

industrial hygienist are quite different than those required for the typical practice of environmental sanitarians. Similar arguments have been advanced by safety professionals and professional engineers. While the Board argues that in some cases the professions overlap, in other cases the Board concedes they are distinct.

I have concluded that Senate Bill 500 is defective because the statutory definition of an environmental sanitarian encompasses the activities of many professionals whose work would not be considered that of an environmental sanitarian but for the broad definition in the bill. It does not appear from the legislative history of the bill that consideration was given to the effect that removing the current exemption for certain professions would have on businesses in the State and the professionals they employ, or whether licensing all of these previously exempt individuals is in the public interest. Many businesses in Maryland employ and rely on industrial hygienists or safety professionals, and requiring these businesses to employ only licensed environmental sanitarians could hamper the efforts of these businesses to maintain a safe workplace.

In addition, assuming, as this legislation does, that diverse groups such as the industrial hygienists and environmental sanitarians should be licensed under the same Board, Senate Bill 500 does not make any provision for recognizing the experience of many of these previously exempt individuals. Some of these previously exempt individuals already have been certified by the American Academy of Industrial Hygiene, a regimen that, according to the Academy, requires five years of practice experience, a bachelor's degree in an appropriate discipline, and passage of a two-day examination.

I recognize that one purpose of the bill is to extend the Board's existence under the program evaluation law for another 10 years. However, the State Board of Environmental Sanitarians does not terminate until July 1, 1993, and therefore the Board may continue under the current statutory scheme pending resolution of these issues during the 1993 Legislative Session. I strongly urge all affected groups to work with the Board to reach an appropriate solution concerning the scope of licensing under the environmental sanitarian law.

For the above stated reasons, I have vetoed Senate Bill 500.

Sincerely,
William Donald Schaefer
Governor

Senate Bill No. 500

AN ACT concerning

State Board of Environmental Sanitarians

FOR the purpose of altering certain responsibilities of the State Board of Environmental Sanitarians; phasing out certain provisions of law that exempt certain individuals from a certain examination requirement as a condition of licensure; revising provisions of law to clarify that an individual must be licensed in order to practice as a registered environmental sanitarian; providing certain exceptions; requiring the