

ferences with vision, then we will be creating a situation where the great mass of people who go to the optometrist will have to go to two people in order to get the complete visual care. By removing these sections that are in question, it would be necessary then that each patient who now goes to the optometrist and trusts him to make the necessary detection for pathology, would have to be cleared through a physician as well. This, I think, would be economically costly.

Mr. HARSHA. Have you any more amendments or changes to offer?

Dr. CHAPMAN. No, sir, I believe that is the final one.

Mr. HARSHA. You said you urged the subcommittee to approve this bill or one similar to it with certain minor amendments, as I remember your testimony. What additional amendments have you to offer?

Dr. CHAPMAN. I have none, Mr. Harsha. I used that terminology only because I doubted very seriously that the bill as presently drafted would have all of the questions answered properly, and there might still have to be some clarifying amendments to it, but only in that sense. As far as I know, there are no major changes anticipated at all in H.R. 12276.

Mr. HARSHA. I have one other question as to page 2, subparagraph (2) under section 3, "practice of optometry" means any one, any combination, or all of the following acts or practices as they are included in the curriculum of recognized schools and colleges of optometry".

Does this mean that a school of optometry can change the law, so to speak, by changing its curriculum?

In your definition, it is left to the curriculum of the school to determine what optometry is. Every time the curriculum changes, so changes the definition of optometry, does it not?

Dr. CHAPMAN. I will ask Dr. Hofstetter to answer that because it is a matter of education.

Dr. HOFSTETTER. I do not know the legal interpretation of the phrase, but when I read it I thought that meant provided that these are taught in the curriculum. It had not occurred to me that it might be the other way.

I really cannot answer that. I can only say that had not occurred to me. I am sure that is not the intent.

Mr. HARSHA. Then you would not object to an amendment to clarify that to make sure?

Dr. HOFSTETTER. I would like to see it clarified.

Mr. HARSHA. That is all I have.

Mr. SISK. The gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Gude.

Mr. GUDE. On the first page of your testimony you say, "It elevates the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia to the level of a profession as recognized in the other States and territories of our Union."

Do you mean there all the States recognize optometry as a profession?

Dr. CHAPMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GUDE. The District of Columbia is the only jurisdiction which does not?

Dr. CHAPMAN. As far as I know, it is the only jurisdiction that does not so identify it.