

77th Congress, 1st Session

House Document No. 142

---

DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES AND  
STABILIZATION OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE  
UNITED STATES

•

JANUARY 1941  
NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

---

**DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES AND  
STABILIZATION OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE  
UNITED STATES**

●  
**JANUARY 1941**

**NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD**

**For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C.**  
**Price \$1.20**

---

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

---

*To the Congress of the United States:*

National defense is more than a mobilization of a Nation's armed strength. Equally must we focus public thought on the ideals and objectives of our national life. We must seek wider understanding of the possibilities for that future we prepare to defend.

Among those possibilities are the larger use, the conservation and development of the Nation's resources. I have from time to time during the past 8 years called to the attention of the Congress these possibilities; and during these years several laws have been enacted to promote the orderly development and prudent husbandry of our national resources, human as well as material.

The National Resources Planning Board has now completed its report, which I send you herewith, on the Development of Resources and the Stabilization of Employment in the United States. This is the first of a series of such reports which each year I shall transmit to the Congress shortly after submission of the Budget of the United States.

The Budget contains the recommendations of the Chief Executive for the financial outlays to carry on a public works program during the next fiscal year. This report places these recommendations within the framework of a long-range policy of intelligent planning for the future. It contains a 6-year program of public construction and a statement of related future policies and plans of the Federal Government.

Under the terms of Reorganization Plan No. 1, effective July 1, 1939, I have, by a series of Executive orders, given to the National Resources Planning Board responsibility for correlating the 6-year public works programs of those agencies which plan or undertake construction directly for the Federal Government and those which indirectly participate in construction by means of loans, grants, or other financial aid. The Board is also aiding cities and States to prepare similar programs or capital budgets so as to develop a full and coordinated program of national development.

The Board can thus help to iron out conflicts among the plans of different agencies, and to present for consideration by the Congress a program which expresses local, State, regional, and national aspirations for a progressive development of our resources and for stabilization of employment.

This 6-year program lists the Budget estimates for the coming fiscal year and summarizes a developing program for the ensuing 5 years. If projects are to be ready at hand for rapid inauguration in times of need, the surveys and investigations, the engineering plans and specifications must be prepared in advance. Authorizations and financial arrangements must be already agreed upon.

The planning revolving fund, suggested in the Board's report, would make available a shelf of useful projects without in any way committing the Government to the immediate construction of such works. Because of the current national emergency, projects not needed for defense have been temporarily deferred. As a result, we are now in the process of storing up a reservoir of nondefense public work which can be loosed when the pace of rearmament slackens.

The report of the Board is divided into three parts:

*Part I. The Federal program for national development.*—This is the report of the Board and contains its findings and recommendations.

*Part II. Regional development plans.*—This section reproduces statements prepared through the 10 regional offices of the Board in cooperation with regional and State planning agencies and with representative citizens.

*Message from the President*

*Part III. Functional development policies.*—This part of the report is devoted to studies by the technical advisory committees of the Board on national policies for the development of our land, water, and energy resources.

To facilitate their use by the Congress, I recommend that all three parts of the report be printed, together with the illustrations and supporting tables.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
March 17, 1941.

---

**PART I. THE FEDERAL PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

---

---

## LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

---

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

*December 31, 1940.*

The PRESIDENT,  
*The White House.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have the honor to transmit herewith a report of the National Resources Planning Board on Development of Resources and Stabilization of Employment in the United States.

In accordance with your instructions and the requirements of the Federal Employment Stabilization Act of 1931, the report reviews "the trend of employment and business activity \* \* \* in the United States," discusses the possibilities of and limitations on the use of public works, both for national development and to combat unemployment, and presents a recommended 6-year program of Federal public works. Supporting this statement by the Board we are also presenting two other parts of the report, so that the whole document consists of:

Part I—The Federal Program for National Development.

Part II—Regional Development Plans.

Part III—Functional Development Policies.

The 6-year program provides a reservoir of long-range projects originated by Federal construction agencies from which the Congress and the administration can select activities in amounts and kinds appropriate to the times and the needs of the Nation. It suggests alternative lines of policy for land, water, energy, and transportation and of regional development as a basis for improved plans and programs in future years. The 6-year program is a concrete and practical application of planning which will change from year to year with the development of our national resources.

Respectfully submitted.

FREDERIC A. DELANO, *Chairman.*  
CHARLES E. MERRIAM.  
GEORGE F. YANTIS.

# NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

CHARLES E. MERRIAM      **FREDERIC A. DELANO, *Chairman***      GEORGE F. YANTIS

---

## ADVISORS

HENRY S. DENNISON      BEARDSLEY RUMFORD

---

## DIRECTOR

CHARLES W. ELIOT 2D

## ASSISTANT DIRECTORS

THOMAS C. BLAISDELL, JR.      FRANK W. HERRING      RALPH J. WATKINS

## EXECUTIVE OFFICER

HAROLD MERRILL



---

**DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES AND STABILIZATION OF EMPLOY-  
MENT IN THE UNITED STATES**

**PART I: THE FEDERAL PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

---

**Contents**

	Page		Page
<b>Recommendations</b>	1	<b>E. Regional and Functional Development Policies—Con-</b>	
<b>A. Introduction—Objectives and Economic Consid-</b>		<b>Functional Development Policies—Continued.</b>	
erations	3	Energy Resource Policies	43
<b>B. Trends of Employment.</b>	6	Transportation Needs and Principles of Ex-	
Conclusion	11	penditure	47
<b>C. Public Works Planning for Employment Stabil-</b>		<b>F. Recommended Six-Year Program</b>	49
ization	14	Summary	49
Public Works for Cyclical Stabilization	14	Procedures in Developing the Program	51
Local Government Public Works	15	Planning, Programming, and Budgeting	53
First National Efforts to Expand Public Works	15	List of Projects	54
The PWA Established	16	Table No. I. Projects Recommended for Fiscal	
Development of the Work Relief Program	16	Year 1942	55
The Course of Public Construction	17	Legislative Establishment	55
What 10 Years of Experience Have Shown	17	Independent Offices and Establishments	55
<b>D. Public Works Planning for National Development</b>	23	Federal Security Administration	56
Federal and Non-Federal Responsibilities	23	Federal Works Agency	56
Federal Participation in Total Construction		Department of Agriculture	57
Activity	24	Department of Commerce	58
Construction Undertaken by the Federal Govern-		Department of the Interior	58
ment	25	Department of Justice	60
Trends in Construction by Federal Agencies	25	Navy Department	60
Trends in Construction by Federal Corporations	27	Department of State	61
Federal Grants-In-Aid for Public Construction	28	Treasury Department	61
Federal Loans for Public Works Construction	28	War Department	61
Federal Loans for Private Construction	30	District of Columbia Government	62
Total Federal Participation in Construction	30	Table No. II. Estimated Construction Financing	
Significance of the Past 10 Years	31	by the Federal Government for Fiscal Year 1942	75
<b>E. Regional and Functional Development Policies</b>	33	Federal Loan Agency	75
Programming of Public Works	33	Federal Security Administration	76
Evaluation of Costs and Benefits	33	Federal Works Agency	76
Financing Public Works	33	Department of Agriculture	76
Functional Policies and Regional Planning	34	Table No. III. Projects Available for Construction	
Regional Development Plans	34	in Later Years	78
Functional Development Policies	36	<b>Appendix. Statistical Tables Covering the Historical</b>	
Land-Use Objectives and Public Works	36	<b>Development and Distribution of Federal Construc-</b>	
National Water Policy	39	<b>tion Expenditures, 1921-1941</b>	79

---

# APPENDIX

## STATISTICAL TABLES COVERING THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION EXPENDITURES, 1921-1941

---

During the past 20 years, the United States Government has directly influenced construction activity in the United States in a number of different ways. These have included:

1. *Expenditures made by regular Government departments* for the Federal account. The construction financed by these expenditures is carried on directly by the Federal Government and the completed works and structures are owned and operated by it.

2. *Expenditures made by Government corporations* for the Federal account.

3. *Grants-in-aid to State and local governments.*—The construction (including work relief) so financed is carried on (or sponsored) by the State and local governments to which the grants are made, and the completed works and structures are owned and operated by them.

4. *Loans to non-Federal public agencies.*—The construction financed by these expenditures is carried on by the agencies to which the loans are made, and the completed works and structures are owned and operated by these agencies.

5. *Loans to private agencies and guaranties of private loans.*—As in the case of loans to public agencies, responsibility for construction, ownership, and operation is outside the Federal Government. The Government underwrites certain types of private construction loans, principally for housing, and the guaranties of these loans represent contingent liabilities of the Government. Consequently, the construction expenditures made by private agencies under these loan-guaranty arrangements must be considered as a part of the construction activity in which the Government is a participant.

The tables in this Appendix have been compiled to show the expenditures made by the Federal Government since 1921 in each of the categories listed above, classified as to purpose.

In addition to this classification of construction expenditures according to the character of the outlays, many different methods might be used to classify such expenditures according to the purpose for which they were made.

From 1921 to 1932, the bulk of Federal construction expenditures was made for roads, river and harbor improvements (including some flood-control work), public buildings, and irrigation works. Beginning in 1932, these expenditures were extended to include—by

means of grants or loans—practically all types of public and private construction. In considering all the purposes for which Federal construction expenditures are now being made, the expenditures have been divided into six major functional classes in these tables:

1. *Water use and control.*—Including flood control, irrigation, hydroelectric plant and transmission systems, public water-supply systems, and public sewerage systems.

2. *Public land development.*—Including park and forest development, wildlife conservation, and soil erosion control.

3. *Transportation.*—Including roads, river and harbor improvements, aids and assistance to navigation, airports and airways, railroads, canals, and various structures such as wharves, docks, bridges, etc.

4. *Defense.*—Including Army and Navy flying fields, military and naval posts, supply depots, and navy yards.

5. *Government plant.*—Including administrative buildings, post offices, research facilities, hospitals, prisons, and educational buildings.

6. *Housing.*

It is recognized, of course, that this classification is very general, and for that reason each major classification has been in turn further subdivided into several additional classifications. The entire classification scheme in general outline is as follows:

1. *Water use and control:*

- a. Flood control.
- b. Tennessee Valley Authority.
- c. Reclamation and irrigation.
- d. Transmission and hydroelectric plant.
- e. Public water supply systems.
- f. Public sewerage systems.
- g. Miscellaneous water use and control.

2. *Public land development:*

- a. Parks.
- b. Forests.
- c. Wildlife.
- d. Soil erosion control.
- e. Miscellaneous land development.

3. *Transportation:*

- a. Roads, streets, and highways.
- b. Rivers and harbors.
- c. Aids and assistance to navigation.

3. *Transportation—Continued.*
  - d. Airports and airways.
  - e. Canals.
  - f. Railroads.
  - g. Miscellaneous transportation.
4. *Defense:*
  - a. Naval.
  - b. Military.
  - c. Miscellaneous defense.
5. *Government plant:*
  - a. Public buildings.
  - b. Research facilities.
  - c. Surveys and investigations.
  - d. Welfare and health.
  - e. Law enforcement.
  - f. Education.
  - g. Recreation.
  - h. Utilities.
  - i. Miscellaneous general facilities.

In addition to the five groups listed above, there is a general over-all "Miscellaneous" group which is included in some of the tables because the data from which these tables were compiled did not, in some instances, permit more specific identification of purpose.

The tables in this Appendix are divided into five groups, corresponding to the character-of-outlay classification described in the first paragraph of this appendix. In addition, there is a sixth table summarizing all expenditures shown on the other five tables.

Each group of tables has a summary table which classifies the expenditures within that group according to purpose, and within each group of tables there is a table for each major purpose category which details the amounts spent by each Federal agency for each item listed within that purpose.

These tables must be used in the light of the following considerations:

1. The expenditures shown within each fiscal year do not correspond precisely to the total volume of construction activity for which the Federal Government was responsible *in that year*, because Federal procedures (with few exceptions) are such that the actual construction work must be performed before payment can be made. Consequently, construction activity financed by the Federal Government generally precedes actual payment. These tables show expenditures in terms of cash payments from the United States Treasury or from funds of Government corporations, with the exception of private construction loans for which the Federal Government has provided a guaranty. These guaranties are included as of the date they are assumed by the Federal Government.

2. The data from which these tables have been compiled are such that it is not possible in all instances to permit a complete classification of the expenditures involved. For instance, all construction expenditures of the Bureau of Reclamation are shown under "Reclamation and irrigation" although some of such expenditures were for hydroelectric plant and transmission lines. However, the nature of the data available did not permit a separation. Consequently, the compilations presented in these tables are not completely precise insofar as the classifications are concerned.

3. All expenditure data shown are for *new* construction only. Major repairs that are, virtually, new construction are also included. Current maintenance and repair work necessary for the preservation of any works, building, or other structure has been excluded.

4. The data shown for the fiscal year 1941 are preliminary and are subject to further revision.

TABLE No. 1.—Summary of expenditures for construction of Federal

[All figures

Function	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
<b>1. Water use and control:</b>							
a. Flood control <sup>1</sup>							\$11,501
b. TVA							2,752
c. Reclamation and irrigation	\$6,073	\$4,946	\$5,659	\$6,782	\$3,899	\$3,300	7,276
d. Transmission and electric plant							
Total	6,073	4,946	5,659	6,782	3,899	3,300	21,619
<b>2. Public land development:</b>							
a. Parks							1,842
b. Forests	6,382	6,263	6,459	7,817	13,066	12,714	12,151
c. Wildlife	129	36	25	5	1	7	24
d. Soil erosion control							
Total	6,511	6,299	6,484	7,822	13,067	12,721	14,017
<b>3. Transportation:</b>							
a. Roads	1,225		2,811	4,678			
b. Rivers and harbors <sup>2</sup>	58,820	43,317	51,393	75,692	79,429	69,004	51,041
c. Aids and assistance to navigation	808	1,185	607	786	843	997	74
d. Airports and airways							
e. Panama Canal <sup>3</sup>	16,461	11,062	8,621	7,142	6,093		
f. Nicaragua Canal							
g. Alaska R. R.	9,561	4,358	4,446	2,838	2,074	1,464	1,572
h. Miscellaneous	573						
Total	87,450	59,922	62,878	91,136	91,139	71,465	52,687
<b>4. Defense:</b>							
a. Navy Department	14,212	10,454	10,073	6,177	3,750	3,257	3,027
b. War Department	52,461	16,569	12,164	6,459	4,581	7,001	9,634
c. War Department—nonmilitary	190						
Total	66,863	27,023	22,237	12,636	8,331	10,258	12,711
<b>5. Government plant:</b>							
a. Public buildings	9,714	5,299	3,454	2,450	2,756	1,940	8,736
b. Research facilities							
c. Surveys and investigations							
d. Welfare and health	285	12,054	10,291	11,611	5,091	5,981	5,976
e. Law enforcement	311	80	174	141	410	73	61
f. Education	47	528	24	3	47	150	233
g. Housing							
h. District of Columbia				45	27		
i. Facilities outside continental United States							
Total	10,357	17,961	13,943	14,250	8,331	8,144	15,006
<b>6. Miscellaneous</b>			1,294	244	253	811	1,560
Grand total	177,254	116,151	112,495	132,870	125,020	106,789	117,600

<sup>1</sup> Estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1941 estimated as of January 1941.  
<sup>2</sup> Up to the end of the fiscal year 1926, expenditures for flood control are included under the item "Rivers and harbors." Some maintenance is included.  
<sup>3</sup> Credits of \$29,000 deducted in Budget statement.  
<sup>4</sup> Credits of \$32,000 deducted in Budget statement.  
<sup>5</sup> Credits of \$30,000 deducted in Budget statement.  
<sup>6</sup> Includes maintenance and operating expenses.

