(3) Apply to any transaction under the Custom Home Protection Act, Title 10, Subtitle 5 of this article; AND

(4) Apply to a home improvement contract by a contractor licensed under Article 56 of the Code[; and

(5) Apply to any contract awarded by:

(i) The State;

(ii) A county;

(iii) A municipal corporation;

(iv) A board of education; or

(v) A public authority or instrumentality].

SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act does not apply to any contract entered into prior to July 1, 1989.

SECTION 3. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effect July 1, 1990.

May 25, 1990

The Honorable R. Clayton Mitchell, Jr.
Speaker of the House of Delegates
State House
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In accordance with Article II, Section 17 of the Maryland Constitution, I have today vetoed House Bill 731.

In its final form, House Bill 731 would prohibit, in Baltimore County, the imposition of a tax or mandatory deposit on beverage containers. By its express terms, the bill would not invalidate such a tax or mandatory deposit for any period before July 1, 1991.

I am very much aware that solutions to the waste problem should be addressed by all entities that contribute to the waste stream, and that supporters of House Bill 731 argue that the beverage container tax in Baltimore County and Baltimore City singles out one industry. I am also sympathetic to problems that could face beverage distributors who conceivably might have to confront 24 different taxes or tax rates. The argument is also made that the tax is excessive and regressive, and that Maryland's business image is hurt because the only three jurisdictions in the nation with a beverage container tax are located in Maryland. I share many of these concerns about the workability of container taxes.