

June 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3365

their pay, by complaints that had gone unheeded, the workers in the large steel plant, about 30,000 in all, staged an uprising which the government quickly branded as a revolt. Tanks were rolled in, artillery pounded the workers, and regular army troops mopped up the hapless workers. In a couple of days, when it was all over, more than 100 were dead and several hundred were wounded.

Though the gallant protest was snuffed out before it could spread to other towns, it did have some beneficial effects. The Polish Communist Government took heed and improved working conditions, trimmed the work week and raised pay scales.

But the meaning of this brief uprising was clear far beyond the reaches of this town in western Poland. It showed that despite Soviet oppression, the will, the desire for freedom is still very much alive in Poland. And it is this unquenchable spirit that we honor today on the ninth anniversary of the Poznan uprising.

The United Nations at 20

SPEECH

OF

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, at this time of year we celebrate not only the birth of our country, but we commemorate the founding of the United Nations. By long and painful struggle, we severed our nationhood from that of Great Britain; by longer and more tortured experience we discovered that we could not separate our welfare from that of the world. Indeed, just as the American Revolution of 1776 protested violations of the basic rights and dignities of man, so did the San Francisco Convention of 1945 protest too many years of bloodshed, privation, and subjugation of peoples against their will.

As the United Nations reaches its 20th anniversary, critics argue that the U.N. has passed from infancy to senility without a ripe middle age of maturity. While nations and nationalism have existed longer than an organization of nations, it is certain that the parents of the United Nations regarded her birth as a blessing to mankind. Much expectation has become fact. But like any organization, the United Nations, regardless of age, has no will of its own; rather, it behaves as its members behave. When states act wisely and in harmony, the United Nations is applauded for its maturity; when countries dishonor the spirit of the charter, the United Nations is rendered feeble, never its most powerful constituents.

My praise of and good wishes for the United Nations cannot adequately attest to the monuments constructed by the U.N. to the peace and security of man. Human beings are alive today as a result of the work done and being carried on by the United Nations Children's

Fund, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, and the World Health Organization. For example, by 1962 the World Health Organization had freed 329 million people from the curse of malaria.

In the past few months Americans have become highly conscious of the word "escalation." I suggest that this term would be much more common to our vocabulary had not the United Nations intervened in Palestine, in Korea, and in the turbulent religious and ethnic conflict that is Cyprus. In 1956 the world created the first international peace-keeping force, the United Nations Emergency Force. Having this power to bolster the collective wishes of its members, the United Nations has restored peace to Suez, and more recently, has prevented the spread of greater and more ghastly horrors in the Congo. To utilize the Emergency Force in Vietnam merits serious attention, and although we cannot ignore the Soviet veto in the Security Council, neither can we pass over the United Nations as a vehicle of negotiations.

Today the United Nations labors under difficulties, but these troubles are overshadowed by the evils which the U.N. prevents and are dwarfed by the good which it has accomplished. Not long ago the Congress appropriated \$200 million to help finance the operations of the United Nations. Can anyone in good conscience say that this was not a wise investment? Perhaps the future will necessitate another such investment. This I would heartily support, for as President Kennedy said of the United Nations in an address before the General Assembly in 1961:

We're not to let it die, to enfeeble its vigor, cripple its powers, we would condemn our future.

Let me say that unlike totalitarian nations, the United States is not and never will be afraid to put its principles and practices before the world in an open and honest fashion. But I shudder at the dire consequences that would ensue should the world not have a meeting place where the actions of its members could be cross-examined, where the wants of its peoples could be fulfilled, and where men could come and reason together.

The Honorable Olin D. Johnston

SPEECH

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina and the Nation suffered a gigantic loss when Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON crossed over the river to take his place in history.

Many great and distinguished men have served in the Congress of the United States from South Carolina, but I know of no man more dedicated to his own State and to his Nation.

OLIN JOHNSTON has left an indelible mark in the annals of our legislative history. He will be remembered by countless thousands for his leadership in improving the working conditions of those who serve in civilian capacities in the Federal Government. But, his tremendous accomplishments in this area cannot overshadow the greatness he achieved as the only individual in the history of South Carolina to twice serve as Governor.

Lawyer, soldier, Governor, Senator. There are few Americans who can claim the distinctions which he earned.

