The REVIEW is pleased to present three contributions in its lead article section for this Summer Issue. The first two of these were originally papers delivered by Messrs. Rignal W. Baldwin and Kenneth C. Proctor respectively, before the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of Maryland Symposium held April 4, 1962 in Baltimore. While they are directed primarily toward the medical profession, and while Mr. Proctor's subject was recently treated by the Review, [See 21 Md. L. Rev. 189 (1961)] they are printed here at the request of the Joint Committee on Medico-legal Problems. The Committee felt it would be desirable for the Maryland Bar to have available to it these comments prepared for the symposium by these two leading members of the Bar, and the REVIEW is happy to comply with the request.
The third article is "A Statistical Study of Occupations of Jurors in a United States District Court" by Dr. Edwin S. Mills, Associate Professor of Economics at Johns Hopkins University. The author does not offer a solution to the problems presented in his statistical study, but he suggests that some consideration could and should be given to improvement. We think you will find his work thought provoking.

The REVIEW announces with regret the retirement of Edwin W. Lowe, Esq., from the post of Editorial Secretary. The student editors have taken over this work and the position of Editorial Secretary has been eliminated. The REVIEW wishes to acknowledge that for many years Mr. Lowe has been considerably responsible for the technical excellence of each issue, and thanks him for his many years of faithful service.

The REVIEW is pleased to announce the Editors for 1962-1963, who have been largely responsible for the Summer Issue. They are: Editor, William H. Price, II; Casenote Editor, Laurence M. Katz; Recent Decisions Editor, Donald E. Sharpe; and Assistant Editors, Mona Salyer Lambird, Wilbur E. Simmons, Jr., and John O. Dyrud.

Notice to all Subscribers

(Including those receiving the Review as Members of the Bar Associations)

We regret that postal regulations have been changed so that the REVIEW must now notify all subscribers that we cannot assure delivery to anyone who does not keep us informed as to changes of address. Copies of the REVIEW returned because of an incorrect or insufficient address used because we were not informed of a change will be readdressed and forwarded to the subscriber only upon receipt of a request accompanied by fifty cents.