

1924 District of Columbia Optometry Law. A significant number of jurisdictions have enumerated this idea as a principle of either judge-made or statutory law.

We have been informed, Mr. Chairman, that it will take an Act of Congress to overcome the judgment of the court in *Silver v. Lansburgh*; that is why we are here before you again today.

The Commissioners last year testified for deletion of those provisions relating to advertising and hiring of an optometrist by anyone other than another optometrist. We do not believe the Commissioners would have made the same recommendation if the bills under consideration were to regulate either the practice of medicine or dentistry. We do not understand their objection when the issue is to regulate the practice of optometry.

Because of the highly personal nature of services rendered and the unique individual needs of each patient, adequate vision care is a highly complex service which does not lend itself to production line methods frequently used in mercantile establishments. The hallmark of this type of operation is big-splash advertising claiming "low prices," "easy credit," "fast and accurate service."

Dozens of articles have appeared in our nation's leading magazines which sound a warning to the public of the dangers of unscrupulous operators in the field of vision care.

The problems involved with unethical practices in this area are (1) "bait" advertising, (2) the lack of adequate time for thorough examination and service, (3) the lack of quality materials and (4) consideration of profit motive above consideration of the patient's best interest.

The basic decision before your Committee is whether optometry in the District of Columbia in this year of 1967 is an independent coordinate health profession to be regulated in the same fashion as the other health professions such as medicine, osteopathy, dentistry and podiatry or whether it is simply a mechanical art as described in the 1924 Act.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that the judgment of this Subcommittee will be for optometry as a profession. We have faith that the Committee will act favorably on the bill before it and make only minor amendments to clarify its intent—to improve the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia for the benefit of those who reside here and those who visit our Nation's Capital City.

Both Dr. Hofstetter and I will be pleased to attempt to answer any questions. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on behalf of the American Optometric Association.

Mr. SISK. That completes your oral statement, Dr. Chapman?

Dr. CHAPMAN. It does, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SISK. Thank you for a very excellent statement, Dr. Chapman.

I note your prepared statement here is a good deal more elaborate than what you presented orally.

Mr. HORTON. Is Dr. Hofstetter going to testify, too, or do you appear together?

Dr. HOFSTETTER. I have no statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACOBS. Dr. Chapman, with reference to the legislation which has been introduced, which I must confess I have not perused as completely as I perhaps should have, it has been suggested to me that