SB 124 continued

legislation in the Call for a special session if the provision regarding district judges is not included.

SB 164 Ogg

DIGEST: This bill would require plumbers working outside municipal limits in populous counties to be licensed. A criminal penalty (Class C misdemeanor) is established for hiring an unlicensed plumber, or committing any other violation of the plumbing license law. Citations for violations could be issued by state plumbing inspectors or, if the violation occurs within city limits, by city plumbing inspectors.

REASONS FOR VETO: This bill would allow a city plumbing inspector to issue a citation to a farmer who has done some plumbing work around his farm.

REACTION: The bill specifically states that a city inspector has jurisdiction only within the city which employs him. Furthermore, this bill does not change the portion of the present law which exempts anyone doing work on his/her own property.

This bill was badly needed in populous counties, where subdivisions are frequently built outside city limits. Counties don't have the authority to require plumbers to be licensed, and as a result, the plumbing in these subdivisions is frequently substandard. Bad plumbing not only adversely affects home buyers, but also people in surrounding areas who may suffer from contamination of water in nearby streams or rivers.

SB 166 Santiesteban

DIGEST: SB 166 amended the Texas Pawnshop Act to prohibit anyone from obtaining a pawnbroker's license who has been convicted or is under indictment for theft, fraud, forgery, or a crime of moral turpitude. This bill also required applicants for a license to have at least $50,000 of assets available for the conduct of the business.

REASON FOR VETO: The Governor vetoed SB 166 because it did little more than protect existing pawnshops while severely restricting anyone else from entering the pawnshop business. It was anti-free enterprise, special interest legislation.

REACTION: The Governor's action was completely unnecessary. It failed to address the problem that there is no regulation of people who are not licensed as pawnbrokers, but nevertheless are engaged in the pawnshop business. If the bill had proven to be anti-free enterprise, any problems could have been worked out next session.