

728.1
:336.18
E55p

PUBLIC HOUSING IN 1942

By

HERBERT EMMERICH

Commissioner, Federal Public Housing Authority

Reprinted from the
HOUSING YEARBOOK 1943



NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING OFFICIALS

1313 EAST 60TH STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

728.1
:336.18

E55 p m.m. α

Doc. #
NK
4/14
4 m 6
c. 1

Public Housing in 1942

HERBERT EMMERICH

Commissioner, Federal Public Housing Authority

THE year 1942 witnessed swift changes in the customs, habits, and production of our country. It marked the rapid shift from a peace economy to a total utilization of our skills and our resources for the prosecution of the War which came upon us in the closing days of 1941. Public housing had been almost entirely concerned with slum clearance and the provision of decent housing for underprivileged families of low income. Here, as in all sectors of our national life, the War wrought a sudden change. Public housing enlisted for the duration; it put aside its long-term social objectives, and turned all its resources to the provision of vitally needed housing for war workers.

During 1942 the United States saw the greatest mass migration in its history. Housing had to be provided, and quickly, to shelter workers coming from all parts of the country to man industrial plants, which in many localities required new workers numbering five to ten times the existing population. In face of this urgent need, drastic action was necessary.

In order to mobilize and integrate all housing resources of the federal government, the President, on February 24, 1942, set up the National Housing Agency by Executive Order issued under the War Powers Act. The Federal Public Housing Authority was created as one of the three main constituent units of NHA. Consolidated in the Federal Public Housing Authority were all the non-farm public housing functions of the federal government, with the exception of housing on military posts and reservations. Among the functions turned over to FPHA was the slum clearance and low-rent housing program of the United States Housing Authority. Further construction under this program was immediately suspended, and wherever possible projects which were under construction and even some of those which had been completed were converted to serve the needs of war workers. With this done, the accumulated resources and experience of public housing were concentrated upon the job of war housing.

The construction program of FPHA is now limited entirely to the provision of public housing for in-migrant war workers in localities where acute housing shortages exist. Determination of need for such housing, and the decision that private enterprise is unable to fill this

need, is a responsibility of the Administrator of the National Housing Agency. The Authority has responsibility for the construction and management of the public war housing which the Administrator programs.

Construction progress during the year was made in the face of many difficulties, especially the disorganization of the war housing programs inherited by FPHA and the serious shortage in critical materials which at times seemed destined to halt construction altogether. Despite these difficulties 183,000 units of all types were completed in the first year of consolidation ending February 28, 1943. During the final quarter alone, 92,000 units were completed, or more war housing than was finished during the whole period prior to the formation of FPHA. Probably the most impressive way to get a clear picture of what has been accomplished during this year of birth-pains and extreme stresses is to examine the record of progress.

ALL PUBLIC WAR HOUSING STARTED AND COMPLETED
BY QUARTERS, FEBRUARY 28, 1942—FEBRUARY 28, 1943

	Units Started	Units Completed
March-May, 1943.....	83,000	27,000
June-August, 1942	66,000	22,000
September-November, 1942	76,000	42,000
December, 1942-February, 1943..	106,000	92,000
TOTAL	331,000	183,000

Although the rate of progress for the first six months of the year was low it was not disappointing. This was the period when the ground was being prepared which made possible the tremendous expansion which occurred in the third and fourth quarters. That the foundations were well built is witnessed by the fact that the effects were cumulative. Units were placed under construction during the fourth quarter at a rate 50 per cent greater than in the three previous quarters. The progress in completions is even more encouraging. In the third quarter, completions were at a rate nearly double that of the first and second quarters. Completions in the fourth quarter again doubled the rate in the third quarter, and as a result fourth quarter completions more than equaled those in the three preceding quarters. It is expected that from here on out the fourth quarter rate of about 30,000 completions per month can be maintained.

At the close of 1942, the public war housing program of the federal government consisted of 561,748 units. Of these, 485,254, or 87 per

cent, were under FPHA, the remainder being under the War and Navy Departments. Together with the 130,847 low-rent units which it inherited, FPHA had under its jurisdiction some 616,000 units. These will house nearly 2,000,000 people—a population equivalent to that of a city third in size in the United States.

