

receptionist pertinent background information and assumed, because she was employed, that her information would be correct.

(2) I was repeatedly addressed as "Connie," a familiar term reserved only for my friends, rather than my correct business and legal name, "Mrs. Borkenhagen."

(3) For undisclosed reasons I was not accepted as a patient at Vent Air despite my patience with the rudeness encountered and despite my attempts to be cooperative.

(4) I found the strong preoccupation with immediate payment distasteful despite faultless credit references. I wondered at the time if that was not the major objective of the business, rather than adequate fitting of lenses.

(5) The telephone receptionist stated that I could not have received incorrect information because my husband made the appointment. I can understand her unwillingness to accept responsibility for a mistake, but that she must. I personally made the appointment; I am fully responsible for all my activities; and my husband's attendance at school precludes his making any appointments.

I am grossly insulted. I have never been treated discourteously to such a degree for most individuals respond to courtesy when it is extended.

Your firm shall be slandered at every opportunity.

Mrs. ROBERT BORKENHAGEN.

[From the Herald-Journal, Apr. 10, 1967]

(An editorial, permission of the New York Post, Copyright 1967, New York Post Corporation)

"A MATTER OF VISION"

"In the blind rush to pass legislation on a wholesale basis, the New York State Assembly and Senate slipped through a bill on optical services that would hit more than half a million New Yorkers right between the eyes.

This bill would inhibit "third party" practice in furnishing eyeglasses to those who presently can get this service on a high-quality low-cost basis. The bill is pure special interest legislation, an exact replica of the onetime efforts of the AMA to block "third party" medicine in America. It would not improve the quality of optical service, since at the present time all such care is handled in "third party" practice by licensed optometrists. It would merely favor the private practitioner who can monopolize the practice at exorbitant rates and without quality supervision.

What is most scandalous is that this important measure was allowed to slide through without hearing, without debate, without any chance to be exposed to public view or review. In all good conscience, Gov. Rockefeller must veto this bill not only for its danger to the consumer but also because of the sly, secret way it was whisked past the eyes of the public."

We urge you to protect your own interests. Please write to Gov. Rockefeller and urge him not to approve the legislation which would amend the law in the practice of Optometry

DEXTER OPTICAL.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 24, 1964]

EYE CLINIC FOR D.C. POOR OPENED BY OPTOMETRISTS

The previously unpublicized operation of an eye clinic for the poor here was announced yesterday by District and nearby Maryland and Virginia optometrists.

Called the Optometric Center of the National Capital, Inc., the clinic at 421 4th st. nw., began accepting patients on Aug. 1, after months of planning, fund raising and gathering of equipment.

Jack H. Mericle, president of the nonprofit center, said the clinic offers eye examinations, needed prescription eyeglasses or contact lenses and other alleviation of vision problems and conducts basic research in non-medical eye problems.

The center is the eighth such facility in the Nation. Other are in New York City, Denver, Atlanta, Lansing, Newark, Richmond and Harrisburg.

Staffing the local center are 101 volunteer optometrists in private practice in the Greater Washington area. Another 25 military optometry officers also are serving.