

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FORCED HOUSING ORDINANCE

From the Illinois Association 'Kit'.

Right to Choose

It takes away the property owner's right to choose as between potential buyers or renters, and it prevents his agent from carrying out his wishes.

It prevents the property owner from carrying out the dictates of his conscience in selecting a purchaser that he knows to be acceptable to neighbors and friends.

Owner's Concern for Neighborhood

Isn't it natural for the property owner to be concerned when leaving a neighborhood that has meant much to him, that involves some of his happiest memories, that contains close friends and relatives? Not only is he concerned about potential drop in property values, but the social change. He reads in the Dr. Ingle report, "The Trials of a Community After Negroes Moved In", in U. S. News and World Report of September 16, 1963, where neighborhoods became unsafe for wives and children. The property owner discovers he is not alone in his feelings when he reads the Aslop-Quayle Report in the Saturday Evening Post of September 7, 1963, that 77% of the people interviewed, from coast to coast, believed that a person should have the right to refuse to sell his house except to a person of his choice. (See quotations attached.)

Right to Deal with Persons of Own Choice

An owner willing to sell his home on contract could be under pressure to sell to anyone of a minority group who had the required down payment and current earnings although the owner might doubt his future financial ability. Suppose he is forced to sell to this person, his apprehensions later develop into reality, and he is faced with taking his property back, in a badly deteriorated condition, and suffers substantial loss preparing the property for resale? Does the Human Rights Commission reimburse him for his loss?

Powers of the Commission

An owner may have had good reason to believe he could secure \$20,000 for his home when he listed it for sale, at a time when the proposed Forced Housing Ordinance might be in effect. His agent is offered \$16,000 by a minority group buyer and the agent transmits the offer to the seller. At this point the seller could properly reject the offer. Later, the seller finds his price of \$20,000 is too high, and he advises his agent to consider offers. A second prospective purchaser submits an offer of \$16,000. The seller accepts. The maker of the earlier \$16,000 offer hears of the transaction, feels he has been discriminated against because of race, and files a complaint as prescribed in the ordinance. The seller must now defend against a charge when it is difficult to prove facts. The charge is not the result of an action, but for a presumed motive. It would appear he could be found guilty although he had acted in good faith. In addition to the expense to the property owner for legal counsel, he could be fined and jailed.

The Forced Housing Ordinance would be administered by a highly controversial, broadly powered commission, which, by its inherent nature, would be difficult to be neutral. It would be inclined to act only against the owner and his agent. It can initiate actions on its own behalf against the owner, has the power to investigate, has the authority, at the taxpayer's expense, to enlist the aid of any and all departments of the city, and has the power to hold hearings, with no need to adhere to rules of evidence. It is in the position of being prosecutor, judge and jury.

(over)

Cost to Owner of Investigation

The property owner may be completely innocent, but have proven it only after considerable cost of time and money. The Ordinance doesn't provide reimbursement for his legal fees or compensation for his lost time. The owner could be continually harassed in this manner until his position could become untenable. Harassment by minority individuals could also lead to blackmail. It is frightening to the owner of rental property to see the almost endless opportunity for people to bring false charges against him under the terms of the Forced Housing Ordinance. The property owner taxpayer foots the bill for the complainant, while as the property owner defendant he may not be financially able to cope with the financial drain in defending himself.

Burden of Investigation on Owner

The legal snarls posed are disturbing. Suppose an owner of rental property rejects a minority couple for the reason they appear not to meet the moral standards required of his tenants. Later he rents to another couple. The first couple file a complaint charging discrimination. In order for the commission to rule fairly on the complaint, it would have to determine by investigation the relative moral character of the complainants and the accepted tenants.

Question of Hidden Sweeping Powers

A disturbing question is posed to an apartment-house owner planning improvements, or for other economic reasons contemplating a rental increase. It would appear to avoid a charge of discrimination, of attempting to force out certain tenants, he might need to be subjected to a complete financial scrutiny by the commission. Could this broadly powered commission interpret the motive as designed to force out tenants and then put themselves in the business of determining rental rates?

