

But anyway, the Board receives numerous complaints. The Department of Occupations and Professions now has a form letter in which they say, "We are very sorry to inform you but the Board is not empowered to take any action."

Mr. HARSHA. You feel that the regulations now or the educational requirements written into the law are totally adequate and in conformity with the majority of the states in the Union?

Dr. WARREN. I would say that is quite right.

Mr. HARSHA. Then do we need the additional requirements that you have in these bills? Why are they in here then?

Dr. WARREN. I think you will find our present law, the one which we are now operating under, and the proposed new requirements are fundamentally the same.

Mr. HARSHA. Why are they in the bill if you are not going to make changes?

Dr. WARREN. Because it has to be a whole new bill.

I might say this came up in the previous testimony. This bill was originally written by the Department of Occupations and Professions because under the new enabling Act of the District of Columbia all of the powers of the Board are really given to the Commissioners and then the Commissioners in turn give them to the Board. So the department had to write the bill so that it would be in the proper form. So they decided that a whole new bill would be written.

Now of course I will admit that our group has made numerous changes in it.

Mr. HARSHA. You say under existing law you have no remedy such as revoking a license or suspending a practitioner for certain violations?

Dr. WARREN. For all practical purposes, none.

Last week we had a man go into Sterling—the name has been mentioned so I will mention it—to have his eyes examined. From the time he walked into the door until he walked out of the examination room with a piece of paper in his hand with a prescription on it was three minutes and 20 seconds. This was a complete eye examination.

He then went somewhere else and picked out a frame. The total bill was \$38. Now this has been going on for years and I hear all of this, and I have been coming up here, sir, for 20-some years testifying on these things, and I see the discussion being sidetracked all the time.

I am not an attorney and I do not know all of the little facets of the turning of a word here or there as to what it does. But what we want to do is to be able to protect the people of the District of Columbia who we think are being robbed. I think that some of the men of this city are using their license to steal. We only have about seven or eight bad apples but that is all it takes.

Mr. HARSHA. You have no method under the existing law—

Dr. WARREN. Under the existing law we can take a license away from a man if he has been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude or is a habitual drunkard—period. We do not even have the right to insist that they inform us where they are practicing.

I remember 15 years ago when my dad was secretary of the Board, suddenly we saw an advertisement in the paper of one of the fur-