

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, you brought this out somewhat a minute ago and I would like to clarify it for the record. It is my recollection that Dr. Meltzer again stated in response to a question concerning the effort of your various organizations to get together on the bill, in fact you also brought this up to quite an extent this morning yourself, Dr. Legault, in this discussion, that at first they opposed the psychologists doing psychotherapy and only later changed their opinion.

You have already hit on this so we will not belabor it, but I got the impression that you started these negotiations and discussions and then this legislation was introduced, and then all of a sudden the negotiations and the talks, or whatever you want to call them, were dispensed with. Am I right in my assumption here?

Dr. LEGAULT. That is correct, Mr. Congressman.

We did engage, we started our discussions with the psychologists concerning the wording of the bill and the aims of the bill early last spring, and we continued our discussions throughout the year after having had extensive discussions in our own society as to what our feelings were about the psychologists, our psychological colleagues.

We continued to discuss the bill with them right up to the time that the hearings were held in the Senate and after the hearings were held in the Senate. We continued to discuss matters with the psychologists until last March. The discussion at this point had come to a point where the professional representatives of both organizations had agreed that the matters that we were considering were legal matters and that we should have attorneys representing both organizations meet and recommend back to the individual organizations how they might agree.

On March 8 I received a letter from Dr. Bayroth, the President of the D. C. Psychological Association, which read as follows:

DEAR DR. LEGAULT: I am concerned that a recent flurry of events interrupted the talks which our groups and lawyers were conducting concerning the bill to license psychologists in the District of Columbia. I am writing now to express our genuine interest in continuing our discussions.

He then summarizes his position. He then says:

Recently we received word that if our bill were to receive full hearings and action in the 90th Congress, we must step up our pace and make only those modifications required by the change in the District Government. We agreed to do so in the knowledge that we were backing a very safe piece of legislation. Accordingly, we instructed our attorneys to discontinue further discussion with your attorney.

And we were so informed. This letter is asking us to resume negotiations, which we did.

We then instructed our attorney to proceed with the negotiations. And then after we had proceeded to do that we again received notification that the negotiations were broken off and that was, as you see, in March. We would have had ample time probably to come to an agreement if the attorneys had continued their negotiations at the time.

Mr. WALKER. Doctor, being a practical politician, I would have to say if I were negotiating with someone and if I thought I could get some legislation through, I would not see much point in negotiating with you further either.

So much for that.