

PERCY A. HARTMAN
VETERANS SERVICE OFFICER
SAN PATRICIO COUNTY
P. O. BOX 1087

Sinton, Texas
May 11, 1964

RE: House Veterans Affairs Print

No. 189

Dr. Hector P. Garcia, M.D. 3024 Morgan Corpus Christi, Texas

Dear Dr. Garcia:

The enclosure is along the subject you and I discussed in San Diego, Texas 26 April 1964.

Congressman Teague is no good for the veterans of Texas, he has proven that time and time again. Mr. Gleason seems to fail to stand up for the veterans of South Texas. In fact we had recommended former Congressman John E. Lyle when Gleason was appointed. If T. C. Connell's name from Olin Teague's district would not have been submitted, John E. Lyle would now be the Administrator. When President Kennedy made the appointment he saw two names from Texas, Lyle and Connell, so naturally he saw our state did not present a solid backing of Lyle, consequently Gleason was chosen.

I believe this South Texas hospital will again take the efforts of all of the veterans organizations combined, the American G.I. Forum, V.F.W., the American Legion, D.A.V. Catholic War Veterans and all interested groups, and a letter from you to the Administration will help.

Enjoyed the meeting in San Diego and our brief meeting and discussion of the above items.

Let me know what your views are on this matter.

Yours very truly,

Percy 🚜. Hartman

Veterans County Service Officer

PAH:pab Encl.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1964.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE, Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are pleased to furnish the following comments in response to your requests for a report by the Veterans' Administration on H.R. 1718 and H.R. 2019, 88th Congress.

The bills, which are identical, would authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to acquire in either the 14th or 15th Congressional District of Texas a suitable site and to construct thereon a 300-bed general medical and surgical Veterans' Administration hospital.

Our long-range planning contemplates hospital location and relocation geographically where beds are required to meet patient demand and where staffing potential is at the optimum level. Every consideration is being given to an equitable distribution of beds by type and by geographic area. We believe that legislation directing the construction of hospitals in particular places would disrupt the orderly system of administrative planning which in the long run would yield the best and most equitable results.

After extensive study of our bed requirements in Texas we requested Presidential authorization to construct a 760-bed hospital at San Antonio, Tex., which will provide facilities for medical, surgical, and psychiatric patients. President Kennedy granted approval for the construction on February 11, 1963. We believe that the decision to construct a new hospital at San Antonio was based on sound program and economic reasons and follows our planning policies which are geared toward providing the best possible care for the greatest number of veterans.

For the reasons indicated I am unable to recommend this legislation which would involve construction of a hospital in the south Texas area at a location different from that which has been carefully selected as a result of intensive administrative study and planning.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

O

Sincerely,

W. J. Driver,

Deputy Administrator

(For and in the absence of
J. S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator).

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS, Washington, D.C., April 12, 1961. Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE. Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. DEAR MR. TEAGUE: The following comments are furnished by the Veterans' Administration on identical bills H.R. 194 and H.R. 680, 87th Congress. The bills would authorize building a 300-bed general medical and surgical hospital at a suitable site in either the 14th or 15th Con-

gressional District of Texas at a cost not to exceed \$26,000 per bed.

Those congressional districts are in south Texas.

Our long-range planning contemplates hospital location and relocation geographically where beds are required to meet patient demand and where staffing potential is at the optimum level. Every consideration is being given to an equitable distribution of beds by type and by geographic area. A new hospital for south Texas, however, is not included in our current planning. We anticipate that additional requirements for medical, surgical, and nuerological beds in Texas will be met through the conversion of tuberculosis beds as the TB demand declines. This, of course, will be a gradual process,

If the proposed legislation were enacted it would either require a change in present planning to accommodate the inclusion of the proposed south Texas hospital within the limits of our overall authorized capacity of 125,000 beds, or would require that this soundly conceived limitation be exceeded. We believe that legislation requiring the construction of hospitals at particular places would completely disrupt the orderly system of administrative planning which in the long run

will yield the best and most equitable results.

Accordingly, I cannot recommend favorable consideration of the

bills by your committee.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely.

J. S. GLEASON, Jr., Administrator.

he some stolerrand