

The staff has provided me with a copy of the North Carolina Act which was passed by the North Carolina Legislature in 1967.¹ I note that Section 3 reads as follows:

PRACTICE OF MEDICINE AND OPTOMETRY NOT PERMITTED

Nothing in this Article shall be construed as permitting licensed practicing psychologists or psychological examiners to engage in any manner in all or any of the parts of the practice of medicine or optometry licensed under Articles 1 and 6 of Chapter 90 of the General Statute, including, among others, the diagnosis and correction of visual and muscular anomalies of the human eyes and visual apparatus, eye exercises, or orthoptics, vision training, visual training and developmental vision. A licensed practicing psychologist or psychological examiner shall assist his client in obtaining professional help for all aspects of his problems that fall outside the boundaries of his own competence, including provision for the diagnosis and treatment of relevant medical or optometric problems. In rendering psychotherapy in any form, the licensee practicing psychologist or psychological examiner shall develop liaison, communication, and meaningful collaboration with a physician, duly licensed to practice medicine in North Carolina, designated by the client.

That language is much more specific than the language proposed here. I am wondering what you gentlemen feel about using the North Carolina language in lieu of the language of Section 4 in the proposed House bill.

Dr. LEGAULT. I think that I can speak for all of my colleagues here. We would be very much in favor of it, not only the language of the North Carolina statute but similar language in licensing laws throughout the United States, but of similar precise legal language defining the relationship between the professionals; in this case the phrase "effective collaboration," that is a phrase used in other licensing acts which say that really spells it out, what the requirements of the law are.

We would be very much in favor of that.

Mr. WHITENER. If that language or similar language were placed in this legislation, that would remove most of the objection you gentlemen have to the legislation, would it not?

Dr. LEGAULT. It would remove some of the objections. I don't think most of them, Mr. Congressman. Because of the fact that there are other things in this legislation, particularly Section 20(B) which I commented on in my prepared statement, which really offer very, very large loopholes as to permission to charlatans to practice in the District of Columbia. Then there are provisions on corporate practice and which I also commented on with which we are very much in disagreement.

Mr. WHITENER. This language, "members of other professions," that may mean what?

Dr. LEGAULT. That can mean anyone.

Mr. WHITENER. It could mean a lawyer.

Mr. SISK. The gentleman from New York, Mr. Horton.

Mr. HORTON. Dr. Legault, your prepared statement refers to a draft bill which your organization has been preparing. Has that been submitted?

Dr. LEGAULT. It has not been submitted.

Mr. SISK. If my colleague would yield, we had a discussion toward the end on that. They have prepared it, but they want to polish it a

¹ North Carolina Laws, Ch. 910, Laws 1967, Senate Bill No. 578. Ratified 22 June 1967