This could end the claim once and for all that examinations by licensed employed optometrists are inadequate in any way.

With the above in mind, we can proceed to analyze H.R. 1283 to see if it accords with the public interest. The guts of the bill are found on page 9, lines 7 through 12 (Section 7(a) subdivisions 17 and 18); on page 10, lines 14 through 18 (Section 8(a) (2)); and page 12, lines 12 through 16 (Section 8(a) (8)). These provisions would prohibit the practice of optometry anywhere except in a salon or office, would prohibit an optometrist from acting as such as an employee, and would prohibit the practice of optometry by a company, association or corporation or by anyone else, even by an ophthalmologist, except, interestingly enough, by another individual optometrist.

What would be the result of the passage of this bill? It would result in the elimination of low-cost optical care to many thousands of people of modest income in the District of Columbia, precisely those who need it most, because salon optometrists charge fancy prices. It would also greatly reduce the number of trained individuals in the optical field who could provide eye care.

Further, it would result in layoffs and the creation of a block of unemployed optometrists, opticians and other employees of corporations and other employers and would force trained employed licensed optometrists to leave the field and to give up valuable rights as employees.

Moreover, it would drive the cost of eyeglasses and eye care up to new heights without any corresponding benefit to the public.

It should be noted that it has never been demonstrated anywhere that the public has suffered as a result of eye care administered by employed optometrists, despite Dr. Chapman's malarkey to the contrary. This question, in fact, was litigated in the State of New York and the Court of Appeals there found:

"* * * although the corporate employment of optometrists has existed for over half a century in this state, no instance has been cited where such employment caused injury to the public." (People v. Sterling Optical Co. Inc., 11 NY 2d 970).

Our union is particularly concerned because the passage of the instant bill in the District of Columbia is intended as a forerunner for all fifty states. It corresponds with simultaneous efforts in other states to enact similar legislation. This would be one of the first and not one of the last, as has been implied. Such legislation, for example, was passed in the final moments of the New York State Legislature this year. That was Senate Bill 3335–A by Senator Gordon, and was vetoed by Governor Rockefeller. A similar bill was vetoed previously by the then Governor Harriman. So it doesn't matter whether we have a Republican or Democratic Governor, on final consideration the bill was vetoed in both cases.

We note the provisions of Section 8, H.R. 1283, would continue to apply to dispensing opticians so they could not, pursuant to page 12, 8(a) (9), exceed the stringent regulations regarding advertising of eyeglasses and could not, as set forth on page 11, lines 17 to 24, Section 8 (a) (5), advertise the price to the public.

In this case he seeks to undermine the opticians and discloses the dichotomy of his position. That is, to at the same time establish himself as a member of a so-called learned profession and as a businessman cornering the market. There is no more reason to preclude an optician