Eviction of Tenants

The uneasy apprehension of charges of discrimination constantly hanging over the owner of apartment houses or single residences complicates his judgment. He is forced to permit almost outlandish conduct before taking action. Thus a new climate is created in the operation of apartments or for any residential rental property. This artificial tolerance is bound to cause other tenants to move more often. Even then, he has no assurance he won't still be faced with the costly necessity of defending action.

Agent's Inability to Inform Seller or Buyer Fully

An agent submitting an offer from a Negro purchaser would not be able to advise the seller of the race of purchaser. And, likewise, an agent could not fully advise the purchaser as to Negro families living in the surrounding area, under threat of violation of the Ordinance.

Unfair and Unreasonable Use of Agent's Time

The Ordinance states the agent cannot refuse to show properties. What are reasonable showings? What if the agent's time is limited because of other prior appointments? It would appear he could be charged with violation and forced to prove his reasons for limited showings were not subterfuge. How long, how many properties does an agent need to show to be immune to a charge of violation?

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR F. MOHL  
REPRESENTING ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BOARDS  
BEFORE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RE: H.B. 755 - - May 8, 1963

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

My name is Arthur F. Mohl - of Chicago. I am here as the authorized spokesman of the Illinois Association of Real Estate Boards and the Realtors of Illinois and as the unofficial spokesman for the great majority of the property owners of the State.

We urge the rejection of House Bill 755 for coercive forced housing regulation for seven reasons:

(1) IT VIOLATES A CONSTITUTIONAL PROPERTY RIGHT:

The effect of the law is to give the State the right to force one citizen to unwillingly sell or rent to another citizen. Such an act can be rationalized only on grounds of public interest or benefit - which has not been proved here.

The theory that the human rights of one citizen should be superior to the human rights of another citizen, cannot be accepted in this free country.

It took the Anglo-American people roughly four hundred years - from 1200 to 1600 - to secure a system of private ownership of land separate from the arbitrary controls and restrictions of government. Today this right has only been limited by the right of eminent domain and the police powers embodied in our zoning laws and regulations. In effect, the proponents of House Bill 755 are asking the Legislature to wipe-out a basic freedom that took the English speaking people 400 years of sacrifice to secure and which we have preserved for almost 200 years.

(2) THERE IS NO PROOF THAT DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING IS THE CAUSE OF STRIFE, OR SICKNESS, OR DANGER:

The argument that this Bill is justified as a police power to protect health and safety, is faulty. You all know there are many all-Negro -- or all-Jewish -- or all Polish neighborhoods -- where the standards of living are high, and where health and safety is as good as any in the land.

The unhealthful, unsafe and unsanitary conditions are caused by people who are unable to pay for standard housing - - who have not achieved mature social behaviour - - and who create slums by their manner of living.

( over )

The idea that a housing shortage exists for Negroes who can pay market rents is based on misinformation. Here are facts from the 1960 U.S. Census for selected areas in Chicago:

	<u>PERCENTAGE NON-WHITE</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE VACANT</u>
Woodlawn	89.6%	5.9%
Hyde Park	40.3	9.0
Oakland	98.7	5.0
East Garfield	62.0	7.4
North Lawndale	91.4	4.1

Raymond Hilliard of Cook County Public Aid stated publicly that Negroes on relief must pay \$125.00 rent for four rooms in Woodlawn. We asked him for a list of them. He found only one such example in his files, and it was occupied by nine people. We found large numbers of standard Negro families in standard 4-room apartments in Woodlawn - - paying \$95.00 rent. Most of Mr. Hilliard's "horrible examples" were of poor people crowded into small quarters in furnished apartments who are not standard tenants and not acceptable to owners of standard rental housing.

Philip Hauser and Beverly Duncan state on page 202 of their Volume - "Housing a Metropolis - Chicago" --- that in 1956, "Rentals of standard units are about the same for white and non-white households". It is generally conceded that since 1956, when this statement was made, the shortage of housing for all citizens has been practically eliminated.

It may be significant that according to the 1960 Census, the total of sub-standard housing units in Chicago declined by about 1/3 without any Forced Housing Legislation - - while, in New York, where this Legislation has been in effect for four years, the total inventory of sub-standard housing units went up by 2/3.