DEVELOPMENTS IN ORGANIZATION AND POLICY

Administrative Problems

On February 24, 1942, the public war housing program of the federal government consisted of 279,000 units. Responsibility for constructing and managing these units was divided among at least eight different agencies and divisions, no one of which was accountable for more than one-third of the whole program. Each of these agencies had different policies and procedures, and each had separate staffs organized on different patterns and with a variety of field arrangements. This division of responsibility and lack of a uniform approach threatened the success of the whole war housing program.

Actually, the various agencies involved were competing one against the other. They were in some cases bidding against each other for sites. Communities were shopping from agency to agency to see where they could get the best deal. No one could speak with full authority. The resulting confusion in war localities was by all odds the most serious consequence of this administrative chaos.

Thus, at the very outset, FPHA was confronted with a tremendous job of overhauling and of organization. Nearly six months passed in low gear. By the end of the year, however, the result of those months devoted largely to perfecting a working organization, governed by a uniform set of policies and procedures, made itself felt. The war housing program began to move into top speed. All of this had to be accomplished during a period when the volume of public war housing more than doubled.

The organization finally developed by FPHA operates through 10 regional offices responsible to a central Washington office. The central office comprises three principal branches—Administrative, Development, and Management. These, together with the Commissioner's own office, the Legal Division, and the Chief Economist's office, constitute the Washington staff. The central office is concerned primarily with the formulation of over-all policies and procedures and a general control of the public housing program and its progress.

The 10 FPHA regional offices, with the same boundaries as those of the offices of the Regional Representatives of the Administrator of NHA, correspond as far as possible with the regions of other im-

portant war agencies such as the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission. These regional offices were set up with their headquarters in the field early in the spring of 1942. The regional offices are administered by Regional Directors and are organized on lines roughly paralleling those of the central office. These offices were given real authority to handle virtually all construction and management operations—operations which in the past had to be cleared through the central offices in Washington of the various agencies which now constitute FPHA. This extensive decentralization has not only speeded the program but has also kept it in touch with local conditions and made it more responsive to local needs.

Use of Local Authorities

Decentralization, however, does not and should not end with the establishment of regional offices. It is the local housing authorities which constitute the true foundation of public housing. Only through local initiative and responsibility can public housing be properly related to local needs and conditions. All of the low-rent housing built under the former USHA program is, of course, owned and operated by local authorities. In carrying out the war housing program, the FPHA regional offices look to the local authorities to assume the fullest measure of responsibility. In the development of war housing, most of which, pursuant to statute, is owned by the federal government, local authorities are invariably consulted in all stages of the program, and are entrusted, wherever possible, with responsibility for the selection of sites, construction, and management. In the management of war housing, the local authorities formerly acted on an agency basis; but more recently projects are being leased to them in order to give the local authorities greater responsibility and simplify procedures. The experience which had been gained by local authorities in carrying out the low-rent program has proved a vital factor in carrying out the war housing program. It was the existence of well organized and responsible local housing authorities which made possible the record of progress achieved by FPHA in 1942.

The setting up of regional councils by the National Association of Housing Officials during 1942 is a significant development. The members of these councils, chosen from the local authorities in each region, meet from time to time with the FPHA regional directors and their staffs for consultation on problems of mutual interest, including questions relating to FPHA policies and procedures. Such periodic consultation will undoubtedly prove of signal benefit to both FPHA and local housing authorities. Chief among the benefits to FPHA is the

fact that its operations can be more closely adjusted to the actual local field experiences.

