

the psychologists and in our dealings with the Senate subcommittee, the major—

Mr. ZWACH. Was this addressed specifically to the Senate, these statements here?

Dr. LEGAULT. At the time the bill was before the Senate subcommittee.

Mr. ZWACH. It was really speaking more to the other body?

Dr. LEGAULT. Oh, yes. So far as our relationships with this subcommittee are concerned, they have been most cordial.

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to say this has been made rather clear, I thought, that this had to do with the situation that existed earlier in the year at that time. Had I felt this had any implications to this committee or this body I would have arisen in somewhat holy wrath, as my colleague has.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ZWACH. I really appreciate that statement because it is very important to me. I think he still can elaborate a little more on it because I want to be sure that does not involve the House of Representatives.

Dr. LEGAULT. Certainly by no means do we feel this subcommittee or any of the representatives on this subcommittee have in any way attempted to treat us in any other fashion but to find out what the issues are in this bill, and we have been most pleased with our contacts with every one of the representatives that we have tried to get in contact with.

So far as our statement about the situation in the Senate is concerned, we do not wish to make any sort of statement about unfair treatment on the part of the Senate. It was our own fault. We actually were commenting on our political naivete.

As Mr. Walker pointed out, as a perfectly elementary fact of politics, if a bill is up for legislation that one should take care to see the legislators involved in the matter and that these things take primary consideration. It is absolutely ridiculous that no representative from any of the professional organizations seated here at this table made any attempt to contact any senator concerned with the bill. It is absolutely preposterous.

We were continuing our professional conversations with the psychologists in the naive expectation that possibly our professional group could hold up on recommending legislation until we were in a position to come to an agreement on it, which we felt we could come to an agreement on because of the fact our position, the position our groups have taken, is the position that is written into laws concerning the regulation of psychology in practically all jurisdictions.

In other words, we were not proposing to the psychologists anything which we expected that they would be terribly in objection to.

Mr. ZWACH. Would you say that this statement is perhaps a little indiscreet?

Dr. LEGAULT. I readily admit to that. I accept that.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, that answers my question.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. I was not going to pin it down quite that much, but I think the gentleman is exactly right. I think this went maybe a little bit beyond.