

Letter to the Editor

LEGISLATION AND TECHNOLOGISTS

We would like to commend Mr. Andrews on his article on health care legislation that was published in the September 1974 issue of the *Journal* (1). It is our hope that his goal of getting nuclear medicine technologists interested and involved in the legislation affecting their livelihood will be achieved.

Mr. Andrews was able to give a fairly comprehensive overview in rather limited space of the many types of legislative items that either have been passed or are pending. The broad areas of Health Maintenance Organizations, Professional Service Review Organizations, and National Health Insurance are extremely difficult subjects to describe in such a short review. For further information regarding these controversial subjects, the reader is urged to take note of two other such articles that appeared in the *Journal* (2, 3).

At this time, we would like to expand on the

comments already made on bills S.667 and HR.673. These bills (virtually identical) set standards for "users of ionizing radiation" and do include nuclear medicine technologists. However, the inclusion is by name only and no nuclear medicine technologist standards were set by the drafters of the bills. In order for these bills to be of any value to nuclear medicine technologists, they must be broadened in scope to give just and fair representation to this profession. We believe that these bills are not basically sound and should not be supported in their present forms.

In the interim period between the publication of Mr. Andrew's article and the writing of this letter, several votes took place in Congress. The Senate attached S.667 to another bill as a device for passage, but support for this package was not available and the bill was withdrawn before a vote

was taken. Later, S.667 was added to the National Health Planning and Resources Development Bill (S.2994) and was passed by the Senate. A companion resolution in the House that did not contain any reference to radiologic technology licensure was approved. Because this bill was passed without any such reference and because there were many differences between the two versions, a House-Senate conference committee met to discuss the subject. As a result of this conference, S.667 was removed from the final version with the stipulation that the House would conduct hearings on the subject in early 1975. We must take steps to see that the views of the Technologist Section are represented at these hearings. Please convey your opinions to your National Council Delegate and to the Licensure and Registration Committee via the National Office.

It is also imperative that all nuclear medicine technologists always keep abreast of current legislation that is pending on both the Federal and State levels and that they express to us their opinions on a continuing basis so that we can better represent their interests.

LICENSURE AND REGISTRATION COMMITTEE, TECHNOLOGIST SECTION

References

1. Andrews RE: Will legislation endanger your livelihood? *J Nucl Med Tech* 2:105-107, 1974
2. Koch EI: Health legislation. *J Nucl Med Tech* 2:20, 1974
3. Simmons HE: PSRO—Its challenge and opportunity. *J Nucl Med Tech* 2:58-59, 1974