

prohibition would be made so that an optometrist could not practice his profession in a retail department store. Is that correct?

Dr. CHAPMAN. That is correct, Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. JACOBS. Would you elucidate as to the reason for that provision?

Dr. CHAPMAN. Yes, sir, I can.

The care of the human vision process is one of the most complex activities that a professional person can involve himself in. The proper caring of human vision and the total examination of a pair of eyes in all aspects is time-consuming, requires far more than just the brief refraction span which sometimes and most of the time is used in the practices which you describe which we are trying to eliminate from this District.

There is far more to this business of seeing than just the wearing of a pair of glasses. The optometrist of today in this modern age of practice will take 45 minutes to an hour to examine a patient adequately and do far more than just a refraction. He will include within his procedures all of the many techniques which delve into the psychological element of seeing, which delve into the efficiency of seeing, the effectiveness of it, and the comfort of it.

It may demand far more than glasses. It undoubtedly would in many instances require the use of vision training in orthoptics. It may require the use of subnormal vision aids, the determination of perceptual abilities of this patient to see.

I could go on and on, Mr. Congressman, with a description of the differences between the two types of practices I am describing, and particularly there is no way in the world that anyone, no matter how capable or competent, can take a patient and in five minutes make any determination whatsoever accurately of his vision status.

This is the type of practice that is so common and which are exhibited in the District of Columbia which commercially exploit optometry and that this bill is designed in part to eliminate.

Mr. JACOBS. From your response I would gather and infer that it is the procedure and not the geography which is objectionable, and therefore I would propound my next question—as to whether the procedure of the practice by a licensed optometrist should not be the subject of the regulation rather than the place where this occurs.

Let me go further by saying this: In my own profession of law there are some of us who practice with firms and some of us who practice, as I did, as a sort of country lawyer in general practice, and there are others who work for large corporations, so-called house lawyers.

I am wondering—and I know the analogy is not apt so far as house lawyers are concerned because they serve the corporation rather than the public in most cases—but my question in essence is this: Is the location of a reputable licensed optometrist what we are really getting at or the procedures followed in any given place?

Dr. CHAPMAN. Particularly, Mr. Jacobs, we are keenly interested in this matter of geography. I could make other comments about your question but I think that the subject is going to be answered in other testimony which will be given by Dr. Berlin of the District of Columbia Society, and it might be more answerable at that time when you hear it given in testimony, so if it is all right with you I would prefer we wait until then.