

RENT REBATES

Dhananjayarao Gadgil Library



GIPE-PUNE-033890

by

GEOFFREY WILSON



LONDON

VICTOR GOLLANCZ LTD

14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.2

AND

THE NEW FABIAN RESEARCH BUREAU

37 GREAT JAMES STREET, W.C.1

NOTE: This pamphlet, like all other publications of N F R B, represents not the collective view of N F R B, but only the view of the member who prepared it. The responsibility of N F R B is limited to approving the publications which it issues as embodying facts and opinions worthy of consideration within the Labour Movement. N F R B itself has no opinions beyond a collective belief in the desirability of encouraging among socialists a high standard of free and independent research.

July 1936

X (L): 22 -

33890

RENT REBATES

NOTE.—Explanation of certain terms used :

ECONOMIC RENT. The rent per house which would have to be charged to cover all annual outgoings in respect of that house, without loss or profit to the local authority, no subsidies being taken into account.

STANDARD RENT. The rent charged for any house or type of house, from or to which deductions or additions are made in accordance with the rebate scale. The standard rent may thus in some cases be the same as the economic rent.

COMMERCIAL RENT. The rent which would be charged for any particular type of house, if built and let by private enterprise.

INCLUSIVE RENT. Rent and rates combined. Where the word 'rent' is used alone, the inclusive rent is meant.

EXCLUSIVE RENT. Rent only, not including rates.

A 2 HOUSE. A two bedroom, non-parlour house.

A 3 HOUSE. A three bedroom, non-parlour house.

INTRODUCTION

Since the War the housing question has bulked large among the problems to be faced by successive Governments. In spite of all fluctuations in wages and building costs, private enterprise has proved itself utterly incapable of providing suitable housing which families with an income of about £3 10s 0d a week or less can afford. Municipal houses, though considerably cheaper, would have been equally beyond their reach, had not every post-war Government realized the necessity and provided a housing subsidy of one kind or another.

It is with the most advantageous distribution of these various subsidies, by means of rent rebate schemes, that this pamphlet is concerned. It will become apparent later, particularly in connection with the depressed areas, that no ideal solution can be attained within the limits of existing legislation. Our object is not to suggest new legislation which might be introduced, but rather to indicate how, within those limits, local authorities can take immediate steps to effect a more equitable distribution of the various subsidies now available than is often the case at the present time.

THE PRESENT POSITION

The most pressing need in housing is the provision of adequate and decent accommodation for the lower paid members of the community, especially so that young children may be brought up in healthy and sanitary conditions, such as are denied to them in the slums of our great cities. Those who need particular consideration in this respect are large families whose weekly income is about £3 10s 0d a week or less, above which figure rebates, with certain notable exceptions, are not at present granted.

In spite of the fact that, for a variety of reasons, building costs have fallen enormously during the past ten years, the average exclusive economic rent of a municipal 3 bedroom, non-parlour (A 3) house, built under the 1930 Act, is still about 10s per week, to which must be added rates, which average about 3s a week. The maximum subsidy at present available, that given under the same Act, works out at about 5s¹ per week per house. Therefore, assuming that this subsidy is equally divided among all the houses for which it is available, the inclusive rent is rarely less than 8s a week; and houses built under the earlier post-war Acts (and some flats, particularly in London) tend to be considerably more expensive. That is a sum far larger than can be paid by a man with a small income, or a large family, or both, unless the whole family is to go short of some of the other necessities of life. The result is that there are large sections of people for whom municipal houses are quite out of the question on account of their cost.

For this difficulty rent rebates provide an immediately practicable, if perhaps only partial, solution. The basic principle of differential rent rebates² is that those tenants who can afford it should pay the full economic rent and receive no assistance from the public purse, while those who cannot afford to pay the economic rent, even after it has been lowered to the maximum extent possible by the application of the full subsidy, should receive further assistance in the form of rent relief, varying in amount with their means and needs. No one can pretend that this is an ideal solution. Under a more rational organization of society rates of remuneration would be such that even the poorest families could afford adequate accommodation. But when a partial solution can be

¹ This figure is arrived at by assuming that, on an average, five people are rehoused in each new house built. Where fewer people occupy a new house, as is frequently the case, the value of the subsidy, of course, falls considerably.

² Differential rents should be distinguished from differential rent relief or rebates. Differential rents are *fixed* different rentals; differential rent relief or rent rebates are *varying allowances made off rents*, which may themselves be differentiated, though usually they are partially subsidized fixed rents.

adopted immediately, it is idle to refuse to apply it because it is not perfect. It has the advantage, moreover, that any local authority can act immediately without asking for further powers from the central government.

Up to the present time there has been a tendency on the part of many local authorities to house the 'well-to-do'. The better paid workers are more likely to pay their rent regularly; they are more likely to keep their houses tidy; they are likely to make 'better tenants'. And so, when the number of applicants for municipal houses has exceeded the supply, local authorities have frequently selected as tenants those whose financial resources were comparatively large, in preference to those whose need of cheap housing was infinitely greater. And because of the system whereby the subsidy was attached to the house instead of to the family, all these tenants have enjoyed the benefit of a subsidy of anything up to 5s per week, irrespective of whether they needed it or not. This practice of attaching a flat rate subsidy to a particular house is both wasteful and unjust. Where the subsidy is attached to the house, the tenant gets the benefit of it, whatever his financial circumstances may be. It is wasteful in that, in many cases, a subsidy is given to a tenant who has no need of it; and it is unjust in that the money thus wasted is not being given to those who really need it.

The fact that even tenants moved from slum areas do not, in a great number of cases, need the subsidy is strikingly shown in a memorandum¹ by Miss Eleanor Rathbone, M.P. "For example, the elaborate survey by sample of social conditions on Merseyside carried on under the auspices of the University of Liverpool showed that of the families sampled and found to be living in overcrowded conditions, only 28% were below the poverty line.² It is estimated that 'more than one half of the families living in overcrowded conditions could probably afford to pay a higher rent'; . . . in making this calculation, it was not assumed that families could 'probably afford to pay a higher rent' unless the income was at least 25% over the poverty line. Again, the Survey³ of housing conditions in Ancoats, carried out by the Manchester University Settlement, estimates that in one especially 'black patch' of that very poor ward no less than 35% of the tenants had a capacity to pay rent of £1 and over after allowing for the relatively high standard of 'human needs' worked out by Mr Rowntree in his

¹ *Memorandum on the Use and Abuse of Housing Subsidies, 1931, p. 4.*

² For the basis of this Poverty Line, see the Report of the Survey in the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, vols. 93 & 94.

³ Manchester and District Regional Survey Society, No. 10. *Housing Needs of Ancoats in Relation to the Greenwood Act, 1930, p. 22.*

famous book." And in Leeds, 12½% of the tenants from slum areas were adjudged capable of paying the economic rent.

The other side of the picture is also given in the survey of housing in Ancoats. After allowing for human needs on the same basis, 24% of the families have a deficit, without making any allowance for rent at all; and 16% of the families have a margin of less than 8s for rent. The net result of all this is that 35% of the tenants can afford an inclusive rent of £1 or over; 40% of the tenants cannot even afford 8s for rent. If the subsidy is applied in flat rate reductions of the economic rent, all these tenants receive exactly the same amount of benefit per week, although in the one case it is not needed, and in the other it may be quite insufficient to enable the tenant to live in a municipal house. There could be no more striking example of the wastefulness and injustice of the flat rate subsidy.

The main reason for this wide divergence in ability to pay rent is not far to seek. Let us take the case of a married couple over a period of 25 years. When he gets married the man may be receiving £3 0s 0d a week; he can afford the full economic rent of a municipal house. Ten years later, his wages may still be £3 0s 0d a week, and he may have four children dependent upon him. Obviously his capacity to pay rent is far less than it was at the time he got married. In another ten years, his wages may be £3 10s 0d a week, and two of his children may be in work, or living away from home; and five years later he may still have £3 10s 0d a week and no dependent children. In that case, he will again be in a position to pay the full economic rent without any difficulty.

That kind of cycle is common to most families who live in slum clearance areas. During the period when they have several children dependent upon them, they are quite incapable of paying the normal rents on a municipal estate; when the period of child-dependency has ceased, they can pay those rents without any difficulty. Nor is this cycle confined to those who live in slum clearance areas. It is equally typical of all families who are, or who may become, municipal tenants. Most of the rent rebate schemes at present in operation are confined to houses built under the 1930 Act, as though tenants compulsorily removed from the slums were the only ones who needed this particular kind of assistance. Far too much, rent rebates are regarded as a merely temporary assistance to tide over the difficult period between removing from a cheap house in a slum to a more expensive house on a municipal estate. But statistics show that, in the great majority of cases, it is the expense of bringing up a family that

necessitates some form of assistance in the payment of rent, and that applies to all municipal tenants, present and prospective, and not merely to tenants removed under slum clearance schemes. If, therefore, the necessity for some form of rent assistance is largely confined to those years when there is a number of dependent children to be supported, it is perfectly apparent that no system of flat rate reductions of the economic rent can give the desired solution.

Under the 1935 Act, local authorities can apply all the housing subsidies, within certain limits which do not matter for our present purpose, in whatever way they choose. There would appear to be two alternatives open to them—either (*a*) to apply the subsidy in flat rate reductions of the economic rent to the standard rent, in which case the subsidy is attached to the house, no matter what the income of the tenant may be; or (*b*) to apply the subsidy only to such persons as are shown to be in need of assistance, in which case the subsidy is attached to the individual and only for so long as he may be in need. The second of these alternatives is the method of rent rebates.

Were the subsidy unlimited in quantity, there might be more excuse for applying it indiscriminately to rich and poor alike. But when it is strictly limited, as it is today, unless there is to be an additional rate charge, justice and economy alike dictate that it should only be applied where it is definitely needed, and so long as there are people who cannot afford decent housing even at the subsidized rents, there is no excuse for those who do not need it being given the benefit of the subsidy.

Subsidies themselves are in the nature of a stop-gap. They provide no permanent solution for anything. But so long as they are there, they should be used to provide houses for those who could not otherwise afford them, and rent rebates are merely a method of making the best use of the available resources. They provide an immediate palliative for a pressing need, and ensure, to some extent at any rate, that public money reaches the pockets of those who need it most.

THE POWERS POSSESSED BY LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Before considering in detail the rent rebate schemes at present in operation, some account must be given of the powers possessed by local authorities to inaugurate such schemes. Apart from Banbury, which has applied a scheme in respect of the 1890 Act houses,¹ and Brentford and Chiswick, Carlisle, Guildford R.D.C.,

¹ These houses were erected as a Re-Housing Scheme under the Housing Act, 1890, and incorporated in the Housing Act, 1923, sec. 1 (3).

Leeds and Winchester, which have applied schemes to all post-war municipal houses, all the schemes apply only to houses built under the Acts of 1923, 1924 and 1930, and of these the great majority apply only to the 1930 Act houses.

Local authorities have, of course, been free to charge such rents for their houses as they please, provided any subsidy necessary in addition to the government subsidy has been met out of the rates. But different considerations apply when the government subsidy itself is used, not merely in a flat rate reduction of the rents of all the houses on a given estate, but in order to finance a scheme which enables some houses on a given estate to be let at a higher, and some at a lower, rent than the average.

The Housing Acts of 1919, 1923 and 1924 gave local authorities no express powers to use the government subsidy in this way, and although Circular 520 (revised) on the Housing Act of 1924, issued on 14th August, 1931, seemed to authorize the giving of rent rebates in respect of the 1924 Act houses,¹ the matter was still in sufficient doubt for a case on the subject to go as far as the Court of Appeal.² It was decided, however, that a local authority was entitled to inaugurate rent rebate schemes in respect of these houses, if it wished to do so, and that such schemes need not be confined to houses built under Acts which specifically recognized the principle of rent rebates. This consideration is now, however, immaterial, in view of the provisions of the Housing Act of 1935.

Explicit legislative sanction for rent rebate schemes was not given until the passing of the Greenwood Act of 1930, and even then the authority given seemed to be somewhat half-hearted.³ But the principle was recognized, and it remained to be seen what use the Ministry of Health and the local authorities would make of their powers. The application of schemes was made permissive, not compulsory, and no general form was laid down which the schemes should take. This was wise, because, apart from the fact that different areas may need different schemes, as will be shown later, no sufficient experience had at that time been gained to indicate what type of scheme was likely to be the most successful.

It is a matter of some regret that rent rebates were first

¹ Cf. p. 7. "The rents charged for individual houses by the Local Authority will not necessarily be the appropriate normal rents. . . . It will be open to the Local Authority to fix different rents for any of the houses, but . . . the total rents charged by the Local Authority for all the houses must not exceed the total rent which would have been obtained if each house had been let at the appropriate normal rent of its class."

² Leeds Corporation v. Jenkinson. 1935. 1 K.B. 168.

³ Cf. Sec. 27.

explicitly authorized in an Act of Parliament which dealt particularly with over-crowding and slum clearance. The result has been, as will appear hereafter, that in many cases rebates have been regarded merely as a method of enabling a tenant to move to a more expensive house than that previously occupied. Schemes have therefore tended to be limited in scope, and have not generally been extended to cover houses other than those built under the 1930 Act. It is to be hoped that the recommendations made in subsequent Ministry of Health circulars, and in the Act of 1935, will stimulate local authorities to apply schemes more widely than has been the case hitherto.

But the beginning thus made was followed up more energetically in the Circulars issued by the Ministry of Health. In the Memorandum annexed to the Ministry of Health Circular 1138, issued in 1930 to explain the general scope of the Act, attention is drawn to the permissive powers contained in Section 27. The permission given in the Act has become a definite recommendation, and the Circular states that "it is the clear intention of Parliament that the benefit of the new grant shall not enure to persons for whom it is not needed. . . . Rent relief should be given only to those who need it, and only for so long as they need it."

The policy thus inaugurated by Mr Arthur Greenwood at the Ministry of Health received the approval of his successor, Sir Hilton Young. A Housing (Financial Provisions) Act was passed in 1933, and in Ministry of Health Circular 1334, explaining the provisions of the Act, attention was called to the possibilities of rent rebates, mainly from the point of view of saving money. But whatever may have been the exact object of the Minister of Health in issuing this Circular, its effect was that a Conservative Government recognized rent rebates as a method of ensuring that subsidies were not wasted on those who did not need them.

