

serious gamut of mental illnesses. There is no such thing as a mental illness, as I am quite sure anybody will recognize.

We are dealing with minor physical illnesses, but there are no minor mental ones, and to undertake to treat them, treat any mental illness is to be involved in effect in doing something equivalent to major surgery. The surgeon never knows what he is going to run into when he opens up a belly, for example. He has to be prepared to do what has to be done. That is the reason why psychologists in their training, although they are trained to treat minor mental illnesses, nevertheless do so under continuing medical supervision.

Mr. SISK. Thank you, Dr. Legault.

The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ZWACH. On the first day of our hearings I asked the psychology association to present to the subcommittee the exact course of study and curricula in a particular program on psychology.

I would like to ask Dr. Steinbach to present to the committee the course of study at Georgetown University for psychiatrists. Could you do that, Doctor?

Dr. STEINBACH. For psychiatrists?

Mr. ZWACH. Yes, so we may compare both the courses and try to get a clear picture.

(The information requested appears in the appendix at p. 142.)

Then I would like to go to page 6 of your testimony, that disturbs me very, very much. You are talking here about trying to work out an agreement for the public good between your groups, and it says:

As a result, our representatives and representatives of the psychologists' associations began discussing precise language and amendments to the bill, which is 10407.

Then in the middle of these conferences, in which the public interest and concern was our pole star, we received a telephone call from a representative of the D.C. Psychological Association, which advised us that they had been informed that appropriate maneuvering could bring their bill to a vote and they no longer wished to confer with us.

I do not know what implications and connotations there is in your statement, but then you go on:

Still later, when these nonprofessional efforts bogged down, there was another telephone call to start treating the problem at a professional level again.

Presumably rather than political.

And once again, there was a telephone call to terminate these efforts, not on any ground that the public interest would be promoted by such termination, but because it was felt that the bill could be enacted in a hurry without further scrutiny.

It has been my privilege to sit as a legislator for 34 years. I have never heard any testimony that comes anywhere close to this type of testimony. I want you to enlarge on that.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that this subcommittee ought to enlarge on that testimony. This testimony has a lot of implications and connotations. Whether it is indicating somebody in the other group or whether it reflects on the Congress, I do not know.

I am asking you, sir, to enlarge on that statement you made.

Dr. LEGAULT. Yes, I would be very pleased to, Mr. Congressman.

I think, first of all, I would like to say that the major difficulty in the situation as I look upon it now, and what occurred between us and