

Mr. Anderson.

Mr. JOHN B. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I too want to take the opportunity of expressing my deep appreciation to Mr. Mathias for his complete candor this morning in acknowledging that he, and I might add quite a few others, were wrong in initially condemning this committee for its decision to hold some hearings and to get into some of the matters involved in the 10 titles of this bill.

I have been the recipient myself, and I know other members of this committee have, too, of some very angry, outraged letters, some of which just reached my desk this morning. I think of one from a clergyman in particular, saying "How dare you bottle up that bill in the Committee on Rules after the Senate debated it for 8 weeks?"

Well, of course, what the Senate talked about for 8 weeks really has very little to do with our function and our responsibility on this side of the Capitol. So I appreciate this public acknowledgment that the committee has served some function and purpose.

Maybe ultimately it will prove beneficial, who knows, to those who are urging a particular procedure in this case. Sometimes those who in their zeal promote their cause do themselves, I think, some damage by not having a decent respect for orderly legislative procedures. So I think the gentleman has performed a real service this morning with his *mea culpa*, if that in fact is what it was.

Mr. MATHIAS. If the gentleman would yield at that point, my feeling that the committee was proper in providing the members this time for reflection will, I feel, be disappointed if the committee doesn't go forward now with the logical sequence to this period for reflection, which is action.

Mr. JOHN B. ANDERSON. That is of course a matter for another day.

Mr. MATHIAS. I just wanted the gentleman to realize that my thought was a comprehensive one, which didn't stop with reflection only.

Mr. JOHN B. ANDERSON. I understand that. I have only one other question, and that is, the gentleman has emphasized his conviction that title VIII of this bill represents the implementation of a great moral principle, far more than the fact that it may have some practical effect in moving people out of the ghettos.

And I think he realizes the limitations of this title in that regard, that it does represent anchoring into the law a great moral principle. Does he agree with me, however, that we have rather sadly compromised that principle in the language that was adopted by the other body, which gives the individual homeowner complete freedom to discriminate as long as he does not retain the services of a realtor?

It seems to me if it is immoral for the homeowner to employ a broker to sell his property, does it suddenly become moral if he undertakes to engage in selling his property himself without an agent and in doing so discriminates?

Mr. MATHIAS. Well, let me say that again I don't feel that this bill anchors any moral principle into the statute books. I think that was done in 1866, 102 years ago. All we are doing is——

Mr. JOHN B. ANDERSON. Obviously that hasn't been very effective, or we wouldn't be here today worrying about the problem.

Mr. MATHIAS. No. The enforcement provisions of that act are 102 years old, and this is what this is all about. But let me say this, the