

JOURNAL OF THE ASSEMBLY [June 2, 1972]

FRIDAY, June 2, 1972.

The chief clerk makes the following entries under the above date.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

June 1, 1972.

To the Honorable, the Assembly:

I am returning herewith Assembly Bill 568 without my signature.

This bill would permit the Optometry Examining Board to adopt a rule which would prohibit the operation of an optometry department in a mercantile establishment. The bill does not create a legislative mandate, but leaves it up to the board to decide whether or not to abolish a significant part of optometric care which has prevailed in the larger cities for many decades.

Adoption of such a rule would be an unwarranted restriction on competition which could lead to higher prices in the eye care field. In addition, adoption of such a measure could lessen the availability of eye care to many of our citizens in cities of the first and second class. The elimination of mercantile departments could make it more difficult for persons with low incomes, or on Medicaid, to obtain the services of an optometrist.

Similar proposals have been introduced in the legislature over the past two decades and have failed.

The optometrists seek, as do all reputable groups, to improve themselves both intrinsically and in the eyes of the public. This is a laudible goal. It can best be served by providing the highest standard of service at the least possible cost. There is nothing to show that the practice of optometry in mercantile establishments is inconsistent with that goal.

Optometry is already licensed and regulated. Optometrists practicing in mercantile establishments are subject to the same rules, regulations and disciplines, as those who are self employed. If there are abuses by some optometrists, their examining board has the authority to correct the abuses.

JOURNAL OF THE ASSEMBLY [June 2, 1972]

Legislation in this field should be based on the public health, safety and welfare. This particular bill does not seem necessary within that standard.

For the above reasons, I do not believe it is in the public interest to sign Assembly Bill 568 at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

PATRICK J. LUCEY,
Governor.

June 1, 1972.

To the Honorable, the Assembly:

I am today returning Assembly Bill 591 without my approval.

This bill would require an applicant for public assistance or general relief to execute his or her application in the presence of the welfare worker processing the application. Under the present law an applicant can mail the application to the processing agency or have someone else deliver it there, as well as filling it out in person.

It appears that this bill intended to prevent fraudulent applications due either to duplicative applications or non-residency in the community. However, the requirements stipulated in this bill will not accomplish the objectives sought.

The key to preventing fraudulent applications is the verification of the data presented in the application. An individual who wishes to file two applications in different counties would not be detected by filing in person in each office. The attempted fraud is detected as a result of verifying social security numbers, births of children, and place of residence. These reviews are conducted presently, and would continue even under this bill, not always in the presence of the applicant. Therefore, the presence of the applicant for the initial filing for aid adds nothing to better administrative control. The face-to-face contact occurs when the caseworker visits the applicant in his or her home.

Further, this bill would create problems for certain applicants and the county or municipal general relief offices. Some disabled, old-age, or blind applicants mail in their forms or have relatives pick up the forms, assist in filling

JOURNAL OF THE ASSEMBLY [June 2, 1972]

them out and return them on their behalf. To require all applicants to appear in person will create hardships on such individuals who cannot easily come to the office.

Presently all counties use the simplified method of filing for adult categories and all but eight use it for AFDC. This represents 95% of the caseload or about 40,000 applications a year, the bulk of which come in by mail. Therefore, enactment of this bill would create the need for additional staff, at state and county expense, to sit in the office to handle the large number of people who would be forced to come into the office as a result of this bill.

Respectfully submitted,

PATRICK J. LUCEY,
Governor.

June 2, 1972.

To the Honorable, the Assembly:

The following bills, originating in the assembly, have been approved, signed and deposited in the office of the Secretary of State:

Assembly Bill	Chapter No.	Date Approved
505 -----	324 -----	June 2, 1972
1348 -----	325 -----	June 2, 1972

Respectfully submitted,

PATRICK J. LUCEY,
Governor.

SPEAKER'S APPOINTMENTS

Wisconsin Legislature
Assembly Chamber
Madison

May 31, 1972.

Pursuant to the authority vested in me under Assembly Rule 5 (11), and in compliance with Chapter 271, Wisconsin

JOURNAL OF THE ASSEMBLY [June 2, 1972]

Laws of 1971, I herewith appoint to the Council on Child Labor the following legislators:

**Representative Marjorie Miller (Dem.-Dane 3rd)
Representative James M. Azim (Rep.-Grant).**

**NORMAN C. ANDERSON,
Speaker.**

June 1, 1972.

As of this date, Representative Terry A. Willkom (Dem.-Chippewa) has been appointed to serve on the committee on Highways to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of William A. Johnson.

**NORMAN C. ANDERSON,
Speaker.**