Thus, we conclude that the purpose of the Bill is not to relieve congestion but to achieve integration - - and we ask, "Does the Legislature have the duty or the right to force this on our citizens?"

(3) THE STATE CANNOT AFFORD THE EXPENSE:

New York State is now spending over One Million Dollars yearly on this program. They are starting to establish offices in most Counties and the cost is rapidly increasing. New York City spent another one-half million annually to administer its own local law. This Bill creates a large new bureaucracy and a still further tax burden on the taxpayers, which the Illinois budget cannot tolerate.

(4) VIOLATION OF THE LAW IS NOT POSSIBLE OF CLEAR DEFINITION:

Acceptability of a renter or a buyer is determined by personal judgment and not by precise yardsticks. Thus, a Commission or a Court finds it difficult to judge whether the accused had a permissible reason for deciding as he did. Such factors as credit, behaviour of children, behavior of relatives and guests - frequency of noisy conduct - - likelihood of long tenancy - exposure to abuse of the premises - compatibility with neighbors, are contributory to the judgment - yet not possible of precision evaluation.

The Resident Owner of a 4-flat in Skokie, who chooses to decline the application of a white renter is today not required to disclose his reason. This law would make him disclose his reason for declining either a white or a Negro renter - - and expose him to the charge he is defaming the character of an applicant.

The accused is placed in the position of having to prove he had a suitable reason for his rejection of the applicant - - he is guilty until he proves his innocence - and the complainant need not prove anything.

To threaten a man with a jail sentence just because he may hesitate listing some personal reasons other than race, creed or color, for rejecting an applicant seems to violate everything for which this country stands.

(5) THE EXEMPTION OF SOME HOME OWNERS IS MISLEADING:

The sponsors of the Bill have exempted owner-occupied properties of 3 or less units. Thus, they say - discrimination is legal for the homeowners but not for the 4-flat owner. It seems too obvious that the purpose is to avoid the wrath of the great mass of our homeowner citizens at this time. If passed now, later amendments would be introduced to greatly increase the scope of this Bill to include every individual residence, even when owner occupied. Regardless of the denials of the proponents, this is the plan. This is exactly what happened in New York when the New York Legislature passed amendments within the past month so as to cover almost all of the property in the State.

The Bill further exempts homeowners if they are actually occupying their residence at the time they are trying to sell. Yet, if they move out of their home, it is no longer "owner occupied" and then would fall under the provisions of this Bill. We fail to see the distinction between the rights of an owner who lives in a particular home and one who does not.

(6) WE ASK:WHY IS DISCRIMINATION A CRIME:

The practice of discrimination in the choice of one's friends, associates and neighbors, has long been a virtue. The fact that discrimination in employment has been outlawed, does not of itself justify the same fate for a man's home - or his castle - be it single family or in a multiple unit structure.

Forcing the owner of a 4-apartment building, to involuntary acceptance of a Negro in an all-white neighborhood, does not achieve tolerance and goodwill among those people.

We know that the Clergy have come here in numbers to support this Bill. We urge you to understand - that in so doing, they resign their role of moral and ethical leadership and they come to you, asking for a policeman to enforce on the whole society (at risk of jail sentence) their concept of the meaning of tolerance and brotherhood.

This type of legislation was tried many years ago, and was called "prohibition". We should have learned a lesson from this.

(7) THE BILL SUPPORTS THE WILL OF A MINORITY - NOT A MAJORITY:

As representatives of the citizens, you have the duty to respect the wishes of the majority in any controversial matter. We believe that a great majority of the citizens of Illinois do not favor this compulsory integration Bill.

To force it upon them at the insistence of a vocal minority, is undemocratic in our view.

\* \* \* \* \*

WE APPRECIATE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR BEFORE YOU. THANK YOU!

STATEMENT OF THE POSITION OF THE REAL ESTATE BOARD OF GREATER BALTIMORE  
IN OPPOSITION TO THE HOUSING SECTION OF ORDINANCE 181 - PRESENTED BY  
WILLIAM B. GUY, JR., IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT

---

The housing section of the Mayor's Civil Rights Bill, known as Ordinance 181, is generally referred to as "fair housing" or "anti-discrimination-in-housing" legislation.

