exceed the total number of dwelling units of families to be displaced as a result of Federal, State, or local governmental action in such community.

It would repeal the protection of communities against unwanted projects, as at Los Angeles, Roanoke, and many other places.

It would repeal the Gwinn anti-Communist provision.

It completely repeals the administration's defense housing request known as the Capehart bill which passed the other body.

We have three times voted down the Socialist public housing program. This Spence bill would revive it and revive it without limit. The sky is the limit and no safeguards.

In Los Angeles a hundred thousand people more voted to throw it out than voted in favor, yet the public housing bureaucrats said "You shall have it anyway."

And believe it or not, Mr. Chairman, we had it jammed down our throats, in spite of the will of the people.

Subsidized public housing costs the taxpayers of our country $26.90 per month per unit on the average, and as vacancies climb it will increase. The request for deficit coverage has increased from $21 million in 1951 to $87 million for this year—and these projects run on for 40 years.

Let us not reverse our three votes against public housing. The country does not want it. Let us let it stay dead.

The Wolcott amendment supplies the urgent need. I ask its approval.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUDGE. Some time ago I offered an amendment. I am wondering if it would not be well to dispose of that amendment at this point. The amendment is still pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that. The request submitted by the gentleman from Kentucky related to the Wolcott amendment and all amendments thereto, which included the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, at 4 o'clock, after the Budge amendment is voted on, there will be an amendment read by the Clerk which I have prepared, to clean up the slums of unhealthy thinking on the part of our Federal Housing Administrators, which has worked contrary to the decisions against segregation by the Supreme Court and policies voiced by the President. What do we have at the present time? A picture that shows that segregation in the North is worse than it is in the South when sponsored by our Federal Housing Authorities. We have more segregation in Levittown, Pa., than we have in Jackson, Miss.

It is time that we pass legislation that will make builders, renters, lenders, buyers, borrowers become Americans.

I will use as background the statement of Clarence Mitchell, director, Washington Bureau, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The national housing program is a cruel and disgusting hoax so far as colored citizens of the United States are concerned. Each year, through the expenditures of millions of dollars in FHA, VA, and slum clearance programs, the United States is expanding housing segregation.

It is an incredible paradox that the same Government which has valiantly and successfully fought racial segregation on other fronts is actively promoting segregation in the places where our citizens live.

An analysis of census data, 1940–50, reveals the following facts:

Nonwhites comprised 10.3 percent of the total population in 1950, but occupied only 8.6 percent of all occupied dwelling units.

The nonwhite population increased at a faster rate than the number of dwelling units it occupied—15 percent against 10 percent—wheras the reverse was true for whites—14 percent against 23 percent. For nonfarm areas alone, the nonwhite population rose by nearly 40 percent, while the number of dwelling units it occupied increased by only 31 percent.

The proportion of overcrowded units, with more than 1½ persons per room, among nonfarm dwellings occupied by nonwhites was some 4 times as high as that for whites.

In nonfarm housing only, the proportion of dilapidated homes among nonwhites was 5 times as high as among whites—27 percent as compared to 5.4 percent—and, in addition, the proportion of homes not dilapidated but lacking in one or more of piped running water, private flush toilet, private bathtub or shower, was more than twice as high among nonwhites as among whites, 35 percent as compared to 17 percent.

Although homeownership rose sharply among nonwhites during the decade 1940–50, nearly two-thirds of the nonwhite households in nonfarm areas were still renters in 1950 as compared with 45 percent of white nonfarm households.

Our efforts have been partly successful in that we have ended court enforcement of racial, restrictive covenants. Where there is a willing seller, and a colored purchaser has the money and access to lending resources, segregation is ending in many old housing units in metropolitan areas.

In contrast, where new housing is built with the help of the resources of the Veterans' Administration, the Federal Housing Agency, and other Federal agencies, there is an ironclad policy of building whole cities for whites only.

The classic example of this is found in Bucks County, Pa., in a development known as Levittown.

I hope the next time that any of you gentlemen go to New York you will just look to the left on the northbound train and see that huge sign which advertises "Levittown," a whole new city in Bucks County, Pa.

The builder of this development could not have done so without the aid of the Federal Government. To many he may be the example of a successful builder, but, in the eyes of minority group members who are denied housing by him solely because of race, he is a symbol of the encroachment of police-state methods in America.

In other words, he has, by his personal fiat, with the help of the Government, set up a rule in that town of several thousand people that you may bring a dog in, but you may not buy a house if you are a colored man, even though you have the money.

A comprehensive suggestion for providing a remedy was submitted to Raymond Foley, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, on January 11, 1952. Mr. Foley and his aides took the suggestions under advisement. Nothing was done to correct the problem.

