

national trade—a major consideration in the crusade for a sound and lasting peace, a goal which is as vital to this and each of the other States as it is to the Federal establishment.

In its true purpose, the bill, if allowed to become law, would have all the attributes of class legislation plus the impropriety of pre-judgment against a company whose practices of business have not yet had the privilege of trial in Maryland.

From either standpoint, such unprecedented and illogical legislation would have a deleterious effect on the highly successful efforts of Maryland, its political subdivisions and its various business and civic associations to bring new business and industry into the State in these years of growth and expansion.

I have noted the text of the report published in 1955 by the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission of the Canadian Department of Justice which was used so extensively in the arguments favoring Senate Bill 38 before both me and the General Assembly. While I do not condone some of the practices attributed therein to Canadian Breweries, Ltd., I have taken cognizance of the fact that many of the circumstances stressed in the report are dated a score of years ago and more; also that they occurred under Canadian laws and not under those of the United States or Maryland.

Beyond that, I am especially cognizant of the fact that Carling, while a subsidiary of the Canadian company, is an American corporation, chartered in Virginia and already operating breweries in the United States and distributing its products on a nationwide basis.

One of the Carling breweries is located in Cleveland, Ohio, and I have before me a copy of a letter from Governor Frank J. Lausche of Ohio, describing the Carling Brewing Company as "a good citizen," and another from Mayor Anthony J. Celebrezze terming the Carling Company "an asset to the City of Cleveland."

Writing of the Carling plant now in the process of construction at Natick, Massachusetts, Governor Christian A. Herter of that Commonwealth wrote of the company as being in "favorable repute and a good corporate citizen."

I am aware of the expressions of fear that Carling located in the Baltimore area, may seriously hurt or even drive local companies out of business, but I am advised, too, that the Carling Company seeks a Baltimore area location not alone to share in the local market, but to service a seven-State area, which, it should be noted again, already is being served by the company from other plants.

I have before me a copy of the Journal of Commerce of February 2, 1956, containing a story which notes that a Cleveland brewer other than Carling has acquired the No. 1 spot in sales in the Cleveland market.

I am confident that the well established brewing company in Maryland and the enterprising businessmen who own and operate them can hold their own against any new competition in the Baltimore market area.

If there is danger of unfair practices, illicit in their nature, from any source, the remedy should lie in the strengthening of existing laws to deal with such practices if and when they made their appearances—not in the barring of an enterprise because of its record of success in competition.

I join with the breweries of Maryland and of the United States in frowning upon the tariff walls which have been erected against