

and deemed to be when Friedmans' case was decided. See Ga. Laws 1956, p. 94, as amended by Ga. Laws 1963, p. 214." *Lee Optical of Georgia Inc. v. Georgia State Board of Examiners in Optometry*, 138 SE2d 165 (Ga. 1965).

ILLINOIS

"There is no argument but what the practice of optometry has an effect on the public health and welfare sufficient to justify that practitioners be licensed, and from such fact we believe it is reasonable for the legislature to prescribe the use of the license which they have suffered a registrant to receive."

"While at first blush it would seem that Sections 13(k), (l) (m) appear to be an arbitrary interference with the right of one to practice optometry, such thoughts are dispelled when the relative aspects of public health and welfare are considered. * * * the legislature is not dealing with traders in commodities but with the vital interest of public health in the treatment of bodily ills."

"In addition, the community is concerned in providing safeguards not only against deception, but against practices which tend to demoralize the business or profession by forcing its members into unseemly rivalry, and which would tend to enlarge the opportunities of the least scrupulous." *Klein v. Department of Registration and Education*, 105 N.E.2d 758 (Ill. 1952)

INDIANA

"The practice of optometry bears a close relationship to the health and welfare of mankind. The eye is a delicate organ closely connected with intellectual, nervous, and physical functions. This fact brings the practice of optometry within the scope of legislative supervision through the exercise of the police power. The principal purpose of the statute is to give protection to the public from quacks, and persons or firms not licensed, but who, as non-resident manufacturers of eyeglasses, etc., employ licensed optometrists to conduct the manufacturer's business in this State for profit." *Bennett v. Indiana State Board of Optometry*, 7 N.E.2d 977 (Ind. 1937)

IOWA

"We might suggest that there is no difference, under our Code, in the law applicable to the practice of dentistry and optometry, and that the general rules laid down by the courts are alike applicable to these as well as all other of the learned professions." *State v. Kindy Optical Co.*, 216 Iowa 1157, 248 N.W. 332 (1933)

KANSAS

"Defendant carried on an extensive advertising campaign in the local newspapers. There were usually rather large display ads. They would devote considerable space to the jewelry business of defendant but always a portion would be devoted to the optical business.

* * * * *

"In practically every authority we have examined on the question the courts have been compelled to examine and consider a course of dealing such as we have here. They have universally held that a lease arrangement such as these parties entered into is a subterfuge." *State v. Zalc Jewelry Company*, 298 P.2d 283 (Kan. 1956)

KENTUCKY

"Our statutes, therefore, place the practice of optometry upon a rather high professional plane." *Kendall v. Beiling*, 295 Ky. 782, S.W.2d 489 (1943)

LOUISIANA

"These courts [in other States] have decided that the statutes are a reasonable exercise of the police power; they prevent 'bait advertising' which attracts the unwary to purchase inferior glasses; eliminate the temptation to, and the pressure upon, customers that result from the assurance that no more than a named price will be charged; protect an incautious and unwary public from being misled and deceived; prevent the increase in sales and the incidental harm that come from unfitted glasses; eliminate to some extent poor quality and poor workmanship which naturally result from the desire to sell spectacles in quantity at a low advertised price for the purpose of underselling competitors." *State v. Ronas*, 67 So.2d 99 (La. 1953)