

ment of any objective or subjective means for the examination of the human eye, including its appendages."

In my limited knowledge in this field, an objective examination of the human eye is done in some cases by the use of drugs, is it not?

Dr. BERLIN. There are many objective examinations. Usually the physician will use a drug for an objective examination, but he also uses visual acuity, part of the visual acuity examination. It is the way the individual turns his head, whether he squints, whether he tilts his head down, whether he turns his head, this can be an objective manner in which he recognizes some defect which would play a significant part in the examination.

Mr. HORTON. I do not think you answered the question. The question as I understood it was whether you could use drugs in the examination.

Mr. HARSHA. What I am trying to get at is this: Does this authorize you in effect to use the method of ophthalmology because, suppose you put this medicine in to dilate the pupil, that is a drug, is it not?

Dr. BERLIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARSHA. Are you not then engaging in ophthalmology?

Dr. BERLIN. This is for the determination purposes only and not for the treatment. This aids in determining the total scope of a visual problem of the patient.

Mr. HARSHA. But whether it is for determination or examination, you still employ the use of drugs and are you authorized to do that under the law?

Dr. BERLIN. Maybe Dr. Warren could answer that for you.

Dr. WARREN. This has been—of course I heard the testimony yesterday—quite a bone of contention—objective or subjective means, and this has to be resolved, I would say, before we go much further.

Optometrists do not use drops in examination of the eye. We have developed historical methods of making eye examinations and the results have been proven quite good over the years without the use of drops.

Now I would be first to admit we are not in complete accord on this thing. I would say that the argument that has been given to me is that, well, 25 years ago we did not have satellites, atom bombs have changed things, progress, and that it is difficult to come back to Congress to get a change, and that if at some future time something were developed in the way of a drop that would be advantageous, it would be nice to have them used. And it is possible that this could be turned around so that it could be "employment of any objective or subjective means for the examination of the human eye." And it might well be that the committee should insert something else in there such as "not to include the use of drugs, medicine, or surgery".

Mr. HARSHA. One other question. I refer you to page 7, line 13, of H.R. 12276, subsection (7); this is in the subsection I was inquiring about.

Section 7 states: "The Commissioners are authorized (A) to refuse to renew, or reinstate any license authorized by this Act, and (B) to suspend or revoke \* \* \* for the following causes—".

And this is subsection (7):

"conduct which disqualifies the licensee from practicing optometry with safety to the public".