"Forced Housing", in our opinion, more accurately describes the proposal, since it restricts the free action of certain property owners to sell to whom they please. This section goes even farther and limits the freedom of owners, brokers, salesmen, lending institutions and others in the offering and showing as well as the actual sale or lease of residential-type properties.

While the legislation was allegedly drafted to advance the human rights of minority groups, it most certainly would limit the rights of a much larger portion of our population if enacted. The fact is that this "larger portion" embraces persons of all creeds, colors and races - our City's property owners. Passage would abridge the human right to own and control property of Negroes and whites, alike.

Nothing would be more wrong than a conflict between property rights and human, or civil rights. There are, in this country, only human, or individual, rights. There is the individual right to own, enjoy and dispose of property, and there is the individual right to equal treatment under law. Both these rights are essential but neither is so important that it should be allowed to restrict the other unduly.

The individual right to own, enjoy and dispose of private property is one of the very cornerstones of our free society just as state ownership is at the center of the Marxist arch. To abridge property rights is to curtail human rights. It is no accident that those countries which have no property rights invariably are those which allow no human rights. A free society must cherish and protect this individual, this human, right to own and dispose of property.

I am not a lawyer, nor am I otherwise qualified to discuss the legality of the housing provisions of the proposed ordinance. However, I am advised that there is a substantial body of opinion among local attorneys that the housing provisions of the proposed ordinance, if enacted, might be held to be in violation of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution, in that persons will be deprived by the ordinance, without due process of law, of the basic right to freely acquire, own and dispose of real property. While the Council no doubt will look to the City Solicitor for his opinion regarding the legality of the proposed ordinance, I did want to mention this aspect of the matter.

Our experience in real estate convinces us that the economic effects of this proposed housing legislation would be extremely adverse to the City. The passage of such legislation, as night follows day, would cause a lessening in demand for and a consequent decline in the value of Baltimore real estate, resulting eventually in erosion and deterioration of our tax base. The budgetary crisis now before you would seem insignificant indeed. We certainly don't want this, and we are sure you must share our apprehension.

As Realtors, we have been working hard to preserve our neighborhoods while maintaining the right of the owner to sell to whomever he chooses. That many white

owners do, in fact, sell to colored buyers is well known. Our 1962 policy statement, in essence, provides that Realtors, throughout the period of a listing, should make every effort to produce a qualified buyer regardless of race, creed or color according to the wishes of the owner. During the past several years, we have also worked closely with many groups throughout the metropolitan area to help them maintain neighborhood stability.

We acknowledge that these efforts, however well intended, have not completely solved the problem of providing housing for minority groups, but they have helped.

We fear that intrusive-type legislation, and that's exactly what this is, will tend to undo the good which has been accomplished voluntarily and will widen the breach between the races.

Although the proposal before us generally would apply to owners of three or more units, this type of intrusive legislation represents "the foot in the door" approach. As you probably know, New York State enacted similar legislation and, just this year, amended their law to include the individual property owner. Such controls upon the human right to own and control property are repugnant to our concept of a republic-type government.

As Realtors we shall continue our work to bring about housing opportunities for all persons. But we must oppose with all of our conscience and strength legislation which would expropriate the human rights of property ownership. It would indeed be a cruel irony to abridge one of our most cherished individual freedoms - the human right to private property - for a majority of our citizens in the name of minority rights. Let us not forget that the minority would also suffer this same loss of their right to their private property. In the name of freedom and common sense, I implore you not to take this dangerous and unnecessary action.



EXERPT from:

Brief filed by Greater Pittsburgh Board of Realtors, November 13, 1963  
as Amicus Curiae in:

Stanton Land Company, et al

Vs.