When the new Administrator took office, our organization met with him on March 15, 1953, to discuss the problem and to make recommendations for correction. During that year we had additional meetings with the Administrator on May 7 and July 22. It is significant that in the July 22 meeting seven major national organizations also urged the Administrator to act on this problem.

When the President sent his housing message to Congress on January 25, 1954, it contained a reference to the problem of minorities in the housing field as well as a promise that something would be done about it. Questions on what would be done have been raised with the President from time to time by various organizations, including the NAACP.

On April 7, 1954, Miss Ethel Payne, Washington correspondent of the Chicago Defender, asked the President in his press conference what was being done to implement the promise of his January 25 message. At that time he said he would look into the matter. On May 5, 1954, the same reporter asked what had been learned when he looked into the matter, and the President suggested that she check with the housing agencies for her answer.

The New York Times of August 5, 1954, carried this version of what the President said at his press conference on the previous day when he was asked about minority housing problems:

> He had tried as hard as he knew how to have accepted this idea, that where Federal funds and Federal authority were involved, that there should be no discrimination based on any reason that was not recognized by our Constitution. He would continue to do that.

The courts have struck that down by saying that you can put a restrictive covenant on property, but you cannot enforce it in court. The result is that colored people are able to buy in any neighborhood where there is existing housing, if there is a willing seller, and if they have the money to buy. The Federal Government has done the thing which the courts, we believe, prohibit, and that is, as an arm of Government has said that it will promote and extend racial segregation. The Court has said you cannot enforce segregation through the courts, and it is not being enforced through the courts. It said that the legislatures may not have segregation,

and the legislatures do not have segregation in the laws, but the Federal Government contends that as an administrative arm of Government it is not reached by these Court decisions and, therefore, they continue to segregate.

Mr. MULTER was on the floor, and I believe Mr. Javits, the present attorney general of the State of New York, a great liberal, offered an amendment which would have acomplished the purpose that we seek here. Mr. MULTER read into the RECORD some correspondence from Mr. Bovard, who was the counsel for the FHA. The burden of that correspondence was that "we don't need this amendment because we can handle it by administrative procedure."

This was the time when the Democrats were in power.

Then after the amendment was defeated on the floor, because FHA said that they could handle it by administrative regulations, we went to FHA. FHA said, "There is nothing we can do about it because if we do Congress will cut our appropriations and make it tough for us." In other words, it is just a vicious circle.

How, in your opinion, has the Voluntary Mortgage Loan Organization facilitated in any way the lending of money or provisions for lending of money to minority groups?

It is strictly a paper program. I think they have made some 200 or more—201 loans.

Loans under that program, but so far as I know, very few have been for minority groups. The Housing Agency made an announcement when it made a loan to a colored man in Washington. It had a big news release on it and had a picture. It turned out there wasn't anything controversial about it. The man lived in a neighborhood where colored people were already living and apparently could have gotten aid from another source. In other words, it is sort of a hoax.

Here is an example of brutal Jim Crow in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. On Monday, July 25, Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, issued to Frank S. Horne, Assistant to the Administrator, a formal reduction-in-force notice, effective midnight August 25, 1955. The notice states:

> Budgetary considerations have made a reduction in force in the Office of the Administrator necessary. As a result, the position which you occupy will be eliminated.

Frank Horne was reassigned to the position he now holds in October 1953 in response to nationwide protest over his political ouster from his former civil-service position as Assistant to the Administrator, in charge of the Racial Relations Service. An official HHFA press release, dated October 1, 1953, announcing Frank Horne's replacement as Racial Relations Adviser and his new appointment as Assistant to the Administrator, stated:

> Mr. Cole also announced that Dr. Frank S. Horne, whom Mr. Ray succeeds, is being named Assistant to the Administrator. In his new responsibility, Dr. Horne will conduct special studies and develop proposals for the Administrator for possible new approaches to the housing problems of minorities.
>
> "The Agency's policy of giving active and strong support to improved housing opportunities for minorities will continue under these new assignments and the integrity and professional quality of these services will be fully maintained," Mr. Cole said.
>
> "Dr. Horne has had long experience and rendered valuable service in housing and racial relations," Mr. Cole said, "and I believe his abilities will be given broader scope in his new assignment. The need for these services at the policy level is apparent as more and more cities, in their efforts to clear slums and remedy blight, face the need for new and more effective means for housing minorities."