OLIN JOHNSTON knew the rigors of war, having served in combat in France in World War I. But, above all, OLIN JOHNSTON understood, loved, and respected the most valuable asset to which any nation can lay claim—its people.

OLIN JOHNSTON never forgot, not for one moment throughout his long and distinguished career, that people are the only truly indispensable national possession.

His efforts in behalf of the farmers of South Carolina, as well as the farmers throughout the United States, will long be remembered.

But, OLIN JOHNSTON did not limit his interest in human affairs to any one particular group, for he was also in the forefront in the fight for better working conditions for men and women everywhere.

He knew the vicissitudes of history. He served as Governor of the State of South Carolina when poverty and unemployment were common catastrophes for countless thousands. He served in the State legislature during periods of prosperity, and he served in the U.S. Senate at the height of World War II.

He was continuously reelected by the people he so ably represented.

I have lost a personal friend. The South has lost a distinguished and truly great son. But the Nation has lost an outstanding patriot who was dedicated to every cause which led to the betterment of our way of life.

No words of mine can console those of his family and friends who remain behind, but we can take solace in the knowledge that we were privileged to know, love, and respect a great man who left this world far better because he lived, and during his lifetime, devoted his towering intellect, his humanness, and his energy to people and their problems.

WH DR Rumsfeld
**The Dominican Failure—And U.S.
Role in It**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James McCartney, of the Chicago Daily News Washington bureau, writes the following telling report on the critical moments of decision for the United States

June 28, 1965

with regard to the Dominican Republic since the assassination of Rafael Trujillo in 1961. As he points out, our Government had hoped to make the Dominican Republic a showcase of democracy in Latin America, but something, somewhere went wrong. Surely there are lessons to be learned from the sequence of events that led up to the present crisis in that land. I commend this report to the readers of the RECORD:

THE DOMINICAN FAILURE—AND THE U.S. ROLE
IN IT

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—Ten huge trucks were lined up in the hot sun just outside the port of Haina, near Santo Domingo. They were loaded with rich, but rotting melons.

The melons were raised, with U.S. assistance, to build a commercial fruit industry in the Dominican Republic as a means of strengthening the island's economy. This was the first commercial shipment, destined for the fruit-starved east coast of the United States.

But gunfire rattled in the distance and the 10 trucks did not move. The port was blocked—tied up by U.S. Navy ships, bringing in supplies for marines.

There was to be no new market, no new industry.

"It was ironic," says Carter Ide, the soft-voiced, mustached head of the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) program in the Dominican Republic. "We succeeded in growing melons. But those trucks just sat there and the melons rotted. It was too late."

In this particular instance, it was too late because the U.S. Government had deliberately withdrawn its AID mission in the Dominican Republic to protest a change in government.

This is the story of much of what happened in the AID program in the Dominican Republic, the major effect of the United States to build a Caribbean democracy.

From the time of the assassination of Dominican dictator Rafael Trujillo in 1961, the United States poured upwards of \$100 million into the Dominican Republic.

There were many points of crisis, but in retrospect it is clear the most critical moments of decision for the United States came on September 26, 1963—the day that Juan Bosch, the U.S.-supported President of the Dominican Republic was overthrown in a military-supported coup.

Bosch was the first freely elected President in Dominican history. Now he had been booted out by a military-supported junta—that hated symbol of Latin American dictatorship.

The United States has been criticized by liberals for tolerating—and sometimes supporting—Latin American dictatorships. President John F. Kennedy now had to make a choice.

His first choice was to withhold recognition from the new regime as a gesture of protest. His second was to withdraw the U.S. AID mission.

He announced that the United States would withhold some \$55 million in loan and grant aid, much of it administered by AID.

Toward the end of October President Kennedy stated U.S. objectives: The United States sought a "restoration of constitutional government" in the Dominican Republic.

That would seem to have been an argument for the restoration of Bosch. An argument raged in Latin circles at the time over whether the United States should recognize the new regime. Some European countries did.

In the State Department the new regime did not look too bad.

Pressures were exerted upon the junta to promise new elections—a tactic that has become a ritual in Latin American coups.