Priorities and Mass Purchasing

During the year 1942, the difficulty of obtaining the materials required in construction presented an almost continuous problem. In many cases construction was stopped altogether or was greatly hampered by the lack of materials. In December of 1942, after extended negotiations, the National Housing Agency was recognized by the War Production Board as a claimant agency. As a result, a given quantity of materials is set aside each quarter for the use of the National Housing Agency, for which it extends blanket preference ratings of AA-3 on projects using standard plans. Accordingly, a preference rating for materials is now handed by FPHA to the region at virtually the same moment that a project is assigned for development. The effective saving by this procedure is not only the 30 to 45 days which were formerly needed to obtain priorities, but also the valuable time gained in site selection and planning by the assurance that necessary materials will be allotted. Arrangements have also been made to extend the same procedure to community facilities.

The possession of a priority certificate does not of itself guarantee materials, particularly plumbing, heating, and electrical equipment, which are becoming increasingly scarce. The stocks of such items which were on hand at the beginning of the War have been almost used up, and those which remain are generally found in quantities too small for large-scale needs. In order to purchase a number of stock items we must arrange to keep certain plants in production. This can be done only by placing large orders. Under ordinary conditions FPHA would not approve the principle of central purchasing; but under present conditions, and with the advice of the War Production Board, we have felt compelled to pursue this policy. The problems of mass purchasing are difficult and unique, but it is hoped that the new and simplified purchasing procedures now in effect will obviate many of the difficulties of individual buying and assure an adequate and continuous supply of scarce items.

War Housing Standards

During the year, FPHA has developed several series of standard plans both for family dwellings and dormitories. It was only because of the existence of these plans that it was possible to work out the blanket priority system. The Authority, to an increasing extent, has had to insist on the use of these plans, not only in order to save time

in the planning process, but to make use of the blanket priority procedure. Only in unusual situations, where the use of standard plans is physically impossible, is a deviation now permitted.

Despite the pressure for speed in the war housing program and the constantly developing material shortages, FPHA has done everything within its power to maintain decent housing standards. Minimum standards have been maintained as to the number and size of rooms necessary for health and privacy. Good water supply, sanitation, and essential community facilities have been insisted upon. Because of the large use of lumber in temporary construction, special attention has been paid to fire protection, including adequate spaces between buildings, the provision of fire walls, and the supply of fire-fighting equipment; although in a number of projects it has not been possible to date to obtain the equipment and water supply deemed essential by FPHA.

The great bulk of public war housing now being built is temporary construction, of a type which would not be built in ordinary times and under normal conditions. The Federal Public Housing Authority, however, has never forgotten the fact that these houses are temporary and only for emergency use, and that they have no place in the long-term housing program of our Nation. These temporary houses must come down after the war. They are not permanent as to location, structure, or occupancy. Increasingly, they are being built on leased land so that they will be sure to come down, and thus avoid the creation of slums for the future.

Tenant Selection for War Housing

All FPHA war housing is reserved for in-migrant war workers, and resident war workers are admitted only when it is determined that there is no further need on the part of in-migrants. An order, issued by the National Housing Administrator in November, 1942, set forth a definition of "indispensable in-migrant civilian war worker" applicable both to public and private war housing.

The Authority, in establishing policy for tenant selection in war housing projects, has been careful to remember that public housing is separate in identity from the industries which it serves. Every attempt is made to cooperate with the managements of war plants to the end that their workers are adequately served. But FPHA has been firm in its attitude that these houses are the property of the federal government, and that tenants will be selected on the basis of the national interest, and not solely on the nomination of any individual plant or establishment. There is nothing—from the standpoint of

worker morale—which would be worse than to have the units which we are building considered as “company houses.”

Payments in Lieu of Taxes

The policy of FPHA in regard to payments in lieu of taxes on public housing was liberalized in 1942, and made uniform for all projects of the same character. In January, the Congress in amending the Lanham Act provided that payments in lieu of taxes approximating full taxes should be made on all projects developed under this Act. The Federal Public Housing Authority has extended this policy of full payments in lieu of taxes to all war housing projects owned by the federal government. On war housing projects developed by local authorities, under the war housing amendment to the United States Housing Act (Public Act 671), payments in lieu of taxes are made to the full extent that operating income permits; it is expected that in almost all cases such payments will approximate full taxes. On the low-rent program, the policy in respect to payments in lieu of taxes has also been liberalized by authorizing local authorities to pay annual sums equal to 5 per cent of shelter rents or one-sixth of the amounts available for the reduction of subsidies, whichever is greater. It is believed that these new policies, providing for larger payments, and extending uniform treatment to all localities, will go far to meeting the problems of payments in lieu of taxes to local governments.