Dr. Horne's services from that day to this have been considered by Mr. Cole and his staff as well as by national leadership across the Nation to be highly satisfactory and of the caliber anticipated from a career Federal employee who, through a period of some 19 years of governmental service—17 of those years in the housing agencies—has become recognized as one of the Nation's leading authorities in racial relations and minority group considerations in the housing field.

Those who protested the original displacement of a highly effective career employee to make possible a political appointment accepted Mr. Cole's "compromise" action appointing Horne to a new job as having been effected in good faith in order to, as Cole stated, maintain in the Agency the skills and mature experience attained by Frank Horne. National organizations and leadership have felt that Horne's presence in the HHFA reflected the continuing intent of the Federal Government to see to it that Negro families received an equal opportunity with all others to buy or rent good housing in decent neighborhoods anywhere in the community. Mr. Cole's use of budgetary considerations to eliminate Horne from the Agency can, therefore, but lead us to question the integrity of the original compromise.

This doubt is aggravated by questions arising as to the validity of the budgetary considerations referred to as justification for Horne's reduction in force. The appropriation for the Office of the Administrator for fiscal 1956 is $5 million, as compared to only $2,868,500 last year, during which Horne was maintained in his job. Further, there has been additional recruitment during past weeks which is still proceeding, especially in the urban renewal program, which is an integral part of the Office of the Administrator with which Horne's new activities are associated. In addition, it has been announced that three additional racial relations officers (grade GS–13) are to be appointed to the staffs of the regional representatives of the Office of the Administrator. It would, therefore, appear at least questionable and even racially discriminatory to absorb budgetary reductions by eliminating 1 of only 8 Negroes employed at grades GS–13 or above, when there are 220 such positions now maintained in the Office of the Administrator. This action of Mr. Cole's, therefore, would ultimately necessitate appeal to and review by the President's Committee on Government Employment Policy. If it is possible by partisan political action, first, to displace such a proficient career employee, with veterans' preference, from the position in which he attained distinction and civil service status, place him in a new job, also in the classified service, and then subsequently summarily dismiss him from the Agency by application of budgetary considerations, then no one—regardless of race or status or degree of achievement or political affiliation—can attain any security in Federal employment in a job at any significant professional level.

Further, there was considerable question of the legality of Horne's removal from his original position. Although Horne's job was "excepted" from the Classified Service to make possible a political appointment, there remained a question as to his legal right to remain in the position and the right of the agency to remove him without written notice of the reasons subject to his appeal. Such question appears to have been resolved by the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on July 16, 1954, in the case of Roth against Brownell. The Court said:

> "Neither the formula of "excepting" the kind of position a person holds, nor any other formula, can obviate the requirement of the Lloyd-LaFollette Act that "no person in the classified civil service of the United States shall be removed * * * therefrom" without notice and reasons given in writing.

This decision was cited by the United States Civil Service Commission in its Departmental Circular No. 789, issued January 24, 1955 which outlined appeals procedure for all other employees against whom previous adverse action may be deemed improper. Frank Horne, in formal memorandum, raised a question with the HHFA some 90 days ago regarding the implications for him of Departmental Circular No. 789. He has as yet received no response whatsoever.

The above facts would lead observers to conclude that the determination now to eliminate Horne's job and, with it, Horne himself from the agency is simply the conclusion of the political effort to oust him from his original job in October 1953. In that instance, the effort was not to eliminate the job but the man in order to make the position available for patronage. In response to demand by an aroused public opinion which protested loudly the political spoliation of a competent, experienced professional operation, a "new job" was set up for Horne. Now "budgetary considerations" are invoked to eliminate the job and Horne. The result now to be effected is revealed as the original intent. The main issue is still whether or not partisan political action is to disrupt a tested professional operation in the field of racial relations and to dislodge a competent career employee of 19 years' service. If Horne goes through this process, the remaining personnel of the Racial Relations Service, in Washington and the field, can be picked off in the same manner.

Finally, many church, labor, business, consumer, and minority group organizations are seriously questioning Govern-

ment housing policy in regard to the administration of governmental housing programs as far as Negroes and other racial minorities are concerned. They are insisting that federally aided housing be open to all eligible families without regard to race. Since Frank Horne, over a period of years in public service, has been clearly identified as one of the leaders in the fight for equal opportunity for all families to attain decent housing which results from the use of governmental funds and powers, his elimination at this juncture can only be considered by a very large segment of public opinion as overt repudiation by this administration of his work and of the nondiscriminatory principles with which he has become identified.

My bill would do the following:

Section 101, loans for home improvements could not be denied to any applicant because of race.

Sections 102 and 103, rental projects built with FHA mortgages in excess of $5 million would be available to renters without regard to race; cooperative housing projects financed under the revived program would be open to all persons without regard to race; any FHA project guaranteed under the $4 million authorization in this act would be open to all applicants without regard to race.