<sup>7</sup> Credits of \$96,000 deducted in Budget statement.  
<sup>8</sup> Difference between statement No. 2 and statement No. 4 of the Budget is \$1,146,000.  
<sup>9</sup> Difference between statement No. 2 and statement No. 5 of the Budget is \$2,435,000.  
<sup>10</sup> Difference between statement No. 2 and statement No. 5 of the Budget is \$19,875,000.

TABLE No. 1-A.—1.

[All figures

Agency	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
<b>a. Flood control:</b>							
1. Corps of Engineers <sup>1</sup>							\$11,501
2. International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico							
Total							11,501
<b>b. Tennessee Valley Authority:</b>							
1. Corps of Engineers <sup>2</sup>							2,752
2. Tennessee Valley Authority							
Total							2,752
<b>c. Reclamation and irrigation:</b>							
1. Bureau of Reclamation	\$6,073	\$4,946	\$5,659	\$6,782	\$3,899	\$3,300	7,276
2. Boulder Dam							
3. All-American Canal							
4. Bureau of Indian Affairs <sup>3</sup>							
5. Small water conservation—Department of the Interior							
Total	6,073	4,946	5,659	6,782	3,899	3,300	7,276
<b>d. Transmission and electric plant:</b>							
1. Corps of Engineers <sup>4</sup>							
2. TVA							
3. Bonneville project							
Total							
Grand total	6,073	4,946	5,659	6,782	3,899	3,300	21,619

See footnotes on pp. 84 to 87.

public works classified according to function, fiscal years 1921-1941, inclusive

in thousands]

1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941 <sup>1</sup>
\$13,271	\$25,340	\$22,805	\$35,844	\$27,996	\$35,118	\$41,862	\$34,403	\$41,474	\$50,280	\$64,979	\$76,444	\$105,749	\$114,281
711	330					8,020	31,179	41,565	35,545	36,538	31,543	39,136	60,000
9,534	10,613	9,398	9,442	23,577	24,067	25,170	42,548	50,947	51,648	66,982	82,099	98,690	84,351
		22	11	15	14	1,444	1,389	6,640	4,600	7,169	11,650	13,380	23,000
23,516	36,283	32,225	45,297	51,588	59,199	76,496	109,519	140,626	142,073	175,668	201,736	256,955	281,632
3,416	4,149	4,077	6,252	6,913	6,537	8,675	13,826	14,538	23,190	18,023	21,158	16,072	17,723
11,001	12,462	11,097	20,641	18,117	12,799	25,048	22,784	20,900	22,913	18,462	18,703	12,911	10,658
4	19	292	463	350	158	568	843	1,995	1,987	1,490	2,747	1,098	755
				5	2		10,334	24,080	300	215	2,819	1,824	767
14,421	16,630	15,466	27,356	25,385	19,496	34,291	47,787	61,513	48,390	38,190	45,427	31,905	29,903
	1,993	2,983	6,719	8,342	5,617	3,754	4,096	2,741	2,026	1,941	1,917	2,129	1,500
58,870	57,718	47,437	53,598	55,842	49,123	79,115	133,036	152,195	147,470	99,047	76,779	61,573	45,115
290	900	876	1,458	2,955	2,644	1,990	3,261	992	2,165	1,815	8,633	5,094	9,148
		1,678	3,026	2,657	628	342	1,784	828	766	2,216	4,232	8,799	34,000
		1,418	1,280	2,220	5,276	4,582	1,956	2,478	2,520	2,223	2,457	15,700	32,271
		51	65										
		264	198	255	157	353	325	329	438	528	482	358	565
		2,749	1,073	1,581	354	30	1	5	23	25			
59,160	60,611	57,456	67,447	73,852	63,799	90,166	144,459	159,568	155,408	107,795	94,500	93,653	122,599
4,885	7,314	8,103	12,941	13,246	12,626	14,110	13,686	14,463	19,053	14,979	48,094	81,652	248,561
6,288	13,338	11,585	25,655	29,718	13,796	35,542	34,280	17,374	23,676	34,375	61,499	72,248	647,701
	584	247	1,182	915		424	411						2,900
11,173	21,236	19,935	39,778	43,879	26,422	50,076	48,377	31,837	42,729	49,354	109,593	153,900	899,162
7,194	30,785	44,294	73,002	100,621	118,177	80,648	60,054	69,028	78,594	79,927	53,506	58,079	57,221
	51	1,333	1,195	632	108	2,655	2,524	1,312	908	838	3,034	6,757	16,182
			3	3	4	778	801	253	488	2,041	1,342	230	1,570
6,609	4,608	12,817	15,369	19,237	19,856	9,397	9,088	11,902	22,540	15,391	25,099	31,503	13,545
30	183		28			1,219	117	272	99	148	105		
149	9	121	727	801	633	533	782	764	515	1,249	3,212	1,697	1,462
						2,372		312		13	65		100,000
		7,637	10,410	12,875	7,736	4,205	8,000	12,345	6,871	7,183	20,495	19,661	8,880
		3,573	3,303	4,822	707	1,731	2,642	3,976	13,738	1,940	6,087	3,745	1,692
13,982	35,636	69,775	104,037	138,991	147,221	103,538	84,008	100,164	123,753	108,730	112,945	121,672	200,552
2,941	16,309												
125,193	186,705	194,857	283,915	333,695	316,137	354,567	434,150	493,708	512,353	479,737	564,201	658,085	1,533,848

Source: Compiled from statements of Federal expenditures for public works construction published annually in *The Budget of the United States Government*. See *The Budget* from 1923-42, inclusive. This statement does not include emergency expenditures from allotments for public works to States, municipalities and other public bodies. However, it does include expenditures from allotments for public works construction (including work relief construction) made to the regular Federal

construction agencies from emergency funds. The sites for construction are included as are vessels for the Coast Guard and Lighthouse Service. All figures on this table and the supporting tables are on a fiscal year basis. In the years up to the end of 1932 it was necessary to supplement the table of public works or construction expenditures with statement No. 2 of the Budget, since that contained information not available in the former.

Water use and control

in thousands]

1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941
\$13,271	\$25,340	\$22,805	\$35,844	\$27,996	\$35,118	\$41,076	\$31,807	\$41,303	\$49,221	\$63,680	\$75,454	\$103,789	\$112,200
						786	2,596	171	1,059	1,299	990	1,960	2,081
13,271	25,340	22,805	35,844	27,996	35,118	41,862	34,403	41,474	50,280	64,979	76,444	105,749	114,281
711	330					8,020	31,179	41,565	35,545	36,538	31,543	39,136	60,000
711	330					8,020	31,179	41,565	35,545	36,538	31,543	39,136	60,000
9,534	10,613	8,611	6,357	5,424	3,488	3,368	15,731	25,486	36,463	47,640	64,394	93,642	81,211
			1,686	17,019	19,709	19,534	22,180	18,913	5,588	7,354	9,093		
			787	1,399	870	39	1,725	4,864	8,550	7,651	3,550	5,048	3,140
				1,134		2,229	2,912	1,684	1,047	4,337	5,062		
9,534	10,613	9,398	9,442	23,577	24,067	25,170	42,548	50,947	51,648	66,982	82,099	98,690	84,351
		22	11	15	14	2						2,529	10,000
						1,442	1,389	6,640	4,600	7,154	6,745	10,851	13,000
										15	4,905		
		22	11	15	14	1,444	1,389	6,640	4,600	7,169	11,650	13,380	23,000
23,516	36,283	32,225	45,297	51,588	59,199	76,496	109,519	140,626	142,073	175,668	201,736	256,955	281,632

TABLE No. 1-B.—

[All figures]

Agency	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
<b>a. Parks:</b>							
1. National Park Service.....							\$1,842
2. Other public parks.....							
<b>Total</b> .....							1,842
<b>b. Forests:</b>							
1. Forest Service, <sup>1</sup> total.....	\$6,382	\$6,263	\$6,459	\$7,817	\$13,066	\$12,714	12,151
<b>c. Wildlife:</b>							
1. Bureau of Biological Survey.....	129	36	25	5	1	7	24
2. Bureau of Fisheries.....							
<b>Total</b> .....	129	36	25	5	1	7	24
<b>d. Soil erosion control:</b>							
1. Soil Conservation Service.....							
2. Extension Service.....							
3. General, Department of Agriculture.....							
<b>Total</b> .....							
<b>Grand total</b> .....	6,511	6,299	6,484	7,822	13,067	12,721	14,017

TABLE No. 1-C.—

[All figures]

Agency	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
<b>a. Roads:</b>							
1. Bureau of Public Roads <sup>1</sup> , total.....	\$1,225		\$2,811	\$4,679			
<b>b. Rivers and harbors:</b>							
1. Corps of Engineers <sup>2</sup> , total.....	58,820	\$43,317	51,393	75,602	\$79,429	\$69,004	\$51,041
<b>c. Aids and assistance to navigation:</b>							
1. Lighthouse Service.....	808	1,185	607	786	543	997	74
2. Coast Guard.....							
<b>Total</b> .....	808	1,185	607	786	543	997	74
<b>d. Airports and airways:</b>							
1. Bureau of Air Commerce.....							
2. Civil Aeronautics Authority.....							
<b>Total</b> .....							
<b>e. Panama Canal:</b>							
1. Panama Canal <sup>3</sup> , total.....	16,461	11,062	3,621	7,142	9,093		
<b>f. Nicaragua Canal:</b>							
1. Nicaragua Canal, total.....							
<b>g. Alaska R. R.:</b>							
1. Alaska R. R., total.....	9,561	4,358	<sup>4</sup> 4,446	2,838	2,074	1,464	1,572
<b>h. Miscellaneous:</b>							
1. War Department.....	575						
2. Arlington Memorial Bridge.....							
<b>Total</b> .....	575						
<b>Grand total</b> .....	87,450	59,922	62,878	91,136	91,139	71,465	52,687

TABLE No. 1-D.—

[All figures]

Agency	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
<b>a. Navy:</b>							
1. Bureau of Yards and Docks, total.....	\$14,212	<sup>1</sup> \$10,454	\$10,073	\$6,177	\$3,750	\$3,257	\$3,027
<b>b. Army:</b>							
1. Quartermaster Corps.....	52,461	16,569	12,164	6,459	4,581	7,001	9,684
2. Nonmilitary <sup>2</sup> .....	190						
<b>Total</b> .....	52,651	16,569	12,164	6,459	4,581	7,001	9,684
<b>Grand total</b> .....	66,863	27,023	22,237	12,636	8,331	10,258	12,711

<sup>1</sup> Up to the end of the fiscal year 1926, flood control expenditures were reported under rivers and harbors work. Also includes funds allotted to the Department of Agriculture.

<sup>2</sup> This item covers dam No. 2 at Muscle Shoals, a project of the Corps of Engineers which is now part of TVA. The original objectives were navigation and the generation of power for nitrates in time of war and fertilizers in time of peace. In the years following 1929 the construction expenditures at dam No. 2 are listed in the Budget

as hydroelectric plant and appear under "Transmission and electric plant" in the analyses.

<sup>3</sup> In 1926 credits deducted in Budget Statement amounted to \$29,000, in 1927 to \$29,000, in 1928 to \$32,000, and in 1929 to \$30,000.

<sup>4</sup> In the years up to the end of 1929 the expenditures for irrigation projects in the Bureau of Indian Affairs were not separated from the general public works expenditures for this Bureau.

2. Public Land development

in thousands]

1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941
\$3,416	\$4,149	\$4,077	\$6,246 6	\$6,900 13	\$6,537	\$8,675	\$13,826	\$14,538	\$23,190	\$18,023	\$21,158	\$16,072	\$17,723
3,416	4,149	4,077	6,252	6,913	6,537	8,675	13,826	14,538	23,190	18,023	21,158	16,072	17,723
11,001	12,462	11,097	20,641	18,117	12,799	25,048	22,784	20,900	22,913	18,462	18,703	12,911	10,658
4	19	161 131	169 294	16 334	6 152	300 268	667 176	1,861 134	1,939 48	1,248 242	1,140 1,607	1,098	755
4	19	292	463	350	158	568	843	1,095	1,987	1,490	2,747	1,098	755
							10,334	22,130 1,950	300	215	2,819	1,824	767
				5	2								
				5	2		10,334	24,080	300	215	2,819	1,824	767
14,421	16,630	15,466	27,356	25,385	19,496	34,291	47,787	61,513	48,390	38,190	45,427	31,905	29,903

3. Transportation

in thousands]

1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941
	\$1,993	\$2,983	\$6,719	\$3,342	\$5,617	\$3,754	\$4,096	\$2,741	\$2,026	\$1,941	\$1,917	\$2,129	\$1,500
\$58,870	57,718	47,437	53,598	55,842	49,123	79,115	133,036	152,195	147,470	99,047	76,779	61,573	45,115
290	900	790 86	1,096 392	1,165 1,790	1,451 1,193	1,520 470	2,471 790	368 624	1,611 554	1,510 305	8,633	5,094	9,148
290	900	876	1,488	2,955	2,644	1,990	3,261	992	2,165	1,815	8,633	5,094	9,148
		1,678	3,026	2,657	628	342	1,784	828	766	2,216	4,232	8,799	34,000
		1,678	3,026	2,657	628	342	1,784	828	766	2,216	4,232	8,799	34,000
		1,418	1,280	2,220	5,276	4,582	1,956	2,478	2,520	2,223	2,457	15,700	32,271
		51	65										
		264	198	255	157	353	325	329	438	528	482	358	565
		2,749	1,073	1,581	354	30	1	5	23	25			
		2,749	1,073	1,581	354	30	1	5	23	25			
59,160	60,611	57,456	67,447	73,852	63,799	90,166	144,459	159,568	155,408	107,795	94,500	93,653	122,599

4. Defense

in thousands]

1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941
\$4,885	\$7,314	\$8,103	\$12,941	\$13,246	\$12,626	\$14,110	\$13,686	\$14,463	\$19,053	\$14,979	\$48,094	\$81,652	\$248,561
6,288	13,338 584	11,585 247	25,655 1,182	29,718 915	13,796	35,542 424	34,280 411	17,374	23,676	34,375	61,499	72,248	647,701
6,288	13,922	11,832	26,837	30,633	13,796	35,966	34,691	17,374	23,676	34,375	61,499	72,248	647,701
11,173	21,236	19,935	39,778	43,879	26,422	50,076	48,377	31,837	42,729	49,354	109,593	153,900	1,899,162

† Certain items representing construction expenditures from special funds (co-operative work, Forest Service and roads and trails for States, National Forest funds) have not been included in the Bureau of the Budget's Statement of public works expenditures from 1921-32 (fiscal years). These amounts, which appear in statement No. 2 of the Budget have been included in the above schedule in order to make the Budget statement of public works expenditures consistent within itself for the entire

period from 1921 through 1941. The following expenditures have been added to the amounts appearing in the Budget statement of public works expenditures: \$6,382,000 in 1921, \$2,001,000 in 1922, \$1,411,000 in 1923, \$2,814,000 in 1924, \$2,938,000 in 1925, \$2,793,000 in 1926, \$1,909,000 in 1927, \$1,168,000 in 1928, \$2,234,000 in 1929, \$2,234,000 in 1930, \$2,965,000 in 1931, and \$2,750,000 in 1932.



