

Here again, maybe because the gentlemen are experts in their field and not too much so in the political field. No criticism is implied.

The gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Doctor, relating our thought for a moment to Section 20(B) in the present House bill, I note that in the North Carolina statute, comparable language is as follows:

Nothing in this Article shall be construed to limit or restrict physicians and surgeons or optometrists authorized to practice under the laws of North Carolina or to restrict qualified members of other professional groups in the practice of their respective professions, provided they do not hold themselves out to the public by any title or description stating or implying that they are practicing psychologists or psychological examiners, or are licensed to practice psychology.¹

That seems to be rather specific language as compared to Section 20(B) in the House bill.

Dr. LEGAULT. I think so. I have not read the entire law.

Mr. WHITENER. This relates to the same subject matter as Section 20(B) where you are talking about other professionals. As I read the legislation now before us, the House bill at least, it does not restrict other professions to the degree that the North Carolina statute does, and I am wondering if this language, in lieu of Section 20(B), would not be helpful.

Dr. LEGAULT. I think it would be better. I would have a question though as to definition of "other professions". Somewhere in the bill it would have to state what another profession is. For instance, is a dyneticist a professional?

Mr. WHITENER. I do not believe you would have any trouble because, after referring to other professional groups, it limits it to the practice of their respective professions.

Dr. LEGAULT. That is right.

Mr. WHITENER. And the statute in North Carolina at least with reference to the legal profession or medical profession or cosmetology profession or whatever it might be would clearly define what the practice is within "their respective professions".

Dr. LEGAULT. I agree.

Mr. WHITENER. If you look at the North Carolina Act, subsection (d) just above where I was referring to, tell us a little bit about social psychologists and whether we need language in the District of Columbia bill with reference to that.

Dr. LEGAULT. As I understand it, that section was stricken from the Senate bill.

Mr. WHITENER. We are starting over here. We are not too concerned, I believe, with what is stricken in the Senate bill. I am asking why was that language in the North Carolina Act and what is the significance of it. We are not experts in your field, and we need a little instruction ourselves.

Dr. LEGAULT. I can say something about it.

Mr. WHITENER. If I may interrupt you, I gather from the language of this section in the North Carolina Act, that you have social psychologists and psychologists and a sociologist might engage in social psychology or a psychologist might engage in social psychology; is that right?

¹ North Carolina Laws, supra, Section 4(e).