

ing authority to bring low-cost housing into their area where they have large investments.

I don't condemn or approve their attitude, but I merely point it out as a specific bit of evidence that people do like to protect their own property.

In an area of the city in which I formerly lived my neighbors were members of the Negro race. A colored church was within a hundred yards of my house. For as long as I can remember, people of both races have lived in this neighborhood in harmony. It was not a slum neighborhood. They live there now without friction.

But I dare say that if you went to my former neighbor who was a member of another race up the street and told him that under a Federal law he had to sell his house to a member of my race, and he had a son who was willing to pay him just a little bit less or a good friend of his own race, that he would loudly proclaim that any such law as that was a foolish law.

This I think is something that we must remember. There are people other than white southerners and Negroes in this country. There are members of religious groups. I know when I went to Brooklyn in World War II where the Navy had sent me, I was amazed that the social life, residential decisions, and everything else in the community where I went revolved around a Methodist Church.

When I wanted an apartment, living with fine fellow Methodists in their home, and we were looking for an apartment, they helped us find an apartment which they knew another Methodist was about to vacate. It was purely on the basis of my religious affiliation and in that time of great housing shortage we found the place to live. But under this bill, as I understand it, I cannot say if I put my house on the market, I cannot say to you, "Well, I will tell you one thing, I am not going to sell it to a Baptist, I am going to sell it to a Methodist because I think I owe it to my church to look after the Methodists."

If I were an Italian living in an Italian neighborhood, I couldn't say, and I couldn't have my broker go out and say, "We don't want any Polish people here, we want to sell this place only to Italians."

So this bill is a little more than just black and white. I certainly would not be understood here as saying that I favor prejudicial conduct on the basis of race, color, or national origin. But I do think that we are entitled as individuals to discriminate, as the Supreme Court has said we are entitled to, as individuals we are entitled to have our prejudices whether they be commended by the community or not.

If you start applying Federal law to every individual that you know that had prejudice about many, many different matters, the Federal judiciary would be totally inadequate in number to undertake to handle the cases.

The antiriot provision we are all familiar with. I would like to point out a rather interesting thing. I don't know that Mr. Celler has dealt with this, but you have a title X in this bill called Civil Obedience. You have another title, the title on riots. You will note that in the chapter 102 on page 9, it is in title I, I guess, it was rather interesting to me to note that in that title, that section on riots, the other body was very anxious to write into that title at the bottom of page 10, line 25, subsection (e), "nothing contained in this section shall be construed to make it unlawful for any person to travel in or use any facility inter-