

zenry in every aspect of their health care, actually disease of the body, physical disease, et cetera, should be guided?

Would you make some comment on that, Dr. Hughes? This does go to the heart of some concerns by members of this committee and others who have some concern with what is going on in the District of Columbia.

Dr. HUGHES. I believe that the Medical Society would feel that the optimum situation would be if the entire Healing Arts Practice Act were rewritten, updated, modernized, and ideally that would include all professions, all endeavors that are involved in health care. It has been our understanding, perhaps erroneously, that it is a somewhat monumental task and might take a great deal of time. That is why the Medical Society in other connections has addressed itself to an amendment or two to try to meet a current problem. The ultimate optimal situation would be to rewrite the entire thing from scratch, eliminating things anachronistic and bringing it up to date. If it could include everyone that deals with sick people in any way, I think this would be ideal. I believe the Medical Society would feel that way unquestionably.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate your statement, Dr. Hughes. I realize the question was all-comprehensive and all-inclusive. The reason that I ask the question is that there is pending now in Congress a variety of bills dealing with licensing procedures, practices, all in the peripheral area of care of people and of their needs from the standpoint of physical needs.

For example, there is a bill dealing with the practice of podiatry here in the District. We have this one on psychology. There is another one on optometry. I remember there are also two or three more dealing with specific licensing procedures for specific groups. That is the reason why it seems to me maybe at some point there should be a comprehensive study and analysis made on how best to proceed in this field. It is evident there is some need to rewrite and update old, outmoded laws. I believe we all recognize that.

Dr. LEGAULT. May I add to something I said before?

Mr. SISK. Yes.

Dr. LEGAULT. Although our psychiatric and psychoanalytical societies have not considered the actual mechanics of the problem of writing laws for what we would call the ancillary professions, those professions that serve in a helping mode the central profession of medicine, though we have not considered how the regulation of such professionals should be written into the law in the District, we have been concerned certainly with a particular point which I think all medical organizations agree on; that is, that in the writing of separate laws for either separate or comprehensive laws for the regulating of such ancillary professions there not be lost sight of the fact that medicine is organized in a rather hierarchal fashion and that this organization of medicine in writing such separate laws must not be interfered with. It must provide for central responsibility of the physician at the core of all licensing acts, provisions for necessary consultation with him whenever it is required.

Mr. SISK. Thank you, Dr. Legault.