

Mr. O'NEILL. I am just trying to prevent anything further from happening.

Mr. WATSON. We have had a lot happen despite other bills that have been passed. I only urge us to face our responsibilities as Members of the House. Certainly we have no control over the other body. I thank the chairman and Members for allowing me the opportunity to testify.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Watson.

The Committee will be glad to hear from you, Mr. Waggonner.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE FOURTH DISTRICT, STATE OF LOUISIANA**

Mr. WAGGONNER. May I express my personal appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee for the opportunity of being heard briefly and after that I will answer any questions that some of you might have of me with regard to this legislation.

I can only wish today that I had the oratorical ability of the 18th century English statesman, Edmund Burke, and if he were here today as a Member of the House of Representatives, I have no doubt in my mind that he would have asked to appear before this distinguished committee as I have in opposition to the bill before you. I feel safe in making this prediction because his position was exactly the same as mine. He summed up his view in words of crystal brilliant purity when he said:

The poorest man may, in his cottage, bid defiance to all the forces of the Crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storm may enter, the rain may enter . . . but the King of England cannot enter; all of his force dares not cross the threshold.

If ever there was an unassailable right of every freeman in America, this has been it: that in his home every man has sanctuary from the oppression of his government. This right, inalienable thus far, has played a vital role in the very development of this Nation, because it has been a heritage, a freedom, and a civilizing force giving us sober stability.

Now you gentlemen have before you legislation that will take away from every man, not just the white man at whom this bill is punitively aimed, but take away from every man the right to own and hold and dispose of his property as he sees fit. Those who want to railroad this bill through the House without benefit of any committee consideration in either the House or the Senate can try to soothe their consciences by saying that human rights take precedence over property rights, but this is self-delusion because, if you take away from man his right to own property, you are stripping him of a human right, not a property right, just as surely as if you took away his right to choose the kind of car he drives, what color suit he wears, what food he eats or what cigarette he smokes. These could be called property rights, too, because they too involve property, but what you take away from a man when you take away from him the right to sell his property as he chooses is not so much his property as his right to dispose of it.

If the present Supreme Court were made up of Justices devoted to preserving the Constitution of the United States instead of prostituting their positions to advance so-called social reforms, such a pro-