

With that I have nothing further to say.

Thank you.

Mr. SISK. I thank my colleague from Indiana. I just have one further question, Dr. Rowe. I appreciate your patience this morning.

We find ourselves, I think, in substantial disagreement in some areas. I want to ask you, because of your statement with reference to the laws in the states of Ohio and Indiana where the optometrist cannot be employed and must practice on his own, why do you oppose a separation here in the District of Columbia?

Dr. ROWE. Because we do not see anything here that would be helped by what happened in Ohio. In other words, I do not feel that the public is served any better by reason of the fact that the optometrist cannot be employed. We see no reason to impose restrictions on the optometrist which would not be for the good of the public.

Mr. SISK. You feel that a great many of the states, like my own state of California, Florida, New Jersey, Arkansas, Indiana, Ohio, and so on, all have made bad moves?

Dr. ROWE. I think that the quality of the optometric care in the District of Columbia is just as good as it is in Ohio or in Pennsylvania or in Indiana. I think that the quality of the optometric care in the state of New York is just as good as in any other state and that the quality of the care in the state of Maryland is just as good as it is in any other state.

In other words, as the Governor of the State of New York said when he vetoed a similar bill, he said that the adoption of this bill will not in any way bring any benefits to the public but will increase the cost of eyecare. So that there is no benefit to be derived, and the people of Ohio and of Maryland and of Pennsylvania and of Indiana are not getting better eyecare as the result of the fact that an optometrist cannot be employed than they are in the State of New York or in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SISK. Apparently, you have not had an opportunity to read the record as to the complaints of malpractice here in the District of Columbia.

We will be printing them in the record, and I can assure you if you will take a look and read not just one or two or three but literally hundreds of instances of malpractice here in the District, you will find that conditions are not just as good here in the District as they are in some states.

Dr. ROWE. We do not know if there have been any complaints regarding advertising here; they say that they have had none.

Mr. SISK. Under the present law, there is no prohibition against advertising?

Dr. ROWE. I was talking about the Bureau of Advertising that is responsible for the advertising being truthful and not being misleading, that they accept for the newspapers. They say that they have not had any complaints from the newspaper readers that their advertising was in any way untruthful or misleading.

Mr. SISK. Have you read the statement made last year by the Board of Optometry here in the District?

Dr. ROWE. I have not as yet.

Mr. SISK. There have been many complaints. When these were called to their attention, the Board had no legal power to act. As I say, Dr. Rowe, I think that you and I have certain basic disagree-