

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, if there be no time to orally present it, of course, I want to file it for the record. I have deep feelings about this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, I call to the attention of my friend from Ohio the fact that we have invited him on several occasions to take the witness stand. The last message I had from him was that he desired to file his statement.

Mr. Latta?

Mr. LATTA. That is the impression that the gentleman gave us. The gentleman from Ohio indicated he wanted to file it rather than to present it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I should like to file this statement and have the time, please, sir, to say, regretfully, that I cannot agree with my very able colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Wiggins. There is a long section of my statement devoted to the constitutionality of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Ohio to submit his statement for the record will be granted.

(Mr. McCulloch's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am pleased to present my views to the Committee on Rules on H. Res. 1100. Everyone knows that the adoption of this resolution by the House would enact H.R. 2516 into law as written by the other body.

From January eighteenth to March eleventh of this year—for nearly two months—the other body considered little more than H.R. 2516. The labors of the other body drew national attention, and rightly so.

Open Housing, a most important part of the Bill, is once again before the Congress. In 1966, the House approved Open Housing legislation, but the other body did not act thereon. Now the other body has acted and the burden is upon us.

The people are watching, the people are waiting.

Indeed, they should. The broad problem of civil rights and civil disorders is one of the most difficult and troublesome domestic issues of our time. The problem saps our national strength, it paralyzes our will, it shames our soul.

Last summer, the President appointed a National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. What the report of the Commission said is pertinent here:

"This is our basic conclusion: Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal."

Focusing on the question of open housing, the Report observed:

"Discrimination prevents access to many non-slum areas, particularly the suburbs, where good housing exists. In addition, by creating a 'back pressure' in the racial ghettos, it makes it possible for landlords to break up apartments for denser occupancy, and keeps prices and rents of deteriorated ghetto housing higher than they would be in a truly free market."

Men can be imprisoned outside of jails. The ghetto-dweller knows that. The Negro knows that he is caged, that society really gives him nowhere else to go. There are no iron bars, but iron bars do not always the prison make. (Apologies to Richard Lovelace.) But neither are there any exits to so many entrances.

A federal open-housing bill could be compared to a writ of habeas corpus for a whole people. On passage of the bill, Congress would thereby decree that society has no right, no authority to imprison a man in a ghetto, because of his color.

A door would be opened. The prisoner would be free to leave, yes, free to flee the ghetto. Of course, the bill would not buy for the prisoner a fine home in the