Donald Reid Cabral, then emerging as the country's new leader, promised the elections. Later, however, they were postponed. The most recent promised date was this coming September.

State Department officials say they were seriously worried at the time by the possibility of a military coup—a move by the far right wing that would have meant certain dictatorship.

As time passed, the longer they looked at Reid the more they felt he was truly a moderate with whom they could deal.

While arguments raged in the island republic, however, President Kennedy was assassinated. Suddenly there were new questions.

Only a few weeks after President Johnson took office, the junta was formally recognized, leading to wide speculation that Mr. Johnson had abandoned what was believed to be Kennedy's anti-junta attitude.

State Department officials insist this sequence of events was misleading—that Kennedy actually made the decision to recognize the junta before he was slain.

When Reid actually assumed the Presidency in January 1964, the United States was deliberately cool. There was no rush to get a new Ambassador to the scene to replace John Bartlow Martin, who had worked closely with Bosch.

It wasn't until April—7 months after the AID mission was removed—that a new mission was established and the program resumed.

By State Department standards, Reid proved to be a top-notch President. No one believes he had wide popular support, but he was a tough administrator.

The economy was running wild and United States and International Monetary Fund experts advised Reid that he needed to institute an "austerity" program.

The military, among others, who fought him tooth and nail, were using military planes to fly in huge quantities of contraband goods—in violation of import regulations. Military brass were getting rich on the proceeds.

When Reid sought to crack down on the military, he lost vital military support.

Then he had more bad luck. The bottom dropped out of sugar prices—and sugar is the basic commodity of the Dominican economy. Sugar prices had risen to an astronomical 12 or 13 cents a pound the previous year because of worldwide shortages. The result was a vast overproduction of sugar around the world—and in the Dominican Republic.

By last September, the penalty for overproduction became apparent—prices dropped to 2½ or 3 cents a pound.

At one time, U.S. experts figured that Reid's government would survive if it could just get through April. The rebellion erupted April 24.

"Reid did everything the experts wanted," says one State Department official. "But every time he did something right, he lost political support. He lost the generals for cracking down on graft, labor for trying to stop featherbedding. He had no political sense."

But most of his advice, it should be recalled, was coming from the United States.

A key point, however, is that Reid actually had little meaningful U.S. help through his most critical days. This was not because of a lack of desire to help. It was an outgrowth of the cancellation of the AID program when Bosch was overthrown.

An AID program cannot be built overnight, and the U.S. program that had been built up in previous years went to pot in the months after it was withdrawn.

Ide, the head of the new mission that was established last April, says he found the program a shambles when he arrived in Santo Domingo.

According to official figures, the United States promised a total of about \$65 million in AID funds to support the Reid regime. That was more than the United States had committed to Bosch.

Ide says he believes that if the re-instituted program had had more time to develop it could have been "politically decisive" in the Dominican Republic. In other words, it could have saved Reid.

But he says it was not strong enough at the time the rebellion began.

How much more time would he have needed?

"In 4 months we could have had visible evidence of the program—in the form of new housing in the slums, rural development programs, that sort of thing," says Ide.

Many State Department officials now believe it was a mistake to withdraw the AID program from the Dominican Republic. Some believe that the lesson to be learned is that aid funds should not be used to try to apply political leverage.

"We should try to help the people," says one. "In the long run that would do us the most good. We may lose sometimes, but in the long run it would be the best policy."

There are other dilemmas as well. Few in the State Department believe that Bosch was stable enough to have become a successful leader.

"As a Government administrator," says one, "he was a great short story writer." Officials doubt, even in retrospect, if restoring Bosch to power would have proven successful.

Almost all officials take the view that Dominicans are so politically immature that expecting them to operate a democracy in the U.S. pattern is asking too much.

"Maybe we tried elections too soon," says one. "Perhaps we should think in terms of permitting long periods of political education before pushing so hard for elections."

Should the United States have recognized the new regime in the Dominican Republic when Bosch was overthrown? Should it have withdrawn its AID mission?

Few here pretend to have absolute answers to these key questions of the Dominican crisis.

But evidence does suggest, however, that U.S. indecision on the questions may have contributed heavily to the Dominican tragedy.

