

designed to eliminate corporate employers of optometrists as examiners. This is the heart of the matter. Leave that provision in and all the other provisions objected to by ophthalmologists, osteopaths, opticians and others would gladly be deleted or amended by AOA. I think Dr. Chapman indicated that in his testimony yesterday. A lot of things amended were satisfactory to him.

On the other hand, make illegal the right of optometrists to sell eyeglasses and H.R. 1283 will be quickly abandoned by AOA. We call upon the subcommittee not to lend itself to this scheme to enrich optometrists who sell eyeglasses at the expense of the rest of the population of the District of Columbia by elevating this inherently quasi-professional group to artificial professional status while it continues to sell eyeglasses in the marketplace which it claims to abhor. We urge the restriction of H.R. 1283 as a myopic bill for the low-income consumer, government employees and the public in general, so long as it contains its main provision of outlawing the employment of licensed optometrists by corporations and firms. We support efforts to modernize the optometry law in the District of Columbia. However, this bill and all of its sister bills create far greater problems than they solve and I thank you for your attention.

Mr. SISK. Thank you, sir, for your statement.

The gentleman from North Carolina?

The gentleman from New York?

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Weinmann, I note that you do have enclosed a copy of the memorandum veto of Governor Rockefeller of the bill that was apparently passed by the Senate and Assembly in the State of New York. Do you have a copy of that bill?

Mr. WEINMANN. I will be happy to make it available to the subcommittee for study.

Mr. HORTON. I would like to determine if the language in that bill is similar to the provisions in H.R. 12276. I note in the Governor's Message he made some reference to the provision of that bill which would make it illegal to open an office in a commercial office building or shopping center. If there is similar language in this—the gentleman from North Carolina yesterday was asking about that, on page 9, lines 4 and 5, which are prohibitions. Also line 7. The authority of the commission is to refuse and suspend a license where the practice of optometry is in any retail or commercial store.

Mr. WEINMANN. Congressman Horton, you are absolutely correct and S. 3335-a did contain precisely the same language or similar language in connection with a prohibition in retail stores.

I might add that the guts of both bills is still the prohibition of employment of optometrists by corporations and firms. This is the guts of both bills and I think that is readily perceptible and I would be very happy to make a copy of S. 3335-A available to this subcommittee.

Mr. HORTON. We do have a copy of that, Mr. Chairman, and I wonder if we could make this copy part of the record.

Mr. SISK. I would like to have a copy of it for the record.

Mr. HORTON. We do have one here.

Mr. SISK. Without objection, a copy of the New York Bill, S. 3335-A, and veto memorandum thereon, will be made a part of the record.

(The documents referred to follow:)