PUBLIC WAR HOUSING

Size and Status of Program

The total sum available for public war housing on December 31, 1942, amounted to \$1,980,274,959, nearly half of which had been appropriated by Congress during 1942. Of this amount, all but \$206,004,939 had been allotted for specific projects on December 31, and \$938,629,777 had been actually expended. The total amount available will provide about 595,000 war housing units of all types—561,748 units of which had been definitely programmed by the end of the year. On December 31, the status of the entire public war housing program of the federal government, the units under FPHA jurisdiction or control, and the units under the War and Navy Departments was as follows:

	Total	Not Under Construction Contract	Under Construction Contract	Completed for Occupancy
Total program	561,748	141,063	204,650	216,035
Under FPHA	485,254	125,142	176,067	184,045
Under War and Navy Depts..	76,494	15,921	28,583	31,990

By the end of the year all public war housing had been brought under FPHA, with the exception of housing on military posts and reservations or of permanent usefulness to the War and Navy Departments. A substantial number of the units now under construction by the Army and Navy will be transferred on completion to FPHA for management.

The source of funds for the public war housing under the jurisdiction or control of the Federal Public Housing Authority is shown in the following table:

	Number of Units
Direct appropriations	
Public Act 849 (Lanham Title I)	282,937
Public Act 522 (Lanham Title IV.—Dist. of Col.).....	9,454
Public Act 9 (Temporary Housing)	119,730
Public Act 781 (Army & Navy Housing).....	4,648
Sub-total	416,769
Defense Homes Corporation.....	11,422
Borrowings under U. S. Housing Act.....	57,063
GRAND TOTAL	485,254

The Defense Homes Corporation, which was transferred to the National Housing Agency by the consolidation order, has a capital stock of \$10,000,000 derived from funds provided under the Lanham Act. It has arranged to borrow up to \$55,000,000 additional from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Funds available under the United States Housing Act have been used to the greatest possible extent for the provision of war housing. Public Act 671 authorized the use of low-rent funds on projects for war workers. Pursuant to this authorization, local housing authorities with 100 per cent federal loans have provided 42,572 family dwellings, and FPHA is building 2,000 units directly. In addition, 12,491 units still under the original United States Housing Act have been converted to the use of low-income war workers. All of the units built under the United States Housing Act will revert to low-rent status after the War.

Types of Accommodations

Many types of construction and of accommodations have been used in the war housing program. Dormitories have been provided for single persons—both men and women. These dormitories are substantially all of temporary construction, and consist of both double and single rooms. These units are furnished, and complete room service, including cleaning and bed-making, as well as heating and electricity,

is provided. Community facilities for eating, recreation, and medical attention are also provided where needed. Dormitory accommodations in industrial areas rent for \$3 to \$4 a week per person for double rooms, and \$4 to \$5 for single rooms; with a slightly higher rate in the District of Columbia. A total of 65,203 dormitory units are under FPHA jurisdiction or control.

A special type of unit has been used for two-person families in some cases where large numbers of couples were expected to in-migrate. Such units consist of a single room which serves as both living room and bedroom, with light-housekeeping equipment and basic furniture. These rent at an average of \$7 to \$8 a week.

Units for larger families range in size from one to three bedrooms. The rooms are relatively small and the equipment provided is at an absolute minimum. Units for families are almost always grouped in large-scale projects which contain play space for children. Day nurseries, shopping facilities, and clinics are also provided when not otherwise available. These units have an average rental, including utilities, of from \$35 to \$40 per month. Family dwellings for two persons and for larger families under FPHA totalled 396,669 on December 31.

In addition to ordinary dwelling units, a total of 23,382 trailers renting for \$6 to \$7 a week have been used in the public war housing program. These trailers, practically all under FPHA jurisdiction, constitute an emergency floating supply of housing, since they can be moved rapidly from one community to another as needs develop. Trailers are stop-gap housing used primarily to provide shelter while more durable houses are being built. It is FPHA policy to move families out of trailers as rapidly as new housing is provided.