Recall of Lyndon Johnson's 1959 Statements to Doctors in 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD today, for the benefit of my colleagues, the remarks of Dr. Ralph C. Teall, president of the California Medical Association, before the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association in New York on June 24, 1965. They are as follows:

I would like to remind this House that in its clinical session in Dallas, Tex., in December 1959, we had the honor of hearing from the late great Speaker of the U.S.

June 28, 1965

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2213. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, urban mass transportation, and community facilities; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above bill when reported by Mr. SPARKMAN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. ERVIN (by request):

S. 2214. A bill making certain amendments to the District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. ERVIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

WH DR Harte
CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—COMBAT INFANTRYMAN BADGE FOR DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we still have a great many of our men in the Armed Forces assisting in the Dominican crisis. During the period since our first activity there, a number of our men there have been killed and a much larger number wounded. Those who have been under fire, of course, comprise a still greater number.

This is an action, I believe, which warrants the award of that coveted recognition which the Nation has given under similar circumstances, and which I understand we do in South Vietnam, the Combat Infantryman Badge. The decision on the matter, of course, must be made in the Pentagon, but it might help to stimulate a favorable decision and give this measure of recognition if the Congress should express its opinion.

I am, therefore, submitting a concurrent resolution which declares it to be the sense of Congress that members of the U.S. Army assigned to duty in the Dominican Republic during the present crisis should be awarded the Combat Infantryman Badge, and that the Secretary of the Army should take the necessary action to do so. I hope it may receive early consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41) to express sense of Congress on awarding the Combat Infantryman Badge to member of armed services assigned to duty in Dominican Republic, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that members of the United States Army assigned to duty in the Dominican Republic during the present crisis in that country should be awarded the Combat Infantryman Badge, and that the Secretary of the Army should initiate appropriate action to award such badge to members of the Army, in the grade of colonel and below, for duty performed in such country during such crisis.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 35, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate ref-

erence, a bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code and the Trademark Act of 1946 with respect to appeals in patent and trademark cases.

The purpose of this bill is to abolish the existing statutory requirement for "reasons of appeal." During the 88th Congress, I introduced a somewhat similar bill, S. 1940.

The objectives sought by this bill have been endorsed by the Judicial Conference of the United States and by the American Bar Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2207) to amend title 35 of the United States Code, Patents, and the Trademark Act of July 5, 1946, as amended, with respect to appeals in patent and trademark cases, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT RELATING TO MINIMUM WAGE AND HOUR REGULATIONS IN SO-CALLED SHELTERED WORKSHOPS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill that would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act by applying minimum wage and hour regulations to what are commonly referred to as sheltered workshops.

These are the establishments that employ handicapped individuals. Over the years, Congress has accepted the view that if these people had to be paid the legal minimum it would be impossible to employ them altogether.

Yet this is the same argument that Congress has rejected for all other establishments. I think the time has come to recognize that the principle of minimum wage laws applies just as much to the handicapped person who is gainfully employed as it does to anyone else. That principle is that there is a minimum standard of decent living that should be covered in wages paid, and that this standard should be met irrespective of considerations of productivity.

In some ways, the minimum living standards for the handicapped are higher than for others, because with special needs for care or for devices to aid them in getting around, the handicapped have higher living expenses. Yet we find that in a shop where these people are gainfully employed, the handicapped person may be receiving as little as 30 cents an hour in wages, while the non-handicapped secretary who handles the clerical business and the truckdriver who picks up and distributes the goods are receiving prevailing wages.

This measure, which is similar to one introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman JOHN DENT, of Pennsylvania, looks to gradual improvement in these conditions. It is not an outright abolition of the present exemption, but it requires that wages paid in most of these establishments be brought up to the prevailing minimum over a period of 3 years. It provides that where

special certificates are issued thereafter by the Secretary of Labor for establishments having special circumstances that warrant a continued exemption, the wages paid must be at least 50 percent of the minimum.

Of course, it will be said that jobs will be eliminated for this group of people. That is what is always said when it is proposed to extend minimum-wage coverage to a group of workers. But when one sees that 167 of the certificates issued by the Secretary of Labor for sheltered workshop exemption permitted wages of less than 25 cents an hour, and 8 permitted wages of only 5 cents an hour, one cannot be sure that employment at that level of earned income is worth saving. Who among us could survive on an hourly wage of 25 cents an hour? With the added expenses incurred by those with physical impairment, I wonder if we do not in fact encourage these people to live on public charity rather than work 8 hours a day for \$2 or less.