By the time therefore that the Housing Act of 1935 came into operation, local authorities were not merely permitted, but were actually recommended to institute rent rebate schemes, and it had been pointed out to them by a Conservative and a Labour Minister of Health alike that the housing subsidies were intended for the purpose of assisting those who needed assistance, and not those who could pay an economic rent out of their own resources.

The Act of 1935 completely altered the scope of the rent rebate schemes for those authorities who chose to avail themselves of its provisions. It is unnecessary here to outline the provisions of that Act, save in so far as they affect the subject with which we are dealing. It enabled local authorities to

consolidate their accounts for all houses built by municipal enterprise since the war, so that, instead of a separate account having to be kept for each set of houses built under a particular Act, each of which accounts had to balance, one Housing Revenue Account was to be kept for all municipal houses, and, so long as that account balanced, as provided by the Act, the subsidy granted under one Act could be used to finance houses built under any of the post-war Acts. Special reference was again made to rent rebates, in Section 51 (5) and (6).¹

Thus, while the legislative authority for giving differential rent relief remained the same as before the 1935 Act, the scope of rent rebate schemes could be vastly increased. Up to this time, the great majority of such schemes as were in operation were confined to houses built under the 1930 Act. The 1935 Act enabled these schemes to be applied, within the same Housing Revenue Account, to all municipal houses built since the war. It is too early as yet to say what the effect of these new powers will be. Local authorities are not particularly quick to act, and in only a few instances have they made use of the new Act in relation to rent rebate schemes. The information at present available refers almost exclusively to schemes operated under the Act of 1930, and what follows will be based on that information. There is, however, no reason why it should not equally apply to schemes operated under the 1935 Act, so long as it is borne in mind that houses built under the Acts of 1919, 1923 and 1924 are, for various reasons, considerably more expensive than those built under the Act of 1930. The same principles will apply, although some modification may be necessary in the financial provisions of the various schemes.²

SUPPORT FOR RENT REBATES

There is a not inconsiderable body of opinion which has already expressed itself in favour of the adoption of rent rebate schemes. The Annual Conference of the Labour Party, held at Southport in 1934, expressed its approval in the following terms:³ "The demands of the social services on public funds are so great and

¹ (5) "In fixing rents, the authority shall take into consideration the rents ordinarily payable by persons of the working classes in the locality, but may grant to any tenant such rebates from rent, subject to such terms and conditions, as they may think fit."

(6) "The authority shall from time to time review rents and make such changes, either of rents generally, or of particular rents, and rebates (if any), as circumstances may require."

² Cf. Winchester, pp. 20 and 21.

³ *Up with the Houses! Down with the Slums!* 1934. pp. 31-34.

urgent, and the amount available under existing conditions so limited in relation to the need, that the best results can only be obtained by a careful schedule of priorities ; and it is, for the time being at least, quite out of the question to consider letting *all* local authority houses at the minimum rents necessary for the poorest families. ' Each according to his need ' is a good socialist precept, especially when there is little enough to go round ; and it is believed that housing subsidies can be put to the best use, and best benefit according to need, by the adoption of the differential principle."

Nor is the support limited to socialist bodies. The Family Endowment Society, mainly under the inspiration of Miss Eleanor Rathbone, M.P., first put forward the proposal and has since done valuable work in securing the adoption of rebate schemes ; the National Housing Committee, in its report for 1934, stated that " there is no justification for allowing those who can afford an economic rent to live for something less than that rent in a subsidized house at the expense of the public purse. The principle of attaching subsidies permanently to particular houses is, in our opinion, a vicious one. . . . We are . . . of the opinion that both the subsidies already in existence, and any new subsidies that may be granted, should be pooled in the hands of the local authority, and used by it for making grants in aid of individual tenants who cannot afford to pay the full economic rent." And Sir E. D. Simon, an acknowledged authority on all matters dealing with housing, has declared that rent rebates are essential to a solution of the problem of decently housing the lower paid workers.¹ The further fact that a Conservative Government has followed in the steps first taken in this direction by a Labour Government shows that there is no difference of opinion on the desirability of differential renting so far as political considerations are concerned.

SCHEMES AT PRESENT IN OPERATION

At the present time in this country some 43 local authorities, of which we have information, have availed themselves of the powers given to them and instituted rent rebate schemes, and it is on the information gathered from these authorities that this pamphlet is based. A few of the schemes, as we have said, cover houses other than those built under the 1930 Act, but unless it

¹ *The Anti-Slum Campaign*. 1933.

Further information on the subject is contained in a memorandum by Mr Lloyd Parry, published by the National Housing and Town Planning Council.

Cf. Also, Rev. Charles Jenkinson's Paper to the Housing Conference of the Association of Municipal Corporations, reprinted in *The Municipal Review* for April 1934, Vol. 5, No. 52.

is otherwise stated, all references will be to schemes operated under that Act.

It might have been anticipated that, after five years' experience, the various schemes would have begun to show some degree of similarity. Nothing could be further from the facts. In practically every respect in which it was possible for one scheme to differ from another, it has done so, and the following figures will give some indication of the prevailing disparity. The maximum inclusive rent is 17s 2d; the minimum (not counting rebate) 6s 6d. The maximum rebate allowed varies between 8s 5d and 2s. The average rebate per house in each town varies between 3s 6d and .74d. And while in Lancaster 94 houses out of the 97 to which the scheme applies are actually in receipt of a rebate, the comparable figures for Wolverhampton are 455 and 1,222. The methods of assessing rebates are equally various, as are also the methods of dealing with the income of members of the household other than the head of the family.¹

If we exclude Leeds, whose rent rebate scheme will call for special consideration later, the total number of houses to which the schemes apply is about 24,000, varying in number in the various towns from 3,400 to 40.² In the case of 32 local authorities, of which full details can be ascertained, the number of houses in the rebate scheme is about 18,000, of which 5,000, or about 28%, are actually in receipt of rebates.

The schemes may be roughly classified as follows,³ although the dividing line between the various classes is in many cases far from clear:

- (a) Standard, or maximum, rent subject to rebates. The appropriate rebate may be ascertained in either of two ways:
 - (i) A fixed rebate on incomes between a certain upper and lower limit—e.g. rebate of x d on incomes between y and z shillings.
 - (ii) A rebate of x d for every y shillings by which the income falls below a fixed scale.
- (b) Minimum rent, which is increased according to a fixed scale, until an upper limit is reached.

¹ The table printed in Appendix I gives a useful summary of all the schemes at present in operation.

² In several large towns—e.g. Manchester and Birmingham—rebate schemes are being applied to pre-1930 Act houses as they fall vacant and are re-let to persons displaced from clearance areas under the 1930 Act. The figure includes only those actually covered by the scheme at present and not those which may be covered by it in the future.

³ This classification differs somewhat from that given by Sir Ernest Simon in *The Anti-Shun Campaign* in that it is considerably more detailed.

- (c) Subsistence scale, balance available in whole or in part for payment of rent.
 (d) Rent to be a fixed percentage of income, with deductions for children.
 (e) Rebates for children only, i.e. a form of family allowance, or family endowment.
 (f) Miscellaneous.

We shall consider each of these types of scheme in turn. In the details which are given below of typical examples of the various types of scheme, a figure is given for the average rebate per house. This is the average for *all* the houses included in the scheme and not merely for those actually in receipt of a rebate. If the average subsidy per house under the 1930 Act is taken as being 5s to 5s 6d, varying according to the number of people rehoused in any particular house,¹ it is possible to calculate approximately how much of the subsidy is being used for rebates and how much for flat rate reductions in the economic rent. Thus if the average rebate per house is 1s 6d, the standard rent is 3s 6d to 4s less than the economic rent. Some further allowance must, of course, be made for the other expenses incurred by the municipality in its rehousing schemes, such as compensation, etc.

(a) STANDARD OR MAXIMUM RENT SUBJECT TO REBATES

This is by far the most common of all the types of scheme in operation. It has been adopted by 20 local authorities, of which 13 have adopted type A (i) and seven type A (ii). The following are typical illustrations of this type of scheme :

(i) BIRMINGHAM.

Substantially, the scheme covers only the houses built under the 1930 Act. At the end of 1935, 1,863 houses built under this Act were included in the scheme, of which 180 were actually in receipt of a rebate. Of these 1,863 houses, about 62% were A 3 type, about 37% A 2, and about 3% of other types.²

The average rebate per house erected is 7½d.

A standard rent is fixed for each type of house, and rebates are given according to a sliding scale. The following extract of part of the sliding scale used in respect of houses let at an inclusive rent of 8s 0d weekly will give some idea of the nature of the scale.

Rent Assistance	Man & Wife	Plus 1 Child	Plus 2 Children		Plus 3 Children		Plus 4 Children	
			£ s d	£ s d	£ s d	£ s d	£ s d	
No assistance	.. 1 14 3	2 0 9	2 5 9	2 9 9	2 13 0			
1s 0d	.. 1 11 3	1 17 9	2 2 9	2 6 9	2 10 0			
2s 0d	.. 1 8 9	1 15 3	2 0 3	2 4 3	2 7 6			
3s 0d	.. 1 6 9	1 13 3	1 18 3	2 2 3	2 5 6			
4s 0d	.. 1 4 9	1 11 3	1 16 3	2 0 3	2 3 6			

¹ Cf. Footnote 1 on p. 4.

² In certain instances, houses built under other Housing Acts, and pre-war properties, are used to accommodate slum clearance cases, and such houses are eligible for rebates. This doubles the number of houses actually in receipt of a rebate, though, as a whole, the scheme does not include houses built under the earlier Acts.

The minimum inclusive rent is 6s 6d or the rent of the house vacated, whichever is the lower. The principle applied is to mark the rent book for the normal rent, less an amount for rent assistance. A review takes place every three months.

STOKE-ON-TRENT

The scheme applies to 1930 Act houses only. At the end of 1935, the total number of houses within the scheme was 1,194, the tenants of 444 of which were actually in receipt of rebates.

The economic rent of an A 3 house is 8s 0d, the standard rent 5s 0d. Rates amount to 4s 2d per week, so that the inclusive standard rent is 9s 2d. The minimum inclusive rent used to be 6s 8d, but it was found possible to reduce it to 6s 2d.

Rents are reviewed every three months, or earlier in the event of any change in the financial circumstances of the tenant.

The scale according to which rebates are assessed is as follows :

Where the weekly income is £3 or more, standard rent to be paid.

Where the weekly income is £2 10s—£3, rebate of 1s 0d per child in excess of 2.

Where the weekly income is £2—£2 10s, rebate of 1s 0d per child for first 3, 2s 0d per child in excess of 3.

Where the weekly income is below £2, minimum rent to be paid.

The average rebate per house erected is 1s 3d.

(ii) BOOTLE

The scheme applies to 1930 Act houses only. At the end of 1935, the total number of houses within the scheme was 81, of which 54 were actually in receipt of rebates.

The standard inclusive rent of an A 2 house is 10s 1d or 10s 4d per week; of an A 3 house, 10s 11d or 11s 3d; and of an A 4 house 13s 5d.

The following is the minimum income on which no rebate is granted :

No. in family	..	2	3	4	5	6	7
Income	..	£2 0 0	£2 5 0	£2 10 0	£2 13 0	£2 15 0	£2 17 0

A rebate is allowed of 4d in every 1s 0d by which the family income falls below the scale until the minimum rent is reached, and 5d in the 1s 0d if the family is re-housed in an A 4 house. The minimum inclusive rent of the A 2 and A 3 houses has been fixed at 6s 0d, and of the A 4 houses at 6s 6d.

The average rebate per house is 2s 8d.

Rebates are revised each quarter.

ROTHERHAM¹

The scheme applies to 1930 Act houses only. At the end of 1935, 439 houses were included in the scheme, of which 233 were actually in receipt of a rebate. The scheme will also be applied to 294 houses at present in course of erection.

The standard rent of an A 2 house is 5s 9d; of an A 3 house, 6s 3d per week. Rates amount to 3s 6d and 3s 11d respectively, so that the standard inclusive rents are 9s 3d and 10s 2d.

The minimum inclusive rent is 5s 11d for an A 2 house, and 6s 0d for an A 3 house.

Revisions are made every three months.

The following is the minimum income on which no rebate is granted :

No. in family	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Income	..	37s 0d	42s 0d	47s 0d	50s 0d	52s 0d	54s 0d	56s 0d

A rebate is allowed of 3d for every 1s 0d by which the family income falls below the scale.

The average rebate per house erected is 1s 3d.

In most of the other cases, the rebate granted is either 3d or 4d for each 1s 0d by which the income falls below the scale.

A scheme of this type is, of course, capable of infinite variations. The scale by which it is ascertained how great a rebate,

¹ The scheme in operation at Doncaster, under which rebates are granted to 95 of the 141 houses built under the 1930 Act, is identical with this one, except for minor differences in the standard rent and rates. The average rebate per house, however, is 2s 1d.

if any, shall be given can be varied indefinitely, as can easily be seen from the examples given above. The type of scale adopted by Stoke-on-Trent is the simplest of any, but that adopted by Birmingham is much more usual. A far more complicated scale, though based on the same principle, is in operation at Dudley, and, roughly speaking, it is true to say that the more detailed the scale, the more likely is it that equitable distribution of rebates will be effected, though it has to be borne in mind that a complicated and detailed scale is unlikely to be understood by the tenants, who may therefore be hostile to the whole scheme on the ground that they are not getting a fair deal.

There is less scope for variation under method (a) (ii) than under method (a) (i). Once the income limit has been fixed above which the standard rent has to be paid, the amount of the rebate can be ascertained automatically, and the scheme is easily intelligible to the tenants.

(b) MINIMUM RENT WHICH IS INCREASED ACCORDING TO A FIXED SCALE UNTIL AN UPPER LIMIT IS REACHED

This is simply an inversion of type (a) (ii) above. An income scale is fixed, on which only the minimum rent is to be paid. This rent is then increased by *x*d for each additional 1s of income, until the maximum rent is paid, e.g. :

FARNWORTH

The scheme applies only to houses built under the 1933 Act. The total number of houses included in the scheme at the end of 1935 was 304, of which 142 were actually in receipt of a rebate.

The inclusive rent for an A 2 house varies between 6s 7d and 9s 11d; the inclusive rent for an A 3 house varies between 6s 8d and 10s 6d. Thus, the minimum inclusive rent chargeable in respect of any house is 6s 0d a week, plus water rate.