Types of Construction and Critical Materials

At the outset of the defense housing program, it was established policy to program permanent housing units in areas where permanent additions to the housing supply were desirable. Where the future of an area was doubtful, demountable units were programmed; and where it was almost certain that the need for housing would not extend beyond the end of the War, the program consisted of temporary units.

With the actual entrance of the United States into the War and the rapidly developing shortage of critical materials, it became impossible to adhere to these criteria. It was necessary, without regard to location, to build as many units as possible with the least amount of critical materials. The following table shows the pounds of critical materials required for the various construction types, including materials for

4876



site improvements and community facilities, in contrast with the materials used in a pre-war family dwelling unit:

	Pounds of Critical Materials per Unit
Pre-war housing	
Permanent housing for families.....	9712
War housing	
Permanent and demountable housing for families..	2717
Temporary housing for larger families.....	1589
Temporary housing for 2-person families.....	1301
Dormitories	425

The shift toward temporary construction of family dwelling units is shown by the following table:

	Permanent Family Dwellings Per Cent	Demountable Family Dwellings Per Cent	Temporary Family Dwellings Per Cent
Assignments prior to March, 1942.....	75	24	1
Assignments March-June, 1942	17	50	33
Assignments July-December, 1942	2	3	95

In the last six months temporary construction, with its substantial savings both in critical materials and in cost, was used for 95 per cent of all family dwellings assigned. Practically all dormitories are of temporary construction.

Construction Costs

While there was some increase during 1942, construction costs remained well within the estimates which were presented to the Congress at the time of the Lanham Act hearings in the middle of 1942. The average total cost of permanent family dwellings was estimated at \$4,500, temporary family dwellings for larger families at \$3,300, temporary two-person dwellings at \$2,400, and temporary dormitories at \$1,200. The figures actually achieved in the last part of 1942 were well below these estimates.

The average total development cost per unit of public war housing projects is shown in the following table which includes only units for which main construction awards had been made as of December 31, 1942:

	All Construction Contracts Awarded	Contracts Awarded Fourth Quarter of 1942
Family dwellings		
Permanent and demountable.....	\$4,255	\$4,275
Temporary for larger families...	2,825	2,970
Temporary for 2-person families.	2,582	2,309
Dormitories, temporary	781	957
Trailers	1,519	1,765

Final costs on dormitories will be somewhat above the averages shown above because of additional project facilities, such as cafeterias, yet to be constructed on some projects. Final costs will, however, be substantially below the \$1,200 per unit estimated for such projects.

Occupancy

In view of the acute shortage of housing in war production localities, the occupancy of public war housing, as was expected, has been almost to capacity. On December 31, approximately 91 per cent of all completed public war housing units were occupied, even though many of the units had just been opened for occupancy and tenants for these were in the process of being selected. War housing projects are usually filled quickly, although in some cases units are deliberately held vacant to serve workers who will come in to work for plants which are about to expand employment. Actually the applications for accommodations have far exceeded the capacity of public war housing, and there are extensive waiting lists for most projects.

There are some variations in occupancy among the various types of accommodations. Occupancy in family dwellings was 94 per cent on December 31, while dormitories were 73 per cent occupied and trailers 89 per cent. The relatively low occupancy in dormitories is partially due to the more rapid turnover in such projects which causes a higher vacancy at any given time, but is also due to the fact that a large number of units had just been completed in the month of December. The completion in the near future of improved eating and recreational facilities is expected to improve the occupancy of dormitory projects.

Extensive data on tenants of public war housing projects are now being collected and tabulated by FPHA. This information will be available shortly and will give details on occupants of war housing, their occupations, incomes, family sizes, and compositions, place of origin before migration, and other items vital to the successful planning and management of the war housing program.

