The REVIEW is pleased to publish as its first article a digest of decisions dealing with the use of Depositions and Discovery in Maryland. The digest is the result of a fortuitous combination of talent, knowledge and experience. The spade-work and initial compilation was done by Christopher H. Foreman while he was Bailiff to Hon. Emory H. Niles, Chief Judge of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City, and had the benefit of Judge Niles' supervision. Judge Niles, a member of the Court of Appeals Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure since its inception, has devoted to the Committee work a great amount of time, effort and enthusiasm and utilized this background as the author of all but two of the State nisi prius opinions cited by the Digest. Frederick W. Invernizzi, Director, Administrative Office of the Courts and Reporter to the Court of Appeals Standing Committee, participated in the final preparation and arrangement of the Digest, adding many of the Maryland Court of Appeals and Federal cases,
and drafting the various editorial notes made necessary by the 1957 Amendments to the Deposition and Discovery Rules. His efforts were invaluable in the arrangement and classification. A native of Louisiana, Mr. Foreman received his A.B. (1950) and M.A. (1951) from the University of Cincinnati, and his LL.B. (1957) from the University of Maryland School of Law. He served with the United States Marine Corps in the Pacific from 1943-1946, and with the United States Army during 1951 and 1952. Mr. Foreman is associated with the law firm of Callegary, Bracken and Callegary, is a member of Phi Beta Kappa, Order of the Coif, Junior Bar Association of Baltimore City, and the Monumental City Bar Association.

Attorneys who could, undaunted, whistle away the night in the proverbial red room at the far end of the moonlit gallery in .................. Castle while reading Blackwood's "The Willows" perhaps find it more difficult to maintain an equal degree of composure when drafting a testamentary document, trust instrument, or conveyance. In the latter situations, the furtive glances and minute examinations must be devoted to the synthesis of a concoction which will deter The Right Honorable Spectre, The Rule Against Perpetuities, a noble and ancient but all too real spirit whose primary mission is to lower the boom on your handiwork, \textit{ab initio}.

In the article "An Attack On The 'Twenty-One Year Rule'," originally presented before the \textit{MARYLAND LAW REVIEW ASSOCIATION} \cite{Dunn1958}, S. Raymond Dunn has given an intelligent, fresh and highly readable discussion of his views as to why the "fee tail's little brother", the twenty-one year period in gross, is an unrealistic one within the framework of our vastly complex era. Mr. Dunn is a Phi Beta Kappa, receiving his A.B. from the Johns Hopkins University in 1933, and an LL.B. from the University of Maryland in 1938. He also has diplomas from the University of Nancy (1931) and the University of Paris (1932). He is a former member of the Student Editorial Board of the \textit{MARYLAND LAW REVIEW}, and was an Official Interpreter to the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City. Mr. Dunn is currently a practicing attorney, an Instructor in Real Property and Future Interests at Mount Vernon Law School, and an active member of the \textit{MARYLAND LAW REVIEW ASSOCIATION}. 