

but, in truth, there is no such conflict. The ownership of property in our society carries with it rights and responsibilities which are indisputably "human rights." Chief among these is the individual owner's right to manage and sell and rent and use his property. As long as the owner pays the taxes on his property and uses it for no illegal or immoral purpose, he can do with it what he wishes. He can occupy it, vacate it, sell it, or rent it as he sees fit and to whom he wishes.

If H.R. 2516 is enacted in its present form, this will no longer be true.

Title VIII of this measure constitutes a dictatorial imposition on the homeowner by the federal government. It constitutes the use of federal force to divest an owner of fundamental rights and prerogatives which have always gone with ownership under our system. It gives preference to one party to a proposed transaction by denying to the other his freedom of choice.

Mr. Chairman, human rights cannot exist without property rights and a healthy respect for both. Any attempt to destroy or weaken the right of private ownership of property is an attempt to destroy a system of private capital and to substitute a totalitarian form of government in its place.

Any government which has the power to give all of its citizens everything can be the same government which can subsequently take away all rights of all citizens—of majority and minority groups alike, reducing them to the status of slaves and subjugating them absolutely to the tyranny of an all-powerful bureaucracy.

For those who clamor so loudly for federal action to correct what they regard as a wrong should reflect that this same federal action may some day be used against them.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that most Americans subscribe to the philosophy of the English statesman William Pitt, who said in the 18th century :

"The poorest man may, in his cottage, bid defiance to all force 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. * * *"

Our federal judiciary has followed William Pitt's philosophy. As Justice Harlan in a concurring opinion in *Peterson v. Greenville*, 373 U.S. 244 stated :

"An individual's right to restrict the use of his property, however unregenerate a particular exercise of that right may be thought, lies beyond the reach of the 14th amendment. The dilution or virtual elimination of that right cannot well be justified either on the premise that it will hasten formal repeal of outworn laws or on the ground that it will facilitate prudent State action is a case of that kind."

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Rules Committee, I respectfully urge that you give most careful consideration to House Resolution 1100 and, in your wisdom, require that the latest civil rights legislation—H.R. 2516—be returned to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives so that the will of the people, through their elected representatives, may be heard on this dangerous and far-reaching proposal.

Thank you very much.