members of the Law Review.