

Section 8(C) has been added and is necessary if the change in Section 7(B) is made.

Section 12, as contained in the draft, is designed to meet a recommendation made previously by the Department with respect to H.R. 10407.

The only change in Section 13 is to conform with the changes previously made in Section 7(B) and the additional 8(C).

The remaining sections in the draft are without substantive changes insofar as we can see.

It is recommended that the committee support the proposed changes indicated in the draft, except that I am mildly inclined to believe that the same standards of education should be required of all psychologists.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, we support generally the changes that are recommended, with the very mild reservation that we are not quite clear that there is a need for the division of the examination and licensing into two categories.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Dr. Schultz.

Mr. Moyer, would you like to summarize now?

Mr. MOYER. Mr. Chairman, on May 17th the District submitted a letter to Mr. McMillan commenting on these two bills, S. 1864 and H.R. 10407. This morning we submitted a letter addressed to Mr. Sisk, dated June 18, in which we commented on this proposed substitute draft bill.

In our letter of May 17 we recommended that the bill as passed by the Senate be considered by the committee because it had several desirable amendments, and in our letter to Mr. Sisk in commenting on the proposed substitute bill we have said that we had no objection to these provisions in the substitute bill. They appeared to clarify the relationship of psychologists to psychiatrists in the field of psychotherapy. Therefore, we offer no objection to this substitute bill. Basically, the District's position is that which I have just enumerated.

Mr. WALKER. At this point, for the record, the letter to Congressman Sisk from Mr. Fletcher will be made a part of the record. It is dated June 18th.

(The letter follows:)

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, June 18, 1968.

Hon. B. F. SISK,
*Chairman, Subcommittee No. 5,
Committee on the District of Columbia,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SISK: In connection with your hearings on H.R. 10407 and S. 1864, bills "To define and regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia", the Clerk of the Committee, James T. Clark, Esquire, furnished to District of Columbia representatives for comment a draft substitute bill proposed by the District of Columbia Medical Society, the Medico-Chirurgical Society of the District of Columbia, the Washington Psychiatric Society, and the Washington Psychoanalytic Society.

The District Government has reviewed the proposed substitute bill. We note that while in large part it is similar to H.R. 10407 and S. 1864, some of the sections of the substitute bill include language which clarifies the relationship of the psychologist to the psychiatrist in the medical field of psychotherapy.

In the District's May 17, 1968 report on H.R. 10407 and S. 1864, we supported the provisions of the bills requiring the psychologist to refer his client to a