

Prices Charged by Washington American Optometric Association Members *
as of June 1967 for Glasses to be Duplicated (Cost of same glasses at Sterling
Optical—\$12.45).

Name	Total price (lenses and frame)
Berlin, M.	\$23.00
Campbell, F.	27.50
Couperthwaite, C.	24.50
Cowan, A.	22.00
Dantzic, D.	26.00
Dosik, R.	16.50
Duff, W.	20.00
Ephriam, Z.	20.00
Goldblatt, D.	22.00
Greenwood, J.	24.00
Kale, D.	18.60
Katz, H.	26.00
Katz, P.	16.50
Keely, W.	22.50
Kershner, L.	22.00
Lee, S.	17.00
Lyner, J.	20.00
Parinet, H.	25.00
Pollack, H.	22.00
Robbins, E.	22.50
Sheley, R.	22.50
Shelton, J.	22.50
Toman, J.	21.25
Teunis, Ralph	25.00
Teunis, Robert	25.00
Uhler, C.	26.00
Warren, E.	23.00

DISCUSSION—THE CHALLENGE OF THE HART BILL: TAKE THE PROFIT OUT OF EYEGASSES

(By Samuel Drucker, O.D.)

Regardless of its eventual fate, the Hart Bill * has raised a moral issue: Should a doctor be permitted to profit from a patient's illness or needs?

In past decades, medicine often confronted optometry with the same issue. Medicine argued that optometrists profited from the sale of eyeglasses and could not, therefore, give an honest opinion on their need. In later years, ophthalmologists began to dispense. The argument by medicine was quietly interred.

If their original argument was valid, why did ophthalmologists turn to methods they had called "unethical" for optometrists? One reason was competitive. It was an attempt to answer the nagging question of why most people went to an optometrist. The answer lay in the unified service of the optometrist. By combining dispensing with refraction, he was offering what the patient wanted, in less time, with less effort, and generally at a lower cost.

If the ophthalmologists had been content to dispense at laboratory costs, the changeover would have been ethical, and the end results might have been devastating to some optometrists. However, the commercial rewards of dispensing proved more attractive than the objective of stripping from optometrists the most accepted feature of their services. Like optometry, ophthalmology fell into the trap of commercialism and will pay the bill in eroded professional prestige.

*Omitted from this listing are those optometrists listed as A.O.A. members in the Washington Classified Directory who are deceased, are retired from practice, have temporarily closed their offices, and who do not duplicate glasses.

*EDITOR'S NOTE: S. B. 2563, introduced in the U.S. Congress on Sept. 28, 1965, by Senator Philip A. Hart of Michigan, is now awaiting hearings. The stated purpose of the bill is: "to strengthen the antitrust laws by prohibiting the payment to or receipt by persons licensed to engage in the practice of medicine, of profit, rebates, refunds, commissions, discounts, rentals or other valuable considerations in connection with the supplying to patients drugs, devices, or other products prescribed by such licensees." Hearing in 1965 prior to introduction of the bill centered on the dispensing of eyeglasses by ophthalmologists.