

District of Columbia within one year after such license has been granted, the Commissioners may revoke such license at any time before such individual actually begins practice in the District of Columbia.

Here is a young man off in Vietnam serving his country and the Commissioner just sits down here and as a matter of policy adopts a fixed policy to revoke all licenses after one year under this provision.

Dr. CHAPMAN. It doesn't say "He shall" but it says "He may". I think the Commissioners——

Mr. WHITENER. You are giving somebody a discretionary right to take away from this individual a very valuable thing without his even having any recourse to the courts.

Mr. SISK. Of course here we are talking about a human need and something having to do with perhaps the most precious thing we have, our eyesight.

I think we can all recognize that an individual may have been out of practice. I don't think my colleague would want to send his children to someone who may have been out of practice for five years, unless he was fairly sure that that individual had not lost——

Mr. WHITENER. It says nothing about five years.

Mr. SISK. The point I make is that we are trying to be sure that the individual who presents himself to the public as capable of taking care of eyes can do it.

Mr. WHITENER. This young man I am talking about may be over in Vietnam as a military officer practicing optometry every day on servicemen, or he may be in California or North Carolina practicing every day.

Here you are giving the Commissioners the authority to just adopt a policy, if they want to, without anybody having any rights to object to the revocation of such licenses.

Mr. HORTON. A doctor of medicine does not have his license revoked if he does not practice here for a year, does he?

Mr. WHITENER. I don't believe so. A lawyer does not.

Mr. HORTON. I think the gentleman from North Carolina has a very good point.

Mr. WHITENER. On page 7, lines 3 through 5, you give to the Commissioners a right to take away a person's license in violation of any of the regulations promulgated by the Commissioners under this Act.

What do you have in mind there? Can the Commissioners say he shouldn't wear a moustache?

Maybe he is inclined toward having some of these long hairdo's that some folks wear.

Dr. CHAPMAN. I don't know how it is conceivable—and perhaps if there is a way we can attempt to do it—but how in every instance in each of these you can spell out a moustache or long hair or long fingernails; I don't know.

Mr. WHITENER. Going down to lines 13 and 14 you state "Conduct which disqualifies the licensee from practicing optometry with safety to the public."

Maybe that is where the long hair would come in. Perhaps he has some other whim.

It seems to me if you are going to take a man's license away you should spell out exact grounds in the statute. We had this discussion a year ago.