

and they have another 4 or 5 months of filibuster, I don't know whether it would be any kind of a bill or not.

Mr. CELLER. May I respond?

One can discriminate, and one cannot discriminate. But it wasn't particularly my choice that that was put in there. That leeway was given to the single houseowner so as to get more support for the bill. That is the reason why that was put in there. There was a tremendous howl that we were hurting the owner of a single house particularly when it was his own residence. That was put in in order to gather more votes in support for the bill. That is the only reason we put that in.

Mr. PEPPER. Then you have got peculiar people like myself that get stuck on that point.

Mr. CELLER. You know if you have a balloon and you press in one direction you enlarge in another direction, and vice versa. What are you going to do about it?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Pepper, is that all?

Mr. WILLIAM ANDERSON. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Celler, you have been able to present your side of the argument in a very convincing manner, at least convincing to those who feel as you do about this matter.

There are some grave questions which have been raised here that I think deserve consideration. Finally, you have been before us now 2 days, which illustrates the controversy here about this bill. Although you have been rather firm in your declarations that this House, a legal body of the Congress, should accept all of these changes that have been made in this legislation, as well as the addition of other matters which in the judgment of this humble member are not germane. You still insist that it should go to the floor under a resolution which would agree to the Senate amendments, cut off entirely the opportunity of any Member of this House to offer an amendment and send it on to become the law of the land, even though Representatives of the people who are elected every 2 years have no opportunity to consider it.

Is that your position, still?

Mr. CELLER. That does not state exactly the real facts. We have, as I indicated before, passed upon practically all of these provisions not in *haec verba* but in substance the provisions were the same as before we passed on them. We approve them.

There has been interminable debate on these matters. There has been inordinate delay. I think in the interest of getting action, we should either accept the Senate amendments or vote them down; that is, this resolution that we are asking for would permit me at the certain stage when the debate is over—depending upon how long you will debate—to ask for the previous question.

Those who feel that we should get this thing over and done with, that we have labored long on these matters and that there is a fair degree of understanding among all the members could vote for the previous question. Those who are contrary-minded vote it down. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. My reply to that is that I don't think the gentleman has stated the question accurately either.

Mr. LATTI. Before you call the next witness, I would like to get the record straight on one thing here. The very able gentleman, chairman