

Mr. YOUNG. But the principle is there that after 1969 they can't use the real estate man.

I want to make this prediction, Mr. Chairman, that there are a lot of people, Members of the House, who have voted for civil rights bills. I have always tried to vote for or against on the basis of content of the bill. I predict that this bill is in trouble and it appears to me that it will be in trouble on the floor. It is going to be, not because of the civil rights but because of the discriminatory character of this legislation against the real estate people in restricting them and saying that they cannot do for the individual what the individual can do for himself.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Pepper, do you have any questions?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I noticed that item about the attorney fee. Who pays that attorney's fee? Who puts up the money? The court may appoint an attorney. But I didn't notice that it provided where the money would come from to pay the attorney.

Mr. CELLER. Whatever court funds would be available for that purpose and State courts as well. The courts would pay that. The individual won't pay it. The court would pay the attorney's fee. It is like when you were a youngster, you were assigned cases, you were paid through the court.

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Excuse me, one other thing. You being the scholar that you are, didn't Abraham Lincoln say something about the matter of property relative importance of property and people, human rights as related to property rights?

Mr. CELLER. I think he did. I couldn't put my finger on the quotation.

Mr. PEPPER. My distinguished friend from Ohio talked about the laws. He was talking about the law and its relationship to the control of property. I can not sell my whisky that I may own to anybody I want to. I can't sell my marihuana, if I had any, to anybody I want to. I can't sell my property to a man to build a saloon on it or to operate a saloon on it in any given area where saloons are forbidden, and the like. So generally property is held subject to the public interest. It is always a matter to agree where the public interest enters into the matter. To me this is a very, very difficult question.

I know the prevailing public sentiment is probably against this type of legislation. There are many, many people who are very conscientious and patriotic Americans and who feel very resentful about this type of legislation. Since Senator Kennedy's name was mentioned by my good friend from Tennessee, I saw somewhere the other day that the Senator thought the emphasis should be put on rebuilding the good housing in what you might call the ghettos, where the minority groups are already congregating.

For the life of me I don't see how we are ever going to break up the ghettos and eliminate some of the bad conditions unless we can disperse the people who live there so that the areas will not be ghetto areas. If somebody knows another way to do it, I don't know. I don't like very much the fact that we offend the sensibility of so many people. I know it will affect property values in areas. That is a practical fact.