

Mr. JACOBS. I have no questions.

Mr. SISK. The gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. I have no further questions.

Mr. SISK. Thank you very much, Mr. Zimmerman. As I understand it, you are in full support of this legislation, and you feel that it would be beneficial to the community?

Dr. ZIMMERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SISK. In view of the time, we are not going to be able to finish the hearings today. The next witnesses are from the Washington Psychiatric Society and the Washington Psychoanalytic Society, and also we have the District government officials.

We are simply going to have to hear this testimony at another time. The Chair wishes to assure you that you will be heard. Unfortunately, we have run out of time. The House is in session.

At this time, without objection, I would like to have the following letters made a part of the record at this point:

A letter to me from the California Psychiatric Society dated May 10, 1968; and two letters to Chairman McMillan, namely, a letter from the Mental Health Ministry dated May 17, 1968, and a letter from Dr. M. Kershaw Walsh with attachment.

(The documents referred to follow:)

CENTRAL CALIFORNIA PSYCHIATRIC SOCIETY,
AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION,
Sacramento, Calif., May 10, 1968.

B. F. SISK, U.S. Congressman,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SISK: It has come to the attention of the Central California Psychiatric Society, a branch of the American Psychiatric Association covering the area including your constituency, that there is before your Subcommittee #5 of the House District Committee, a bill to license psychologists. We have not seen the bill and would appreciate an opportunity to study it. However, we are pleased that an effort is being made to protect the public in its quest for professional help in coping with the multitude of emotional stresses and symptoms of which all of us are increasingly aware. We are aware that your committee and the Congress will be trying to protect the public while allowing as much manpower as possible to be available to help persons in mental and emotional distress.

Since we in California have had similar concerns and have engaged in relevant deliberations we should like to throw what light we can on the subject.

We concur with the need to define the qualifications of persons entitled to call themselves psychologists, to insure the adequacy of education, training, experience, and discipline.

We also believe it important to define the scope of responsibilities appropriate to persons with the stated qualifications. However, it should not be assumed or implied that *only* persons with the stated qualifications can offer the services set forth in a licensing bill. Although qualified psychologists should have the ethical discipline and supervised training to permit them to provide psychotherapy, others, such as psychiatrists, also have such discipline and training. The law must not limit the license to provide psychotherapy to one profession; it must recognize that psychotherapy is a procedure appropriate to other trained and disciplined professions. Indeed, psychotherapy is a significant modality of medical practice and must be continued to be subsumed under Medical Practice Acts.

Indeed, this leads to a third consideration. Because psychotherapy is a treatment technique employed with seriously mentally ill persons, it seems important that a non-medical psychotherapist be required, in the interest of the protection