LOW-RENT HOUSING

Status of the Program

All of the low-rent housing formerly under the United States Housing Authority, including the units originally built by the Public Works Administration, was transferred to FPHA by the consolidation order. In addition, the non-farm low-rent housing of the FSA was also transferred. As a result of the consolidation the FPHA active low-rent program now comprises the following.

Low-rent Housing	Number of Family Dwellings
United States Housing Act.....	103,414
PWA projects	21,445
FSA projects	
Greenbelts	2,267
Subsistence Homesteads	1,947
GRAND TOTAL	<u>129,073</u>

In addition FPHA holds for collection securities on 1,774 low-rent units which had been sold by PWA and FSA. All of these units were completed before the end of 1942, and 99 per cent were occupied.

In addition to these active low-rent projects, USHA contracts were outstanding on 26,804 units which had been suspended for the duration of the war.

As mentioned before in connection with the war program, funds under the United States Housing Act have been used to provide 57,063 war housing units. These are in addition to the 103,414 present low-rent units, but will of course revert to the use for which they were originally intended at the end of the War.

The total number of units financed from funds made available under the United States Housing Act, including suspended projects and war projects, amounts to 187,281, with an estimated total development cost of \$868,691,000. All of this housing is owned and operated by local authorities, with the exception of 2,000 war units being built directly by FPHA under Public Act 671.

Financial Operations under the U. S. Housing Act

At the end of 1942, projects with a total development cost of \$418,566,898 had been permanently financed. While FPHA may lend up to 90 per cent of the development cost, FPHA loans and loan commitments on these projects actually amounted to \$309,392,760, or only 74 per cent of the cost. The remainder of the cost of the projects was financed with borrowings from private investors.

The ability of local housing authorities to borrow an increasing proportion of the capital cost from private investors—some authorities have thus financed as much as 85 per cent of the cost with maturities running up to 42 years—is a tribute to the confidence which local authority bonds enjoy in financial markets. Further evidence of the increasing acceptance of local authority issues is found in the extremely low interest rates which were obtained during 1942. New issues floated during 1942 amounted to \$31,210,000, with average maturities of about 20 years. The average interest rate on these bonds was 1.99 per cent. Even taking into account the tax exemption feature of the bonds, this

rate compares favorably with current rates on bonds of the lowest risk and comparable maturities.

During the year, a number of authorities took advantage of the low interest rates prevailing in the market to refinance their existing obligations. The savings in interest achieved by these refunding operations will result in a substantial reduction in annual contribution by FPHA in future years.

Results of Project Operations

Operating statements for low-rent projects continue to reveal exceedingly able management on the part of local housing authorities. Typical of the results achieved by low-rent projects is the consolidated statement covering the first year operation of 125 projects containing 40,270 units with an average over-all development cost of \$4,375 per unit.

	Amount per Unit per Month
<i>Operating Income</i>	
Dwelling rent per schedule.....	\$16.89
Less: Vacancy losses24
Net dwelling rent	<u>16.65</u>
Other income28
TOTAL	<u>\$16.93</u>
<i>Operating Expense and Debt Service</i>	
Management, service, repairs, and insurance....	\$ 4.11
Dwelling utilities	4.16
Collection losses02
Reserves for:	
Repairs, maintenance, and replacements.....	3.64
Vacancy and collection losses.....	.54
Payments in lieu of taxes.....	.63
Debt service	<u>12.65</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$25.75</u>
<i>Net Current Deficit</i> , to be covered by federal annual contributions	\$ 8.82

The operating results of these projects for the past year compare very favorably with the best results achieved by privately-owned projects. Of special note is the vacancy loss of \$.24 per unit per month and the collection loss of only \$.02, which together amount to but 1.5 per cent of rents, an exceptionally low figure.

Substantial reserves, amounting to 22 per cent of rental income, were set aside in the first year of operation for repairs, maintenance, and replacements. These reserves were set up to cover the inevitable increase in the cost of these items as the projects become older.

Payments in lieu of taxes amounted to \$.63 per unit per month in the past year on these projects. This figure will, however, be somewhat increased in future years because of the recently liberalized policy of FPHA in regard to such payments.

