On the other hand, how are you ever going to break up the ghettos and distribute the people around unless you give them the same access to where they went to live as you and I live?

This poses a very difficult problem for all of us.

Mr. Quillen. If the gentleman will yield.

I understand this week's Life magazine makes a suggestion to the Senator from New York that he find a good barber. Maybe it would be very helpful if he started cleaning up a little bit himself.

Mr. Pepper. He may get a trimming of a sort before this matter

is over. I just don't know.

Mr. John B. Anderson. Would the gentleman from Florida yield? I think you have made a fair statement, Mr. Pepper, about this problem of dispersing people in the ghettos. My problem is this, on this exemption: It also goes in a way of the question Mr. Young raised. Aren't we by adopting this compromise of what is supposed to be, and I think is a great moral principle by adopting this separate compromise where we say to Harry Homeowner, you go out and discriminate to your heart's content just as long as you don't go and hire a member of the real estate fraternity?

I think we are building subterfuge into that law and making trouble for us. We are going to have to come back in the Congress and eliminate that kind of dichotomy, the fellow who discriminates without any legal sanction of his own. This is what I have not been able to get through my head. I went so far the other day as to draw a resolution that would accept the Senate bill with the single amendment, strike out that exemption altogether that permits an individual homeowner to discriminate as long as he doesn't hire a broker. How would you feel about that?

Mr. Pepper. Would the gentleman let me answer that, since he commented on my remarks, and then you will get the authoritative answer

from the able chairman.

There is a technical justification for the position that the able chairman of the Judiciary Committee takes in the sense that you sort of are using people that are devoted by their protection to the service of the public interest. But, actually, I agree with you that lawyers know the Latin that means what you may do by yourself, you may do by

When I tell an agent what my limitations are that he can handle my property in such a way, and give him a specific instruction, it ought to be the same as if I do it myself. We all know as a practical matter here now that the rules being what they are, the other body, if we make one little amendment and send it back over there, no matter how easily they could accept it, we all know as a practical matter that it opens the things up to another filibuster.

They had this bill over there for months. That is another matter, relative weighing of interest. So we take a little something that we don't really like, as against the possibility that we may lose everything

if it goes back over there for another filibuster.

Mr. John B. Anderson. They voted cloture twice in 2 weeks over there.

Mr. Pepper. If I could vote for amendment to change this about the realtor, I would do it. If I have to do that and send it back over there