

March 2, 1978

LR 172
LB 569

CLERK: Senator Savage voting aye.

SENATOR SAVAGE: Have you all voted? Have you all voted? Record.

CLERK: 28 ayes, 0 nays on the motion to adopt the resolution, Mr. President.

SENATOR SAVAGE: The resolution is passed. The next bill will be LB 569 by the Government Committee for the Board of Cosmetologists. Senator Stoney, do you want to carry this one?

SENATOR STONEY: Yes, Mr. President.

SENATOR SAVAGE: We will read the bill first.

CLERK: Mr. President, LB 569 was a bill introduced by the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee and signed by the members thereof. Title read. The bill was read for the first time on January 4, 1978. It was referred to Government Committee. The bill was advanced to General File. There are committee amendments pending by Senator Rasmussen's Government Committee, Mr. President.

SENATOR SAVAGE: The Chair recognizes Senator Stoney.

SENATOR STONEY: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, again this is one of the agencies that was affected through the sunset provisions. If you will refer to your bill book and refer to the white copy which are the amendments and do become the bill, I will go over the provisions and the changes that are required. Section 3 deals with performance and review audit. It recommends that a statement of purpose for such licensure as it relates to the health and welfare of the citizens. Section 4, subsection 5 provides the department clear authority to accredit schools of cosmetology but only under the provisions of section 10 which follows. This section 10 establishes an accreditation team made up of the Board of Cosmetology Examiners and a representative of the Department of Education. This amendment should better insure utilization of the expertise of the Board coupled with expertise of the Department of Education. The next change is in section 4, subsection 10, it more clearly defines a place of cosmetology practice. Section 4, subsection 15 reestablishes manicuring as a part of cosmetology. It does not control manicuring unless this function is performed for a fee and in a cosmetology establishment. Therefore, persons who perform such services for themselves or others who perform such services without a fee and outside the field of cosmetology are exempted. Next change, section 5, currently in the law but not in this form of amended language, separation is clarified by language. Section 7, this corrects a problem which occurred recently. Schools became operational before all criteria had been met on the basis of need to certify original freshmen students. This was a Department of Health recommendation and not a result of the performance audit. Section 8, subsection 1 deals with the performance audit suggested departmental authority and board relationship should be clearly defined. The board is directly responsible to and under the supervision of the department. Next, in section 8, subsection 2, the performance audit suggests

07102