The net current deficit of \$8.82, or about \$2.35 per person per month, is approximately equal to the amount of federal annual contributions applicable to the year's current operations. The net cost to the federal government is substantially less than this figure due to the difference between the interest rates at which, pursuant to statute, FPHA makes loans to the local authorities, and the rates at which it borrows funds.

Annual Contributions

The annual contributions actually paid by FPHA during the calendar year 1942 amounted to \$8,813,957. This amount will increase when all present low-rent projects become eligible for contributions, but it is expected that during the emergency annual contributions actually paid will not exceed \$11,500,000 per year.

The maximum amount of contributions for which FPHA is authorized to contract is \$28,000,000 per annum. Outstanding contracts with local authorities as of December 31, 1942, call for maximum annual contributions of \$27,165,000 per annum based on latest estimated development costs. These contracts, together with margins of safety in case of overruns in development cost, have practically exhausted FPHA's contractual authorization.

The difference between the maximum amount of \$27,165,000 contracted for and the \$11,500,000 estimated to be actually paid during the emergency is due to the following causes: (1) on suspended projects with an estimated development cost of \$110,000,000 no contributions will be paid during the emergency; (2) on war housing projects with an estimated development cost of \$280,000,000 no contributions will be required, apart from a few exceptional cases of projects serving low-income families; (3) on low-rent projects with an estimated development cost of \$479,000,000 the amount of contributions actually required will be substantially less than the maximum contractual amounts because rents as originally set by the local authorities required less than maximum subsidy, and because rents now charged tenants more nearly approach an economic level in line with increased tenant incomes due to war conditions.

LOOKING FORWARD

The year 1943 will inevitably be marked by a general lowering in living standards to meet the requirements of the War. The Nation

is willing to make the sacrifices necessary to winning the War quickly, but there is often a tendency to minimize or even overlook altogether the importance to the war effort of civilian morale and well-being. Civilian requirements for food, clothing, and housing must be cut to the bone, but we must always remember there is a limit below which it would be dangerous to go. In housing, we must use all our ingenuity and exert every effort to restrict the use of labor and materials, but we must continue to insist on receiving the minimum amounts necessary for the housing of workers who are essential to war production.

Much has already been done, but much more is necessary to reconcile the differences between public housing on one side and the private builders, real estate, and financial interests on the other. There has been blind antagonism on both sides. This can only be remedied by intelligent effort on the part of each of the two groups. With a little sane and rational thinking it should be readily appreciated that public housing is only a complement of private building, and that these two entirely non-competing groups should not be fighting over bugaboos.

Plans must be laid now for postwar disposition of public war housing. The size of the war housing program and its tremendous impact upon particular communities makes it imperative that eventual disposition should not be left to chance or to the exigencies of the moment. The problem must be studied in advance, community by community, and even project by project. Public war housing built for use during the emergency and which is unsuitable for permanent use in a community either because of its location, design, or construction must be removed as soon after the termination of the War as the need for it ceases and the public interest permits. Houses unfit or unneeded for permanent use must not be left standing to become future slums or ghost towns.

Finally, it is important that an over-all national housing policy be developed if housing is to fill the significant role it will be called upon to play in the postwar economy. The problem of providing decent housing for every family must be attacked on all fronts by both public and private enterprise; every possibility must be explored; and every success and failure of the past be taken into full account when planning for the future.

Public housing must subject itself to the most rigorous self-examination. It must ask itself: Are our patterns, policies, and procedures sound for use in a continuing program? What will be the respective markets for public and for private housing, in accordance with the level and distribution of family incomes we are likely to have in the

postwar period? What improvements in housing design and construction will be possible as a result of new techniques and materials developed during the War? What is the proper relationship of public housing to municipal governments and their fiscal policies?

This kind of thinking must be behind us, and working answers must be found to these and many other questions before we can begin to develop definite postwar plans. Although public housing today is devoting all its resources to war housing, we must yet be thinking and planning for the future.

728.1 :336.18 E55p

Emmerich, Herbert.
Public Housing in 1942.

DATE	ISSUED TO