

client's mind to the little understood separate payment of the clerk of the works, as well as the engineers. One of our clients voiced this feeling recently when he blurted out, "We paid for your superintendents on the last job." From our recent experiences I can vouch for the fact that while we have been fully reimbursed, our clients' satisfaction in the "all-inclusive fixed fee" has fully justified its adoption.

In looking back over the operation of the "committee system," the application of the "fixed fee" to sub-contractors as well as the general contractor, and especially to our own

"all-inclusive fixed fee" for architectural and engineering services, there were many occasions which sprang to mind when we were thankful, indeed, not only because the disinterested character of our services excluded them from the often trying discussions over jumping prices, but more particularly because of the comfortable feeling that while we were being adequately paid for the service rendered, we were not profiting by the misfortunes of our clients, and so we feel that we can conscientiously commend to the profession and to our future clients, "the flat fee as a measure of equity."

Report of New York Architects on Housing

At a meeting on November 18th, the New York State Association of Architects adopted a report incorporating an analysis of the housing problem as affecting that State and embodying recommendations for legislation, which, in view of the subject, is of general interest, and from which the following is quoted in part:—
— The housing problem is not a new nor a temporary problem. Rent legislation will not solve it. Offers of bounties to the speculative builders can only at the best serve to resurrect an incompetent system that in a wasteful manner has given a small proportion of us quite unsatisfactory dwelling places.

We can only hope to start the machinery of house production and to make it function for the good of the community by a change in our attitude in regard to the part that must be played by credit, materials, labor, land, planning and the State.

The control of credit is mainly in the hands of a small group of men. These heads of the banks and insurance companies are responsible to their stock and bond holders to get the greatest possible profit on their investment. Housing is risky. It does not pay as well as other investments. And so they will not lend money for investments. But the credit which they lend is based on the saving of working men and women. These same people are congested in a manner which endangers health and happiness while their money is used to build theatres and garages.

There is no solution of the housing problem until the control of credit becomes a public function. Credit for housing must be used where it is most needed and when it is most needed. This will be possible when the State lends its money or credit for housing at a low rate of interest and for long terms, or when the people finance the building of their own

homes by forming credit unions for that purpose.

Material and building service, like money, are practically unattainable for housing. There has not been material or organized and trained labor enough for all purposes. Bricks have been used for loft building, not for houses; glass needed for homes has gone into automobiles. There is reason to believe that the scarcity of materials has, at least in part, been created by curtailment of supply for the purpose of keeping prices high enough to pay large profits. It is apparent that a stronger control by the public of the manufacturing and distribution of essential material is needed. But this alone will not suffice. All unnecessary waste and undue profit must go if we are to bring the cost of housing within the means of the more poorly paid half of the population.

Workers in the building trades are not giving their full effort. In part, this is due to the disorganization that has resulted from the war. But there are more deep-seated causes. Artisans and laborers are discontented, perhaps because they feel that their efforts will not so much serve to promote their own interests as to enrich speculators and landlords who may afterwards squeeze them without mercy. If they felt that buildings were erected for the purpose of serving the need of the workers and the public in general instead of for profit, it might be more possible to get a full and enthusiastic day's work from workers.

The cost of land alone, according to the housing report of the Reconstruction Commission, is "generally sufficient to prevent a large part of the workers from escaping from the slums." The value of land increases with the congestion of population. However, the individuals who are crowded together in our cities get none of the increase which results from their