

Yet, even for those attending, there is not much time for real discussion in the House. Policy matters usually come up only if they are the subject of a resolution. Debate, "new business" and "good and welfare" are usually lost in the lack of time and the rush toward adjournment.

In such an atmosphere, there is a tendency to leave things undone and decisions unmade. There is a feeling that things will take care of themselves for another year.

High attendance and crowded programs are a way of life at conventions in many fields. However, for delegates the many features should be attractions, but not distractions.

EYEGASSES, PROFIT AND THE PUBLIC WELFARE

BRONX, N.Y., APRIL 18, 1966.

Editor, THE OPTICAL JOURNAL-REVIEW:

In the April 15th issue, Dr. Samuel Drucker's article "The Challenge of the Hart Bill" presented an interesting evaluation of optometry's position in our changing society. His suggestion that the profit be taken out of professionally dispensed eyeglasses is an excellent one, since Senator Hart's subcommittee will likely soon come to the same conclusion.

The specter of governmental intrusion into the practice of health care is very distasteful to most optometrists. Nevertheless, we had better resign ourselves to the fact that the federal government is in the business of consumer protection to stay. The automotive industry recently discovered that it is no longer master of its fate when the safety and welfare of the public are concerned. It is highly probable that the health-care professions will soon come to the same realization. It would, therefore, behoove the health professions to put their houses in order before the legislators do it for them.

The chief flaw in the optometric structure is the practice of profiting from the sale of self-prescribed materials. It should be obvious to the Senate subcommittee that this system encourages abuses by unethical practitioners. It will be surprising if steps are not taken to further protect the public.

CODE OF THE MARKET PLACE

The interprofessional squabbles that have plagued the field of eye care will undoubtedly be brought out in the hearings. As a result, the ophthalmic professions will be made to appear as self-interest groups rather than as professional people concerned with the visual welfare of the public. We must realize that the privileges awarded to professional men by society may be retracted if they conduct themselves according to the code of the market place.

If the ophthalmic professions would retain the confidence of the public, they must cease their bickering and eliminate practices inimical to the public welfare.

Optometry must eliminate commercialism and restrict its activities to those professional services for which it is best trained. This does not include the grinding or dispensing of eyeglasses.

Opticianry must abandon all claims to contact lens fitting and concentrate on lens grinding and dispensing of eyeglasses.

A rigid system of quality control on all ophthalmic materials should also be imposed.

Ophthalmology must discontinue its efforts to monopolize the field of eye care and must conduct its practices in a manner befitting eye surgeons.

A "summit conference" of leaders of the three disciplines would now be in order to clean up the back yard before Senator Hart does it for us.

VINCENT P. LUPICA, O.D.

The following is taken from the Principles of Professional Conduct of the Medical Society of the State of New York:

PATENTS, COMMISSIONS, REBATES, AND SECRET REMEDIES

Section 6. An ethical doctor of medicine will not receive remuneration from patents on or the sale of surgical instruments, appliances, and medicine, nor profit from a copyright on methods of procedures. The receipt of remuneration from patents or copyrights tempts the owners thereof to retard or inhibit re-