Amendment

Mr. Chairman — All of the facilities mentioned under Sec. 651 on page 5 could be built under the existing Hill-Burton Act if built in connection with hospitals. Each type and many more of each type could be built if only the Administration would ask for an appropriation of the 150 million already authorized. We could even build them as the Administration proposes, merely by striking the phrase "in connection with hospitals" from the existing law.

Therefore, I regard any claims that this legislation represents a great extension of the Hill-Burton Act as simply not true.

But, since the Administration reluctantly proposes to ask only 75 million in Hill-Burton funds and passage of this bill will force it to ask further funds for essentially the same purpose, I shall vote for the bill.

However, in order to keep the record clear and make the bill less subject to misleading propaganda, I move the following amendment:

On line 15, page 5, after the last word, strike the dash and insert ", in addition to the $150,000,000 currently authorized for each of those years, -".

The vote on this amendment will show whether or not we really believe that a $210 million dollar a year program is needed. Adoption of the amendment will mean that everyone can compare the authorization with the appropriation actually requested and see clearly how much or how little of a program the Administration says it believes in, it actually wants to carry out.
See top of page 8, our analysis.
Mr. Chairman — The new language at the beginning of Section 654(b) is a decided improvement over the original bill. It allows funds allocated to any one of three types of facilities to be transferred to either of the other two if there are not enough approved applications to use up the funds in one category. It's an improvement, but I don't think it goes far enough.

It's quite possible that in any one year, a State may have some approved applications in all three of these categories, but not enough to use up the funds in any category. At the same time, however, that State may have many more applications for mental or T.B. or general hospitals than it has funds for.

To meet this situation and to see to it that all the funds a Congress is willing to appropriate in any one year are properly used, I think that any unused funds in these three categories should be made available for unmet needs in the basic program.

Therefore, I move that on line 22, page 9, we strike the comma after the word "paragraphs" and insert "or for the purposes set forth in the Hospital Survey and Construction provision of the United States Public Health Service Act". (This language can be sharpened up if time permits or after adoption of the amendment.)

I further move that the language on line 6 of page 10 be changed accordingly.
I move that we strike out everything after the word "that" on line 24 of page 9 to and including the word "and" on line 1 of page 10.

(for explanation see last paragraph on page 4 of our analysis of bill)
Amendment – Page 14, lines 22 and 23.

On page 14, strike out lines 22 and 23 and substitute "a facility for diagnosis or for the diagnosis and treatment of ambulatory patients".

(for explanation see last item on page 5 of our analysis)
Amendment:

If the words following "hospital" on line 21 of page 15 and all of lines 22, 23 and 24 are not stricken (that is, if the Committee decides to permit the building of rehab facilities "not in connection with hospitals"), the following amendment should be considered –

On lines 21 and 22 of page 15, strike the words "and related health".

(for explanation see last paragraph on page 6 of our analysis)
POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS

1. "Diagnostic or treatment centers", first referred to on page 2, is defined on page 14, line 21, as meaning "diagnosis or diagnosis and treatment center".

   Why not use this language all through the bill?

2. "Nursing homes" (page 2)

   Why not amend by substituting "convalescent centers"?

3. Page 2, line 20

   Change "by" to "in". (Services are not supplied by facilities)

4. Page 11, line 5

   Should the word "cooperative" be added?
Amendments

Technical Amendments to H.R. 8149 and technical questions pertaining to bill.

On page 2, line 20, substitute "in" for "by".

Page 10, line 7 - (See page 5 of analysis)

On page 11, lines 4 and 5: does the phrase "corporation or association" include "cooperatives"? If not, add the word. If so, let the report or floor debate so stipulate.