

The child immediately went to Johns-Hopkins and the sight was preserved.

These are the things that concern medicine and all of us as citizens, Mr. Chairman, that there should never be a delay by the device of discrimination or equation or by any other device, between the time when an eye which has pathology, is placed in a physician's care.

You yourself have said sight is a priceless thing. Neglected sight, failure to send people with disease such as early glaucoma may mean the loss of that sight. I am sure that no member of this committee would want to be a party to that sort of procedure.

This is precisely what Section 14 does. We know it happened under this similar provision under the Social Security Act in the North Carolina survey.

On behalf of Medicine, gentlemen, these bills as written, including the amended one, are not in the public interest and the Medical Society of the District of Columbia opposes them.

If Congress sees fit to enact legislation, they have worked long and late in making suggested changes on H.R. 1283 which they feel they can live with and which are in the public interest and will promote health care in the District of Columbia.

May I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to make this statement to you.

Mr. SISK. Thank you, Mr. Magee.

There are a number of questions which I would like to ask. This committee, you may or may not know, made an investigation into the background of the North Carolina situation. I think what you are basing your statement on was proved to be, we won't say false, but having less than a factual basis. I think your line of suggestion has been well covered.

Mr. MAGEE. May I answer that, sir. We checked with the North Carolina authorities. We submitted certifications from the state that that survey was an official state certification and was correct, factually and otherwise.

Mr. SISK. We have evidence coming from North Carolina to disprove this survey. This was pretty amply taken care of last fall. There is a record on that. I do not particularly care to argue this question further.

Dr. Albert, I would like to go back to your statement that you would like certain language incorporated in this particular section. Unfortunately I do not have a copy of what you were reading from.

It would require, as I understood it, any patient who had seen an optometrist, and this patient had an eye problem which departs from the normal. Then that patient must see an ophthalmologist. Would you please clarify this?

Dr. ALBERT. Yes.

Most or practically all pathological states are reflected in the functioning of the eye, of the visual apparatus, so that if a pathological state exists, it is most likely to produce decreased functioning as would be manifest in reduced visual acuity.

Mr. SISK. Let me ask you, Dr. Albert, is such a statement included in any state law in the land?

Dr. ALBERT. I will have to defer that to our counsel.