Families whose income is equal to, or less than, the following scale are charged the minimum rent only :

No. in family	..	2	3	4	5	6	7
Income	..	25s 0d	30s 0d	34s 0d	37s 6d	42s 0d	49s 0d

The minimum rent is increased by 4d for every complete shilling of family income in excess of the above scale until the maximum rent is reached.

The average rebate per house erected is 1s 8d.

Revision takes place every three months.

This is one of the very few instances where a new scheme has been adopted completely different from that first introduced. Originally Farnworth adopted a scheme closely resembling those at present in operation in King's Lynn and Lancaster.

A variation of this type of scheme is to fix the income figure on which the minimum rent is to be paid for the man and wife only. This rent is subject to an increase for each increase in income, but a deduction of 6d or 1s, or some similar amount, is made in respect of each dependent child.

There does not appear to be much to choose between this type of scheme and type (a), except that psychologically it is probably better to have a maximum rent which is decreased than a minimum rent which is increased.

In Enfield, on an income of 34s a week, or less, the rent paid is 6s a week, which increases by 1s for every additional 3s per week earned, until a rent of 15s a week is reached. 15s is the economic rent of the house, and nobody is called upon to pay more than that. The simplicity of such a scheme is attractive, but its incidence is unfair, in that it takes no account of dependent children.¹

(c) SUBSISTENCE SCALE, BALANCE AVAILABLE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, FOR PAYMENT OF RENT

This is the type of scheme that was formerly adopted by Leeds, and also by five other municipalities, though the Leeds scheme differs from those in operation elsewhere in important particulars. In the most usual type a subsistence scale is drawn up, in greater or less detail, and only the amount by which the actual income exceeds the subsistence scale is to be paid in rent, subject to a minimum rent, e.g.:

WOLVERHAMPTON

The scheme includes houses built under the 1930 Act only. Of these, there were at the end of 1935 1,222, of which 455 were actually in receipt of a rebate.

The normal inclusive rent of an A 3 house is 7s 5d; of an A 2 house, 6s 4d; and the minimum rents are 4s 7d and 4s 1d respectively.

The scheme is operated as follows:

- Allow for food alone 7s 0d per week for each person over 14 years.
- " " " " 5s 0d per week for children between 5 and 14.
- " " " " 4s 0d per week for children under 5 years.
- " " " " 7s 0d per week for first three persons in family for all other expenses.

Allow a further 1s 0d per week for each additional person.

Deduct the total from the weekly income, and if the balance is as much as the rent, full rent must be paid; otherwise the tenant pays only the margin available for rent, subject to the minima mentioned above.

The average rebate per house erected is 10½d.

Rebates are varied week by week as the incomes alter.

Two alterations have been made in this scheme since its inception, one being that instead of the minimum being the rent formerly paid in the house which has been demolished, a scale of minima has been fixed, as shown above. The other alteration was the cancellation of the rule that a tenant who had paid full rent for any period of twelve months should not be eligible for rent relief in the future.

An alternative method, which has been adopted in Walsall, is to draw up the subsistence scale on different lines, and then grant a rebate equal to the amount by which the income falls short of the subsistence scale. If the subsistence scale is drawn

¹ This scheme has now been abandoned.

up so as to include the payment of rent, the results achieved by the two methods are identical. This type of scheme takes more explicit notice of human needs in respect of food and clothing than types (a) and (b), and the results achieved are on the whole more generous to the tenants, but the same results can be obtained by either of the other two methods, provided suitable scales are drawn up.

LEEDS¹

The Leeds Labour Party's scheme was the largest and most thoroughgoing yet put into operation. From its inception in April 1934, it embraced all 1923, 1924 and 1930 Acts houses; in April 1935 all other post-war municipal houses (*i.e.* all 1919, 1925 and Local Acts houses) were added, making a total in March 1936 of 11,238 actual tenancies.

The economic rents of all houses were averaged, regardless of the Act under which they were built, sufficient of the Addison subsidy being attached to the Addison houses to enable their rents to be brought to the same level as the other houses.

The economic rents were: A 1 6s 0d plus rates 2s 7d; A 2 8s 0d and 8s 6d plus rates 4s 0d to 4s 4d; A 3 8s 0d and 9s 0d plus rates 4s 4d to 5s 3d; A 4 9s 6d plus rates 5s 7d to 5s 11d; A 5 10s 0d plus rates 6s 3d; A 2 cottage flats 6s 6d plus rates 2s 11d; A 3 cottage flats 7s 0d plus rates 3s 3d to 3s 7d.

The total value of the subsidies, government and municipal combined (with the exception of that part of the Addison subsidy allocated for the purpose just mentioned) was allocated to a Subsidy Pool, out of which all rent rebates were granted. A rent rebate or a revision of rebate could be applied for by any tenant at any time. Such rebate was granted in case of need, on averaged circumstances, but for so long only as the need continued. A general revision of all rebates took place six months from the last previous revision if no application for revision had been made within that time.

Rebates were granted on the basis of a subsistence scale and any family not having more than the appropriate income was granted a total rent rebate: *i.e.* had the whole of its rent paid out of the Subsidy Pool. The subsistence scale was:

	s	d
Man living alone	11	0
Woman living alone	10	0
Persons over 65 years of age	9	0
Man and wife	19	0
Children under 10 years of age	4	0
Persons 10 and under 14 years of age	5	6
Persons 14 years of age and over living in a family	8	0

In addition, 5s 0d per week of the income of every person aged 16 or over who was in work was not taken into account, and 5s 0d extra was also allowed for ageing persons on superannuation, etc., or living by taking in lodgers.

There were also additional special allowances made where persons were suffering from tuberculosis and for extraordinary travelling expenses. Also young married couples for the first four years of married life were treated as if having one child, this extra relief continuing until either there was more than one child or, the couple remaining childless, till the end of the fourth year, when they would be dealt with as man and wife only.

Rebates were granted on detailed tables, drawn up on the principle that only a percentage of the margin of income over the subsistence amount should be paid in rent. This percentage was further scaled in relation to each type of accommodation, the amount payable being related to the number of persons occupying the accommodation. The objects of this were to encourage the smaller families not to occupy larger houses than necessary, and to enable the larger families to occupy the larger accommodation without undue strain.

¹ We are indebted to the Rev. Charles Jenkinson for the following details about Leeds.

The adjustment of rebate to every size of family in every type of dwelling necessitated the granting of rebates on the basis of a separate table for each type of dwelling. Though simple in operation, the effect of the scheme cannot be fully appreciated without reference to the detailed tables.¹

No table such as is given in Appendix II for the other schemes which are here illustrated would give an adequate impression in the case of Leeds, where there were so many variable factors to be taken into account, but a comparable table appears in Appendix IIIc.

The last published official figures for the scheme, giving the position as on 10 February 1936 were as follows :

Paying economic rent	4,398	tenants
Receiving partial rent rebate ²	5,727	..
Receiving full rent rebate ²	1,113	..
	11,238	..

The official figures as to the state of the subsidy pool are available only up to 31 December 1935 when a "surplus" of £9,888 existed.

The Present Conservative Scheme. As a consequence of a change in the political control of the Council, the Labour Party's scheme was superseded on 1 April 1936 by a scheme which combines differential rents with differential rent rebates, and which deals with tenants on entirely different principles, according to whether they are "voluntary" or "compulsory" tenants. The former are tenants who go to reside on a municipal estate of their own free will, and they are not entitled to any rebate, although part of the subsidy has been applied in a flat rate reduction of the economic rent in the case of these tenants. The "compulsory" tenants are those removed under a slum clearance order; they are entitled to claim rebates, but a minimum rent has been introduced which, in the case of an A 3 house, varies between 5s 8d and 6s 3d per week, according to the type of house.

The method by which the rebate is assessed is as follows: The same subsistence scale is adopted as under the earlier Labour scheme. The household income is then assessed, 5s 0d being deducted from the actual earnings of a tenant wage-earner and one-half being deducted in the case of income from a disability pension. The income of persons over 65 is treated as earned income, whether earned or unearned, except in the case of Public Assistance. Of the margin between household income so determined and subsistence, the following proportions are payable as rent:

(a) Margin up to and including 10s 0d—three-fourths for rent, rates, etc., subject to a minimum. (In the case of an A 3 house, the minimum is 1s 4d plus rates.)

(b) Margin above 10s 0d—one-half for rent, rates, etc., with a minimum of 7s 6d inclusive.

It is interesting to note that the distinction between "voluntary" and "compulsory" tenants has broken down already, and that a third class of "voluntary tenants treated as if they were compulsory tenants" has come into being. This seems to indicate a serious failure in the new scheme to deal adequately with the situation which exists in Leeds.

4,900 tenants are affected by the scheme, of whom 3,450 are actually in receipt of rebates, but no details as to the financial results of the scheme are as yet available; in view of the success of the previous scheme, they will be awaited with the greatest interest.

(d) RENT TO BE A FIXED PROPORTION OF INCOME, WITH DEDUCTIONS FOR CHILDREN

This type of scheme is perhaps the simplest of any, both to administer and to understand. The following table illustrates how it operates :

¹ A table applicable to A 3 houses will be found in Appendix IIIa.

² A detailed analysis of these figures will be found in Appendix IIIb.

CARLISLE

The scheme includes all houses built under the Post-War Housing Acts. In May 1936, 3,471 such houses had been built, of which 286 were actually in receipt of a rebate.

The standard exclusive rent of an A 2 house is 4s 9d and of an A 3 house is 6s 8d to which must be added the rates, namely 2s 0d and 2s 10d, making inclusive rents of 6s 9d and 9s 6d.

The average rebate per house is 2½d.

Families must pay one-fifth of their family income as rents and rates, less 6d per week for each child of school age, the resultant rent to be between the maximum of 6s 9d (for an A 2 house) or 9s 6d (for an A 3 house) and a minimum inclusive rent, in either case, of 5s 0d.

Rebates are revised every week where necessary.

Schemes substantially identical with that at Carlisle were previously operated by Wakefield R.D.C. and Stockport, but were abandoned in April and May respectively this year. The reasons given in the case of Wakefield R.D.C. were as follows :

"It was found that, the area being mainly a mining area, the wages fluctuated so much that the only fair way of arriving at the true rebate would be to calculate the amount each week, which would necessitate extra staff. On the system already adopted, viz., revision each quarter, the scheme failed owing to the fact that tenants, whose rents were based on the previous quarter's income when perhaps they had worked quite regularly, were often working short time. Thus the anomaly was created that they were sometimes paying a high rent when the wage was low, and a low rent when they were receiving a higher wage.

"Another troublesome point was the question of Public Assistance; where the Council allowed a rebate in the rent, the P.A.C. reduced their allowance accordingly, and the Council felt that they were subsidising the P.A.C.

"The tenants themselves resented the questions *re* their income and preferred (in most cases) to pay the standard rent."

These difficulties, which must exist in greater or less degree in all rebate schemes, are considered below.¹

This type of scheme also is capable of a wide range of variations, such as variations of the allowance per child, and of the figure at which the minimum rent (if any) and the maximum rent shall be paid. The results given in Carlisle, and previously in Stockport and Wakefield, compare favourably, in generosity to the tenant, with results given by other schemes, and it is somewhat surprising that this type of scheme has not been more widely adopted.

(e) REBATES GIVEN IN RESPECT OF CHILDREN ONLY

A fixed rebate of, for instance, 6d, 9d or 1s is given in respect of each dependent child. Guildford R.D.C. and Finsbury give no rebate other than this one, the amount allowed per child in each case being 6d. This is the type of scheme which is also generally adopted by voluntary housing societies, partly on the ground that they do not wish to have anything which might be considered to be in the nature of a means test.² This objection

¹ See pp. 28 and 35 below.

² See pp. 40 and 41.

has not the same validity in the case of a local authority, which is also responsible for the administration of, for instance, public assistance, and there seems to be little reason why a scheme should be restricted to children only.

(f) MISCELLANEOUS

There is a number of types of scheme which do not fall within any of the above categories, and which seem to be peculiar to individual towns. Space prevents an enumeration of all of them, and we will give three only, which seem to be of particular interest.

LANCASTER¹

The scheme includes houses built under the 1930 Act only. At the end of 1935, 97 of these had been built, of which 94 were actually in receipt of rebates.

The economic rent of an A 3 house is 8s 0d per week, plus rates, 2s 6d per week, making a total of 10s 6d.

The scheme operates as follows:

A "basic inclusive rent" of 8s 6d per week is fixed, which must be paid by a man and wife with an income of £2 per week. A rebate is allowed of 1s 0d for each child of school age, and of 6d for each 2s 6d by which the income is less than £2. The maximum rebate is 5s 0d, i.e. the minimum rent is 3s 6d. An addition to the basic rent is made of 1s 0d for each child earning 25s 0d or over, of 6d for each child earning between 15s 0d and 25s 0d, and of 6d for each 10s 0d by which the family income exceeds £2.

No rent may be less than that paid in the old house, though exceptions are made where the rent previously charged was exorbitant.

The average rebate per house is 9d.

Revision takes place every three months.

The basic rent has been reduced from 9s 3d to 8s 6d since the scheme first began.

This scheme and that formerly in operation at Winchester are more generous to the tenants than any of the others. The maximum rents are very low, and the possibility of raising the rent above the standard rent in certain cases means that more money is available for the assistance of the poorer tenants. But if the standard rent were fixed at, or near, the economic rent, the psychologically bad effect of appearing to raise certain rents would be avoided.

WINCHESTER

Under the provisions of the Housing Act, 1935, a scheme of rent rebates has been applied to the whole of the 1,074 houses under the control of the Corporation as from 1 April 1936.

New standard rents were fixed for each house in accordance with the principles of valuation for rating. Rent increases varied from 6d to 1s 3d according to the amenity

¹ Except that the basic inclusive rent is 8s 9d and the minimum rent 3s 9d, and except for certain minor modifications in the scale of additions to the basic rent, the scheme in operation at King's Lynn is identical with that in operation at Lancaster. The average rebate per house is, however, about 3s 6d.

of the site, and the result of these increases generally has been to raise rents to an economic level. In addition, the rents of certain tenants known to be in receipt of a large income were increased by a further 2s od. Every tenant was supplied with a form giving the opportunity of claiming an allowance in accordance with the scale approved by the Council, as follows:

Where the family consists of two adults only, the following inclusive rents are paid:

	s	d	s	d	s	d	s	d	s	d	s	d		
Income	20	0	25	0	30	0	35	0	40	0	45	0	50	0
Inclusive Rent ..	6	6	7	0	7	7	8	2	8	10	9	7	10	5
Income	55	0	60	0	65	0	70	0	75	0	80	0		
Inclusive Rent ..	11	4	12	4	13	5	14	7	15	10	17	2		

There is a rebate of 6d per week for each child under 16, the total rebate in any case not to reduce the rent below 6s 6d.

