

certain related institutions [[need not carry malpractice insurance]] are required to obtain malpractice insurance as a prerequisite to obtaining or retaining a license to operate ; providing that schools of beauty culture may operate at certain times; providing for part-time students; and specifying a certain student-faculty ratio for those schools.

May 15, 1975.

Honorable John Hanson Briscoe
Speaker of the House of Delegates
State House
Annapolis, Maryland

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In accordance with Article II, Section 17 of the Maryland Constitution, I have today vetoed House Bill 679.

This bill requires beauty shops and related institutions to obtain malpractice insurance as a prerequisite to obtaining or retaining a license to operate. It further specifies the courses which certain schools of beauty culture may provide, and specifies the times during which certain schools may operate.

As originally drafted, House Bill 679 provided that the obtaining of malpractice insurance was not a condition precedent to licensure of a beauty shop, school of beauty culture, or postgraduate school of beauty culture. During the legislative process, the bill was sent to conference committee; the committee report reversed the original intent of the bill so that proof of malpractice insurance was required in order to obtain a license to operate any shop or school mentioned above.

The State Board of Cosmetologists has advised me that such a requirement would seriously impede the effective regulation of the practice of cosmetology. In addition, both of the sponsors of House Bill 679 have requested that I veto this bill because it was not their intent to require malpractice insurance as a condition precedent to licensure.

For these reasons, I have decided to veto House Bill 679.

Sincerely,
/s/ Marvin Mandel
Governor
