ering, a lot of prejudice and division, divisiveness that exist in America today by this bill if it is enacted into law.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. May I comment, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly, you can respond to the gentleman's question.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman concludes by saying we are going to eliminate a lot of prejudice and divisiveness and bickering which is going on in this country today by passing this so-called civil rights proposal.

I don't think any of our members need to be very long in remembering that this same claim was laid to each of the previous civil rights proposals that we have had in recent years, beginning with my first session in the Congress, the 87th Congress, and I don't think any of you will challenge the statement when I make the statement that none of these have accomplished what its proponents said.

Now the gentleman started by saying that neither he nor I were real estate experts. I readily agree that I am not. And I accept the gentleman's statement that he is not. But the very fact that he admits that he is a lawyer, that as a Member of Congress, and I admit that I, not as a lawyer, but as a Member of Congress considering this legislation, cannot class myself as a real estate expert makes necessary the usage of third parties in conducting real estate transactions. And the use of third parties is outlawed by this proposal if a man is not to be subject to the penalty of the law after a due process of time, when the law is fully in effect.

Now there isn't anything in the present law today that prevents any man who owns a home or any real estate man who is engaged in the real estate business from selling to whomever they want to, if they want to. These things can be done now if people want to.

I think the very fact that people don't want to is demonstrated by virtue of the fact that they haven't been doing these things that we are going to compel them to do by passage of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Anderson?

Mr. JOHN B. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, just one question. I understood the gentleman to say that he interprets section 805 to say that a financial institution cannot deny a loan.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHN B. ANDERSON. I read those words "to deny a loan" in connection with the next clause "or to discriminate against him because of race, color, religion, or national origin." I don't see how you can come to the conclusion that this is a prohibition against turning down a loan. Don't you have to read in the other clause in that section?

Mr. WAGGONNER. Yes, sir. But it says "or to discriminate against him in the fixing of the amount of interest rate, duration or other terms or conditions of such loan or other financial assistance."

Mr. JOHN B. ANDERSON. Because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Mr. WAGGONNER. But not the basic right. The basic right to deny the loan is not included in those prohibitions.

Now the English construction, Mr. Anderson, simply is not there.

Mr. JOHN B. ANDERSON. Well, I wouldn't set myself up as a stylist and perhaps the gentleman's knowledge of syntax is better than