

Editorial Section

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

Recommended Citation

Editorial Section, 30 Md. L. Rev. 89 (1970)

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr/vol30/iss2/1>

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.

Maryland Law Review

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

STUDENT EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief

PAUL M. VETTORI

Articles Editors

GILL COCHRAN
THOMAS A. SPEICHER

Notes and Comments Editors

GEORGE W. MAUGANS, III
DENNIS R. NEUTZE

Managing Editor

JOHN J. KENNY

Research Editor

ALAN L. LIBSHUTZ

JEFFREY W. BOLOTIN

JOSEPH M. FAIRBANKS

ROBERT L. BROWNELL

Faculty Advisor

HAL M. SMITH

Ass't Faculty Advisor

LAURENCE M. KATZ

EDITOR'S NOTE

The REVIEW's current offering is somewhat of a variant from the usual fare. For this issue, the REVIEW presents as its lead article a topic dealing with a recent proposal for reform of laws relating to homosexual acts by the Maryland Commission On Criminal Law. *The Sex Offender Provision Of The New Proposed Maryland Criminal Code: Should Private, Consenting Adult Homosexual Behavior Be Excluded?*, by Robert G. Fisher, is a provocative article which the Editors hope will arouse interest in a topic which cries out for legislative attention.

The student works in this issue of the REVIEW include a Comment and three Notes. The first student offering is a Comment which investigates the legality of the Revised Philadelphia Plan, a much debated proposal designed to ensure that certain government contractors take prescribed steps to meet numerical standards of minority group utilization.

The first student Note treats a recent California case which represents a departure from the common law in that it recognized as homicide the killing of a viable fetus without the necessity that the fetus be born alive and have a separate existence.

Important to the proper functioning of our dual system of courts is the federal anti-injunction statute. By denying federal courts the

power to enjoin state court proceedings except where expressly granted by Congress, the statute reflects the principles of comity necessary for the effective functioning of the system of federalism. The second student Note examines an implied exception read into the statute by a recent fifth circuit case under circumstances where first amendment rights were involved. The final student offering is a Note dealing with a subject that has recently been of some debate. The Railway Labor Act has been the source of much criticism, and the student author investigates the provisions of the RLA dealing with the voluntary settlement of major disputes and specifically the right of self-help prior to the exhaustion of RLA procedures.

This issue marks the end of office for the present Editorial Board and the beginning of new leadership. The outgoing editors extend congratulations and best wishes for success in the ensuing year to the new editors: Gregory L. Reed, Editor-in-Chief; Kaye T. Brooks and Dennis J. DuBois, Articles Editors; Kenneth C. Lundeen, Managing Editor; Judith A. Arnold, Charles R. Moran and Jay I. Morstein, Notes and Comments Editors; John Charles Nason, Research Editor.

The REVIEW would also like to express its appreciation to the faculty advisors, Professors Hal M. Smith and Laurence M. Katz; Mrs. Shirley Meyers, the REVIEW secretary; and the *Daily Record Company*, the REVIEW printer.