As I have noted, in cases where the productivity of the individual is so small as to be only token, the bill would permit the Secretary of Labor to continue issuing certificates of exemption. But even in these cases I believe the minimum paid should be at least half the legal minimum.

I hope that this measure can be considered along with other proposed changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act so that we can begin applying the same worthwhile principle of minimum wage legislation to the men and women who work in this type of establishment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2210) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase to 50 percent of the minimum under section 6 the minimum wage applicable to handicapped workers employed in sheltered workshops and to provide for periodic increases beginning January 1, 1966, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 88-597, TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF THE MENTALLY ILL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, less than a year has elapsed since Public Law 88-597 was enacted to protect the rights of the mentally ill in the District of Columbia. Obviously, this is too short a period to permit a fair commentary on the effectiveness of the new law. Since a comprehensive new system was inaugurated with this legislation, it was to be expected that some time would be necessary to implement it smoothly under new regulations. We did not attempt to close every loophole or deal with every detail by statutory provision, for one of the complaints about the old law was its rigidity, and its complex, involved machinery which had been amended in piecemeal fashion over many years in an

June 28, 1965

attempt to meet every situation which might occur. From reports I have received thus far, however, the new system is working well. Vast numbers of individuals in the medical and legal professions, as well as private citizens, have indicated satisfaction with the new system.

Admission statistics compiled by the staff of St. Elizabeths Hospital illustrate the salutary impact which the new law is having in the treatment of the mentally ill. Dr. Dale Cameron, Superintendent of the hospital, informed me earlier this year that it appears to have changed the composition of admissions to St. Elizabeths. The number of voluntary admissions has increased under the new procedures, while the number of civil commitments has decreased, and the District of Columbia is beginning to compare quite favorably in this respect with other jurisdictions.

These changes were described in some detail in the "Superintendent's Column" of the Saint Elizabeths Reporter of March. It was stated there:

While the professional staff members in the receiving services of the hospital are well aware that during the last few months something is happening in terms of increased admissions, particularly of voluntary and emergency patients, the magnitude of this happening is perhaps best appreciated by looking at a few statistics. In the year before the enactment of Public Law 88-597, the provisions of which were described in a previous issue of the Reporter, admissions of civil patients averaged 101 per month. Of these, 82 percent were committed and only 18 percent were voluntary. Since that law was passed, such admissions have averaged 122 per month and the number is steadily rising. In January, 145 were admitted. But of even greater importance is the fact that committed patients now constitute only 52 percent of admissions, while voluntary and non-protesting patients account for 48 percent of all civil admissions.

It is much too soon to predict at what level these figures will stabilize, but certainly they indicate that the new law is having the effect its sponsors and supporters sought. Patients are increasingly availing themselves of needed hospital services without the necessity of being forced to do so.

The measure drafted in subcommittee and passed by Congress dealt with procedures for hospitalization of the mentally ill and the protection of their rights once they are in the hospital. Last fall, just before the passage of the bill, various groups expressed an interest in amending it. Most of the amendments, I felt at the time, were directed to tangential, longstanding problems not directly arising from the provisions of the bill. They relate to residency, liability of relatives, and fiscal arrangements of the District of Columbia and Federal Governments. In order to afford them appropriate consideration and study by committee as to their effect on the policy of the new law, I am introducing them now.

At an early date, I hope to schedule hearings before the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee to review the operation of the new law and the course of its implementation.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2214) making certain amendments to the District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act, introduced by Mr. ERVIN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 12 of the District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act is amended to read as follows:

"NONRESIDENTS"

"SEC. 12. (a) If an individual who is a patient in a public hospital pursuant to section 4, 5, or 7 of this Act is not a resident of the District of Columbia, he shall, upon the ascertainment of such individual's residence in a State, be transferred to that State if an appropriate institution in that State is willing to accept him; except that, if an individual hospitalized under section 4 or 5, or any other person entitled to demand his release thereunder, protests such transfer after receipt of notice of the proposed transfer, such protest shall be deemed to be a demand for such release under section 4(b) or 5(b), as the case may be. Notwithstanding any provisions of the preceding sentence, alternative arrangements for the care and treatment of the patient within or outside the District of Columbia (other than at a public hospital in the District and other than at the expense of the Federal Government or the District of Columbia) may be made at the request of the patient or a responsible person on his behalf. If the person to be transferred is an indigent, the expense of transferring him, including the traveling expenses of necessary attendants, shall be borne by the District of Columbia.

