

house has been built for 50 years. How do you come along and say to this individual that his right to dispose of this property should be controlled?

I can't quite bring myself to see your reasoning. The mere fact that you say that you have got zoning statutes and that you have passed laws in Ohio and other States just does not ring a bell with me. I have got to know the reasoning behind it.

Mr. CELLER. We exempt that particular house that you mentioned.

Mr. LATTA. Beg pardon?

Mr. CELLER. You are speaking of the single family occupied home.

Mr. LATTA. He can't sell it on his own. This man is 80 years old. He can't go out and sell, he has got to use a broker or an agent.

Mr. CELLER. That is what is treated in the bill as a public sale, the public is involved there.

Mr. LATTA. How about an attorney who is settling an estate? Is he going to be covered by this?

Mr. CELLER. No, the attorney is not covered. In other words, there is a provision in the act that lawyers, solicitors, and others who aid in the clearing of title, for example. No attorneys are involved. That is expressly in the act. Of course, if he uses the attorney as an agent, that is another matter.

Mr. LATTA. Certainly he is an agent.

Mr. CELLER. On page 26 you find the exception, line 22, "Nothing in this proviso shall prohibit the use of attorneys, escrow agents, abstractors, title companies, and other such professional assistance as necessary to protect or transfer the title."

Mr. LATTA. You make a point here about the realtor. Mr. Chairman, certainly we have seen that the course of civil rights legislation is the same as other legislation. As soon as you open up the door one year, the next year you are in for something else and later something else again. So next year you can't use that argument, if this legislation passes this year. Isn't that a fair statement? What is going to be left for the next year or the following year when they talk about civil rights and open housing?

Mr. CELLER. Maybe at that time we won't need restrictions.

Mr. LATTA. Maybe an atomic bomb will fall on us and we won't need anything. That is really not the answer to the question. Let me ask you this question: Certainly if you use this elusive reasoning—I haven't yet been able to put my finger on it from a legalistic standpoint—as to real property, why can't you cover personal property in the next civil rights bill? This pencil belongs to me. Why can't you put regulations in there and say that you can't offer it for sale, you can't give it away, you can't divide it, you can't bequeath it, unless you have some kind of open sale provision.

The same type of reasoning that you are using for real property certainly should apply to personal property, shouldn't it, Mr. Celler?

Mr. CELLER. I don't know what this will lead to. We will cross that bridge when we come to it.

Mr. LATTA. The people in the country are interested in knowing where it might lead to. If you can sit here and attempt to reason with this committee and the Nation and say this is the reason that applies to real property and you can't say what it might do as far as personal is concerned, and you don't know what the future might hold, I think