TABLE No. 1-E.—

[All figures

Agency	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
<b>a. Public buildings:</b>							
1. Architect of the Capitol.....							
2. White House.....							
3. Procurement Division.....	\$3,134	\$3,209	\$3,454	\$2,450	\$2,756	\$1,940	\$3,736
4. Public Buildings Administration.....							
5. Supreme Court.....							
6. Federal Security Agency.....							
7. U. S. Maritime Commission.....							
8. Department of Agriculture, Government Island, Calif.....							
9. American Red Cross.....							
10. Warehouse, Washington, D. C.....							
11. War Department.....	808						
12. Legislative buildings and grounds, Interior Department.....	679						
13. Courthouse, Interior Department.....	3						
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>9,714</b>	<b>5,209</b>	<b>3,454</b>	<b>2,450</b>	<b>2,756</b>	<b>1,940</b>	<b>8,736</b>
<b>b. Research facilities:</b>							
1. Bureau of Animal Industry.....							
2. Bureau of Dairy Industry.....							
3. Bureau of Plant Industry.....							
4. Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.....							
5. Bureau of Agricultural Engineering.....							
6. Weather Bureau.....							
7. Beltsville.....							
8. Agricultural Research Stations.....							
9. Miscellaneous agricultural research facilities.....							
10. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....							
11. Bureau of Standards.....							
12. Bureau of Mines.....							
13. Bureau of the Census.....							
<b>Total.....</b>							
<b>c. Surveys and investigations:</b>							
1. Geological Survey.....							
2. International Boundary Commission, United States, Canada, Alaska.....							
3. Coast and Geodetic Survey.....							
<b>Total.....</b>							
<b>d. Welfare and health:</b>							
1. Bureau of Indian Affairs.....							
2. Veterans' Administration.....		11,853	10,060	11,238	4,673	5,150	4,599
3. Bureau of Prisons.....	182	190	112	99	178	618	1,261
4. Department of Interior, hospitals.....	103	11	119	274	240	213	116
5. Department of State, sanitation.....							
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>12,054</b>	<b>10,291</b>	<b>11,611</b>	<b>5,091</b>	<b>5,981</b>	<b>5,976</b>
<b>e. Law enforcement:</b>							
1. Immigration and Naturalization Service.....	311	80	174	141	410	73	61
2. Department of Commerce.....							
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Education:</b>							
1. Howard University.....		177	24	3	47	150	233
2. Smithsonian Institution.....							
3. Expositions and memorials, miscellaneous agencies.....	47	351					
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>528</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>233</b>
<b>f. Housing:</b>							
1. Interior, subsistence homesteads.....							
2. District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Authority.....							
<b>Total.....</b>							
<b>g. District of Columbia, total.....</b>							
<b>h. Facilities outside continental United States:</b>							
1. Foreign Service buildings office.....							
2. American Battle Monuments Commission.....							
3. Alaska, miscellaneous agencies.....				45	27		
4. Puerto Rico, miscellaneous agencies.....							
5. Philippine Islands, miscellaneous agencies.....							
6. Virgin Islands—miscellaneous agencies.....							
<b>Total.....</b>				<b>45</b>	<b>27</b>		
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>10,357</b>	<b>17,961</b>	<b>13,943</b>	<b>14,250</b>	<b>8,331</b>	<b>8,144</b>	<b>15,006</b>

TABLE No. 1-F.—

[All figures

Agency	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
<b>6. Miscellaneous: Various agencies, total.....</b>			<b>1,294</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>811</b>	<b>1,560</b>

\* The figures from 1934 to 1940, inclusive, represent residual amounts after the Department of Commerce figures on Federal grants for highways were deducted from the total grants and expenditures of the Bureau of Public Roads as reflected in table No. 3 of the Budget.

† Appears in statement No. 2 but not in statement No. 6 of the Budget.

‡ Appears in statement No. 2 but not in statement No. 5 of the Budget.

§ Up to the end of the fiscal year 1926 expenditures for flood control are included under "Rivers and harbors." Maintenance is included.

|| Maintenance and operation included.

¶ There is a discrepancy between Budget statements Nos. 2 and 6 which evidently arose from a transposition of numbers in the item listed for the Alaska R. R. (\$4,446,000 in statement No. 6 and \$4,473,000 in statement No. 2.)



5. Government plant  
in thousands]

1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941
		\$1,143	\$3,367	\$3,201	\$5,237	\$1,563	\$1,650	\$1,594	\$3,505	\$4,950	\$1,142	\$328	\$202
\$7,194	\$30,785	188	9	3									
		42,802	69,014	90,603	108,800	76,408	56,631	66,708	75,047	74,857	51,127	56,940	55,890
			297	487	3,545	2,640	1,773	726	42	120	10		
				125	595						862	811	1,128
			43	608		37					365		
		161	272	594									
7,194	30,785	44,294	73,002	100,621	118,177	80,648	60,054	69,028	78,594	79,927	53,506	53,079	57,221
		28	80	28	30	995	683	15	205	153	70	54	52
		43	75	38	23	131	130	29		10	10	15	12
		198	181	81	21	820	580	262	41	338	35	33	87
		21	20	4	11	72	106	57	6	7	492	16	10
		43		5	4	95	121	26	17	3	21	40	16
				43	3	75	90					18	230
		24	21	13	1	6	96	423	37	33	1,641	2,029	1,139
			26	31	6	80		1	89	202	251	3,062	4,182
		757	236			179	349	152	8	53	165	75	75
	51	510	510	389	5	202	217	178	293	6	34	988	10,150
		95	46		4			313	218	33	31	337	229
		42									449		
	51	1,333	1,195	632	108	2,655	2,524	1,312	908	838	3,034	6,757	16,182
						751	797	123	202	110	730	73	67
					1	23	1	130	285	1,931	56		
		3	3	3	3	4	3		1		556	110	528
		3	3	4	4	778	801	253	488	2,041	1,342	<sup>16</sup> 230	<sup>16</sup> 1,570
5,222	4,044	1,737	2,891	2,759	2,237	4,694	5,626	7,234	10,703	3,489	6,587	5,171	5,435
1,251	524	9,948	10,613	12,048	14,303	3,309	2,864	3,808	9,218	9,634	11,715	14,546	7,020
136	40	471	1,478	3,915	2,563	502	65	525	2,403	2,013	6,406	8,651	255
		661	387	515	753	892	533	335	71	255	391	819	535
6,609	4,608	12,817	15,369	19,237	19,856	9,397	9,088	11,902	22,540	15,391	25,099	<sup>17</sup> 31,503	<sup>18</sup> 13,545
30	183					1,219	117	272	99	148	105		
			28										
30	183		28			1,219	117	272	99	148	105		
149	9	14	488	309		227	668	680	388	801	473	189	79
			30							2		270	
		107	209	492	633	306	114	84	127	446	2,739	1,238	1,383
149	9	121	727	801	633	533	782	764	515	1,249	3,212	1,697	1,462
						2,372		312		13	65		
						2,372		312		13	65		<sup>19</sup> 100,000
		7,637	10,410	12,875	7,736	4,205	8,000	12,345	6,871	7,183	20,495	19,661	8,880
		1,939	617	2,402	11	201	17	552	17	69	357	485	705
		1,195	1,180	656	285	257	112	16	12				
		429	479	555	86	834	734	664	206	421	158	133	29
		10	1,027	1,209	177	239	1,061	1,966	12,204	926	4,765	2,523	752
						148	200	15	43	43	294	312	
								718	763	481	513	292	206
		3,573	3,303	4,822	707	1,731	2,642	3,976	13,738	1,940	6,087	3,745	1,692
13,982	35,636	69,775	104,037	138,991	147,221	103,538	84,008	100,164	123,753	108,730	112,945	121,672	200,552

6. Miscellaneous

in thousands of dollars]

1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941
2,941	16,309												

<sup>13</sup> Credit of \$96,000.00 deducted in Budget statement No. 2.  
<sup>14</sup> Cemeterial and parks.  
<sup>15</sup> Includes \$2,900,000 of miscellaneous defense construction by the Department of State not itemized in the table.  
<sup>16</sup> Includes \$47,000 of construction by Bureau of Mines not itemized in the table.  
<sup>17</sup> Includes \$975,000 of construction by Bureau of Mines not itemized in the table.

<sup>18</sup> Includes \$2,316,000 of construction by the Public Health Service not itemized in the table.  
<sup>19</sup> Includes \$300,000 of construction by the Public Health Service not itemized in the table.  
<sup>20</sup> Consists of \$100,000,000 of national defense housing construction by the Federal Works Agency not itemized in the table.

TABLE No. 2.—Summary of expenditures for construction by Federal corporate and

[All figures

Function	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
2. Public land development:							
a. Miscellaneous, total.....							
3. Transportation:							
d. Miscellaneous, <sup>1</sup> total.....	\$4,102	\$1,469	\$631	\$312	\$1,108	\$887	\$1,605
4. Government plant:							
g. Housing, total.....							
Grand total.....	4,102	1,469	631	312	1,108	887	1,605

TABLE

[All figures

Agency	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
2. Public land development:							
a. Miscellaneous:							
1. Farm Security Administration, <sup>2</sup> total.....							
3. Transportation:							
d. Miscellaneous:							
1. Inland Waterways Corporation <sup>3</sup> .....	\$2,335	\$1,459	\$604	\$114	\$824	\$476	\$1,139
2. Panama R. R. Co. <sup>4</sup> .....	1,767	10	27	198	284	411	466
Total.....	4,102	1,469	631	312	1,108	887	1,605
4. Government plant:							
e. Housing:							
1. Farm Security Administration <sup>2</sup> .....							
2. U. S. Housing Authority <sup>5</sup> .....							
(P. W. A. Housing Division).....							
Total.....							

<sup>1</sup> Includes vessels.

<sup>2</sup> Source is U. S. Department of Agriculture Report on the financial status and operations of the Farm Security Administration from inception to June 30, 1939, statement of reconciliation of changes in net worth with statement of revenues and expenditures for each fiscal year from 1935 to 1939, inclusive. 1940 figures represent special tabulation. The real properties (including land) purchased and constructed

by the Farm Security Administration and its predecessors include rehabilitation projects of several types, community or contiguous farm projects, separate farms subsistence homestead projects, suburban housing projects and migratory labor camps. Subsistence homestead projects acquired from the Department of the Interior have been excluded. The land utilization projects cover conservation of all kinds, forestation, terracing, check dams, soil conservation, etc. The cost of land

TABLE No. 3.—Summary of expenditures for Federal grants for public construction

[All figures

Function	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
1. Water use and control:							
a. Flood control.....							
c. Reclamation and irrigation.....							
d. Transmission and electric plant.....							
e. Public water supply systems.....							
f. Public sewer systems.....							
g. Miscellaneous.....							
Total.....							
2. Public land development:							
b. Forests.....							
d. Soil erosion control.....							
e. Miscellaneous.....							
Total.....							
3. Transportation:							
a. Roads.....	\$57,452	\$91,653	\$72,148	\$80,969	\$95,337	\$88,480	\$82,975
c. Aids and assistance to navigation.....							
d. Airports and airways.....							
h. Railroads.....							
i. Miscellaneous.....							
Total.....	57,452	91,653	72,148	80,969	95,337	88,480	82,975
4. Defense, total.....							
5. Government plant:							
a. Public buildings.....							
d. Welfare and health.....							
f. Education.....							
g. Housing.....							
j. Recreation.....							
k. Utilities.....							
l. Miscellaneous.....							
Total.....							
6. Miscellaneous, total.....							
Grand total <sup>1</sup> .....	57,452	91,653	72,148	80,969	95,337	88,480	82,975

See footnotes on pages 92 and 93.

quasi-corporate agencies classified according to function, fiscal years 1921-40 inclusive

in thousands]

1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
							\$2	\$18,099	\$47,649			\$5
\$2,523	\$1,633	\$3,839	\$3,177	\$1,639	\$366	\$329	31	134	914	\$5,589	\$10,524	
						5	9,014	33,295	99,992	79,408	9,422	6,024
2,523	1,633	3,839	3,177	1,639	366	334	9,047	51,528	148,555	84,997	19,946	6,029

No. 2-A

in thousands]

1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
							\$2	\$18,099	\$47,649			\$5
\$1,566 957	\$1,151 452	\$3,201 638	\$2,709 468	\$1,090 549	\$324 42	\$312 17	31	133	305 609	\$1,754 3,835	\$1,250 9,274	(9) (9)
2,523	1,633	3,839	3,177	1,639	366	329	31	134	914	5,589	10,524	
							212	11,668	49,930	33,123 22,744	5,970 3,452	5,803 221
						5	8,802	21,627	50,062	23,541		
						5	9,014	33,295	99,992	79,408	9,422	6,024

and equipment is included.

\* Source is special statement of Inland Waterways Corporation. 1940 data not available; books kept on calendar year basis.