"(b) In any proceeding for hospitalization under court order pursuant to section 7, the Commission shall, subject to review by the court, making a finding as to whether the respondent is a resident of the District of Columbia and, if then known or readily ascertainable, as to his place of residence in any case in which he is not a resident of the District of Columbia. In the case of any individual hospitalized under any section of this Act with respect to whom either of such findings has not been so made, such finding shall be made by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or its designee, subject to de novo judicial review upon petition filed by the patient or any other interested person with the court within five days after notice of proposed transfer has been given by such Board or designee to the patient. Notice of the proposed transfer shall also be given, if known, to the patient's attorney, legal guardian, spouse, parents, or other nearest adult relative. Such petition may be referred by the court to the Commission for hearing and report.

"(i) For the purposes of this section, the term 'resident of the District of Columbia' means an individual who has had his principal place of abode in the District of Columbia for more than one year immediately prior to the filing of the application or petition referred to in subsection (a) of section 4, 5, or 7 of this Act, or is domiciled in the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. The District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"TRANSFER OF PATIENTS"

"SEC. 21. For the purpose of insuring the proper and efficient utilization of the public hospitals owned and operated by the De-

partment of Health, Education, and Welfare and of the District of Columbia, respectively, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, provide by agreement for the designation of the specific public hospital or hospitals to which individuals shall be initially admissible under this Act, and for transfer of patients from one such hospital to another.

"LIABILITY FOR COST OF CARE"

"SEC. 22. (a) A patient hospitalized under this Act or under the Act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 625), as amended, the Act of August 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1293), as amended, or the Act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 572), as amended, or his estate if sufficient for that purpose, or the father, mother, spouse, or adult children of such patient, if of sufficient ability, shall be legally responsible for the cost of such hospitalization.

"(b) Where the cost of care of a patient in Saint Elizabeths Hospital is chargeable against funds of the District of Columbia or against Federal funds appropriated to the hospital, the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of Saint Elizabeths Hospital (or his designee) are, respectively, authorized to make such agreements as they deem necessary with any person legally responsible therefor for payment to the District of Columbia or to the hospital, whichever is chargeable with the cost of the patient's care, of all or a portion of the cost of such care. The District and the Superintendent are, further, respectively authorized to take or cause to be taken appropriate steps, by legal action or otherwise, (1) to enforce such agreements, or (2) in the absence of an agreement, to recover such cost of care or a portion thereof, from any person legally liable therefor.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Act of August 4, 1947 (61 Stat. 751, 24 U.S.C. 169), the funds collected pursuant to this section for the cost of care chargeable to the hospital shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the then current appropriation for the operation of the hospital.

"AVAILABILITY OF DISTRICT FUNDS"

"SEC. 23. (a) The funds of the District of Columbia shall not be available for the care of any patient hospitalized prior to the effective date of this Act for whom the District of Columbia was not responsible prior to the date of this Act; and they shall not be available for the care of any patient hospitalized on or after that date under this Act (except those hospitalized in the District of Columbia General Hospital under section 6 or 7), unless he either (a) has had his principal place of abode in the District for more than one year immediately prior to application for his hospitalization under this Act or the filing of the petition referred to in section 7(a), or (b) was domiciled in the District of Columbia at the time of such application or filing. Nor shall the District of Columbia be liable for the cost of hospitalization of an individual under this Act in any private hospital except pursuant to contract between the District and such hospital. The term 'domicile' shall not include domicile established for the sole or primary purpose of hospitalization.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (a), the cost of care of patients hospitalized at Saint Elizabeths Hospital under this Act shall be a charge upon the District of Columbia and shall be paid by the District to the hospital."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first month which follows the date of the enactment of this Act by more than thirty days, except that section 23, as added by this Act, shall be effective on and after September 15, 1964.