As, however, there seemed to be some moral obligation to persons re-housed under the Housing Act, 1930, all tenants who were paying less than this new minimum of 6s 6d were allowed to continue to pay such lower amounts.

Of the 1,074 tenants, approximately 500 have applied and qualified for some relief, and it is interesting to note that the returns show incomes varying from £1 0s od to £6 0s od, with a well defined modal figure of £2 10s od.

Rents are to be revised at six-monthly intervals.

The standard rent of an A 3 house is 12s 4d inclusive.

A scheme was previously in operation which applied substantially to the 1930 Act houses only. This previous scheme was much more generous, and Winchester provides an illuminating example of what happens when schemes are devised to include houses built under the earlier Acts, which were considerably more expensive. The material details of the earlier scheme are given below.

40 houses had been built under the Act of 1930 up to the end of 1935, of which 22 were actually in receipt of rebates, and there were a further 5 houses built under the 1924 Act which came within the scheme.

The standard rent of an A 3 house built under the 1924 Act was 7s 1d; under the 1930 Act, 5s 10d; to which must be added rates at 2s 7d per week, making a total of 9s 8d and 8s 3d respectively.

The scale used in assessing rebates was as follows:

Where the family consisted of two adults only, the following rents were paid:

	s	d	s	d	s	d	s	d	s	d	s	d		
Income	20	0	25	0	30	0	35	0	40	0	45	0	50	0
Inclusive Rent ..	6	6	7	0	7	6	8	0	8	6	9	0	9	6
Income	55	0	60	0	65	0	70	0	75	0	80	0		
Inclusive Rent ..	10	0	10	6	11	0	11	6	12	0	12	6		

There was a rebate of 1s od per week in respect of each dependent child under 16 years of age, and of 6d per week in respect of each dependent child over 16 years of age.

This scheme is very similar to the percentage schemes at Carlisle and formerly at Stockport and Wakefield, and little is gained by choosing one rather than the other. The percentage schemes are more generous to the poorer tenants, and less generous to the wealthier tenants than the earlier Winchester scheme, with which they should properly be compared, and they apply throughout the whole income range, and not merely at intervals of 5s, as is the case at Winchester.

MANCHESTER

The basis of the rent rebate scheme at present in operation in Manchester may briefly be stated to be the difference between the rent paid by the tenant actually dispossessed at the time of his removal, and that payable for the accommodation in which he is re-housed. This rebate is subject to the condition that where the investigation of means based on the Atwater-Clark Scale¹ shows that a lesser rebate is sufficient, then such amount only is granted.

This scheme is admittedly confined to assisting tenants, where necessary, to pay the difference between their old and their new accommodation, and takes no account of whether or not the rent paid for their old accommodation was such as they could really afford. But the scheme could very easily be made of more general application by abolishing the provision that the rent for the new house must be at least as great as that paid for the old, in which case the scheme would fall within type (c) above, where the difference between the actual income and the subsistence scale is to be available for payment of rent, the subsistence scale in this particular case being the Atwater-Clark scale.

Such are the main types of rent rebate schemes in operation in this country at the present time. It may be that new types of scheme will be evolved in the future, but it is difficult to see how they could differ in principle, however much they might differ in detail, from one of the types which have been outlined.

An attempt will be made later to draw some conclusions as to the relative merits of the various schemes, but there are certain questions which must arise in connection with any scheme of rent rebates, and which have been dealt with in strikingly different ways by the various local authorities.

SHOULD THERE BE A MINIMUM RENT ?

Except in a few cases, of which Leeds was the most notable example, all local authorities have decided that a minimum rent shall be paid. The figure varies between 3s 4d and 8s 3d, both

¹ The Atwater-Clark Scale lays down the following personal allowances as a minimum :

	s	d	<i>Individual Comforts Allowance</i>			
	s	d	s	d		
Man and Wife	14	6	3 6
Males, 17 or over	9	6	2 6
14—16	8	6	1 0
Females, 17 or over	8	6	2 0
14—16	8	0	1 0
Children, 10—13	4	0	}	0 6 each
6—9	3	6				
5	3	0				
2—4	5	0				
0—1	4	6				
						Minimum 4s 6d

Where this scale is applied, the minimum inclusive rent is 5s 0d.

inclusive, the average being about 5s 2d. Even in Leeds, of course, the tenant was not freed from the obligation to pay rates; the rates fall within the jurisdiction of a committee other than that concerned with housing, and in necessitous cases the relief of rate payments would have to be dealt with by the appropriate committee.

The question of whether a minimum rent should be charged or not depends on two considerations—(a) whether it is necessary for the financial stability of the scheme; and (b) whether it is desirable on grounds of expediency.

(a) So long as the amount of money available for a rebate pool is limited, unless, of course, the statutory subsidy contribution is increased by a further charge on the rates, the financial necessity of a minimum rent will depend largely on the figure at which the standard rent is fixed. If the bulk of the subsidy is used in a flat rate reduction of the economic rent, little will be left to finance a rebate scheme, and a minimum rent will probably be necessary, especially in a district where the state of employment is such that many people are living on, or near to, the subsistence level, and where comparatively few tenants will be able to pay the maximum rent. But the closer the standard rent approximates to the economic rent, the larger will be the proportion of the subsidy available for the rebate pool, and there will not be the same necessity for a minimum rent to ensure financial stability. When economic circumstances and building costs vary so widely from district to district, it is impossible to lay down any general rule, but the fact that it was found possible in Leeds, by charging the full economic rent to all tenants judged capable of paying it, to give other tenants a rebate amounting to the whole of the rent, and yet show a surplus, indicates that in many districts at any rate, provided a suitable scheme is adopted, financial stability does not demand a minimum rent.

(b) Rent rebate schemes, however excellent both in theory and practice, are still something of a novelty, and to many people there is something incongruous in allowing a family to live in a new, well-constructed house entirely free of rent. Where a scheme is introduced, there is bound to be a certain amount of criticism and even hostility from people who know that their neighbour, living in a precisely similar house, is paying a rent less than that which they themselves are paying. But the criticism and hostility are likely to be even greater if it is known that the neighbour is paying no rent at all. As municipal tenants become more accustomed to the scheme of rebates, this difficulty is likely to diminish, but it may be doubted whether it is wise in practice to proceed

so far in one step. The success of any scheme depends so much on the goodwill, or, at any rate, on the absence of active hostility on the part of the tenants, that it is worth sacrificing something in order to gain their support.

There is also the question of the morale of the tenant who pays nothing in rent. There will always be those who are ready to point out that he is living rent free, and he himself will be more likely to appreciate a house for which he pays some rent, however small. Yet, if once it is admitted in principle that the amount paid in rent should bear some relation to the income of the tenant, it is obvious that there will be some cases where the tenant should not be expected to pay rent at all. While, therefore, in practice it is probably wise, for the time being at any rate, to charge some small and almost nominal minimum rent, it should be recognized that this is a matter of policy rather than principle.

But there is one form of minimum rent which seems to be wholly undesirable. In many cases, the local authority has laid down that the minimum rent for tenants removed under the 1930 Act shall be x shillings, or the rent paid for the house which has been vacated, whichever is the higher. So long as rent rebates are regarded merely as a means of providing financial assistance to persons compulsorily removed from the slums, this policy, if not acceptable, is at any rate understandable. For there is some excuse for insisting that a person should continue to pay the rent which he has been paying hitherto.¹ But if rent rebates are regarded as a means of enabling poor people to live in decent houses, which seems to be the purpose of the rebate provisions in the 1935 Act, all excuse for this practice disappears, since there is a multitude of reasons which might have led a family to pay a rent higher than that which could properly be afforded. A family should not be penalized for having previously paid a high rent; in many cases it is due to a very commendable desire to find decent accommodation, and such a family should not be denied the advantages granted to a family which has made no such attempt. Far better is it to adopt the practice of Birmingham, where the minimum inclusive rent is 6s 6d (which we consider too high) or the rent of the house vacated, whichever is the *lower*.

METHODS OF DEALING WITH INCOME OF OTHER MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD

Up to now we have assumed throughout that the only income coming into the house was the wages of the father. In many

¹ It should be borne in mind, however, that, as a rule, living in a new housing estate is more expensive than in a slum area or a central area.

cases, however, there is one child or more still living at home who is in work, and who is week by week bringing home a certain amount in wages. Subletting to lodgers is generally prohibited, but often it does take place, and in these cases also the household income is substantially augmented.

It would be unreasonable not to take some account of these additional sources of income in fixing the rebate. Part of what the lodger pays is profit, and a child in work, provided his wages are greater than a certain figure, should be expected to pay something towards the rent of the house in which he lives. Cases could be given in which the income of the head of the family was only £2, while two children still living at home might be bringing in an additional £4 a week. If in such a case the number of totally dependent children was two, it is plainly inequitable that such a family should receive the same rebate as a family of a father, mother and two dependent children where the father's £2 a week was the only source of income.

On the other hand, anything in the nature of a family means test, as at present understood, must be carefully avoided. This is not the place to set out the evils which such a policy entails, but other earning members of the household can only be expected to contribute to the rent of the house to an extent which will leave them with sufficient money under their own control to purchase such things as they need for themselves. Yet the amount of the rebate must in some way be related to the total income of the house.

Here again it is impossible to lay down any hard and fast rule of universal application. In most areas at present the total income of the household is taken into account in assessing the amount of the rebate. In those areas where this practice is not adopted, the usual course is to allow for each child a certain sum which shall not be taken into account in assessing the family income, and to say that all above that amount shall be included. We give below a list showing examples of the way in which this additional income is treated :

BARKING	Earnings of each child in excess of 5s 0d to be reckoned in family income.
BOLTON	Earnings of each child in excess of 6s 0d to be reckoned in family income. Rebate reduced by 1s 6d for each lodger.
BRENTFORD AND CHISWICK	Three-quarters of earnings of children and other members of family, and three-quarters of any National Health Insurance, to be included in family income.
DONCASTER	Total income of all members of household included, lodgers who are relatives being counted as members of the family. If lodgers are not relatives, 5s 0d is considered profit where the lodger is in employment, 2s 6d if unemployed.

GLOUCESTER	20% of income of sons or daughters to be reckoned as income to household, and income of any child under 10s od to be ignored. Children earning 7s 6d per week or more not to be counted as dependents. Children earning less than 7s 6d to be included as dependents, and half the wages to be reckoned in with family income.
GUILDFORD R.D.C.	9d per week extra for each lodger.
KING'S LYNN	1s od per week extra for each lodger. 1s od per week extra for each child earning 15s od and upwards. 6d per week extra for each child earning from 10s od to 15s od.
LANCASTER	1s od per week extra for each child earning over 25s od. 6d " " " " " " " " between 15s od and 25s od. 1s od " " " " " " permitted lodger.
LEEDS	The Labour Party's scheme rejected entirely the family means test principle in assessing the contribution of earning children towards rent. The amount payable by the tenant apart from such earnings was first determined, and to it was added an amount determined in each particular case according to the accommodation occupied by earning children considered in relation to the margin of their earnings over the subsistence scale. A son occupying a bedroom to himself was thus expected, on the same income, to contribute more towards rent than a son sharing a bedroom. Only in exceptional circumstances was more than 3s 6d per week assessed as an earning child's contribution to rent. Similar considerations applied in the case of lodgers. Under the present Conservative scheme, two-thirds of the income of other earning members is added to the family income, with a maximum contribution of 25s od in the case of males and 20s od in the case of females.
MIDDLESBROUGH	Earnings of each child in excess of 7s od to be reckoned in family income.
ROTHERHAM	Three-quarters of earnings of children included in family income, and also of lodgers who are relatives. If lodgers not relatives, allow 2s 6d for profit if not working, 5s od if working.
WALSALL	Full family income, but 2s 6d to be added to family subsistence allowance in respect of each person at work in addition to the head of the family.
WREXHAM	Earnings of each child in excess of 6s od to be included. Rebate reduced by 1s 6d for each lodger.

From this list it will be seen that, though the schemes in various towns differ considerably in detail, the principle is widely recognized that lodgers and children in employment should not be expected to place the whole of their earnings at the disposal of the household.

There is much to be said in favour of the view that no hard and fast scale can adequately meet the different circumstances that often arise in connection with these 'mixed' families. But unless each such case is to be dealt with individually, as used to be the case in Leeds—a task which will enormously increase the already heavy administrative difficulties—it is far better to have some scale which will partially relieve children from the necessity of having to support their parents at the moment when they may want to save up in order to establish homes of their own, than to

say that they shall enjoy none of the benefit of the subsidy until they have exhausted their own resources. A scale of some sort is also desirable in order to obviate the suspicion of personal favouritism which might otherwise arise.

REBATES AS TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE ONLY

A provision which is sometimes found in rebate schemes is that, when once the income of a tenant has risen to a level at which he is no longer entitled to a rebate, all right to any rebate shall thereafter cease, no matter how low his income may subsequently fall. This is another provision, like that which says that the minimum rent shall never be lower than that paid for the house vacated, which can be attributed to the view that the sole purpose of rebates is to enable those removed from slums to pay for their new accommodation. Fortunately it is not widespread, and would have no application where a scheme was intended to apply to all municipal tenants, and not merely to those removed under a slum clearance order. Now that the 1935 Act has made it clear that rebate schemes are permitted, and indeed advocated, for all municipal tenancies, it is improbable that this provision will be introduced into any new scheme, and the tendency hitherto has been for it to be discarded even by those authorities which previously introduced it.

SPECIAL EXPENSES

In any scheme of municipal rehousing, tenants are liable to be put to certain expenses which they would not otherwise incur, chief of which are travelling expenses and the cost of meals. Where a new housing estate is built at some distance from the centre of a city, or where a tenant moves into a corporation house, he frequently finds that he has to travel a much greater distance than previously to his work. This may easily discourage a family, other than one compulsorily removed, from seeking better accommodation, unless financial assistance is forthcoming to meet the increased expense.

(a) TRAVELLING EXPENSES

These should be deducted from the family income before the amount of the rebate is assessed. In Brentford and Chiswick up to 3s od a week is allowed for travelling expenses, and the same practice should be adopted elsewhere, if the rebate schemes are to work equitably. If it were thought desirable, an upper limit of 3s od might be fixed in small towns, and 5s od in large towns, and it might be provided that only fares in excess of 1s od a week should be allowed for.

(b) MEALS AWAY FROM HOME

Where a man lives near enough to his work to go home for dinner each day, the cost to the household is only a few pence. Where, however, he has to go so far that it is necessary to have his midday meal out, some allowance should be made for it. A figure for this could easily be fixed for each locality, and this amount should also be deducted from the family income before assessing the rebate.

(c) INSURANCE

Contributions for unemployment and health insurance are also frequently deducted from the family income. Were this expense the same for every household, there would be less need to make any special provision for it, but as it is, it should be dealt with in the same way as travelling expenses and meals.

RELATIONS WITH THE UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE BOARD AND THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

The objection is often raised that, in providing rent relief, the local authority is usurping functions which ought more properly to be exercised by the U.A.B. or by the P.A.C.¹ It is impossible to lay down a hard and fast rule of universal application as to what exactly the arrangements should be between the Housing Committee and these other bodies. It is a matter to be borne in mind by any authority which introduces a rebate scheme, and special arrangements should be come to in each locality.²

DRAWING UP A SCHEME

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of ensuring that the type of scheme to be applied is one that is suitable for the particular locality. A scheme that would work admirably in a prosperous district in the Midlands would probably bankrupt most towns in County Durham, since the amount of subsidy available is the same everywhere, and a substantial amount of unemployment would obviously involve a drain on any rebate pool which might be difficult to meet. Any loss in the working of a scheme

¹ Certain difficulties might have been avoided in Wakefield (p. 19), if such arrangements had been made there.

² Though it falls outside the scope of this subject, the somewhat anomalous position of our system of social services should be noticed. It is possible that three different 'means tests'—U.A.B., P.A.C. and rent rebate—may, in certain circumstances, be applied to the same household! Each test may be a different one, involving separate investigation, taking into account different elements in family income, and applying a different criterion of need.

has to be made good out of the rates, and if the rates were raised in order to meet such a deficit, it might easily mean the end of rent rebates in that district for many years to come.

On the other hand, the scheme should be such as to make full use of the money that is available so long as any need for a subsidy persists. Under the 1935 Act, any unexpended surplus on the Housing Revenue Account must be returned to the Government at the end of each five years, and though it is possible to distribute any such surplus in the form of increased amenities or a lowering of the standard rent, or in some other manner, once a rebate scheme has been embarked on, it is more satisfactory to use the subsidy for that purpose. It should be noted that, where the standard rent is the same as the economic rent, the subsidy is so administered as to become self-extinguishing, if not needed, or to the extent to which it is not needed. Thus, in the case of the earlier Leeds scheme, for example, if things became so prosperous in the city that all municipal tenants could afford the economic rent, the whole of the subsidy would be returned to the national or local exchequer, and in that case the subsidy was, in fact, partially self-extinguishing with improvement. This is a strong argument for making the standard rent the same as the economic rent.

It is in this connection that the chief difference will arise as between those authorities whose schemes cover 1930 Act houses only, and those whose schemes cover all municipal houses. In the former case, though building costs and interest rates will vary to some extent from year to year, the amount of the subsidy is constant,¹ the field to be covered is comparatively limited, and the inauguration of a scheme will be a much more simple matter. In the latter case, however, the vast difference between the cost of the Addison houses and the cost of the Greenwood houses has to be taken into account, and the amount of the subsidy varies according to the particular Act under which it is given.

In either case, the first essential for a comprehensive and successful scheme is a full and accurate survey of the conditions of those who are either now municipal tenants or are likely to become so in the near future. Detailed statistics must be obtained of the composition of families and their incomes—the number of dependent children and of wage earners, etc. Such a survey will no doubt involve a considerable amount of work, but once the initial task of making it has been carried through there will be no great difficulty in keeping it up to date. The local authority will

¹ Though *cf.* footnote 1 to page 4.

tenancies, but that, subject to rebates, the full economic rent would be charged when any new tenancy was created. If it were felt that by this method too long a period would elapse before all municipal houses were brought within the ambit of the scheme, the standard rent might be raised to the economic rent by a series of stages spread over a number of years. The skilled artisan whose rent was raised overnight by some 4s od or 5s od a week might feel a sense of injustice,¹ which would be less acute if the rent were raised by four or five stages of 1s od each. But the exact method by which rents are to be raised is a matter of policy on which each local authority may hold different views.

In most districts, as the experience of Leeds has shown, the money thus available will be sufficient to finance a scheme on a fairly generous scale. But in cases where this is not so, further resources could be secured by making the standard rent which is subject to reductions, not the economic, but the 'commercial rent' of the house. If the standard rent were, in fact, the commercial rent, it might be said that a tenant would prefer to live in a house built by private enterprise, but this is a matter of some doubt, and the adoption of this policy would enable an authority to make its relief scales more generous. There would be no question of the local authority making a profit from its houses in the aggregate—what it gained over and above the economic rent by charging a commercial rent for some houses would be used to make up the deficit caused by charging a low rent for other houses. But the criticism would then be made that the better-to-do tenants were being made to pay the rent of the poorer tenants, and that is a criticism which cannot be made so long as the rebate pool is derived from the subsidy alone. This policy would also have a tendency to keep rents at an unnecessarily high level. For these reasons, it is probably wiser not to charge the commercial rent, unless financial necessity makes it unavoidable.

As has been shown previously, there are several schemes in operation where the practice is to make additions to a minimum rent, instead of deductions from a maximum rent, or where the rent is varied above and below a mean. While the results thus obtained may appear excellent on paper, it is doubtful whether this is a wise policy to pursue. Few things are more likely to create hostility among the tenants than the feeling that their rent is raised above that which others are paying, and from a psychological

¹ His attitude would in some cases be reasonable; e.g. a man with one child (or more) might, at some sacrifice to himself, have been able to send him to a secondary school. The extra rent demanded from him might upset his calculations, and mean the sudden end of the child's school career.

have already a detailed record of the number and types of houses to which the scheme is to be applied, and will know the total amount of subsidy available in respect of these houses. Plans will have to be drawn up of what new municipal accommodation¹ it is intended to provide during the ensuing years, and, on the basis of all the information so collected, the problem will be to devise a scheme which will enable the largest and the poorest families to live in municipal houses at rents which they can afford, or possibly at no rent at all,² and which will at the same time be financially sound.

A simple example will show how essential it is to have a scheme which is properly adjusted to the economic needs of the neighbourhood. Let us take 100 houses, for which the economic exclusive rent is 10s 0d a week, and the average subsidy per house 4s 0d a week. From these 100 houses, £30 must be taken each week in rents, i.e. an average of 6s 0d a week each.

Let us suppose, further, that a rebate scheme is in operation, under which the maximum rent is the economic rent of 10s 0d, and the minimum rent nil, and that the rent paid varies between these figures according to a fixed scale. In a normal district, it might be found that 20 out of the 100 families could pay the full rent, and that 20 could pay nothing. The total rents collected in respect of the first 20 families would be £10, which would leave £20, or an average of 6s 8d each, to be paid by the 60 families in receipt of partial rent relief.

But if an identical scheme were applied in a town in one of the depressed areas, the number of families able to pay the full rent would be smaller, and the number who would need total rent relief would be larger. If we suppose the numbers to be 10 and 30 respectively, the total rents from this source would be only £5, and the other 60 tenants would have to find £25, or 8s 4d each per week. And as we have already postulated that this district is much poorer than the one we took before, it would be quite impossible to raise 8s 4d per family by applying the same income scale as was applied in the more prosperous district.³

¹ It is important to bear in mind the necessity of providing adequate accommodation of different kinds. The bulk of the houses will be of the A 3 type, but one, two, four and five bedroom houses must also be provided, in numbers corresponding with the composition of the families which are to be re-housed.

² Cf. pp. 21-24.

³ The difficulty of financing rebate schemes for districts where there is a large volume of unemployment might be met by increasing in these districts that portion of the subsidy which is provided out of national funds. That, however, is a subject which does not fall to be dealt with in a pamphlet which is concerned with the best way to use the existing subsidies.

The need of a detailed survey thus becomes immediately apparent. So long as economic conditions vary from one district to another, so long will it be impossible to apply the same rebate scheme universally; though the same principles will be universally applicable. If the best use is to be made of the subsidy, and if it is to be divided equitably among those who are in need of relief, the scheme must be drawn up in strict accordance with the needs of the district, and those needs can only be adequately ascertained by means of some kind of survey. Provided the survey is carefully and thoroughly carried out, it will be a comparatively simple matter to devise a rebate scale which will make full use of the resources at the disposal of the local authority, and which will enable those families which need it most to have the kind of accommodation which their present resources put quite beyond their reach.

The burden of this survey will be considerably lessened by the fact that local authorities are already under a statutory obligation to make two housing surveys—one under the 1930 Act in respect of slum clearance, and the other under the 1935 Act in respect of overcrowding. A very considerable amount of saving will be effected if the survey necessary as a preliminary to the introduction of a rebate scheme is conducted in conjunction with these other two surveys.

It has already been emphasized that rent relief should not be given to families which do not need it; subsidies are a make-shift at the best of times, but they are intolerable when they are given to people who have sufficient already, and there can be no justification of any kind for allowing those who can pay a full rent to benefit from a subsidy which has been given in order to enable those who could not otherwise afford it to live in decent houses. What this means in practice is that the full economic rent should be charged to all tenants who can afford it. In this way, the whole of the subsidy is available to finance the rebate pool, and it may be stated as an axiom that the higher the standard rent, the more money will be available for those who really need assistance. No matter what the economic conditions of a district are, the standard rent from which reductions are made should always be the full economic rent. There may be reasons of expediency for not adopting this policy immediately in respect of all municipal houses. Tenants whose rents are suddenly raised are likely to be discontented, even though no hardship is involved, and their opposition might have serious effects on the popularity of the scheme. Where such a difficulty is anticipated, the local authority might say that no rents would be increased in respect of present

point of view it is better to have deductions from a maximum than additions to a minimum or a mean.

For the same reason, where there is some uncertainty, as there must necessarily be, about how much exactly a rebate scheme will cost, it is wiser to fix rents rather too high to begin with, and then to lower them when experience shows this to be possible, than to fix them too low, and then to have to raise them in order to avoid a drain on the rates. The former course will be interpreted as good management, the latter as mere inefficiency.

The economic rent will naturally differ for different types of house, and it is the almost universal practice at the present time, where a standard rent other than the economic rent is fixed, not only for the standard rent to vary according to the type of house occupied, but for the minimum rent, and also the intermediate rents, to be higher in the case of larger houses. In other words, the larger the house occupied, the greater is the rent. At the higher income levels, there is obviously a great deal to be said in favour of a tenant paying more rent for better accommodation, but a rent rebate scheme is introduced largely for the benefit of those who are living at, or near, the subsistence level, and in the case of those persons the charging of a higher rent for a larger house may cause considerable hardship. Especially is this the case where a minimum rent is charged. Thus, to take a typical example, in Bolton, the exclusive rents for A 2 and A 3 houses are 5s 3d and 6s 6d respectively. The maximum rebate allowed is 3s 0d, and a man earning 34s 0d a week, with a wife and five children to support and living in an A 3 house, pays 9d a week more in rent than a man earning the same amount with a wife and only two children, who can live in an A 2 house.

In order to make the best use of its accommodation, it is essential for a local authority to see that each family occupies the right type of house. For a family of father, mother and one child to occupy an A 3 house is to waste available accommodation; for a family of father, mother and four children to occupy a A 2 house is to encourage overcrowding. But there will always be a tendency for a large family of small means to overcrowd a small house, if it can pay a smaller rent by so doing, and for a small family in comfortable circumstances to occupy a larger house than is really necessary.

This situation can best be met in the following way. The rent to be paid should be fixed solely in accordance with the family income, irrespective of the type of house occupied, up to the level at which the full economic rent is paid, which will, of course, be different for different types of houses. Thus, a family of father,

mother and three dependent children with an income of, say, £2 a week, would pay the same rent whether it lived in an A 2 or an A 3 house. The local authority should have an unfettered discretion in deciding what kind of house to allot to a particular tenant. When a family is removed from a slum clearance area, or when it applies for a house on a municipal estate, its present size and composition should be ascertained, and an estimate made of its probable growth or contraction in the future, and a house should then be allotted to it in accordance with its requirements. Once it has been decided what is the proper accommodation for such a family, the question of a rebate should be considered, and such rebate should be calculated, not in relation to the type of house which has been allocated, but according to what the tenant is able to pay.

In no other way will it be possible to ensure that the best use is made of municipal accommodation, and that large families with a small income are not deterred from trying to live in decent houses by the fear that they will not be able to pay even the minimum rent for that particular type of house.

A problem that will grow more acute with the passage of time is that of the removal of tenants from one house to another. To take an extreme case: imagine a family of father, mother and five dependent children, with an income of £4 10s 0d a week, which has been allotted a 4-bedroom house at the full economic rent. Ten years later, two of the children may be married, two may be living away from home, while the father may be out of work, and in receipt of full rent relief. An A 2 house would obviously meet the needs of the father, mother and one child who are left, and the local authority may need the 4-bedroom house to accommodate another large family. That is an extreme case, but the same thing will constantly happen on a smaller scale. To remove a tenant from one house to another with every change in the size of his family would cause quite justifiable resentment, but to allow a tenant to occupy the same house for ever, whatever the size of his family, would seriously handicap the working of any scheme. This is another case in which no fixed rule can possibly be laid down. The difficulty can be stated, and experience will in course of time suggest a solution.

Once it has been decided to adopt a rebate scheme, and the survey has been carried out and a scale of rebates drawn up, the most arduous task of the local authority in the actual administration of the scheme will be the adjustment of the rebate to the changing circumstances of the family. This can be done in a variety of different ways, and where there is a periodical revision,

the details given on pages 13-22 show that there is little uniformity in the length of time between each revision. This is a matter which must be considered when the scheme is drawn up, and the decision arrived at must be communicated to the tenants, in order that they may understand it as far as possible. To have frequent revisions may give the impression of undue interference. Perhaps the best solution is to have a revision of the circumstances of each family at intervals of, say, six months, starting from the date when the tenancy commenced, unless the tenant himself applies earlier for a revision, on the ground of a fall in income. Any adjustment of the rebate should not be made retrospective, unless there has been some kind of wilful concealment of income on the part of the tenant.

Apprehensions of dishonesty by the tenants in disclosing their incomes do not seem to have been realized in those towns where schemes are in operation, and the information given can generally be checked, either by communicating with the tenant's employer,¹ or with the P.A.C. or the U.A.B. But it is likely that this problem would be considerably simplified by the appointment of a skilled house property manager.

It lies outside the scope of this pamphlet to discuss the question of house property management, save in so far as it affects rent rebates. A woman house property manager, trained under the Octavia Hill, or some other system, who collected the rents and visited the houses regularly once a week, would soon gain such a knowledge of each household that she would quickly discover any changes in the income of the family, and such information would be available for the body which fixed the rebates. There are some places where, as in the case of Wakefield,² the tendency of wages to fluctuate week by week makes the assessment of the appropriate rebate a matter of some difficulty. This problem can only be solved by an efficient and sympathetic staff of house property managers, in whom the tenants would have sufficient trust to disclose week by week the details of their earnings. Quite apart from this, however, the house property manager could perform an invaluable service in explaining the whole system of rent rebates to the tenants. These schemes necessarily involve a more personal relationship between the tenant and the local authority than is involved where there is no such scheme in operation, and the house property manager could supply that personal link which

¹ Care should be taken to enlist the employers' understanding and support for the scheme, so that wages returns may be sent in promptly. A circular asking for their co-operation might be of some assistance.

² Cf. p. 19.

would do much to secure the cooperation of the tenants, and which would go a long way to remove the suspicion which is sometimes apparent when a scheme is first introduced.

CRITERIA OF SUCCESS

Having outlined the main types of scheme at present in operation, and the chief considerations which have to be borne in mind, it now becomes possible to indicate the main criteria by which the success or otherwise of any scheme will be judged.

(a) EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF THE SUBSIDY

This is the very essence of any rebate scheme. It is precisely because the application of the subsidy to houses instead of to families is inequitable that rebate schemes are introduced, and the most successful scheme will be that under which the subsidy is most equitably distributed. This means that, so far as is possible within the limits of the money which is available, no family however large, or however meagre its resources, should be debarred from living on a municipal estate by reason of poverty. If it is found that at one end of the scale a family which could afford to pay the economic rent is in receipt of part of the subsidy, while at the other end of the scale the minimum rent demanded prevents certain families from living on a municipal estate, it cannot be said that the subsidy is being equitably distributed, yet this is what must inevitably be happening where a high minimum rent is fixed. The object of rent rebates is to apply the subsidy where it is really needed, and any scheme is defective in so far as it fails to achieve this object.

(b) SIMPLICITY OF ADMINISTRATION

This is of importance from the point of view both of the local authority and the tenant. If the administration is complicated, a larger staff will be needed to operate it, and it will be much more expensive. It is impossible to deny that any rebate scheme will involve difficulties of administration such as are not encountered where there is no such scheme. If a scheme is to be comprehensive, it will necessitate the use of rebate scales of greater or less complexity, and there will always be the difficulty of the periodic revision of rebates in accordance with the changed circumstances of the tenants.¹ But much of this will soon become a matter of routine, and the complexities need never be such as to deter an authority from embarking on a scheme.

¹ The cost of administration under the earlier Leeds scheme was one clerk for each 1,250 tenants, or about 2s 6d per year per tenancy. That sum was included in the rent as an administration charge.

The more complicated the scheme, the more difficult will it be for the tenants to understand it, and the less likely will they be to cooperate willingly in its working. Unless they can understand the basis upon which it is operated, there will always be a tendency for some among them to think they are not getting a fair deal. Therefore, both for the authority and the tenant, the simpler the scheme, the greater likelihood will there be of its success, and it may in some cases be wise to sacrifice something in the way of mechanical perfection, in order that the scheme may be more readily intelligible. There is a lot to be said for having a scheme whereby the tenant can always work out for himself the rebate which he will be entitled to receive. That can never happen so long as a complicated sliding scale remains locked within the inmost recesses of the Town Hall.

(c) THE SATISFACTION OF THE TENANT

This includes something more than (a) and (b) above. Rebate schemes concern the tenants more intimately than anybody else, and their success or failure will depend largely on the degree to which the cooperation and goodwill of the tenants can be secured. The whole idea of paying different rents for identical accommodation is comparatively new, and it will naturally take time before it is universally understood and approved by those whom it most affects. The reports available from those local authorities where schemes are in operation generally indicate that they are well received by the tenants, and that little hostility is displayed. But it is more difficult to obtain information from the tenants' point of view, and what little there is tends to show that it is advisable, from a practical point of view, to proceed with some caution. Thus, in principle, it is good to charge the full economic rent where possible, and to charge no rent at all in necessitous cases. But that involves a sudden and startling change, and the man whose rent is raised to the economic rent while his neighbour's rent is reduced to nothing, may well feel a sense of grievance until he grows accustomed to the idea of differential renting, and can appreciate its justice. For this reason, it may be found advisable to proceed by stages, in order to avoid jealousy between the tenants, and the antagonism to the whole scheme which might otherwise be aroused. However equitable, and however administratively simple a scheme may be, it will be foredoomed to failure if even a considerable minority of the tenants are markedly hostile, and it is worth sacrificing a certain amount in these respects in order to gain their approval.

SOME COMPARISON OF EXISTING SCHEMES

The main conclusion to be drawn from the analysis that has been made of the schemes at present in operation is that, apart from the cases where rebates are given in respect of children only, substantially the same results can be obtained by any of the types of scheme indicated. Each type is capable of numerous variations. The maximum and minimum rents can be varied within wide limits; different allowances can be made in respect of children; there are any number of subsistence scales to choose from; the sliding scale, where that is adopted, is rarely the same in any two cases; different arrangements can be made for dealing with the incomes of lodgers and children; where the rent paid is a fixed percentage of income, the percentage can be altered at will. And by a coordination of any or all of these devices, it would be possible to secure substantially identical results no matter what type of scheme was adopted. No one type will always and universally give the best results, so far as the equitable distribution of the subsidy is concerned. The tables given in Appendix II show that different schemes are more generous at different income levels, and that, on the whole, the types of scheme in operation at King's Lynn, Lancaster, Leeds (under the Labour Council), and Winchester (while the scheme was confined to the 1930 Act houses) are the most generous, in that they give the greatest assistance to large families. But it should not be forgotten that, with the exception of Leeds, these are fairly small towns which are comparatively prosperous, and that Leeds is not a depressed area; therefore the formulation of a generous scheme is a matter of no very great difficulty.

Although, therefore, there is little to choose between the various types of scheme so far as the financial results which can be obtained are concerned, there are two types which have advantages not possessed by the others.

The first of these is that based on the subsistence scale, of which the best example was Leeds. The principle of these schemes is that no rent at all shall be paid until provision has been made for the other necessities of life.¹ Where Leeds differed from other schemes of the same type is that there only a proportion of the balance had to be paid in rent, whereas elsewhere the whole of the balance must be paid, until the maximum rent is reached. This explicit recognition of the principle that rent can only be paid when the other necessities have been provided for is a thing which can be appreciated by the tenants, and which is likely to

¹ Subject to the payment of a minimum rent in most cases.

help them to recognize the justice of the scheme. The chief drawback of the Leeds scheme was the extreme complexity of the table by which it was determined how much of the balance should be paid in rent, and the fact that the scale was not open to public inspection.¹ This complexity is no doubt an unavoidable element in a mathematically perfect scheme, but it makes its operation less intelligible to the tenant, and so runs some risk of being misunderstood. The principle of a subsistence scale is, of course, implicit in the other schemes as well, but it is an advantage to have the scheme drawn up so as to call attention to it, in order that the fixing of any particular rebates may not appear to be entirely arbitrary.

The second type of scheme which has particular advantages is that which fixes the rent to be paid as a definite percentage of the income. This is the simplest of all the types of scheme, and can easily be understood by all the tenants. To avoid hardship where the income is small, it should be provided that only the minimum rent, or no rent at all, as the case may be, should be paid on all incomes below a certain level, i.e. this method could be combined with a subsistence scale, and then the percentage of income would only be paid after a certain income level had been reached. A scheme such as this would enable each tenant to calculate for himself what his rent ought to be, and he need never have the feeling that he was being swindled by somebody. Moreover, he would easily understand the principle involved, and would appreciate the justice of providing that the rent paid should have some definite relation to the income of the family.

The alternative to these two methods is that of keeping a sliding scale by which the amount of the rebate is calculated in any given case. As has been seen already, the results obtained might well be identical, but a sliding scale not easily understood will be suspect, and for that reason it is probably better to avoid its use where possible. But the advantages of the subsistence scale and the percentage basis of calculation are by no means conclusive; their chief attraction lies in the fact that they are likely to be more acceptable to the tenants, and will require less explanation.

It would be a source of no small satisfaction, after analyzing the schemes which have already been tried, to be able to draw up a model scheme, or at any rate indicate some type of scheme,

¹ For some months, these tables were regarded as experimental. It was the intention of the Labour Council in Leeds to publish full details of the tables in a handbook, to be given to every tenant, but before this could be done the control of the Council had changed hands.

which would, under any and every combination of circumstances, always produce the best results. But to do so would be merely misleading; general principles can be indicated; methods of dealing with details can be analyzed; and recommendations can be made about particular considerations which have to be borne in mind. But so long as there is diversity between economic conditions in different parts of the country, so long will each district have to evolve the scheme best suited to its own circumstances.

SOME CRITICISMS ANSWERED

There are those who will say that the introduction of rent rebate schemes involves the application of a means test. But a distinction must be drawn between a grant which is made to a man who becomes unemployed through no fault of his own, in which case the principle of work or maintenance should be applied, and a reduction of charge which is made in a particular instance, such as the payment of rent. The housing subsidies are limited in amount and are intended for the specific purpose of providing houses for those who could not otherwise afford them. Obviously, therefore, those who are able to pay for houses out of their own resources have no claim to any assistance out of the subsidy, and it is the duty of those who administer the subsidy to see that it does not pass into the pockets of those who do not need it. The only way in which a local authority can discharge this duty is by ascertaining what resources are available to its tenants.

Nor is the fact that, in assessing the rebate, the income of earning children is taken into consideration, a necessarily objectionable feature. It is one thing for children who want to save up for homes of their own to have to contribute to the support of their parents; it is quite a different thing for them to be expected to contribute something towards the rent of the house in which they live. The table which has been printed earlier¹ shows that many municipalities have realized the necessity of avoiding anything in the nature of the present family means test, in that they say that the first x shillings of a child's earnings shall not be taken into consideration in assessing the family income. That part of the child's earnings which is taken into consideration is intended to provide only for the amount which he can reasonably be expected to pay towards the rent of the house in which he lives. No one can deny that an enquiry into income is essential to the success of any rebate scheme; but what better method can be devised for

¹ Pages 25 and 26..

apportioning a subsidy, strictly limited in amount, among those who need it most ?

Again, it may be said that the better-off tenant is being made to pay the rent, or part of the rent, of the poorer tenant. This criticism shows an entire misconception of the whole subject. The subsidy is there, and the best use ought to be made of it. No tenant will pay more than the economic rent of the house in which he lives ; he will contribute nothing towards the rent of the poorer tenant save in his capacity of rate and tax payer, in which respect he is in precisely the same position as every other person in the country. But he will not be entitled to share in a subsidy to which his financial circumstances give him no claim.

Nor is it probable that, as some suspect may happen, the more affluent municipal tenants, actual or prospective, will move elsewhere, and leave the municipal estates entirely to those who need special assistance. If some tenants do in fact adopt that course, so much the better, as it will leave more accommodation for those who need it. But with the present shortage of working class houses at moderate rents, there is no immediate prospect of a large exodus, and the standard of privately built houses, and the rents at which they are let, are not such as to attract many of those who live on municipal estates. Nevertheless, the number of tenants well above the subsistence level who will be attracted to a municipal estate will depend to a large degree on the standard of accommodation and management provided by the municipality.

Other possible objections to rebate schemes have been mentioned and considered in earlier pages, but those enumerated above are the ones which most commonly arise. None of them have any real validity, and are only likely to appeal to such persons as are opposed to rent rebates because they are something novel, which they do not properly understand. Once the principle is appreciated of distributing the subsidy among those who are in need of it, it becomes immediately apparent that it must be attached to persons and not to particular houses ; and once it has been realized that the subsidy must be attached to persons in order that the best use may be made of it, it is equally apparent that some form of rent rebate must be introduced. What particular form of rent rebate is the best it is quite impossible to say—each locality has its own particular needs—but until the principle is universally adopted, the granting of subsidies to those who do not need them will compel thousands of families with young children to pass their lives in conditions of quite unnecessary squalor and degradation.

Appendix

RENT REBATE SCHEMES

The following table is printed by the kind permission of the proprietors of *The Municipal* which it was compiled. It makes no pretence of being exhaustive in so far as the details of must lead to a certain amount of distortion where the subject matter is so infinitely varied. of comparison

Authority	Act	Minimum Income on which Full Rent Paid										A 3 House	
		A 2 House					A 3 House					Stan. inclus. Rent (1)	Min. inclus. Rent
		Man & Wife	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 Children	5 Children						
		£ s d	£ s d	£ s d	£ s d	£ s d	£ s d	£ s d	£ s d	£ s d			
Banbury	1890	2 10 0	2 18 0	3 6 0	3 14 0	4 2 0	4 10 0				10/9†	6/6	
Barking	1930	—	2 10 0	2 10 0	2 15 0	2 15 0	3 0 0				9/5	4/5	
Berwick-upon-Tweed ..	1930										12/-	5/6	
Birmingham	1930	1 14 3	2 0 9	2 5 9	2 17 6	3 0 9	3 3 3				11/-	5/6	
Bolton	1930	1 12 0	1 17 0	2 2 0	2 7 9	2 11 9	2 15 9				9/9	6/9	
Bootle	1930	2 0 0	2 5 0	2 10 0	2 13 0	2 15 0	2 17 0				10/11	6/-	
Brentford and Chiswick.	1919 to 1930	1 10 4	1 18 4	2 6 4	2 15 5	3 1 5	3 6 5	Fares up to 3/- and 1/4 N.H.I. plus :			13/5	5/-	
Bury St. Edmunds ..	1930	1 17 6	2 2 6	2 7 6	2 12 6	2 17 6	3 2 6				6/6	4/3	
Cambridge	1919 to 1930	No rebate-ment (Assuming insurance =	1 12 11	1 17 11	2 3 8	2 10 8	2 17 8				8/-	5/-	
Carlisle	1919 to 1930	1 13 9	1 16 3	1 18 9	2 15 0	2 17 6	3 0 0				9/6	5/-	
Doncaster	1930	1 17 0	2 2 0	2 7 0	2 10 0	2 12 0	2 14 0				9/11	5/11	
Dudley	1930	2 12 0	2 16 0	2 16 0	2 16 0	2 16 0	2 16 0				7/4	3/7	
Eccles	1930	1 9 6	1 15 6	1 19 6	2 6 1	2 11 1	2 16 1				10/1	5/-	
Edmonton U.D.C. ..	1930	2 0 0	2 5 0	2 10 0	2 15 0	3 0 0	3 5 0				6/6	—	
Exeter	1930	1 10 0	1 15 0	2 0 0	2 5 0	2 10 0	2 15 0				9/6	3/4	
Farnworth	1930	1 15 0	2 0 0	2 4 0	2 9 6	2 14 0	3 1 0				10/6†	6/8	
Finsbury	1924 1925	No Income Test											
Guildford R.D.C. ..	1919 1923 1924	No Income Test											
Gloucester	1930	1 8 6	1 12 6	1 16 0	1 19 0	2 1 6	2 4 0				7/7	5/4	
Hull	1924 1930										13/2	8/-	
Kendal													
King's Lynn	1930	2 0 0	2 10 0	3 0 0	3 10 0	4 0 0	4 10 0				8/9	3/9	
Lancaster	1930	2 0 0	3 0 0	4 0 0	5 0 0	6 0 0	7 0 0				8/6	3/6	

* Not below former rent.

† In order that schemes should be comparable, the maximum is given as the standard from which are made.

I IN OPERATION

Journal, in which it appeared on 19 June 1936, and of the Family Endowment Society, by any given scheme are concerned, and indeed any attempt at classification in summary form. But it shows clearly the salient features of each of the schemes and forms a useful basis between them.

Average Rebate per House (Approx.) (2)	Method of Rebates	Number of Tenancies	
		In Scheme	In receipt of Rebates
1/-	Minimum rent 6s 6d rising by 1½d for every 1s of income over 30s less rebate 1s for every child.	206	80
3d	Rebates vary from 7/- (for four B.R. house—five children) to 1/- according to amount by which actual income falls below scale after deducting fares, insurance and compulsory contributions towards maintenance of relatives.	350	34
2/11	Rebates granted on income and dependency qualification. No definite scale.	—	34
6d	Rebates given increasing in shillings according to scale showing amount by which income falls short of this base.	1,863	346
10d	Rebate at 3d in every 1s below scale until minimum is reached.	326	126
2/8	Rebate to be granted of 4d in every 1s by which family income falls below scale until minimum rent is reached, and 5d in the 1s if the family is rehoused in an A 4 type house.	81	54
6d	Rebate is difference between actual family income and subsistence scale. Allowance up to 3s for fares; only three-quarters of earnings of children and of National Health Insurance counted. Tenant under P.A. or U.A.B. excluded.	1,500	130
—	Rebates made of 3d for every 2s 6d by which income falls below £1 17s 6d and of 6d for every child under 16. Subject to departures in particular instances.	40	—
4d	1924 Rents adopted as standard. Where income minus (inclusive rent plus insurance, plus 10s, or 2s per head, whichever is greater) divided by the number of persons is less than 3s 6d, 1s rebate per child. Where more than 3s 6d and less than 4s 6d, 6d rebate per child.	1,843	246
1d	Families to pay 1/5th income in rent less 6d for each child within the maximum and minimum rent limits.	3,400	89
3/1	Rebate of 3d in each 1s by which actual income falls below this standard.	141	95
1/1	1924 Rents adopted as standard. Allowance of 1s 4d per adult where family income does not exceed £1, diminishing by 1d for every additional 1s of income. Allowance of 6d per child up to third, and 4d per child after, diminishing till cease at income of £2 16s 0d—additional allowance where rental in excess of 6s 8d per week.	671	403
4d	Rebate granted by amount income falls below scale subject to condition that rent shall not fall below actual or maximum controlled rent of former house (whichever is higher) nor below half standard rent of new house.	100	10
4d	Rebate of 1s a week for every £1 income falls short of scale, but ignoring parts of £1 less than 15s.	77	25
—	Rebates granted proportional to amount by which income falls below scale, subject to minimum rent of 1s plus rates.	—	—
1/8	Rebate of 4d for every 1s by which income falls below scale until minimum rent reached.	304	142
6d	Rebate of 6d per child, less 6d for every wage-earner other than the head of family.	468	215
—	Rebate of 6d per week for each child in excess of two, addition of 9d for each room let to lodger.	381	126
10d	1924 Rents adopted as standard. Rebate of 9d for first 6d by which income falls below scale, then of 6d for every additional 6d below until maximum rebate is reached.	145	50-70
3/1	1924 Rents adopted as standard. No official scale adopted. Rent varies above minimum according to circumstances. Cases of exceptional hardship considered separately.	1,561	1,383
3/-	Adopted block differentiation; so that, e.g., large family pays same for four B.R. house as small family does for two B.R. house.	88	83
3/-	Abatement of 6d for each 2s 6d or fraction of 2s 6d by which income falls below £2 and of 1s for each dependent child. Addition of 6d for each 5s by which income exceeds £2 and additions for lodger and children earning.	88	83
9d	Abatement of 6d for each 2s 6d or fraction of 2s 6d by which income falls below £2 and of 1s for each dependent child. Addition of 6d for each 10s by which income exceeds £2 and additions for lodger and children earning.	97	94

rebates are made. In these two cases the minimum rent is actually the standard to which additions

RENT REBATES

Authority	Act	Minimum Income on which Full Rent Paid										A 3 House										
		A 2 House					A 3 House					Stan. inclus. Rent (1)	Min. inclus. Rent									
		Man & Wife	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 Children	5 Children	£	s	d	£			s	d							
		£	s	d	£	s	d	£	s	d	£	s	d	£	s	d						
Lecds	1919-1935													11/7			5/8					
Lincoln	1930	2 0 0	2 10 0	2 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	10/9½			6/6					
Manchester	1930	1 10 1	1 15 1	1 18 7	2 4 0	2 8 6	2 13 0	2 8 6	2 13 0	2 13 0	2 13 0	2 13 0	2 13 0	10/10			*5/-					
		(Assuming insurance 1/8)																				
Middlesbrough		2 7 0	2 9 0	2 11 0	2 13 0	2 15 0	2 17 0	2 15 0	2 17 0	2 17 0	2 17 0	2 17 0	2 17 0	10/11			3/6					
Northampton (3)	1930	1 9 6	1 12 3	1 17 3	2 3 9	2 8 3	2 12 9	2 8 3	2 12 9	2 12 9	2 12 9	2 12 9	2 12 9	11/9			*					
Norwich	1930	2 1 0	2 1 0	2 1 0	2 3 0	2 7 0	2 11 0	2 1 0	2 11 0	2 11 0	2 11 0	2 11 0	2 11 0	8/3			5/9					
Preston	1930	1 15 0	1 17 6	2 0 0	2 2 6	2 5 0	2 7 6	2 5 0	2 7 6	2 7 6	2 7 6	2 7 6	2 7 6	10/3			*8/3					
Reading	1930	1 5 0	1 10 0	1 15 0	2 0 0	2 5 0	2 5 0	2 5 0	2 5 0	2 5 0	2 5 0	2 5 0	2 5 0	10/8			—					
Rochdale	1930	1 9 1	1 19 1	2 9 1	3 0 9	3 10 9	4 0 9	3 10 9	4 0 9	4 0 9	4 0 9	4 0 9	4 0 9	10/8			6/9					
Rotherham	1930	1 17 0	2 2 0	2 7 0	2 10 0	2 12 0	2 14 0	2 12 0	2 14 0	2 14 0	2 14 0	2 14 0	2 14 0	10/2			*5/10					
Smethwick	1930	(-----) No Rebate (-----)					2 16 0		2 16 0		2 16 0		2 16 0		10/-			—				
Stoke-upon-Trent	1930	2 0 0	2 10 0	2 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	9/2			6/2					
Todmorden	1930	2 2 0	2 8 0	2 14 0	3 2 0	3 6 0	3 10 0	3 6 0	3 10 0	3 10 0	3 10 0	3 10 0	3 10 0	10/3			4/3					
Wallasey	1924	1 10 0	1 15 0	2 0 0	2 6 0	2 9 0	2 12 0	2 9 0	2 12 0	2 12 0	2 12 0	2 12 0	2 12 0	12/6			6/3					
Walsall	1930	1 17 9	1 17 9	2 1 9	2 5 9	2 9 9	2 13 9	2 9 9	2 13 9	2 13 9	2 13 9	2 13 9	2 13 9	9/9			*6/-					
Welwyn	1923	No Income Test										10/6		10/6		10/6		10/6		10/6		
	1924											10/6		10/6		10/6		10/6		10/6		
Winchester	1924	4 0 0	Rebates for children irrespective of income										12/6		12/6		12/6		12/6		12/6	
	1930											12/6		12/6		12/6		12/6		12/6		
Wolverhampton (3)	1930	1 7 3	1 11 3	1 17 3	2 4 4	2 10 4	2 16 4	2 4 4	2 10 4	2 16 4	2 16 4	2 16 4	2 16 4	7/4			*4/6					
Wrexham	1930	1 10 0	1 15 0	2 0 0	2 5 0	3 0 0	3 5 0	2 5 0	3 0 0	3 5 0	3 5 0	3 5 0	3 5 0	7/-			4/-					
York	1930	1 10 0	1 15 0	2 0 0	2 5 9	2 10 9	2 15 9	2 5 9	2 10 9	2 15 9	2 15 9	2 15 9	2 15 9	8/9			6/-					

* Not below

NOTE: (1) In each case the standard rent (inclusive of rates) has been given of
(2) Including houses where no rebate.
(3) Assuming ages of children consecutively 2, 6, 8, 11, 13 years.

RENT REBATES

Average Rebate per House (approx.) (£)	Method of Rebates	Number of Tenancies	
		In Scheme	In receipt of Rebates
—	The former system of rent rebates has now been superseded by a scheme applicable only to tenants rehoused under the Acts of 1930 and 1935 or otherwise compulsorily rehoused (irrespective of the Act under which the houses they now occupy were built). The "compulsory" tenants pay a lower scale of standard rents from which further rebates may be claimed. The minimum rent is fixed at one-quarter the standard rent on the lower scale. The following scales of weekly income qualify for the reduction to the minimum rent: Man and Wife, 19s 0d; children under 10, 4s 0d; 10-14, 6s 6d; 14 and over, 8s.	—	—
3/3	Where income £2 10s—£3 rebate of 1s per child in excess of two.	310	255
1/1	Where income £2—£2 10s rebate of 1s per child for first three children, then 2s per child. Where income less than £2, former rent is paid.	1,864	523
3/6	To the Atwater-Clarke scale of needs is added insurance, comforts allowance and rent. The rebate is amount by which actual income falls below scale or difference between standard rent and former rent, whichever is the least.	50	37
6d	Rebates graduated as income falls below scale. Only applied to rehousing of tuberculous families.	422	101
8d	Scale of family needs calculated according to size of family and ages of children. Amount by which actual income exceeds scale available for difference between new and old rents. Scale is not rigid and cases are considered on their merits.	663	280
11d	Rebates granted where income below scale.	96	50
1/1	Rebates varying from 9d to 3s according to amount by which income falls below scale.	198	53
—	Rebates granted where income below scale. Minimum abatement 3s 11d. Where the weekly income per head not more than 10s after deducting normal rent, rebates ranging from 6d for one B.R. house to 7s 4d for four B.R. house.	—	341
1/3	Rebate of quarter the amount by which actual income falls below this standard until minimum reached.	439	233
1/2	1924 Rents adopted as standard.	494	167
1/3	Rebates granted to families whose income does not exceed £2 16s 0d and the number of whose children exceeds four.	1,194	444
2/-	1924 Rents adopted as standard. Where income £2 10s 0d—£3 rebates given of 1s per child in excess of two. Where income £2—£2 10s 0d rebate of 1s per child up to three children and of 2s per child in excess of three. Where weekly income less than £3 minimum rent charged.	112	56
3/4	Rebates of 6d per week for each complete 1s 6d by which actual income falls below scale.	351	209
2/3	Rebates in units of 11d given as income falls below scale.	695	330
9d	Rebate equals amount by which income falls below scale till minimum rent is reached.	620	408
1/-	6d per child from birth to school leaving age. 1s extra for "lodger" (anyone in receipt of means and paying for their keep).	45	27
11d	Maximum rent reduced for every 5s by which income falls below £4 per week plus a rebate of 6d per week for each child under 16.	1,222	455
1/9	1924 Rents adopted as standard. Living needs scale drawn up, based on size of family and ages of children. Amount by which income falls below scale given as rent relief—subject to minimum.	243	155
1/7	Rebates given in proportion as family income falls below scale.	440	189
	Rebate equal to one half of difference between income and scale.		

former rent.

the least expensive type of Non-Parlour 3-Bedroom House let by the Authority.

Appendix II

The tables which are printed below show the amount paid in rent at various income levels and for varying sizes of family; they also show the percentage which the rent paid bears to the total income. Owing to the divergencies which exist between the schemes, it is a matter of some difficulty to draw any general conclusions. Certain facts, however, emerge quite clearly.

1 The size of the minimum rent, in the great majority of cases, imposes a burden upon families with an income of 30s od or less far heavier than they can properly bear.

2 The fixing of a standard rent considerably below the economic rent unduly favours small families with an income of £2 10s od and upwards.

3 Under about half the schemes illustrated, and under more than half the schemes not illustrated, all right to a rebate ceases when the family income reaches £3, irrespective of the number of dependent children. Insufficient consideration seems to be given to large families with an income of £3 and upwards.

These three deficiencies could, in most cases, be met without difficulty, if the standard rent were made the same as the economic rent, the result of which would be to increase the funds available in the rebate pool.

In the tables which follow it is assumed that families consisting of father, mother and two children, or less, are housed in an A 2 house; where there are three children or more, it is assumed that they occupy an A 3 house. In the case of tables marked * all the figures given are for A 3 houses.

The first figure in each column shows the amount paid in rent, and the second, the percentage of total income paid in rent.

BIRMINGHAM

Income	Man & Wife			Plus 1 Child			Plus 2 Children			Plus 3 Children			Plus 4 Children			Plus 5 Children			
	£	s	d	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%	
1 4	0	6	6	27.1	6	6	27.1	6	6	27.1	6	6	27.1	6	6	27.1	6	6	27.1
1 9	0	6	6	22.4	6	6	22.4	6	6	22.4	6	6	22.4	6	6	22.4	6	6	22.4
1 14	0	7	0	20.6	6	6	19.1	6	6	19.1	6	6	19.1	6	6	19.1	6	6	19.1
1 19	0	8	0	20.5	7	0	17.9	6	6	16.7	6	6	16.7	6	6	16.7	6	6	16.7
2 4	0	8	0	18.2	8	0	18.2	7	0	15.9	6	6	14.8	6	6	14.8	6	6	14.8
2 9	0	8	0	16.3	8	0	16.3	8	0	16.3	7	6	15.3	6	6	13.3	6	6	13.3
2 14	0	8	0	14.8	8	0	14.8	8	0	14.8	9	6	17.6	8	6	16.0	7	0	13.0
2 19	0	8	0	13.6	8	0	13.6	8	0	13.6	11	0	18.6	10	6	17.8	9	6	16.1

N.B.—The rent may be less than 6s 6d if the rent of the house vacated was less than that amount.

BOOTLE

Income	Man & Wife			Plus 1 Child			Plus 2 Children			Plus 3 Children			Plus 4 Children			Plus 5 Children			
	£	s	d	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%	
1 4	0	6	0	25.0	6	0	25.0	6	0	25.0	6	0	25.0	6	0	25.0	6	0	25.0
1 9	0	6	5	22.1	6	0	20.7	6	0	20.7	6	0	20.7	6	0	20.7	6	0	20.7
1 14	0	8	1	23.8	6	5	18.9	6	0	17.6	6	0	17.6	6	0	17.6	6	0	17.6
1 19	0	9	9	25.0	8	1	20.7	6	5	16.5	6	3	16.0	6	0	15.4	6	0	15.4
2 4	0	10	1	22.9	9	9	22.1	8	1	18.4	7	11	18.0	7	3	16.5	6	7	15.0
2 9	0	10	1	20.6	10	1	20.6	9	9	19.9	9	7	19.6	8	11	18.2	8	3	16.8
2 14	0	10	1	18.7	10	1	18.7	10	1	18.7	10	11	20.2	10	7	19.6	9	11	18.4
2 19	0	10	1	17.1	10	1	17.1	10	1	17.1	10	11	18.5	10	11	18.5	10	11	18.5

RENT REBATES

•STOKE-ON-TRENT

Income	Man & Wife			Plus 1 Child			Plus 2 Children			Plus 3 Children			Plus 4 Children			Plus 5 Children					
	£	s	d	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%			
1 4 0	6	2	25.7	6	2	25.7	6	2	25.7	6	2	25.7	6	2	25.7	6	2	25.7	6	2	25.7
1 9 0	6	2	21.3	6	2	21.3	6	2	21.3	6	2	21.3	6	2	21.3	6	2	21.3	6	2	21.3
1 14 0	6	2	18.1	6	2	18.1	6	2	18.1	6	2	18.1	6	2	18.1	6	2	18.1	6	2	18.1
1 19 0	6	2	15.8	6	2	15.8	6	2	15.8	6	2	15.8	6	2	15.8	6	2	15.8	6	2	15.8
2 4 0	9	2	20.8	8	2	18.6	7	2	16.3	6	2	14.0	6	2	14.0	6	2	14.0	6	2	14.0
2 9 0	9	2	18.7	8	2	16.7	7	2	14.6	6	2	12.6	6	2	12.6	6	2	12.6	6	2	12.6
2 14 0	9	2	17.0	9	2	17.0	9	2	17.0	8	2	15.1	7	2	13.3	6	2	11.4	6	2	11.4
2 19 0	9	2	15.5	9	2	15.5	9	2	15.5	8	2	13.8	7	2	12.2	6	2	10.5	6	2	10.5

•WINCHESTER

Income	Man & Wife			Plus 1 Child			Plus 2 Children			Plus 3 Children			Plus 4 Children			Plus 5 Children					
	£	s	d	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%			
1 5 0	7	0	28.0	6	6	26.0	6	6	26.0	6	6	26.0	6	6	26.0	6	6	26.0	6	6	26.0
1 10 0	7	7	25.3	7	1	23.6	6	7	21.9	6	6	21.7	6	6	21.7	6	6	21.7	6	6	21.7
1 15 0	8	2	23.3	7	8	21.9	7	1	20.2	6	7	18.8	6	6	18.6	6	6	18.6	6	6	18.6
2 0 0	8	10	22.1	8	4	20.8	7	10	19.6	7	4	18.3	6	10	17.1	6	6	16.3	6	6	16.3
2 5 0	9	7	21.3	9	1	20.2	8	7	19.1	8	1	18.0	7	7	16.9	7	1	15.7	7	1	15.7
2 10 0	10	5	20.8	9	11	19.8	9	5	18.8	8	11	17.8	8	5	16.8	7	11	15.8	7	11	15.8
2 15 0	11	4	20.6	10	10	19.7	10	4	18.8	9	10	17.9	9	4	17.0	8	10	16.1	8	10	16.1
3 0 0	12	4	20.6	11	10	19.7	11	4	18.9	10	10	18.1	10	4	17.2	9	10	16.4	9	10	16.4

WOLVERHAMPTON

It is here assumed that :

Where there is 1 child, it is between the ages of 5 and 14

 " " are 2 children, 1 is above, and 1 below, 5 years

 " " " 3 " 2 are " " 1 " 5 "

 " " " 4 " 2 " " " 2 " 5 "

 " " " 5 " 3 " " " 2 " 5 "

Income	Man & Wife			Plus 1 Child			Plus 2 Children			Plus 3 Children			Plus 4 Children			Plus 5 Children					
	£	s	d	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%	s	d	%			
1 4 0	4	1	17.0	4	1	17.0	4	1	17.0	4	7	19.1	4	7	19.1	4	7	19.1	4	7	19.1
1 9 0	6	4	21.8	4	1	14.1	4	1	14.1	4	7	15.8	4	7	15.8	4	7	15.8	4	7	15.8
1 14 0	6	4	18.6	6	4	18.6	4	1	12.0	4	7	13.5	4	7	13.5	4	7	13.5	4	7	13.5
1 19 0	6	4	16.2	6	4	16.2	6	4	16.2	4	7	11.8	4	7	11.8	4	7	11.8	4	7	11.8
2 4 0	6	4	14.4	6	4	14.4	6	4	14.4	7	1	16.1	4	7	10.4	4	7	10.4	4	7	10.4
2 9 0	6	4	12.9	6	4	12.9	6	4	12.9	7	5	15.1	7	1	14.5	4	7	9.4	4	7	9.4
2 14 0	6	4	11.7	6	4	11.7	6	4	11.7	7	5	13.7	7	5	13.7	6	1	11.3	6	1	11.3
2 19 0	6	4	10.7	6	4	10.7	6	4	10.7	7	5	12.6	7	5	12.6	7	5	12.6	7	5	12.6

Appendix III

LEEDS

A

TABLE FOR THREE-BEDROOMED HOUSES, INCLUDING THE "C" TYPE

Full rent :

Small (724 ft) type : 8s 9d ; rates and water charges 4s 4d ; total 13s 1d.

All other non-"C" types : 9s 0d ; rates and water charges 4s 8d to 4s 11d ; total 13s 8d to 13s 11d.

"C" type : 9s 0d ; rates and water charges 4s 11d to 5s 3d ; total 13s 11d to 14s 3d.

Amount payable plus rates and water charges :

<i>On a margin of</i>	<i>One person</i>	<i>Man and wife</i>	<i>Man, wife and 1 or 2 children</i>	<i>Man, wife and 3 children</i>	<i>Man, wife and 4 children</i>	<i>Man, wife and 5 children</i>
<i>s d</i>	<i>s d</i>	<i>s d</i>	<i>s d</i>	<i>s d</i>	<i>s d</i>	<i>s d</i>
5 0 ..	To make 5s 0d with rates, or rates only where over 5s 0d.					
6 0 ..	1 6	1 6	1 3	1 0	1 0	1 0
	or 6s 0d with rates, whichever is least.					
7 0 ..	2 6	2 6	1 9	1 6	1 6	1 3
	or 7s 0d with rates, whichever is least.					
8 0 ..	3 6	3 0	2 2	2 0	1 9	1 6
	or 8s 0d with rates, whichever is least.					
9 0 ..	4 6	3 6	2 6	2 3	2 0	1 9
10 0 ..	5 6	3 9	2 9	2 6	2 3	2 0
11 0 ..	6 6	4 0	3 0	2 9	2 6	2 3
12 0 ..	7 0	4 3	3 3	3 0	2 9	2 6
13 0 ..	7 6	4 6	3 6	3 3	3 0	2 9
14 0 ..	8 0	4 9	3 9	3 6	3 3	3 0
15 0 ..	8 6	5 0	4 0	3 9	3 6	3 3
16 0 ..	9 0	5 3	4 3	4 0	3 9	3 6
17 0 ..	*	5 6	4 6	4 3	4 0	3 9
18 0 ..	*	5 9	4 9	4 6	4 3	4 0
19 0 ..	*	6 0	5 0	4 9	4 6	4 3
20 0 ..	*	6 4	5 3	5 0	4 9	4 6
21 0 ..	*	6 8	5 6	5 3	5 0	4 9
22 0 ..	*	7 0	5 9	5 6	5 3	5 0
23 0 ..	*	7 4	6 0	5 9	5 6	5 3
24 0 ..	*	7 8	6 4	6 0	5 9	5 6
25 0 ..	*	8 0	6 8	6 3	6 0	5 9
26 0 ..	*	8 4	7 0	6 6	6 3	6 0
27 0 ..	*	8 8	7 4	6 9	6 6	6 3
28 0 ..	*	9 0	7 8	7 0	6 9	6 6
29 0 ..	*	*	8 0	7 4	7 0	6 9
30 0 ..	*	*	8 4	7 8	7 3	7 0
31 0 ..	*	*	8 8	8 0	7 6	7 3
32 0 ..	*	*	9 0	8 4	7 9	7 6
33 0 ..	*	*	*	8 8	8 0	7 9
34 0 ..	*	*	*	9 0	8 4	8 0
35 0 ..	*	*	*	*	8 8	8 4
36 0 ..	*	*	*	*	9 0	8 8
37 0 ..	*	*	*	*	*	9 0

NOTE.—* Indicates maximum or full rent.

CHECKED
2003-04

RENT REBATES

B

Details of rebate granted, partial and full rebate taken together :

<i>Amount of relief per week</i>			<i>No. of Tenants</i>
1d to 6d	201
7d to 1s 0d	283
1s 1d to 1s 6d	350
1s 7d to 2s 0d	357
2s 1d to 2s 6d	442
2s 7d to 3s 0d	440
3s 1d to 3s 6d	403
3s 7d to 4s 0d	448
4s 1d to 4s 6d	371
4s 7d to 5s 0d	439
5s 1d to 5s 6d	381
5s 7d to 6s 0d	372
6s 1d to 6s 6d	357
6s 7d to 7s 0d	447
7s 1d to 7s 6d	173
7s 7d to 8s 0d	302
8s 1d to 8s 6d	145
8s 7d to 9s 0d	804
9s 1d to 9s 6d	30
9s 7d to 10s 0d	33
10s 1d to 10s 6d	8
10s 7d to 11s 0d	54
			<hr/>
			6,840
			<hr/>

C

THE LEEDS LABOUR PARTY'S DIFFERENTIAL RENT RELIEF

Table showing amounts payable (*inclusive of rates*) by typical families in (1) a two-bedroomed h
In all cases the income is assumed to be from one wage-earner.

The "full" (i.e. non-subsidy) rent of the two-bedroomed house is 8s 6d, plus rates 4s 0d=12s 6d, of the rates 4s 8d=13s 8d.

Average net weekly income	Father, mother and one child under 10		Father, mother and two children, one under 10, one 10-13		Father, mother and three children, all under 10		Father, mother and four children, all under 10		roomed house, not to be overcrowded	RENT REBATES
	In two-bedroomed house	In three-bedroomed house	In two-bedroomed house	In three-bedroomed house	In two-bedroomed house	In three-bedroomed house	In two-bedroomed house	In three-bedroomed house		
£ s d	s d	s d	s d	s d	Rates s d	Rates s d	Rates s d	Rates s d	Rates s d	
2 0 0	7 6	7 11	5 9	6 0	4 0	4 8	4 0	4 8	4 8	
2 5 0	8 9	9 2	7 4	7 9	6 3	6 11	5 0	5 0	4 8	
2 10 0	10 0	10 5	8 7	9 0	7 6	8 2	6 6	6 11	5 11	
2 15 0	11 3	12 2	9 10	10 3	8 9	9 5	7 9	8 2	7 2	
3 0 0	Full rent 12 6	Full rent 13 8	11 1	11 9	10 0	10 8	9 0	9 5	8 5	
3 5 0	Full	Full	Full rent at 12 4	Full rent at 13 5	11 3	12 0	10 3	10 8	9 8	
3 10 0	Full	Full	£3 5 6 12 6	£3 5 6 13 8	Full rent 12 6	Full rent 13 8	11 6	11 11	10 11	
3 15 0	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full rent at £3 14 0 12 6	13 4	12 2	
4 0 0	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full rent at £3 16 0 13 8	Full rent 13 8	