† Estimated.

‡ Source is special statement of Panama R. R. Co. 1940 data not available. From 1937 to 1939 expenditures of the Panama R. R. Steamship Line are included.

§ The P. W. A. Housing Division projects were turned over to the United States Housing Authority in November 1937.

classified according to function, fiscal years 1921-40, inclusive <sup>1</sup>

in thousands]

1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
						\$29,514 4,088 62	\$140 24,101 35	\$9,152 44,319 13,728	\$494 57,786 9,133	\$530 37,175	\$45,646 1,130	\$25,352 810
						200	17,494	36,497	44,336	39,623	62,768	43,124
						419	34,769	101,165	103,883	88,849	136,330	90,511
						18	1,248	1,248	1,728	1,942	2,260	1,619
						34,301	76,888	206,109	217,410	168,119	248,134	161,416
						351	2,032	2,134	981	1,416	7,839	4,613
						81,774	2,194	4,050	6,367	1,012	2,644	1,797
						321	1,860	17,047	21,904	3,382	7,226	8,930
						82,446	6,086	23,231	29,252	5,810	17,709	15,340
\$82,515	\$84,007	\$77,891	\$155,889	\$188,717	\$165,735	494,846 524	446,916 2,975	625,608 4,450	878,268 6,274	670,595 5,122	1,009,419 6,013	697,456 4,166
						11,856	10,329	18,150	35,107	21,320	34,381	19,441
						252	2,514	1,347	1,258	1,428	1,551	1,675
								13,113	12,433	19,208	34,561	24,581
82,515	84,007	77,891	155,889	188,717	165,735	507,478	462,734	662,668	933,340	717,673	1,085,925	747,819
							5,518	6,544	16,354	11,556	34,870	22,042
						122,153 37,083 330	19,000 22,217 35,923	37,901 65,104 110,504	57,910 77,689 124,365	39,825 45,312 104,436	51,835 63,464 181,912	36,615 40,668 127,383
						35,359	86,376	168,016	186,403	130,647	166,933	92,785
						29,224	4,981	8,414	26,958	11,919	33,179	36,004
						35	17,891	15,891	18,161	18,827	25,578	23,631
						224,184	186,388	408,298	497,295	351,215	526,921	358,030
						33,204	978	8,112	2,962	1,412	5,274	3,778
82,515	84,007	77,891	155,889	188,717	165,735	881,613	738,592	1,314,962	1,696,613	1,255,785	1,918,833	1,307,925

TABLE NO. 3-A.—1. Water use and control  
[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>a. Flood control:</b>							
1. PWA	\$11	\$140	\$9,152	\$494	\$530		
2. WPA	29,503						
Total	29,514	140	9,152	494	530		
<b>c. Reclamation and irrigation:</b>							
1. PWA	25	594	416	1,481	353	\$377	\$270
2. WPA	4,063	23,807	43,908	56,305	36,822	45,269	25,082
Total	4,088	24,101	44,319	57,786	37,175	45,646	25,352
<b>d. Transmission and electric plant:</b>							
1. PWA, total	62	35	13,728	9,133		1,130	810
<b>e. Public water supply systems:</b>							
1. PWA	200	3,142	12,896	15,057	12,004	29,383	21,048
2. WPA	(?)	14,352	23,601	29,329	27,619	33,385	22,076
Total	200	17,494	36,497	44,386	39,623	62,768	43,124
<b>f. Public sewer systems:</b>							
1. PWA	419	3,107	29,950	14,070	18,359	23,630	20,508
2. WPA	(?)	31,662	71,215	89,813	73,490	107,700	70,003
Total	419	34,769	101,165	103,883	88,849	136,330	90,511
<b>g. Miscellaneous:</b>							
1. PWA, total	13	349	1,248	1,728	1,942	2,260	1,619
Grand total	34,301	76,838	206,109	217,410	168,119	248,134	161,416

TABLE NO. 3-B.—2. Public land development<sup>1</sup>  
[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>a. Forests:</b>							
1. WPA, total	\$351	\$2,032	\$2,134	\$981	\$1,416	\$7,839	\$4,613
<b>d. Soil erosion control:</b>							
1. PWA				(?)	176	(?)	(?)
2. WPA	81,774	2,194	4,050	6,367	836	2,644	1,797
Total	81,774	2,194	4,050	6,367	1,012	2,644	1,797
<b>e. Miscellaneous:</b>							
1. WPA, total	321	1,860	17,047	21,904	3,382	7,226	8,930
Grand total	82,446	6,086	23,231	29,252	5,810	17,709	15,340

See footnotes on pages 92 and 93.

TABLE No. 3-C.—

[All figures

Agency	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
<b>e. Roads:</b>							
1. PWA.....							
2. WPA.....							
3. Bureau of Public Roads.....	\$57,452	\$91,653	\$72,148	\$80,969	\$95,337	\$88,480	\$82,975
Total.....	57,452	91,653	72,148	80,969	95,337	88,480	82,975
<b>c. Aids and Assistance to Navigation:</b>							
1. PWA.....							
2. WPA.....							
Total.....							
<b>d. Airports and Airways:</b>							
1. PWA.....							
2. WPA.....							
Total.....							
<b>A. Railroads:</b>							
1. WPA.....							
<b>f. Miscellaneous:</b>							
1. PWA.....							
2. WPA.....							
Total.....							
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>57,452</b>	<b>91,653</b>	<b>72,148</b>	<b>80,969</b>	<b>95,337</b>	<b>88,480</b>	<b>82,975</b>

TABLE No. 3-D.—

[All figures

Agency	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
<b>1. WPA,<sup>a</sup> total.....</b>							

<sup>a</sup> : WPA figures derived from report Showing the Financial Status of Funds Provided in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939 published by the U. S. Treasury Department as of June 30, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1940. The figures for 1934 represent CWA and FERA Expenditures. CWA data were drawn from Analysis of Civil Works Program Statistics published by the Works Progress Administration in June 1939 with certain adjustments made to exclude non-Federal contributions. The source of the FERA material was a mimeographed pamphlet issued by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Estimated Total Costs of Projects Conducted Under the Emergency Work Relief Program, Continental United States. Data for construction outside continental United States could not be obtained. The FERA figures were distributed over the fiscal years 1934, 1935, and 1936 in accordance with a special tabulation of earnings on FERA projects prepared by the Work Projects Administration. The 1935 figures appearing under WPA in the supporting tables represent FERA expenditures, while the

amounts given for 1936 include both WPA and FERA expenditures. All CWA, FERA, and WPA expenditures were reduced by 15 percent at the suggestion of WPA to exclude maintenance. Cumulative expenditures of \$27,786,000 for land utilization and rural rehabilitation programs administered by the Farm Security Administration could not be excluded from the WPA figures. They are not included in the Farm Security Administration totals. However, transfers to all other Federal agencies are not included under WPA. The Bureau of Public Roads (now Public Roads Administration) figures are those reported by the Department of Commerce. The project type distribution of PWA grants was estimated by applying the percentage which each project type was of the total grant allotment for each fiscal year to the grant payments made within each year. Since grant allotments by project type were not available for 1940 the 1939 percentages were applied to the 1940 grant payment data.

3. Transportation

(in thousands)

1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
						\$157	\$6,518	\$17,887	\$27,153	\$13,770	\$67,054	\$48,033
						270,879	158,882	377,364	504,575	426,136	749,231	482,141
\$82,515	\$84,007	\$77,891	\$155,889	\$188,717	\$165,735	223,810	281,516	230,357	346,540	230,689	193,134	167,282
82,515	84,007	77,891	155,889	188,717	165,735	494,846	446,916	625,608	878,268	670,595	1,009,419	697,456
						11	10	187	247	1,589	2,637	1,889
						513	2,965	4,263	6,027	3,533	3,376	2,277
						524	2,975	4,450	6,274	5,122	6,013	4,166
						2		21	247	177	377	270
						11,854	10,329	18,129	34,860	21,143	34,004	19,171
						11,856	10,329	18,150	35,107	21,320	34,381	19,441
								1,347	1,258	1,428	1,551	1,675
						252	2,514	13,104	12,095	18,359	34,281	24,557
								9	338	849	280	24
						252	2,514	13,113	12,433	19,208	34,561	24,581
82,515	84,007	77,891	155,889	188,717	165,735	507,478	462,734	662,668	933,340	717,673	1,085,925	747,319

4. Defense

(in thousands)

1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
							\$5,518	\$6,544	\$16,354	\$11,556	\$34,870	\$22,042

<sup>1</sup> The cost of land is not included in WPA construction grants, the land being supplied by the sponsor. However, in the case of PWA, 1.4 percent of the total estimated cost of projects constructed under the PWA non-Federal program was for the purchase of the site. The RFC states that an extremely small proportion of its loans was expended for the purchase of land, in most cases the entire proceeds of the loan having been used for construction.

<sup>2</sup> Includes waterways.

<sup>3</sup> Includes some grants for flood control.

<sup>4</sup> Water power development.

<sup>5</sup> The CWA reports do give a break-down of utilities grants which probably include some made for sewer and water systems.

<sup>6</sup> Some expenditures for wildlife are listed for WPA in the source but since according to WPA they were not for construction they have been excluded from this tabulation.

<sup>7</sup> Includes parks.

<sup>8</sup> Less than 0.1 percent of total; no estimate made.

<sup>9</sup> Includes bridges, tunnels, viaducts, subways, wharves, and small amount for "other" engineering structures.

<sup>10</sup> In the source this item is described as "Federal government buildings including military and naval" mainly armories according to WPA.

<sup>11</sup> Includes improvement of grounds around public buildings.

<sup>12</sup> A break-down of CWA expenditures for public buildings is not available. This figure is a total which is not comparable with the amounts given for public buildings in all other years since it includes all types of buildings.

<sup>13</sup> One-half the amount listed as having been spent for Sanitation and Health is considered by WPA to have been for construction.

<sup>14</sup> CWA does not give a break-down of "Utilities." Therefore, this may include water and sewer systems which elsewhere have been classified as water use and control.

TABLE No. 3-E.—5. Government Plant

[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>a. Public buildings:</b>							
1. PWA.....	862	\$1,257	\$3,320	\$19,760	\$12,534	\$19,880	\$14,032
2. WPA <sup>1</sup> .....	122,091	17,743	29,581	39,150	27,291	32,246	22,683
Total.....	122,153	19,000	37,901	57,910	39,825	51,835	36,615
<b>d. Welfare and health:</b>							
1. PWA.....	127	3,666	14,768	41,716	17,301	29,383	21,048
2. WPA <sup>1</sup> .....	36,956	18,551	50,336	33,973	28,011	34,081	19,620
Total.....	37,083	22,217	65,104	77,689	45,312	63,464	40,668
<b>f. Education:</b>							
1. PWA.....	330	8,623	70,302	74,053	67,084	129,588	92,829
2. WPA.....		27,300	40,202	50,312	37,852	52,324	84,555
Total.....	330	35,923	110,504	124,365	104,936	181,912	127,383
<b>g. Housing:</b>							
1. WPA, total.....			2,468	5,809	249	3,970	944
<b>i. Recreation:</b>							
1. PWA.....	7	175	1,456	2,468	3,354	3,014	2,159
2. WPA.....	33,352	86,201	166,560	183,935	127,293	163,969	90,626
Total.....	33,359	86,376	168,016	186,403	130,647	166,983	92,785
<b>k. Utilities:</b>							
1. PWA.....	16	2,793	2,288	15,798	2,118	12,431	8,905
2. WPA.....	29,208	2,188	6,126	11,160	9,801	20,748	27,099
Total.....	29,224	4,981	8,414	26,958	11,919	33,179	36,004
<b>l. Miscellaneous:</b>							
1. PWA.....	35	1,012	4,160	9,380	8,474	11,301	8,096
2. WPA.....		16,879	11,731	8,781	10,353	14,277	15,835
Total.....	35	17,891	15,891	18,161	18,827	25,578	23,931
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>224,184</b>	<b>186,388</b>	<b>408,298</b>	<b>497,295</b>	<b>351,215</b>	<b>526,921</b>	<b>358,030</b>

See footnotes on pages 92 and 93.

TABLE No. 3-F.—6. Miscellaneous

[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>a. PWA.....</b>	<b>886</b>	<b>978</b>	<b>83,112</b>	<b>82,962</b>	<b>81,412</b>	<b>83,274</b>	<b>83,778</b>
<b>b. WPA.....</b>	<b>33,118</b>						
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>33,204</b>	<b>978</b>	<b>83,112</b>	<b>82,962</b>	<b>81,412</b>	<b>83,274</b>	<b>83,778</b>

TABLE No. 4.—Summary of expenditures for Federal loans for public construction classified according to function, fiscal years 1933-40, inclusive<sup>1</sup>

[All figures in thousands]

Function	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>1. Water use and control:</b>								
a. Flood control.....		\$797	\$1,284	\$14,493	\$366	\$668		
b. Reclamation and irrigation.....	\$1,765	4,895	7,947	1,258	3,501	1,188	\$1,400	\$786
c. Transmission and electric plant.....		8,427	8,843	38,193	9,174		11,510	3,581
d. Public water supply systems.....	10,415	28,207	41,904	45,537	44,935	31,549	22,816	14,412
e. Public sewer systems.....	136	20,615	11,301	10,467	2,192	2,172	2,375	2,623
f. Miscellaneous.....		507	2,711	1,074	510	1,571	932	1,057
Total.....	12,316	63,448	73,990	111,022	61,178	37,148	39,042	22,459
<b>2. Public land development:</b>								
a. Soil erosion control.....							104	117
Total.....							104	117
<b>3. Transportation:</b>								
a. Roads.....		2,173	11,841	1,745	408	267	11,876	31,043
b. Aids and assistance to navigation.....		797	143	268		468		
c. Miscellaneous.....	15,939	28,424	21,307	56,753	15,828	8,471	9,832	9,220
Total.....	15,939	41,394	33,291	58,766	16,236	9,206	21,708	40,263
<b>4. Government plant:</b>								
a. Public buildings.....		1,598	6,109	1,749	713	1,303	2,879	2,584
b. Welfare and health.....		2,680	13,696	2,818	204	134	6,734	7,632
c. Education.....		11,452	42,167	15,303	7,391	5,514	10,487	12,156
d. Recreation.....		217	856	5,502		134	259	294
e. Utilities.....		435	11,413	2,836	21,938	49,780	68,254	105,701
f. Miscellaneous.....		145	11,699	805	612	13,268	7,511	8,513
Total.....		16,527	85,940	29,013	40,858	70,133	96,124	136,890
<b>5. Housing.....</b>						3,388	55,562	196,263
Total.....						3,388	55,562	196,263
<b>7. Miscellaneous.....</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>3,652</b>	<b>5,243</b>	<b>787</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>10,916</b>	<b>42,401</b>
Total.....	840	3,652	5,243	787	153	267	10,916	42,401
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>29,095</b>	<b>125,021</b>	<b>198,464</b>	<b>199,588</b>	<b>118,425</b>	<b>120,142</b>	<b>223,456</b>	<b>438,353</b>

See footnotes on page 96.

