

Minutes of Meeting - HEALTH AND WELFARE COMMITTEE - 56th  
ASSEMBLY SESSION - February 8, 1971

Present: Wilson, Homer, Swallow, White, Glaser, Smalley,  
Prince, Valentine, and Poggione

Absent: None

Guests: Ken Shaddy, President of the Nevada Barber Board;  
Louis McLane, Barber's Local 600; Dan Gray, Nevada  
State Barber's Association; Howard Sonderson, Nevada  
State Barber's Association; Dorothy Feeney, Board  
of Cosmetology; Bernice Randall, Secretary of  
Nevada State Board of Cosmetology; Mr. Wahrenbrock,  
Department of Health, Welfare, and Rehabilitation;  
Howard DeMille, Licensed Cosmetician.

Meeting was convened by Chairman Wilson at 2:03 P.M.

A.B. 101 was discussed which: Amplifies definition of  
"practice of barbering."

Dan Gray, Nevada State Barber's Association was introduced in behalf of this bill. He said that there are many people that go around and advertise that they do hair weaving. In most instances, to have this done right, a person must have some of their own hair cut. When this is necessary, he felt that it should come under the jurisdiction of a licensed barber. He then showed pictures from a magazine explaining the procedure for hair weaving. When any part of the human hair is worked with, he felt, it must be by a licensed barber. He also brought up the fact that it says in the Cosmetology law that licensed cosmeticians can do women and children's hair only. The barber law just has the word "person". Under the cosmetology act, they have what is called a demonstrators license. This is for the sale of wigs only. Mr. Gray said these people have not had any previous study as to sterilization or diseases of the scalp. He said this is true of people that now do hair weaving. They could have had any other job, such as car salesman, before. For the concern of the people, he felt that any work with the human scalp itself, should come under the jurisdiction of licensed barbers.

Mr. Ken Shaddy, President of the Barber's Board then spoke. He said there were people interested in learning hair weaving for sale only. He felt that these people were interested in the "dollar only." These type of people, he felt, are not interested in the care of the people at all.

Howard DeMille, Licensed Cosmetologist spoke against the bill. He said he was a licensed hairdresser and a salon owner. He felt that this was unfair in the fact that he was experienced but would not be allowed to do this type of thing.

## Assembly

Page 2 - HEALTH AND WELFARE COMMITTEE  
February 8, 1971

Mr. Gray explained that the barber's were not against cosmetologists who do this and this bill had been approved by the Board of Cosmetology. He said the reason he could not do this was that it was against the cosmetology law which states: where the human scalp is concerned, services may be performed on women or children only.

Mr. Prince wanted to know if they would service the hair-piece once it had been sold. He said often times appliance dealers won't service an appliance that was not sold by him.

Mr. Gray said no - the barber's want more work, not chase it off.

Mr. Wilson then excused the guests.

Mr. Prince made a motion to move the bill out of the Committee on the floor with a do pass. Mr. Swallow seconded; motion carried unanimously.

A.C.R. 15 was discussed which: Directs health division of Department of Health, Welfare, and Rehabilitation not to move laboratory from Clark County.

Mr. Prince stated that he could not support the resolution. Mr. Poggione said that in looking the report over and in listening to the people that speak, that he too could not go along with it. He said he had asked five people about the budget and not a one could answer him. He had also heard testimony that in keeping it there, that the quality wasn't even up to par with their own standards and if they couldn't meet standards it shouldn't be there.

Mrs. White said that the laboratory was responsible for reports and her personal opinion was that they should ask for a study of what has been done and what they plan to do. She felt that if private laboratories were allowed to do the studies that things might not be done right on non-routine tests. A person has to have experience in this type of thing. She also brought up the fact that many of the tests that are done have to be done right away. If a T.B. sputum test had to be sent up here it could be spoiled in transit, as would certain venereal disease specimens and food specimens.

Mr. Swallow wanted to know who she recommended for these studies.

Mrs. White suggested Dr. Ravenholdt, Dr. Browning, and Dr. Carr, so that they could furnish information necessary. She also suggested toxicology reports in the future.

Mr. Wilson suggested holding this bill until they could get the information from the doctors. He said when they get the information, they could then make a definite decision. All voted to hold the bill until the information

Assembly

Page 3 - Health & Welfare Committee  
February 8, 1971

21

could be obtained.

A.B. 7 was discussed which: Removes requirement that administrator of alcoholism division be an arrested alcoholic.

Mr. Wilson reminded the committee that he had requested Mr. Getto, introducer of the new bill, to get an amendment so they could decide what to do with A.B. 7. Mr. Getto had then introduced A.B. 156 which: Redefines qualifications of administrator of alcoholism division and functions of the division.

Mr. Glaser made a motion to postpone indefinitely A.B. 7 because A.B. 156 redefines it; Mr. Valentine seconded; motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wilson brought up BDR-1304<sup>\*</sup> which: Commemorates National Negro History Week. He said it would be from February 7 - 14. He wanted to know if any of the members wanted to introduce it. Mr. Poggione made a motion to have the whole Health and Welfare Committee introduce it. Mr. Glaser seconded; motion carried unanimously.

Discussion followed with Mr. Wahrenbrock concerning the public welfare hearing for Thursday, February 11.

The meeting was adjourned.

\*A.C.R. 18

