

(i) a unit obtains the services of a contractor to represent the State;
and

(ii) the nature of the services to be performed requires confidentiality.

(3) This subsection does not apply if the unit reasonably can anticipate a continuing need for a contractor described in paragraph (1)(ii) or (iii) of this subsection.

(C) (1) BEFORE A UNIT AWARDS A CONTRACT UNDER SUBSECTION (A) OF THIS SECTION IN AN AMOUNT IN EXCESS OF \$25,000, THE UNIT SHALL PUBLISH NOTICE OF THE PROPOSED CONTRACT IN THE MARYLAND REGISTER CONTRACT WEEKLY AT LEAST 20 DAYS BEFORE THE CONTRACT IS AWARDED.

(2) AT THE WRITTEN REQUEST OF ANY PERSON, THE UNIT SHALL PROVIDE, WITHIN 7 DAYS OF RECEIVING THE REQUEST, JUSTIFICATION FOR ITS DETERMINATION TO AWARD THE CONTRACT UNDER THIS SECTION.

[(c)](D) Not more than 30 days after the execution and approval of a procurement contract awarded under this section, a unit shall publish in the Maryland Register CONTRACT WEEKLY, notice of the award.

SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effect October 1, 1994.

May 26, 1994

The Honorable Casper R. Taylor, 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 909.

House Bill 909 would limit to 10,000 square feet the total area of a licensed premises that could be used for the off-sale of alcoholic beverages in Prince George's County. In effect, the bill would prohibit discount warehouse liquor stores from operating in the County.

House Bill 909 is ultimately an anti-business, anti-competition, and, above all, anti-consumer initiative that would cast the State in an unfavorable light for those businesses interested in establishing or expanding their operations here. The State should not restrict a retail operation on the basis of its size and the volume of its stock, as such an action would have a chilling effect on marketplace competition. The spirit of this competition is rooted in the concept that the consumer makes a free choice based upon the optimum available price. The State, by prohibiting a large discount store from obliging this consumer demand, in fact would be stifling competition in violation of this spirit.

House Bill 909 could have an adverse impact on other large discount operations that