

ments and understand the different definitions we may have. At some point we will have to consider the inclusion of these amendments or their modification.

Mr. HARSHA. I have one question with respect to proposed section 4(B). Maybe this does violence to the whole section, I do not know.

Is there any objection to the following language:

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as permitting the administration or prescription of drugs, surgery, or any manual or mechanical treatment whatsoever, by any person not certified under the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, as amended.

Dr. CUMMINGS. This is in accordance with our code of ethics, sir.

Dr. LEGAULT. No, I do not think that that would be complete enough. That is the suggested change of the psychologists. It follows very much the way they have wished to change their 4(B). We do not think that it is complete enough because it ducks the issue of under what circumstances the psychologist shall be permitted to treat mental disease without supervision. Some way or another, this limitation has to be specified in the Act, and the subcommittee will have to come to a conclusion as to how to do that.

Whether it is agreeable or not, this is the issue. The psychologists are attempting to deal with the issue by saying everything can be called a mental disease and, therefore, their activities cannot be limited by referring to such a vague term. On the other hand, we know very well that there are such things as mental diseases and, therefore, we wish to specify that in these circumstances there be some wording in the law regulating its treatment.

I wish to point out the differences in the attitude of our two groups here. Dr. Meltzer's statement is that the diagnostic and statistical manual of the psychiatrists called nail-biting, stuttering, mental diseases. This is not the case. There is no mental disease called stuttering or nail-biting in the diagnostic and statistical manual. There is in the back of that manual an enumeration of a great number of different symptoms which may or may not be evidences of mental disease, but that is an exaggeration as he stated it. His general statements are exaggerated.

The psychiatrists did not testify anything whatsoever about Senator Goldwater. It was established in court in New York that the entire matter was a fraud, and that the American Psychiatric Association was in no way involved and no reputable psychiatrist was ever involved in doing anything of the sort. I resent these implications being made about our profession.

Mr. SISK. Gentlemen, we must keep this strictly on a gentlemanly basis. Sometimes we disagree, but we try to disagree agreeably.

I appreciate your position, Dr. Legault, and also Dr. Meltzer's.

MENTAL ILLNESS

Mr. HARSHA. Can we define mental illness in the bill?

Mr. SISK. We have had some discussion on that. Do any of you want to make a brief comment? Definition seems to be difficult in the area of psychology and psychiatry.