City of Pittsburgh, et al

in the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania

In August 14, 1963 issue of the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, an interesting article appeared entitled "Successful Businessman Speaks Out - Negro Blames His Race for Crisis". The article is written by S. B. Fuller, a Negro, of Chicago, and majority stockholder in nine corporations, one of which publishes the Pittsburgh Courier; another is the Fuller Products Co., manufacturer of a nationally known line of cosmetics and allied products, with gross sales of 10 million dollars a year and a minority of white employees. The article is taken from a copyrighted article from U.S. News & World Report.

"Negroes 'have some legitimate complaints' about their lot in life, 'but not very many,' says Fuller.

'They will find that you cannot sue a man and make him want to live next door to you. You've got to sell him the idea that you are just as good as he is, by performance.

'You must perform well in your job. You must train your youngsters. You must keep your community as clean as the whiteman's community. You must keep up the home as well as he does.

"Asked for his answer to the nation's race problem, Fuller replied: 'Well, the problem is one the Negro has to work out himself. Negroes are not discriminated against because of the color of their skin. They are discriminated against because they have nothing to offer that people want to buy.

'The minute they can develop themselves so that they excel in whatever they do -- then they are going to find that they don't have any real problem.'

"Discrimination is practiced by both Negroes and whites whenever it is found profitable, Fuller believes.

'One thing I find in my organization', he says, 'is this: If I don't watch very closely, the Negro bosses will discriminate and hire all Negroes and no whites. I'm constantly watching them to see that they hire people on merit and not on the color of their skin.'

"About 20% of the Fuller payroll is white, in addition to 500 of 3,000 door-to-door salesmen...

"I came from a very poor family and in those days there was not the crime that you have today. When I was a boy, they kept us busy doing something. Today it's hard to find a boy in Harlem to sell newspapers.'

(OVER)

Exerpt from brief filed by Pittsburgh Board  
in Stanton Land Co., Vs. City of Pittsburgh

(cont'd)

"'Is America, do you think, a good place for Negroes?' Fuller was asked. 'America is the best place for the Negro in the world,' he replied. 'America is the best place for any man in the world.'"

There was printed in U. S. News & World Report, September 2, 1963, an article by David Lawrence entitled Let Booker T. Washington Speak Again!. Mr. Lawrence quotes from an address given by Booker T. Washington, speaking at the opening of the Cotton States and International Exposition in Atlanta, Georgia, in 1895, as a representative of Negro enterprise and Negro civilization:

"The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercise of these privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in the opera-house."

END  
OF  
EXERPT



## PROPERTY OWNERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

In 1789, the people of America were fearful that government might restrict their freedom. The first Congress of the United States, in that year, proposed a Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights, essentially, tells the government what it cannot do. The statements comprise the first 10 amendments to the United States Constitution.

The Bill of Rights has had a profound impact upon the history of the world.

Forty million immigrants gave up much to come to this land, seeking something promised here — and only here. Many countries have abundant natural resources, vast vacant lands, and climate as good as America.

They came here for the promise of security — the promise of freedom — for the precious right to live as free men with equal opportunity for all.

In July of 1868, a new guarantee of freedom was ratified. Its purpose was to guard against human slavery. Its guarantees were for the equal protection of all.

This new guarantee of freedom is the 14th Amendment. It reads, in part, as follows:

“No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

The vital importance of these federal laws was re-emphasized in a recent statement of the Chief Justice of the United States in which he urged the retention of “government of laws in preference to a government of men.”

Today, the rights and freedoms of the individual American property owner are being eroded. This en-

dangers the rights and freedom of all Americans. Therefore, a Bill of Rights to protect the American property owner is needed.

It is self-evident that the erosion of these freedoms will destroy the free enterprising, individual American.

It is our solemn belief that the individual American property owner, regardless of race, color, or creed, must be allowed, under law, to retain:

1. The right of privacy.
2. The right to choose his own friends.
3. The right to own and enjoy property according to his own dictates.
4. The right to occupy and dispose of property without governmental interference in accordance with the dictates of his conscience.
5. The right of all equally to enjoy property without interference by laws giving special privilege to any group or groups.
6. The right to maintain what, in his opinion, are congenial surroundings for tenants.
7. The right to contract with a real estate broker or other representative of his choice and to authorize him to act for him according to his instructions.
8. The right to determine the acceptability and desirability of any prospective buyer or tenant of his property.
9. The right of every American to choose who in his opinion are congenial tenants in any property he owns — to maintain the stability and security of his income.
10. The right to enjoy the freedom to accept, reject, negotiate, or not negotiate with others.