TABLE No. 4-A.—1. Water use and control  
[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>a. Flood control:</b>								
1. PWA.....		\$797	\$1,284	\$14,493	\$866	\$668		
Total.....		797	1,284	14,493	866	668		
<b>c. Reclamation and irrigation:</b>								
1. PWA.....		1,955	5,279	403	2,294	668	\$363	\$411
2. RFC.....	\$1,765	2,940	2,668	855	1,207	520	1,046	375
Total.....	1,765	4,895	7,947	1,258	3,501	1,188	1,409	786
<b>d. Transmission and electric plant:</b>								
1. PWA.....		4,490	428	27,644	9,174		3,161	3,581
2. RFC.....		3,937	8,415	10,549			8,349	
Total.....		8,427	8,843	38,193	9,174		11,510	3,581
<b>e. Public water-supply systems:</b>								
1. PWA.....		7,532	19,116	8,454	4,383	2,741	2,227	2,524
2. RFC.....	10,415	20,675	22,788	37,083	40,552	28,808	20,589	11,888
Total.....	10,415	28,207	41,904	45,537	44,935	31,549	22,816	14,412
<b>f. Public sewer systems:</b>								
1. PWA.....		19,844	11,271	10,467	2,192	2,172	2,020	2,290
2. RFC.....	136	771	30				355	333
Total.....	136	20,615	11,301	10,467	2,192	2,172	2,375	2,623
<b>g. Miscellaneous:</b>								
1. PWA.....		507	2,711	1,074	510	1,571	932	1,057
Total.....		507	2,711	1,074	510	1,571	932	1,057
Grant total.....	12,316	63,448	73,990	111,022	61,178	37,148	39,042	22,459

TABLE No. 4-B.—2. Public land development  
[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>d. Soil erosion control:</b>								
1. PWA.....							\$104	\$117
Total.....							104	117
Grand total.....							104	117

TABLE No. 4-C.—3. Transportation  
[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>a. Roads:</b>								
1. PWA.....		\$2,173	\$11,841	\$1,745	\$408	\$267	\$2,435	\$2,760
2. RFC.....							9,441	28,283
Total.....		2,173	11,841	1,745	408	267	11,876	31,043
<b>c. Aids and assistance to navigation:</b>								
1. PWA.....		797	143	268		468		
Total.....		797	143	268		468		
<b>i. Miscellaneous:</b>								
1. PWA.....		19,046	2,283	41,600	1,223	2,640	829	939
2. RFC.....	\$15,939	19,378	19,024	15,153	14,605	5,831	9,003	8,281
Total.....	15,939	38,424	21,307	56,753	15,828	8,471	9,832	9,220
Grand total.....	15,939	41,394	33,291	58,766	16,236	9,206	21,708	40,263

See footnotes on page 96



TABLE No. 4-D.—5. Government Plant

[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>a. Public buildings:</b>								
1. PWA.....		\$369	\$3,709	\$1,074	\$663	\$1,303	\$363	\$411
2. RFC.....		729	2,400	673	50		2,516	2,173
Total.....		1,098	6,109	1,749	713	1,303	2,879	2,584
<b>d. Welfare and health:</b>								
1. PWA.....		2,680	13,696	2,818	204	134	6,734	7,632
Total.....		2,680	13,696	2,818	204	134	6,734	7,632
<b>f. Education</b>								
1. PWA.....		10,356	41,945	15,298	7,391	5,514	8,755	9,921
2. RFC.....		1,096	222	8			1,732	2,236
Total.....		11,452	42,167	15,303	7,391	5,514	10,487	12,156
<b>g. Recreation:</b>								
1. PWA.....		217	856	5,502		134	259	294
Total.....		217	856	5,502		134	259	294
<b>h. Utilities:</b>								
1. PWA.....		435	11,413	2,013	20,896	1,604	5,957	6,782
2. REA <sup>c</sup> .....				823	11,042	48,176	62,297	98,949
Total.....		435	11,413	2,836	31,938	49,780	68,254	105,701
<b>i. Miscellaneous:</b>								
1. PWA.....		145	11,699	805	612	13,268	7,511	8,513
Total.....		145	11,699	805	612	13,268	7,511	8,513
<b>Grand total.....</b>		<b>16,527</b>	<b>85,940</b>	<b>29,013</b>	<b>40,858</b>	<b>70,133</b>	<b>96,124</b>	<b>136,890</b>

TABLE No. 4-E.—6. Housing

[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>1. U. S. H. A.....</b>						\$3,388	\$55,562	\$196,263
<b>Total.....</b>						<b>3,388</b>	<b>55,562</b>	<b>196,263</b>

TABLE No. 4-F.—7. Miscellaneous

[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>1. PWA.....</b>		\$579	\$4,993	\$537	\$153	\$267	\$10,152	\$11,507
<b>2. RFC.....</b>	\$840	3,073	250	250			764	30,894
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>3,652</b>	<b>5,243</b>	<b>787</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>10,916</b>	<b>42,401</b>
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>3,652</b>	<b>5,243</b>	<b>787</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>10,916</b>	<b>42,401</b>

<sup>1</sup> Compiled from special tabulations prepared by the United States Housing Authority, Rural Electrification Administration, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The project type distribution of Public Works Administration loans was estimated by applying the percentage which each project type was of the total loan allotment for each fiscal year to the loan payments to public agencies within that fiscal year as recorded by the Public Works Administration. Since loan allotments by project type were not available for 1940, the 1939 percentages were applied to the 1940 loan payment data.

<sup>2</sup> Includes loans to mutual associations and cooperatives.  
<sup>3</sup> Seven-tenths of one percent of the loans for power development were made for the construction of steam and Diesel engine plants.  
<sup>4</sup> A minute percentage of the loans made by REA was to private utility companies, almost the entire amount having been lent to cooperatives and publicly owned utilities.

TABLE NO. 5.—Summary of expenditures for Federal loans and Federal guaranties for private construction, classified according to function, fiscal years 1933-40, inclusive <sup>1</sup>

[All figures in thousands]

Function	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
1. Water use and control:								
a. Flood control.....		\$11						
c. Reclamation and irrigation.....		422	\$521					
e. Public water-supply systems.....	\$87	115	53					
g. Miscellaneous.....		427						
Total.....	87	975	574					
2. Land development:								
e. Miscellaneous.....						\$199	\$584	\$1,034
Total.....						199	584	1,034
3. Transportation:								
h. Railroads <sup>1</sup> .....		74,494	101,309	\$24,077	\$1,095			
i. Miscellaneous.....	99	1,932	225					
Total.....	99	76,426	101,534	24,077	1,095			
5. General facilities:								
d. Welfare and health.....		422	6,457	113				
f. Education.....		76	1,855	6,924				
i. Miscellaneous.....	217	541	2,286	448	1,875	1,518	6,330	8,919
Total.....	217	1,039	10,598	7,485	1,875	1,518	6,330	8,919
6. Housing, total.....		5,312	23,052	197,726	399,348	427,564	675,092	706,784
7. Miscellaneous, total.....					3,512	180		
Grand total <sup>2</sup> .....	403	83,752	135,758	229,288	405,830	429,461	682,006	716,737

TABLE NO. 5-A.—1. Water use and control

[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
a. Flood control:								
1. PWA, total.....		\$11						
c. Reclamation and irrigation:								
1. PWA.....		68						
2. RFC.....		354	\$521					
Total.....		422	521					
e. Public water-supply system:								
1. PWA.....		66	53					
2. RFC.....	\$87	49						
Total.....	87	115	53					
g. Miscellaneous:								
1. PWA, total.....		427						
Grand total.....	87	975	574					

TABLE NO. 5-B.—2. Land development

[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
e. Miscellaneous:								
1. Farm Security Administration <sup>2</sup> .....								
Total.....						\$199	\$584	\$1,034
Grand total.....						199	584	1,034

See footnotes on page 98.

TABLE No. 5-C.—3. Transportation

[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>k. Railroads:</b>								
1. PWA, total.....		\$74,404	\$101,309	\$24,077	\$1,005			
<b>l. Miscellaneous:<sup>6</sup></b>								
1. PWA.....		247						
2. RFC.....	\$99	1,685	225					
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>1,932</b>	<b>225</b>					
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>76,426</b>	<b>101,534</b>	<b>24,077</b>	<b>1,005</b>			

TABLE No. 5-D.—5. General facilities

[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>d. Welfare and health:</b>								
1. PWA, total.....		\$422	\$6,457	\$113				
<b>f. Education:</b>								
1. PWA, total.....		76	1,853	6,924				
<b>l. Miscellaneous:</b>								
1. PWA.....		34	2,236					
2. RFC.....	\$217	807	60					
3. RFC Mortgage Co. <sup>7</sup> .....				448	\$1,875	\$1,022	\$4,811	\$5,732
4. FSA.....						496	2,019	3,187
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>841</b>	<b>2,286</b>	<b>448</b>	<b>1,875</b>	<b>1,518</b>	<b>6,830</b>	<b>8,919</b>
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>1,039</b>	<b>10,598</b>	<b>7,485</b>	<b>1,875</b>	<b>1,518</b>	<b>6,330</b>	<b>8,919</b>

TABLE No. 5-E.—6. Housing

[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>1. PWA.....</b>		\$697	\$7,172	\$2,243	\$285			
<b>2. RFC.....</b>		4,615	3,491	71	37			
<b>3. FSA<sup>8</sup>.....</b>						\$561	\$2,138	\$4,137
<b>4. FHA.....</b>			12,389	193,412	399,026	427,003	672,954	702,647
<b>Total.....</b>		<b>5,312</b>	<b>23,052</b>	<b>197,726</b>	<b>399,348</b>	<b>427,564</b>	<b>675,092</b>	<b>706,784</b>

TABLE No. 5-F.—7. Miscellaneous

[All figures in thousands]

Agency	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
<b>1. PWA, total.....</b>					\$3,512	\$180		

<sup>1</sup> Special tabulations were prepared by the RFC, RFC Mortgage Co., FSA, and FHA. FSA figures for 1940 were taken from a report of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, Tenant Purchase Division entitled "Tenant Purchase Loans" Report No. 8. Certain data pertaining to the RFC was available in its quarterly reports as of June 30, 1938, and June 30, 1939. PWA loans to railroads and housing corporations are recorded figures. Other PWA loans payments were estimated by applying the percentage which each project type represented of the loan allotment in each fiscal year to the net figure remaining after deducting railroad and housing loan payments from total loan payments (private) within each fiscal year.

<sup>2</sup> If a portion of the loan was spent for the purchase of land this amount has been included. It is estimated by PWA that 1.4 percent of the total estimated cost of PWA non-Federal projects was for the purchase of land. In the case of FHA guaran-

ties because of certain compensating factors present it may be roughly estimated that the entire volume of loans insured was equivalent to the value of the improvements on the land. The mortgages insured represent about 85 percent of the total value of the property while the land amounts to about 15 percent of the total value. The RFC states that an infinitesimal proportion of its loans was expended for the purchase of land, in most cases the entire proceeds of the loan having been used for construction.

<sup>3</sup> Terracing, conservation of various types.

<sup>4</sup> Includes docks, terminals, bridges, and other structures.

<sup>5</sup> Loans on income-producing business properties; includes repairs and improvements.

<sup>6</sup> Loans to tenant farmers for purchase and construction under Bankhead-Jones Act.

TABLE No. 6.—Summary of Federal expenditures, corporation outlays, grants, loans, and

[All figures

Function	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
<b>1. Water use and control:</b>							
a. Flood Control <sup>1</sup> .....							\$11,591
b. TVA.....							2,752
c. Reclamation and irrigation.....	\$6,073	\$4,946	\$5,659	\$6,782	\$3,809	\$3,390	7,276
d. Transmission and electric plant.....							
e. Public water-supply systems.....							
f. Public sewerage systems.....							
g. Miscellaneous.....							
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>6,073</b>	<b>4,946</b>	<b>5,659</b>	<b>6,782</b>	<b>3,809</b>	<b>3,390</b>	<b>21,619</b>
<b>2. Public land development:</b>							
a. Parks <sup>2</sup> .....							1,812
b. Forests.....	6,382	6,263	6,459	7,817	13,066	12,714	12,151
c. Wildlife.....	129	36	25	5	1	7	24
d. Soil-erosion control.....							
e. Miscellaneous.....							
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>6,511</b>	<b>6,299</b>	<b>6,484</b>	<b>7,822</b>	<b>13,067</b>	<b>12,721</b>	<b>14,017</b>
<b>3. Transportation:</b>							
a. Roads.....	58,677	91,653	74,959	85,647	95,337	88,480	82,975
b. Rivers and harbors <sup>1</sup> .....	58,820	43,317	51,393	75,692	79,429	69,004	81,041
c. Aids and assistance to navigation.....	808	1,185	607	786	543	997	74
d. Airports and airways.....							
e. Panama Canal.....	16,461	11,062	3,621	7,142	9,093		
f. Nicaragua Canal.....							
g. Railroads <sup>2</sup> .....	11,328	4,368	4,473	3,036	2,358	1,875	2,038
h. Miscellaneous.....	2,910	1,459	604	114	824	476	1,139
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>149,004</b>	<b>153,044</b>	<b>135,657</b>	<b>172,417</b>	<b>187,584</b>	<b>160,832</b>	<b>137,267</b>
<b>4. Defense:</b>							
a. Navy Department.....	14,212	10,454	10,073	6,177	3,750	3,257	3,027
b. War Department.....	52,461	16,869	12,164	6,459	4,581	7,001	9,584
c. War Department—Nonmilitary.....	190						
d. Miscellaneous.....							
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>66,863</b>	<b>27,323</b>	<b>22,237</b>	<b>12,636</b>	<b>8,331</b>	<b>10,258</b>	<b>12,711</b>
<b>5. Government plant and general facilities:</b>							
a. Public buildings.....	9,714	5,299	3,454	2,450	2,756	1,940	3,736
b. Research facilities.....							
c. Surveys and investigations.....							
d. Welfare and health.....	285	12,054	10,291	11,611	5,091	5,981	5,976
e. Law enforcement.....	311	80	174	141	410	73	61
f. Education.....	47	528	24	3	47	150	233
g. District of Columbia.....							
h. Facilities outside continental United States.....				45	27		
i. Recreation.....							
j. Utilities.....							
k. Miscellaneous.....							
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>10,357</b>	<b>17,961</b>	<b>13,943</b>	<b>14,250</b>	<b>8,331</b>	<b>8,144</b>	<b>15,006</b>
<b>6. Housing, total.....</b>							
<b>7. Miscellaneous, total.....</b>			1,294	244	253	811	1,560
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>238,808</b>	<b>209,273</b>	<b>185,274</b>	<b>214,151</b>	<b>221,463</b>	<b>196,156</b>	<b>202,180</b>

<sup>1</sup> From 1921 to 1926, inclusive, expenditures for flood control are included under the item "Rivers and harbors."<sup>2</sup> From 1921 to 1926, inclusive, expenditures for the National Park Service are not listed in the Budget statement of construction expenditures.

