

his prescription to him easier. So, we are located as close as we can be to them.

Mr. JACOBS. If you will yield?

Mr. SISK. Yes.

Mr. JACOBS. Then, the difference between the two situations that you have described is that the optician does not draw his source of income from the same place as the optometrist, in the first place, and, in the second place there, would that be a fair comment under the two analogies?

Dr. ROWE. I think so.

Mr. SISK. Dr. Rowe, as I say, these are merely indicative of, I think, the evil of the corporate approach. Aside from your company, Dr. Rowe, what has been developed here is that the corporations make profits for their stockholders. I do not blame them for that. The only concern of this committee is the eyecare and the doctor-patient relationship within the District of Columbia. We can only legislate for the District of Columbia and not for the Nation.

You recognize that many of our States have outlawed the corporate practice of optometry as not being in the best interests of the welfare and health of the public. This is, of course, what we seek to stop, here in the District.

You, apparently, oppose that position?

Dr. ROWE. Yes, because I feel that an optometrist is capable of doing his job wherever he may be located; that is, if he wants to do the proper job. If he does not want to do the proper job, it does not matter where he is located. This is not going to affect him.

These are optometrists with the same training and qualifications as any other optometrist. They are just as capable as the others, and to the extent that is so. I send my children to the optometrist in the Sears-Roebuck store in Cleveland, because they are there. My children go to these optometrists. I know they are well taken care of, because I know that the optometrist is vested with knowledge and education and background and has as much personal concern over his patient as any optometrist anywhere.

Mr. SISK. You must be confident, Dr. Rowe, in the particular store to which you are referring. As for myself, I would not personally send my children into some of these stores. As I say, this is a matter of confidence.

Mr. JACOBS. I would like to say, Dr. Rowe, that the fellow in Cleveland who has your confidence, nobody would ever question his ability in every respect except to show undivided concern for the individual patient. Is this not the old quarrel that has been going on since way back in 1949 when my father was here in Congress? Is this not the same quarrel that has been going on year in and year out, about socialized medicine? Is it not part and parcel of the same thing?

The idea is that in England where the doctor works for some huge impersonal entity and is going to be paid not by the patient, there is a tendency to become a little calloused with respect to "one more fellow coming through the line." The doctor is going to be making money one way or the other—Is that not part and parcel of the whole dialog about socialized medicine as opposed to the doctor-patient relationship?

Dr. ROWE. Well, this is possible maybe. It is just as possible I think for an optometrist, in spite of the fact of that, to become calloused