Section 104, any housing constructed under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Service Act in the year 1955–56 would be open to all eligible persons without regard to race.

Sections 105 and 106, any slum clearance project financed by the money authorized under this section—$200 million for the years 1955 and 1956—must be open to all eligible persons without regard to race.

Section 107, any public housing units authorized under this act must be open to all qualified applicants without regard to race.

Any residences constructed on property acquired by the Housing Administrator under powers granted him under this section and made available for private development for permanent residential development must be open to all applicants without regard to race.

Section 108, any housing for elderly persons made available under this section must be open to all eligible elderly persons without regard to race.

Section 109 relating to the Home Loan Bank Board and section 110, relating to the Home Owners Loan Corporation, would not appear to be affected by title VI.

Sections 202 to 205, any public facility financed by money advanced by the Federal Government by loan or purchase of obligations of a State or its political subdivisions must be open to all persons without regard to race.

Sections 301 to 303, any college housing constructed with loans authorized under title III of this act must be open to all qualified applicants without regard to race.

Sections 401 to 403, any housing constructed under the Wherry Act until 1958 would be available to eligible applicants on an open occupancy basis without regard to race.

Sections 501 and 502, loans made under the farm housing program could not be denied any applicant on the basis of race.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. McVEY] is recognized.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] in support of his amendment to H. R. 7473.

It seems to me that the Wolcott amendment provides essential elements for a sound, constructive public housing program. Much has been said about the administration program here this afternoon. We do not have before this House any administration program in its entirety. S. 2126 goes much beyond the recommendations of the President of the United States. It provides for 50,400 new housing units. The President asked for only 35,000.

It seems to me that by adopting the Wolcott amendment we should have the best opportunity of coming out of that conference with a bill that will be satisfactory to the President of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the committee's attention to one of the items the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] referred to that has been repealed by the committee bill. It is a provision in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1954 which provided that no locality, community, State, or other governing body could have public housing facilities built in it without a vote of the governing body.

You are going to give a Federal bureaucracy complete control to walk into any community, as they did in my community, and foist public housing on the people against their will in many instances where they proceeded to condemn property and proposed to build public housing units that the people did not want. We voted against that. On several occasions we have expressed our views and have voted consistently against public housing.

If you adopt the committee bill you are repealing that section that this Congress put into the act in order to protect the local communities from such an imposition of a Federal bureaucracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that so many Members who speak with such great authority about this bill have not taken the time to read the committee's hearings, the President's messages, the bill or the law. The fact of the matter is that the Roanoke amendment, the Phillips amendment, the McDonough amendment are all covered by the Hiestand amendment which is a part of the law and is not affected by anything in this bill. The President's appointee, Mr. Cole, who came before our committee, said this bill is the President's program. He said the President asked for 35,000 public housing units. That is what we have provided for.

As to the technical amendments in this bill that are not in the Senate bill and will not be in conference if you adopt the Wolcott amendment, let me quote what Mr. Cole said:

> And there is another phase of this public housing legislation that is just as vital as the number of units. It is the revision of unworkable and hobbling restrictions that discourage communities from proceeding with their plans and made the authorization itself extremely cumbersome and in some cases impossible of application.

The amendment that you have in the Spence bill to remove the "unworkable and hobbling restrictions" is not in the Senate bill, it is not in the Wolcott bill. Therefore you must vote down the Wolcott substitute if you want the President's program or if you want the public housing program to proceed without the limitations against which the President himself has personally spoken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from New York brought up that question because I have before me the President's attitude in respect to his stand on public housing. It is stated:

> The low-rent public housing legislation requested by the administration, unlike the provisions of S. 2126, would be limited to meeting the relocation needs of families of low income displaced by slum clearance and urban renewal projects or by other governmental action. The legislation proposed by the administration would authorize continuation of the public housing program but would retain present requirements which make public housing a part of the Government's overall program for helping cities to eliminate and prevent slums and urban blight.

Therein lies the fundamental difference between what the House and Senate did and what the President wants.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I might say to the gentleman from Michigan that the administration feels that in adopting the Wolcott amendment and getting the whole subject to conference they will get a bill that more nearly conforms to the wishes of the administration than the bill that is before the House officially today.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am happy that I have been a stanch supporter of public housing over the years. If I had to depend on what the President stood for and listening to the different members of his own party get up on the floor, I would certainly say that I would be very much confused. I am not voting for the public housing program because of the memory of Bob Taft or because the President is for it. If Bob Taft or the President happen to be for public housing, I am glad to have them associated with me. I think the