The Program—for National Development

guaranties for new construction classified according to function, fiscal years 1921-40, inclusive

In thousands]

1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940*
\$13,271	\$25,340	\$22,805	\$35,844	\$27,996	\$35,118	\$72,184	\$35,827	\$65,119	\$51,640	\$66,177	\$76,444	\$105,749
711	330					8,020	31,179	41,685	35,545	36,538	31,543	39,136
9,534	10,613	9,398	9,442	23,577	25,832	34,575	75,117	96,524	112,935	105,345	129,154	124,828
		22	11	15	14	9,933	10,267	58,561	22,907	7,169	24,290	17,771
					10,502	28,522	59,451	82,034	89,321	71,172	85,584	57,536
					136	21,034	46,070	111,632	106,075	91,021	138,705	93,134
						952	3,060	2,322	2,238	3,513	3,192	2,676
23,516	36,283	32,225	45,297	51,588	71,602	175,220	260,971	457,757	420,661	380,935	488,912	440,830
3,416	4,149	4,077	6,252	6,913	6,537	8,675	13,826	14,538	23,190	18,023	21,158	16,072
11,001	12,462	11,097	20,641	18,117	12,799	25,399	24,816	23,034	23,894	19,878	26,542	17,524
4	19	292	463	350	158	568	843	1,995	1,987	1,490	2,747	1,098
				5	2	81,774	12,528	23,130	6,667	1,227	5,567	3,738
						321	1,862	35,146	69,553	3,581	7,810	9,969
14,421	16,630	15,466	27,356	25,385	19,496	116,737	53,875	102,843	125,291	44,199	63,824	48,401
82,515	86,000	80,874	162,608	197,059	171,352	500,773	462,853	630,094	880,702	672,803	1,023,212	730,628
58,870	57,718	47,437	53,598	55,842	49,123	79,116	133,036	152,195	147,470	99,047	76,779	61,573
290	900	876	1,488	2,955	2,644	3,311	6,379	5,710	8,439	7,405	14,646	9,260
		1,678	3,026	2,657	628	12,198	12,113	18,978	35,873	23,536	38,613	28,240
		1,418	1,280	2,220	5,276	4,582	1,956	2,478	2,620	2,223	2,457	15,700
		51	65									
957	482	902	666	804	199	74,864	101,665	25,886	3,400	5,791	11,307	2,033
1,566	1,151	5,950	3,782	2,671	16,716	40,950	24,047	69,872	28,589	29,458	45,643	33,801
144,198	146,251	139,186	226,513	264,208	245,938	715,793	742,049	905,213	1,106,993	840,263	1,212,657	881,235
4,885	7,314	8,103	12,941	13,246	12,626	14,110	13,686	14,463	19,053	14,979	48,094	81,652
6,288	13,338	11,585	25,655	29,718	13,796	35,542	34,280	17,374	23,676	34,375	61,499	72,248
	584	247	1,182	915		424	411	5,518	6,544	11,556	34,870	22,042
11,173	21,236	19,935	39,778	43,879	26,422	50,076	53,895	38,381	59,083	60,910	144,463	175,942
7,194	30,785	44,294	73,002	100,621	118,177	204,399	85,163	108,678	137,217	121,055	108,220	97,278
	51	1,333	1,195	632	108	2,655	2,524	1,312	908	838	3,034	6,757
			3	3	4	778	801	253	488	2,041	1,342	230
6,609	4,608	12,817	15,369	19,237	19,856	49,582	51,458	79,937	100,433	60,837	95,297	79,803
30	183		28			1,219	117	272	99	148	105	
149	9		727	801	633	12,391	80,727	133,495	132,271	111,199	195,611	141,236
			10,410	12,875	7,736	4,205	8,000	12,345	6,871	7,183	20,495	19,661
			3,573	4,822	707	1,731	2,642	3,976	13,738	1,940	6,087	3,745
						35,576	87,232	173,518	186,403	130,781	167,242	93,079
						29,659	16,394	11,250	58,896	61,699	101,433	141,705
						217	721	31,876	17,144	33,613	39,419	41,063
13,982	35,636	69,775	104,037	138,991	147,438	342,916	366,934	542,180	657,972	531,334	738,285	624,557
						7,689	32,066	233,801	505,149	510,622	744,111	910,015
2,941	16,309				840	36,856	6,221	8,899	6,627	1,859	16,190	46,179
210,231	272,345	276,587	442,981	524,051	511,736	1,445,287	1,516,011	2,289,074	2,881,776	2,370,122	3,408,442	3,127,159

\* Includes the Panama R. R. Co., which operates many enterprises in addition to the railroad, the most important being the Panama R. R. Steamship Line.

\* No data available for 1940 for Inland Waterways Corporation and Panama R. R. Co.

---

**PART II. REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS**

---

---

# THE PROGRAM—REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

---

## Contents

	Page
FOREWORD	106
REGION 1. New England	107
REGION 2. Middle Atlantic	129
REGION 3. Southeast	151
REGION 4. Lake States and Ohio Valley	169
REGION 5. South Central	195
REGION 6. Missouri Valley	225
REGION 7. Mountain States	249
REGION 8. Pacific Southwest	267
Hawaii	289
REGION 9. Pacific Northwest	297
REGION 10. Alaska	327

---

## FOREWORD

---

Well-considered programs for national development must, of course, reflect local, State, and regional points of view as well as the best judgment of administrative groups and functional policies. This part II of the report on Development of Resources and Stabilization of Employment reproduces statements on regional development plans prepared in the field in cooperation with regional and State planning agencies and with representative citizens.

What is a region? Americans have always recognized the existence of regions or groups of States within the United States which have distinctive problems or unifying backgrounds. From the earliest Colonial days of the New England Confederation, through the time when the South was clearly recognized, down to the more recent realization of great geographic areas like the Dust Bowl, or the Tennessee Valley, we have thought in terms of regions. In 1935 the National Resources Committee issued a report on Regional Factors in National Planning and Development which reviewed the many types of regions and regional organization in this country. Since that time, many further efforts have been made to organize regionally or on a sub-national basis for both public and private purposes.

The desire of the National Resources Planning Board and its predecessors to aid decentralized planning has contributed a number of experiments in this field. The Board has organized its field staff in regional centers, serving areas with no fixed boundaries and using a variety of different planning methods adapted to the special situations in each area. For strictly administrative and budgetary reasons, the number of centers which the Board could staff was limited to 10, located as follows:

1. Boston, Mass., serving New England.
2. Baltimore, Md., serving the middle Atlantic region.
3. Atlanta, Ga., serving the southeastern region.
4. Indianapolis, Ind., serving the Ohio-Great Lakes region.
5. Dallas, Tex., serving the south-central region.
6. Omaha, Nebr., serving the Missouri Valley.
7. Denver, Colo., serving the Intermountain-Great Plains area.
8. San Francisco, Calif., serving the Southwest.
9. Portland, Oreg., serving the Pacific Northwest.
10. Juneau, Alaska, serving Alaska.

From each of these field offices or regional centers the Board has received preliminary statements of the objectives of regional developments as seen by the regional officers of the Board. These programs have been revised, reworked, and expanded during the last year with the cooperation of State planning boards, regional planning commissions, special advisory groups, and with the active assistance of the field representatives of many Federal agencies. The resulting statements are called "regional development plans." They are obviously first approximations of plans rather than full specifications.

The criteria or statements of objective which these regional plans suggest for testing public-works projects vary as might be expected in accordance with the widely different problems which the regions face. It is hoped that these first statements and the revisions and improvements in these regional plans which are already under way may aid in the public understanding of regional points of view toward development projects and aid the Congress in making decisions concerning them.



---

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
NEW ENGLAND: REGION 1, BOSTON, MASS., 1940**

---

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	108
SUMMARY STATEMENT	109
THE PROBLEM	110
THE PEOPLE	111
THE PLAN	113
Land Use	113
Recreation	115
Water Use and Control	117
Industry	118
Housing	119
Transportation	121
Education	123
Welfare	124
Defense	126
Administration	127

**Report of the New England Regional Planning Commission**

ELISABETH M. HERLIHY,  
*Chairman, Massachusetts State Planning Board.*

FREDERIC H. FAY,  
*Member at Large.*

Capt. JAMES M. LANGLEY,  
*Chairman, New Hampshire State Planning and  
Development Commission.*

Mrs. CHARLES SUMNER BIRD,  
*Member at Large.*

ROBERT F. SHEPARD,  
*Chairman, Rhode Island State Planning Board.*

F. W. SHEPARDSON,  
*Chairman, Vermont State Planning Board.*

CHARLES E. ROLFE,  
*Chairman, Connecticut Development Commission.*

ARTHUR C. COMEY,  
*Consultant.*

ROLAND B. GREELEY,  
*Planning Technician.*

VICTOR M. CUTTER  
*Chairman, Region No. 1, National Resources Planning Board*

---

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
MIDDLE ATLANTIC: REGION 2, BALTIMORE, MD., 1940**

---

**Contents**

	Page		Page
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	131	<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>	140
Characteristics of Region	131	Highways	140
Need for Planning	132	Railways	141
<b>LAND</b>	132	Waterways	142
Submarginal Land	132	Airways	142
Urban Blight	133	<b>RECREATION</b>	143
Premature Land Subdivision	134	Deficiencies	143
<b>WATER</b>	134	Proposed Developments	145
Drainage Basins:	134	<b>HOUSING</b>	146
Hudson	134	The Need	146
Lake Ontario	135	Meeting the Need	147
St. Lawrence	135	<b>EDUCATION</b>	147
Champlain	136	School Planning	147
New York-New Jersey Coastal	136	Declining Enrollments	148
Delaware	137	Vocational Training	148
Susquehanna	137	Education in the South	148
Chesapeake	138	Rural Libraries	148
Carolina Coastal	139	<b>TOWARD PLANNED REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT</b>	149
<b>INDUSTRY</b>	139	State Planning Progress	149
Major Objectives	139	Local Planning	149
Program	140	The National Interest	150

**Report of the Middle Atlantic Regional Planning Office**

**MORTON L. WALLERSTEIN,**  
*Regional Chairman, Region No. 2, National  
Resources Planning Board*

**HAROLD MERRILL,**  
*Acting Counselor, Region No. 2, National  
Resources Planning Board*

*JOHN W. HYDE, Planning Technician, Region No. 2, National Resources Planning Board*

---

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
SOUTHEAST: REGION 3, ATLANTA, GA., 1940**

---

**Contents**

	Page		Page
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	153	INDUSTRY	162
THE SOUTHEAST	155	FORESTRY	163
AN AGRARIAN COUNTRY	156	WATER RESOURCES AND TRANSPORTATION	165
PROGRAM OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT	157	HEALTH AND EDUCATION	167
AGRICULTURE	159		

**Report of the Southeastern Regional Planning Commission**

A. J. HAWKINS,  
*Director, Alabama State Planning Commission,  
Montgomery, Ala.*

GEORGE G. GROSS,  
*Executive Secretary, Florida State Planning Board,  
Tallahassee, Fla.*

ROBERT F. MADDOX, Sr.,  
*Atlanta, Ga.*

MUNDELL M. BUSH,  
*Executive Secretary, Mississippi Board of Develop-  
ment, Jackson, Miss.*

P. D. HOUSTON,  
*Chairman, Tennessee State Planning Commission,  
Nashville, Tenn.*

LUCIEN BURNS,  
*Mayor of Selma, Selma, Ala.*

WILLIAM R. DAVLIN,  
*Associate Planning Technician.*

SAMUEL TEAGUE,  
*Tallahassee, Fla.*

Dr. T. F. ABERCROMBIE,  
*Director, State Board of Health, Atlanta, Ga.*

W. O. TATUM,  
*Hattiesburg, Miss.*

HOWARD DANNER,  
*Vice Chairman, South Carolina State Planning  
Board, Beaufort, S. C.*

HOMER M. PACE,  
*South Carolina Power Co., Charleston, S. C.*

E. W. PALMER,  
*Kingsport Press, Kingsport, Tenn.*

E. BRUCE WEDGE,  
*Associate Planning Technician.*

HENRY T. McINTOSH,  
*Chairman, Region No. 3, National Resources Planning Board.*

---

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
LAKE STATES AND OHIO VALLEY: REGION 4, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., 1940**

---

**Contents**

	Page		Page
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	170	WATER—Continued.	
SUMMARY	173	Industrial Pollution	190
REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES	176	Flood Control	190
FORESTS	179	TRANSPORTATION	190
AGRICULTURE	180	Rail	190
Pasture Land	180	Highways	190
Crop Land	182	Navigation	191
LAND CLASSIFICATION	184	Air	191
RECREATION	185	Coordination	192
WILDLIFE	186	PERSONNEL	192
MINERALS	187	HOUSING	192
INDUSTRY	187	MUNICIPAL PLANNING AND GOVERNMENT	192
WATER	189	CONCLUSIONS	193
Power	189		
Ground Water	190		

**Report of the Lake States and Ohio Valley Regional Planning Office**

LAWRENCE V. SHERIDAN,  
*Regional Counselor, National Resources Planning  
Board.*

PAUL E. MIDDLETON,  
*Planning Technician, National Resources Planning  
Board.*

---

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
SOUTH CENTRAL: REGION 5, DALLAS, TEX., 1940**

---

**Contents**

	<b>Page</b>		<b>Page</b>
FOREWORD	196	<b>THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN—Continued.</b>	
SUMMARY	198	Energy Resources	213
THE REGION—ITS CHARACTERISTICS AND RE- SOURCES	201	Transportation	213
Physical Characteristics	201	Industry	217
Early Settlement and Growth	201	Rural Electrification	218
Present Population	202	Housing	219
Natural Resources	203	Health	219
THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN	207	Education	220
Future Population	207	Recreation	221
Land Use Adjustment	207	Wildlife	222
Soil Conservation	208	Income Sources	222
Forests	208	Urban Areas	223
Farm Tenancy	210	National Defense	223
Tax Reverted Rural Lands	210	ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES AND SOCIAL ADVAN- TAGES	224
Water Resources	210		

**Report of the South Central Regional Planning Office**

EARL O. MILLS,  
*Regional Counselor*

JULIAN W. TARRANT,  
*Planning Technician*

---

## FOREWORD

---

The regional development plan for the south-central region represents the first known attempt to prepare a comprehensive word picture of the physical characteristics, resources, problems, future needs, and possibilities within the entire area. Obviously, such an undertaking has necessitated the assembling of much data and many proposals from numerous sources, particularly the State and Federal agencies.

It has long been realized, of course, that many individuals and agencies have been making important investigations and plans relating to the development of the region and that there was need for more effective cooperation in order to facilitate the activities of each agency and insure proper coordination of their respective programs. Accordingly, a permanent unofficial Regional Planning Advisory Committee was established to fulfill this need and to cooperate with the Dallas regional office, not only in the immediate task of preparing the first draft of the regional development plan, but more particularly for the purpose of cooperating in the further study and development of the plan that is to follow. It is contemplated that within the full committee, which is comprised of members from both State and Federal agencies, subcommittees will be appointed to facilitate future study and planning operations.

Although a considerable amount of essential information is now available for the planning of the area, it is clearly evident that this represents only a small portion of that required before complete plans and final recommendations can be made for the orderly and economic building of the region. Consequently, the regional development plan as presented herein must be regarded only as the foundation or framework upon which may be constructed gradually the comprehensive detailed plan so glaringly needed as an intelligent guide for future regional development.

The preparation of such a plan is no mean task, and the degree of success eventually achieved will depend almost wholly upon the sustained interest and cooperation of such individuals and agencies as those represented in the membership of the Regional Planning Advisory Committee. In the light of the invaluable services already rendered and the splendid spirit of cooperation manifested by the members of the Regional Planning Advisory Committee at its first meeting on September 23-24, 1940, there is every reason to believe that such cooperation in the south-central region will not only continue but will grow in its effectiveness. Moreover, it is believed that through this

medium, the regional development plan can and will be made a sound and useful instrument for evaluating public works programs and enhancing the social and economic welfare of the region.

Members of the Regional Planning Advisory Committee who assisted in drafting this report are—

L. A. Henry, director, Arkansas State Planning Board.

George C. Branner, Arkansas State geologist.

Sam S. Mims, representing DeWitt L. Pyburn, chairman, Louisiana State Planning Commission.

Ernest E. Scholl, chairman, Oklahoma State Agricultural Land Use Planning Committee.

C. S. Clark, chairman, Texas Board of Water Engineers.

W. E. Morgan, extension service, Texas Agricultural and Mining College.

Print Hudson, in charge, flood control surveys, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, region 6.

James W. Browning, in charge, flood control surveys, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, region 9.

Morris Evans, in charge, flood control surveys, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, region 2.

C. O. Henderson, area leader, Division of Land Economics, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, southeastern area.

Karl A. Shafer, representing T. G. Standing, leader, Division of Farm Population and Rural Welfare, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, area 6.

Ralph Rogers, regional representative, Division of State and Local Planning, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

L. P. Merrill, conservator, Soil Conservation Service, region 4

H. H. Finnell, conservator, Soil Conservation Service, region 6.

T. Roy Reid, director, Farm Security Administration, region 6.

C. M. Evans, director, Farm Security Administration, region 8.

R. B. Baxter, representing Wilson Cowen, acting director, Farm Security Administration, region 12.

I. F. Eldredge, representing E. L. Demmon, Southern Forest Experiment Station.

Dwight P. Reardon, representing W. R. Parkhill, chief, Engineering Section, Farm Credit Administration.

Edwin R. Henson, coordinator, United States Department of Agriculture, southern Great Plains.

P. L. Sharkey, representing A. N. Thompson, engineer, Bureau of Reclamation.

E. C. Sullivan, district engineer, United States Public Health Service.

J. L. Lytel, representing Lawrence M. Lawson, commissioner, International Boundary Commission.

L. C. Fuller, representing M. F. Christiansen, assistant regional director, National Park Service.  
F. R. Oliver, representing J. A. Elliott, district engineer, Public Roads Administration.  
L. C. Elliott, regional manager, Civil Aeronautics Administration.  
Col. F. S. Besson, district engineer, Corps of Engineers, Galveston district.  
Maj. W. W. Wanamaker, assistant division engineer, Corps of Engineers, southwestern division.  
Capt. W. H. Hastings, representing Maj. Samuel D. Sturgis, acting district engineer, Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg district.  
J. L. Saunders, district engineer, United States Geological Survey, Fort Smith, Ark.

C. E. Ellsworth, district engineer, United States Geological Survey, Austin, Tex.  
A. C. Monahan, regional coordinator, Office of Indian Affairs.  
George E. Barclay, representing John C. Gatlin, director, Fish and Wildlife Service, region 2.  
Roy Moore, assistant regional director, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, region 4.  
Gabriel C. Harmon, land planning consultant, Federal Housing Administration.  
J. R. Cobb, representing C. O. Falkenwald, director, Division of Cooperative Relations, Rural Electrification Administration.

---

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
MISSOURI VALLEY: REGION 6, OMAHA, NEBR., 1940**

---

**Contents**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT</b>	<b>228</b>
The Missouri Valley Region	228
The Need for a Regional Plan	228
The Resources for Planning	230
1. Land (Agriculture)	230
2. Land (Mining)	231
3. Manufacturing	231
4. The People	231
Limits of Regional Planning	231
<b>II. THE REGIONAL PLAN</b>	<b>232</b>
Water resources	237
Land Use	240
Minerals and Energy Resources	240
Industry	242
Transportation	243
Education	243
Recreation	244
Housing	245
Public Works	245
Public Works Programming	246
<b>III. LOOKING FORWARD</b>	

**Report of the Missouri Valley Regional Planning Office**

**T. HILLARD COX,**  
*Planning Technician*

**DENNIS O'HARROW**  
*Assoc. Planning Technician*

**C. WOODY THOMPSON,**  
*Planning Technician*

**PHILIP H. ELWOOD,**  
*Regional Chairman*



---

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
MOUNTAIN STATES: REGION 7, DENVER, COLO., 1940**

---

**Contents**

	Page
FOREWORD	250
SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES IN THE REGIONAL PLAN	251
THE REGION—ITS CHARACTERISTICS, RESOURCES, AND PROBLEMS	251
OUTLINE OF THE REGIONAL PLAN	252
I. Conservation and Development of Natural Resources	252
II. Expansion of Commerce, Industry, and Employment	262
III. Improvement of Facilities and Services	262
IV. Development and Protection of Human Resources	265

**Report of the Mountain States Regional Planning Office**

PAUL L. HARLEY,  
*Assistant Planning Technician*

Judge CLIFFORD H. STONE,  
*Regional Chairman*

HARLOWE M. STAFFORD,  
*Regional Counselor*

---

## FOREWORD

---

The National Resources Planning Board has requested that each of the nine regional offices of the Board submit reports for their respective regions, delineating the essential framework of a plan for the development and conservation of the resources of the region.

Pursuant to that request, this report presents the results of the efforts of the region 7 office, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local interests, to prepare such a plan for the Mountain States region.

Conservation of resources does not mean abstinence from use or hoarding; rather, it means the wise and efficient use of our resources in the interest of the regional and national welfare, the avoidance of unnecessary waste in their development and utilization, and the safeguarding in economic health of the industries and population on which we rely for the development of those resources. It is the purpose herein to set forth for the Mountain States region a plan for the development and conservation of its resources, keeping in mind this definition of conservation.

This plan, or rather, framework of a plan, does not presume to be a complete plan for the region. A complete plan is a concept not yet attainable in the Mountain States region. It does, however, endeavor to present the major objectives of regional development and to outline the patterns of action for the attainment of those objectives.

In the preparation of the material for this report, the regional office has had the advice and assistance of many agencies and individuals throughout the region. At a regional meeting held in Denver on September 17, 1940, attended by representatives of State agencies of Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming, and by representatives of the many Federal agencies concerned in the region, a preliminary draft of the regional plan was presented and discussed. Many valuable additions, revisions, and criticisms resulted from this meeting, and subsequently, many of those in attendance contributed material for and participated in the preparation of certain sections of the report.

Because of its regional nature, the plan presented cannot be of the specific or blueprint form that might be possible for a small area or individual project. It must be over-all, and emphasize the larger aims above those of a more minor and transitory character. Moreover, it must be flexible—an adjustable framework susceptible of modification from time to time as required to meet changing conditions and needs. Above all, it should be subject to wide review and criticism to the end that its progressive development may represent a harmonious blending of the considered judgments of all regional, State, and local interests concerned.

---

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
PACIFIC SOUTHWEST: REGION 8, BERKELEY, CALIF., 1940**

---

<b>Contents</b>		<b>Page</b>
FOREWORD		269
THE REGION AND ITS POTENTIALITIES		271
Future Outlook		272
Plans for Future Development		272
I. BETTER USE OF RESOURCES		273
1. Put More Water to Work		273
2. Conserve Land Resources, Improve Land Use, and Preserve Water Supplies		276
3. Maintain Agricultural Productivity and Increase Opportunities for Farm Settlement		277
4. Obtain Larger Incomes and Greater Benefits from Recreation and Wildlife		278
5. Develop Mineral Resources to Aid National Defense and Maintain Mining Industries		280
6. Improve Methods of Producing Petroleum and Natural Gas		280
7. Preserve and Build Up Commercial Fisheries and Sport Fishing		281
II. EXPANSION OF MANUFACTURING, COMMERCE AND EMPLOYMENT		281
Economic Objectives		281
III. IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FACILITIES AND SERVICES		283
Transportation		283
Urban Development		284
Public Works		285
Public Health and Sanitation		286
Housing		287
Education		288
IV. HAWAII		289

**Report of the Pacific Southwest Regional Planning Office**

VAN BEUREN STANBERRY,  
*Regional Counselor*

DONALD F. GRIFFIN,  
*Associate Planning Technician*

BALDWIN M. WOODS,  
*Chairman*

---

## FOREWORD

---

Since the days of early settlement, countless individuals and groups have been planning more or less independently for the development of the Nation and its regions. Farmers surveyed the land, laid out their farms, and planned their crops. Prospectors discovered minerals and planned their extraction. Industrial managers planned their factories and output. Although cities, farms, industries, institutions, and physical improvements were not charted in advance, nevertheless they are the resultant of the aspirations and plans of all the people, acting individually or in independent groups.

While these myriad plans were aimed primarily to provide individual incomes, they were also directed more or less consciously toward building prosperous and enduring communities and States. To further these common interests, public agencies and private groups were organized to study the natural resources of land, forests, water, and minerals and to aid in conserving and developing them for the use and benefit of the people. For many years Federal, State, and local agencies and private organizations have been continuously engaged in making and carrying out plans for better use of our natural assets.

In order to present an over-all picture of the possibilities for further development in each region of the Nation, the National Resources Planning Board asked its nine regional field offices to submit a summary report setting forth desirable objectives and lines of action for future progress. This is the report for the Pacific Southwest.

Such an over-all summary has been made possible by the studies and work of the numerous agencies and organizations that have for years been investigating resources, problems, and possibilities of the Pacific Southwest. The Geological Survey and State departments dealing with water and minerals have long been engaged in investigating the region's water and mineral resources and assembling the data needed for their development. The Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with State and local agencies, are studying harbors and rivers, and recommending programs and projects to regulate stream flow, prevent floods, and improve navigation. The Bureau of Reclamation has built many of the large irrigation projects in the Pacific Southwest, and, together with State engineers and local organizations, is making investigations and preparing construction plans for future irrigation projects.

The Forest Service, working with State forestry departments, local officials, and private timber opera-

tors, has prepared programs for multiple uses of forest lands and sustained-yield management. The Soil Conservation Service, Farm Security Administration, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and other divisions of the Department of Agriculture are cooperating with State agricultural services and local groups throughout the region to reduce erosion, conserve soil, and aid farmers to hold their land. Through the work of State and county agricultural and land-use planning committees, detailed programs for improving land use are evolving. The Grazing Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Park Service are cooperating with the Southwest States in planning for development of range lands, fish, wildlife, and recreation areas.

The agencies mentioned above are only a few of the numerous organizations and groups that have been actively engaged in planning for development of the Pacific Southwest.

The statement of objectives and recommendations for action given below is an attempt to present a consensus, incorporating the judgment and opinion of representative agencies, organizations, and individuals in the Pacific Southwest States, that would outline a broad plan for future development. The statement is not presented as a comprehensive plan but as a summary of the kinds of action that would lead to integrated and balanced growth. The purpose of this outline is not to lay down hard and fast lines that must be rigorously followed, but to provide a broad framework that will be filled out by detailed programs and projects designed to meet local conditions and needs.

This plan in outline is a composite product assembled from information, published reports, advice, and suggestions obtained from numerous agencies, organizations, and individuals in different parts of the region. Informal conferences, reports of State planning boards, and meetings of the five Pacific Southwest drainage basin committees held during the last 5 years supplied the basic data for many recommendations. A preliminary draft of this report was prepared by the staff of the field office of the National Resources Planning Board in Berkeley, Calif., and submitted for criticism to representatives of more than 75 agencies and organizations in the Pacific Southwest, most of whom reviewed the draft, forwarded valuable comments, and suggested many revisions. The comments and suggestions have been carefully considered and incorporated, as far as practicable, in the statement that follows.

---

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
HAWAII: REGION 8, BERKELEY, CALIF., 1940**

---

**Contents**

	<b>Page</b>
FOREWORD	290
THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS	291
LAND AND WATER RESOURCES	292
PUBLIC RECREATION AREAS	293
TRANSPORTATION	293
INDUSTRY	294
PUBLIC HEALTH AND SANITATION	295
LIVING CONDITIONS	295
URBAN DEVELOPMENT	295
EDUCATION	295
NATIONAL DEFENSE	296

**Report of the Hawaii Territorial Planning Board**

---

## FOREWORD

---

The following report is a brief summary of some of the principal facts about the resources, economic activities, and possibilities for development of the Hawaiian Islands. The information and data were taken from the First Progress Report of Hawaii Territorial Planning Board, entitled "An Historical Inventory of the Physical, Social, and Economic and Industrial Resources of the Territory of Hawaii," published February 8, 1939. The recommendations for action have been prepared and submitted by the Director and staff of the Hawaii Territorial Planning Board after consultation with members of the board and representatives of Federal, Territorial, and local agencies and private organizations interested in development of the islands.

