

quite far from the eyeball. Therefore, the court said, contact lenses should only be fitted by those trained and licensed to do it properly.

Mrs. Crawford was working with the police and the Board of Optometry when she made her first approach to Mr. Field's store. As a result of his conviction and yesterday's Appeals Court ruling, police will have a clear-cut basis to arrest opticians who agree to fit contact lenses.

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 1, 1965]

TIGHTER OPTOMETRY LAW URGED IN SENATE REPORT

(By William Grigg)

Eyeglasses are for sale by dime stores here and laymen own and operate optometry firms, a Senate subcommittee on fraud said in a report today.

It suggested that the District look into tightening its laws concerning these two practices and also look into a bar on the advertising of eyeglasses and contact lenses by price.

Horace White, executive director of the District Optometric Society, agreed today that the laws here are lax. He said the same criticism can be made of Maryland, but that Virginia's laws are tighter.

White said the society's grievance committee receives most of its complaints from patients who have gone to firms here that advertise and are owned by laymen.

EXEMPTION ASSAILED

Magnifying eyeglasses—what the trade calls “glazed goods”—are sold both here and in nearby Maryland, White said. Their exemption from optometric regulations, he said, is a hangover from “horse-and-buggy” days.

The Subcommittee on Frauds and Misrepresentations Affecting the Elderly brought the situations into focus in its report today. It suggested that the Senate District study the problem.

White said a new law was submitted to the District Commissioners about three years ago. He said the Corporation Counsel asked that the changes be made as amendments, rather than as a whole new law.

The District Board of Examiners in Optometry is now working on these amendments, White said.

CITES OBJECTION

The primary objection to laymen owning optometry firms is that they are guided by profit motives, Dr. Maurice G. Poster, chairman of the contact lens committee of the American Optometric Association, said.

“A person who depends for his livelihood on the sale of merchandise is unlikely to give the patient the attention which is required to instruct and supervise the patient,” Dr. Poster said.

He said that in the District and all 50 States, only optometrists and physicians are licensed to prescribe contact lenses.

“In actual practice, however,” he said, “unlicensed and untrained and unsupervised laymen are fitting a staggering number of patients. We think this constitutes a health hazard to the public.”

Other optometry officials called the District's law “antiquated” and “lax.”

United States of America Before Federal Trade Commission
[Docket No. 8715]

IN THE MATTER OF VENT-AIR CONTACT LENS LABORATORIES, INC., A CORPORATION,
AND LAWRENCE LEWISON, MARVIN SHORE AND SHIRLEY LEWISON, INDIVIDUALLY
AND AS OFFICERS OF SAID CORPORATION.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Act, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Vent-Air Contact Lens Laboratories, Inc., a corporation, and Lawrence Lewison, Marvin Shore and Shirley Lewison, individually and as officers of said corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said Act, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding