

to prevent the shipment of such frozen meats from other States into Maryland. When questions of health and sanitation are not involved, then no State can discriminate against the food products of other States and exclude them from its markets. Neither the present bill nor any other bill could have that effect. This has been decided by the courts many times.

Therefore, the only effect Senate Bill 183 could have would be to prohibit local packers and local dealers from using the new process, should they want to use it for the benefit of local consumers who might desire it. If in the future frozen meats of this kind should be shipped into Maryland (and as just stated no law could prevent that), then it is entirely probable that the Maryland packers and dealers would want to utilize the same process in order to compete with the shipments from other States. This bill, if approved, would purport to deny them that right.

It is unfortunate that those who favor this bill are under a misunderstanding as to what its effect would be. The situation, however, is as indicated above.

It may be added that the process, if and when perfected, may be of great value to other lines of industry in this State, such, for instance, as Maryland oysters, crabs and fish. It may preserve Maryland seafood in a way which would enable its shipment to distant points with complete safety.

## DENTISTRY.

(Chapter 452, Senate Bill No. 102.)

This bill provides that, with certain exceptions, no person shall practice dentistry except under his proper name, which shall be the name used in his license, and that no person shall use the name of any company, association or corporation or any trade or business name in connection with the practice of dentistry.

I have been asked to veto the bill by the owners or operators of two dental parlors on the ground that, as it does not contain any saving clause in favor of existing dental parlors or associations, it deprives them of their property and is unconstitutional.

The State Board of Dental Examiners introduced a comprehensive bill on the subject of dentistry, some of the provisions of which adequately regulated the practices of dental corporations and associations, but that bill (House 505) was defeated.