The purpose of the report is to outline some of the initial steps in a broad program for the conservation and development of the physical and human resources of the Territory.

---

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
PACIFIC NORTHWEST: REGION 9, PORTLAND, OREG., 1940**

---

**Contents**

	Page
FOREWORD	299
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	301
TABULAR OUTLINE	302
I. BASIC RESOURCES OF THE REGION: OVER-ALL VIEW OF THE POSSIBILITIES AND PROBLEMS OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT	303
II. OBJECTIVES OF THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	311
III. THE REGION ONE OR TWO DECADES HENCE: INFLUENCE OF CURRENT AND FUTURE PROGRAMS	315
IV. THE ROLE OF PUBLIC POLICY AND PUBLIC WORKS PROBLEMS, PROGRAMS, AND METHODS OF COORDINATION	322

**Report of the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission**

**B. H. KIZER,**  
*Chairman, Washington State Planning Council,  
Spokane, Wash.*

**D. P. FABRICK,**  
*Chairman, Montana State Planning Board,  
Helena, Mont.*

**WALTER CLARK,**  
*Vice Chairman, Idaho State Planning Board,  
Boise, Idaho*

**DAVID ECCLES,**  
*Executive Secretary to the Governor,  
Salem, Oreg.*

**ROY F. BESSEY,**  
*Counselor, Region 9, National Resources Planning Board*

---

## FOREWORD

---

In the social consciousness of every region, there is some general conception of the goals toward which that community should be striving.<sup>1</sup> Within recent years, there has been a rapid development of this community consciousness in all parts of the country, accompanied by a conviction that we should realistically take stock of what resources we have, and carefully think out how these resources can best be used in promoting the welfare and security of the people who are dependent on them.

In response to this movement, which has been particularly strong in the Pacific Northwest, the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission, together with the other eight regional offices of the National Resources Planning Board, has been asked by that Board to submit reports, each delineating the essential framework of the regional development plan that has thus far emerged in each of the great regions of the United States. In this request, it has been suggested that each region attempt to convey in its report an idea of what that region may become within the next one or two decades on the basis of feasible use of the natural and human resources that are known to be available.

In proceeding with this assignment, the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission does not presume to adopt the role of regional master architect. It does attempt to report relevant facts and to draw together and harmonize the various plans that have been developed by the people of the region, and by the technical agencies that serve them.

Such a regional development plan does not need to be drawn out of the imagination. Beginning in 1927, the Congress authorized the Secretary of War to begin a series of studies looking toward the full control and use of the water resources in each of the river systems of the United States. A comprehensive report covering the Columbia River and its tributaries with a plan for multiple use development was submitted by the Army Corps of Engineers in 1932. Further detailed studies covering the Willamette River Basin and other drainages<sup>2</sup> have since been completed. During the same period, the United States Forest Service has been at work on studies of the forest resources of the region and on studies designed to bring about improvement in forest management. The Bureau of Reclamation has been making technical investigations of the possibilities

for the expanding of irrigation and has worked out detailed engineering plans for a number of important projects in various parts of the region.

With the establishment of the Soil Conservation Service, the Farm Security Administration, and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in the Department of Agriculture, a broad and comprehensive program for the conservation and rehabilitation of farm lands began to take form. All three of these services operate on a decentralized regional or State basis, and each is engaged in working out a program designed to meet local conditions. In addition to these activities, which stem from Nation-wide statutory authorizations, the Department of Agriculture, through its Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Forest Service, and cooperating State extension service, has been sponsoring a localized program of agricultural and land-use planning. Committees, composed primarily of local farmers, are functioning in most of the counties of the region, with the technical assistance of personnel made available by the bureau and its cooperating agencies. As a result of this activity, there is developing in each agricultural area a fairly concrete plan for the development and better use of the land.

The Grazing Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, the Oregon and California Revested Lands Administration—all of the Interior Department—have been active in planning for the conservation and development of resources placed under their care. The Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, with State cooperation, have contributed a large amount of scientific information in the mineral resources field.

The establishment of the Bonneville Power Administration in 1937, and the recent Executive order charging it with responsibility for the marketing of surplus power soon to become available at Grand Coulee Dam, gave the region still another broad field in which public planning must function.

To follow this list of Federal agencies, and the equally important State agencies, to its end would consume more space than can be afforded here. Suffice it to say that the planning activity involved in the execution of this multitude of services that have been undertaken by Federal, State, and local governments does involve a complicated maze of relationships—physical and economic. There is definite need at each level of government for central planning agencies, the chief function of which is to try to see the community as a whole, and to facilitate the harmonizing of plans and the

---

<sup>1</sup> For some time there has been concrete evidence of this in organizations like the New England Council, the New York Regional Plan Association, and the Southern Regional Committee of the Social Science Research Council.



interchange of information among the many groups concerned.

The Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission, with the cooperation of the State planning boards, began to pursue this course in 1934. In 1935, it submitted a report on the future of the region and on the regional organization for planning, construction, and operation of public works.<sup>2</sup> Currently, the commission has been engaged in a study of migration and other population trends, and of land and industry, as fundamental means for adding to economic opportunity in the region.<sup>3</sup> Between these major studies, it has carried out others, for example: Of the region's balance of trade, to throw light on the essential economic position of the region;<sup>4</sup> of the forest resource on which the region is economically dependent to a high degree.<sup>5</sup>

With a broad background of study, conference, and discussion concerning resource, conservation, and development problems and proposals, it has been possible to prepare, with a degree of confidence, this framework for a regional development plan for the Pacific Northwest.

It should be noted that a framework—and not a plan—is here presented. A complete plan for the region is a concept not yet attainable in the Pacific Northwest. Such a plan would have to be a synthesis of a great many individual plans—of Federal departments, of States and their subdivisions, of civic, corporate, and private interests. Since many of these do not exist and all cannot be secured, much less compiled, in a single

<sup>2</sup> Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission, National Resources Committee: *Regional Planning*, pt. I, Pacific Northwest, 1936.

<sup>3</sup> Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission: *Migration and the Development of Economic Opportunity in the Pacific Northwest, 1939* (mimeographed).

<sup>4</sup> Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission: *Balance of Trade of the Pacific Northwest, 1937* (mimeographed).

<sup>5</sup> Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission: *Pacific Northwest Forest Resources, 1938*.

widely understandable plan, the endeavor has been to select only the broad essentials of the larger plans and weave them into a relatively simple statement of objectives for the region, together with general analyses of the outstanding needs and the kinds of public policies, works, and organization that will further the broad and progressive development of the region.

This kind of a skeleton plan is also more in harmony with the nature of subnational regions. While such regions are quite often fairly well defined physical, economic, and cultural entities, they are not units in which a unified political control may be exercised. The more detailed and specific plans are the concern of the States and other responsible political subdivisions. Yet these regions are units for which general directives and plans are extremely desirable, and in which the maximum degree of correlation of development policies and plans will be very profitable.

The regional development plan cannot be in common blueprint form—as might the physical plan for a small area or an individual project. Yet, considering the area and scope of the subnational region, it may be relatively realistic, even though set out in general terms. It must be over-all to be comprehensible. It should be related to a generally ponderable period of time—to the ensuing decade as well as to the coming generations. It should emphasize the larger aims above those of more minor and transitory character. Yet it should be flexible—susceptible of being readily reshaped from time to time to meet new conditions and new knowledge. It should, of course, be subjected to wide review and criticism.

To give a general conception of the regional development plan as a whole, a tabular outline of the framework of a development plan has been presented at the opening of this report.

---

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

---

This report represents, as stated in its foreword, a brief composite of the development programs and policies formulated by the people of the region and the various agencies that serve them. No one group—least of all the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission (which has reviewed and sponsored the report) or the National Resources Planning Board regional office staff (which has done the mechanical work of drafting it)—would presume to claim this framework of a plan as its own creation. The broad view intended to be presented could result only from a continuing contribution—on the part of the many

Federal and State agencies and public-minded bodies and individuals concerned—to the knowledge of the Region's resources and to clarification of its aims. Grateful acknowledgment is made of that long-term cooperation with the regional planning commission and its associated committees and advisers, as well as of immediate assistance of agencies and individuals in furnishing advice, information as to plans and projects and other data, and illustrations for the report. It is regretted that the great amount and wide range of assistance received precludes specific mention here of those to whom sincere thanks are due.

---

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
ALASKA: REGION 10, JUNEAU, ALASKA, 1940**

---

**Contents**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>FOREWORD</b>	<b>328</b>
<b>ALASKA DEVELOPMENT PLAN</b>	<b>329</b>
<b>THE ALASKA SCENE</b>	<b>329</b>
<b>PART 1. RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT:</b>	<b>331</b>
Vegetative Resources	331
Water Resources	332
Mineral Resources and Mining Industry	334
Wildlife Resources	335
Scenic and Recreational Resources	336
Human Resources	338
<b>PART 2. PROJECT REVIEW BY FUNCTIONAL FIELDS:</b>	<b>340</b>
Land Use	340
Industrial Development	340
Transportation and Communication	340
Recreation and Tourist Trade	343
<b>PART 3. TERRITORIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>344</b>
<b>PART 4. MILITARY DEVELOPMENT AS A STIMULUS TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>345</b>

**Report of the Alaska Planning Council**

**DR. HUBERT A. BAUER, *Consultant, Region 10, National Resources Planning Board***

327

---

## FOREWORD

---

Since no field office has yet been established in region X, Alaska, Dr. Hubert A. Bauer, consultant to the National Resources Planning Board in Alaska, was given the assignment of preparing a regional development plan for Alaska. In carrying out this assignment, Dr. Bauer had the benefit of the data at hand in the office of the Alaska Planning Council, and the various Federal and Territorial offices located in Juneau.

Due to the limited time for preparation of the development plan, during which no meeting of the Alaska Planning Council was scheduled, the approval of the whole council was not obtainable, but the plan was submitted to the majority of the members of the council, residing in Juneau, and their suggestions and revisions were incorporated in the development plan.

---

**DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES AND STABILIZATION OF EMPLOYMENT  
IN THE UNITED STATES  
PART III: FUNCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES**

---

<b>Contents</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>FOREWORD</b>		<b>351</b>
<b>LAND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES</b>		<b>353</b>
Land-Use Objectives and Public Works		355
The Programming of Public Works Affecting Land Use		358
The Land-Use Outlook and Public Works		363
Land-Use and Public Works in the Next Six Years		366
<b>WATER DEVELOPMENT POLICIES</b>		<b>371</b>
National Water Policy		373
Integrated Water Planning		374
Programming Projects		379
Financial Policy		381
Construction and Operation		388
Regulatory Measures		389
Summary of Major Recommendations		392
<b>ENERGY DEVELOPMENT POLICIES</b>		<b>401</b>
Introductory: The Problem		403
Major Elements in a Long Range-Program		405

---

## FOREWORD

---

For the further development of a program of public works which will provide most effectively for the full utilization of resources and a higher standard of living in all parts of the country, it is necessary to appraise individual projects from various standpoints. They must be looked at from the point of view of their effect upon employment, the ways in which they may stimulate and aid private enterprise, their possibilities and desirability from the point of view of regional interests and their conformity with long-range policies for functional efficiency, use, and development of land, water, energy, transportation, etc.

This Part III of the report by the National Resources Planning Board on The Development of Resources and Stabilization of Employment in the United States is concerned with statements on frameworks of policy in the functional fields on which committees of the Board have been working for some years. Later, it is proposed in other reports to supplement these statements with other documents of similar intent on long-range work and relief policies, transportation policies, and housing. Each of the statements in this part of the report is the work of the members of the technical committees in the indicated field. The views of the Members of the National Resources Planning Board on these problems are summarized in Section E, Part I, of the report.

### Public Works and Land Use Adjustment

The Land Committee of the Board has been concerned during the past 2 years with the study of some of the special problems involving land and with putting together background materials as the basis for formulation of policy statements.

The report on Land Acquisition in Rural and Urban Areas provides a general basis for appraisal of the timeliness and value of proposals for public acquisition of various types of land as an aid to making land more useful and productive. A study of Tax Delinquency has been undertaken to attack the problem of "No Man's" land where neither private owners nor public bodies assume responsibility for the proper maintenance of land resources. A major report on Land Classification and procedures for determination of the available uses of land has been completed. It will serve as a measure for the evaluation of future proposed survey, mapping, and classification activities.

In connection with the work of the Board under the Federal Employment Stabilization Act of 1931 the Land Committee has recently concentrated its attention on proposed planning procedures for application in

local, State or regional areas which are intended to produce an analysis of the problems which those areas face and possible lines of solution. It has also established a Subcommittee to prepare a general policy statement on Public Works and Land Use Adjustment. The Chairman of the Subcommittee, Dr. Carl Alsberg of the Giannini Foundation, developed suggestions for this statement of policy, but unfortunately, died before completion of the report.

### National Water Policy

Since the National Resources Board was organized in 1934 and absorbed the former Mississippi Valley Committee to prepare plans for the use and control of water in all parts of the country, the Water Resources Committee has been engaged in the preparation of reports and plans on all aspects of water utilization. Through membership on the committee of key personnel from all of the Federal agencies concerned with water problems and with the aid of specialists from outside of the Government, the committee has made a number of important contributions to the development of plans and public understanding of water problems. Their emphasis on multiple purpose developments and on treatment of drainage basins as single units for planning has had a large effect on the planning and construction activities of all of the agencies concerned.

The statement on National Water Policy which is presented herewith summarizes and repeats many of the major recommendations which have previously appeared in other reports of the Board and its predecessors, in the preparation of which the Water Resources Committee played an important part.

### Energy Resources and National Policy

Two years ago the President transmitted to the Congress a report of this title, prepared by the Energy Resources Committee of the Board. Since that report was transmitted the committee has continued its work with special relation to emergency problems in the use of energy resources. The statement submitted herewith summarizes the key points in the earlier document and adds numerous other items from materials developed since the issuance of the previous report.

All three of the statements submitted in this volume emphasize the continuing nature of the problem of building national policies for the best use of resources. Policies for the use of one resource cannot be adequately considered without reference to corresponding policies for many other resources. Funds, personnel, and energies of the Board will not permit attacking all

problems at once, and it has therefore been a process of gradual growth and accumulation to build up and fit together the various parts of the picture. In future years it is the hope of the Board that additional statements of this character can be added to the three sub-

mitted in this report and that these statements can be revised and brought up to date from year to year to show more adequately the relationship among all our resource policies for the development of the Nation's resources and the stabilization of employment.