

That is why I want something so we will have a pretty good analysis of what we are talking about here.

I don't know how closely these witnesses are tied in with the differences but I thought Dr. Chapman could relate to us what some of these changes are and the position of his group with regard to them.

Dr. CHAPMAN. I will be glad to try that. There have been several bills and I will do my best to quickly give you the salient points of the major differences in this newest one, but particularly as changed from the last one which you discussed here last year.

On page 2, line 20, item (d), of H.R. 1283 the determination of the scope of the functions of the human eye in general, has been deleted. The current bill will not have—

Mr. HORTON. What line?

Dr. CHAPMAN. Line 20.

Mr. HORTON. Item (d) has been deleted from H.R. 12276?

Dr. CHAPMAN. Yes.

Mr. HORTON. Determination of the scope of the function of the human eye in general?

Dr. CHAPMAN. Yes, sir. There was some renumbering but that was incidental.

Mr. HORTON. Was this the recommendation of your organization?

Dr. CHAPMAN. We are so very anxious in my Association to somehow bring the antiquity of optometry out of the dust from 1924 up to the modern day period that we have been perfectly willing to sit with and try as best we can to work out the objections to the original bill. Where we could we were willing to accept the feelings of other groups interested in this piece of legislation and we tried to cooperate as completely as we could.

Mr. HORTON. This has to do with the definition of the profession of optometry in the District of Columbia. Do you have in your statement, which we have not had an opportunity to read, do you have anything in your statement which would cover the deletion of that part of H.R. 1283?

Dr. CHAPMAN. No, sir, I don't believe there is reference made to deletions from the bill in my statement.

Mr. HORTON. I meant with regard to the change of the definition of the practice of optometry.

Dr. CHAPMAN. No, sir.

Mr. HORTON. Do you have any comments to make with regard to the deletions and the effect of them?

Dr. CHAPMAN. I think the effect would simply be that item (d) was not clear. It left a considerable amount of conjecture on the part of someone reading the words in it, and it was not definite enough to the point that people would be absolutely certain of just exactly what it included.

Have you any further comment, Dr. Hofstetter?

Dr. HOFSTETTER. Not at this time.

Dr. CHAPMAN. The statement itself was not meaningful. It had various meanings to those who read it and it was eliminated. It is as simple as that.

Shall I move to another?

Mr. HORTON. Yes. Under this practice of optometry in the new bill are there any additions?