

on this Subcommittee voted in favor of that bill which is designed to afford more equitable representation to the large Negro population of the District. That in turn we presume will tend to alleviate some of the complaints of this segment of the population. H.R. 1283 is inconsistent with that bill to the extent that it will drive up the cost of optical care for this very population and will tend to heighten their economic disadvantage, instead of relieving it.

VETO MEMO 274, MAY 2, 1967

This bill would prohibit a corporation or other retail firm or store from employing a licensed optometrist to provide optometric services to persons other than fellow employees. The bill would also prohibit an optometrist from establishing a practice in association with other licensed medical practitioners. It appears to require a prescription for optical instruments that have no necessary relationship to the correction of any visual defect or deformity, such as binoculars, microscopes and telescopes. It appears to make it illegal for an optometrist to open an office in any commercial office building or shopping center, since under the provisions of the bill such a building is a "place" where occupations unrelated to the practice of optometry are carried on. "It attempts to permit those now employed by a corporation or other firm to continue this employment, but in another subdivision of the bill, it makes it a misdemeanor to provide such employment."

Moreover, the Insurance Department urging disapproval of this bill, has written to me as follows:

"* * * the Department is concerned with the bill since it could prevent union welfare funds and health centers regulated by III-a of the Insurance Law from employing the services of optometrists, and hinder the right to choose optometric vendors, thereby increasing the cost of optometric services, with no foreseeable benefits to members. In addition, insurers who cover the cost of optometric materials would be faced with increased costs which would have to be ultimately reflected in the rates with no increase in the quality of services for the foreseeable future.

* * * * *

"The Department favors the highest quality optometric care, but this legislation will not accomplish such result. The bill is penal in nature and violation of its vague provisions is a misdemeanor. Because of its defects and ineffectiveness, we urge that it be vetoed."

Also recommending disapproval of this bill are the Department of Commerce, the New York State AFL-CIO, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and the National Association of Optometrists and Opticians, among numerous others.

The bill is disapproved.

By NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

Mr. WEINMANN. First, may I express my appreciation for the fact that you have rearranged this schedule for our convenience.

My name is Richard A. Weinmann. I am a partner in the law firm of Sipser, Weinstock & Weinmann, 50 Broad Street, New York City, counsel for the past 25 years to the United Optical Workers Union Local 408, International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, located at 150 Fifth Avenue, New York City. We are also counsel to many pension and welfare funds. I am here today to testify in opposition to H.R. 1283 on behalf of the Optical Council of the International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, the National Optical Workers Conference, and the United Optical Workers Union Local 408, Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, Flat Glass Workers International Union, United Automobile Workers Union, Building Service Employees International Union, Laborers International Union, all affiliated with the AFL-CIO.

With me, among others is Henry McKinnell, who is sitting on your right, and whose name is incorrectly spelled in our formal statement. It should be M-c K-i-n-n-e-l-l.