Loss of these rights diminishes personal freedom and creates a springboard for further erosion of liberty.

# To every home and property owner in the United States:

A drastic Federal forced housing law now being considered by the Congress would deny you FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREEDOM OF CONTRACT.

## Read details — then act!

Because we are concerned about the human rights of *all* Americans, we urge you to read on and learn how this bill would destroy fundamental rights of free men.

Published by the National  
Association of Real Estate Boards.



National Association of Real Estate Boards  
1300 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036



## AN URGENT MESSAGE TO EVERY HOME OWNER IN THE UNITED STATES

### WRITE TO:

Senator Frank J. Lausche  
Senator Stephen M. Young

Senate Office Bldg.  
Senate Office Bldg.

Washington, D. C.  
Washington, D. C.

Congressman Frances P. Bolton  
Congressman Michael A. Feighan  
Congressman William E. Minshall  
Congressman Robert E. Sweeney  
Congressman Charles A. Vanik

House Office Bldg.  
House Office Bldg.  
House Office Bldg.  
House Office Bldg.  
House Office Bldg.

Washington, D. C.  
Washington, D. C.  
Washington, D. C.  
Washington, D. C.  
Washington, D. C.

**A BILL** soon to be voted on by the Congress will deny you, as a property owner, the right to sell or rent to persons of your choice.

**WE BELIEVE** this is a *forced*, not fair, housing bill that deprives you of a basic individual freedom—the right to dispose of your private property as you choose.

**WE URGE** you, as a property owner, to defend your freedom of choice by writing a letter of protest to your Representative in the House and to your two United States Senators.

**NOW**, read the details of this legislation.

**THE BILL** is H.R. 14765 in the House of Representatives and S. 3296 in the Senate.

**TITLE IV** of the bill concerns housing.

**1.** It will deny you the right to exercise *freedom of choice* in contracting for the sale or rental of your property. This means that the Federal government could force you to sell or rent your property to a person not of your choice, whether your property is your home, rental housing, a room for rent in your home or boarding house, or land to be used as the site for housing.

**2.** If you insist on exercising *freedom of choice* in contracting for the sale or rental of your property, a complaint may be filed against you in a Federal district court. This court, sitting without a jury, may order you to sell or rent to a person not of your choice. It may also assess unlimited damages against you.

**3.** If the complainant alleges that he cannot afford a lawyer, he will be furnished with counsel free. You, however, will have to pay your own lawyer to defend your *freedom of choice*.

**4.** If the Attorney General wants to make an example of you, he can intervene in the case. Then you will have to fight the complainant and the United States—all because you want to defend your *freedom of choice*.

**THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BOARDS IS NOT AGAINST OPEN OCCUPANCY, OR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN HOUSING.** The real issue is whether one person should be given the right to force an unwilling owner to enter into a contract at the expense of the owner's individual, human right. To deny any property owner *freedom of choice* erodes the rights of all the people.

We believe that progress in race relations will be retarded—not advanced—by this attempt to deny people *freedom of choice*. Under the influence of church, school, and men of good will, the objectives of the struggle to obtain equal opportunity in housing are being achieved. Voluntary efforts to this end should be given every encouragement. A forced housing law that tramples on a fundamental right will not advance this important cause.

## **WHAT CAN YOU DO ABOUT IT?**

**WRITE TODAY** to your Representative and to both your United States Senators. Tell them what you think. Tell them that this bill would grant one group a so-called right by destroying a basic human right that belongs to all persons. Caution them that good race relations will be set back by this attempt to deny people the *freedom of choice*.

**WRITE TO WASHINGTON TODAY.** The address of your Representative is: House Office Building, Washington, D.C., and the address of your two Senators is: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

**THE CONGRESS** will reject this bill if home owners and other real property owners make it clear that they are opposed to this legislation because it is destructive of the rights of all persons.

**WRITE TODAY!**