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# THE BUSINESS SITUATION IN TEXAS 

Francis B. May

The seasonally adjusted index of Texas business activity declined 3 percent in February to a value of 181.0 percent of its 1957-59 average monthly value. This decline, which followed a sharp 8 -percent rise in the index in January, makes plain the fact that the weakness in the state's economy which appeared in the final quarter of 1966 is still present. Business activity is on a high plateau. It is above the average level of JanuaryFebruary 1966, but expansive forces of the first half of 1966 have moderated.

These expansive forces carried the index of Texas business activity from a value of 168.0 percent in January 1966 to a high of 183.1 percent in August, a 9 -percent rise. They were compounded of a high level of demand for automobiles, rising incomes, heavy investment in new plant and equipment by business, defense requirements, and high levels of construction other than residential. These factors were dominant in the national economy as well as in the state's economy.

Demand for durable goods, particularly demand for automobiles, has been an outstanding characteristic of the current cyclical upswing since its beginning in February 1961. The average number of cars assembled each week rose from 106.1 thousand in 1961 to 179.4 thousand in 1965. It reached a peak of 197.5 thousand cars a week in March 1966. Then a slow decline began. After the lull due to the changeover to 1967 models in August 1966, the assembly rate rose to 196.6 thousand cars in October and declined steadily thereafter to 127.0 thousand in the week ending February 4 of this year. There has been some improvement since then but not to the high levels of early 1966. The manufacture of automobiles is
an important part of total manufacturing activity in the country. Consumption of steel, rubber, plastics, glass, and other materials is greatly affected by the rate of production of automobiles. Retail sales of automobiles, tires, batteries, gasoline, and accessories amounts to approximately 25 percent of total retail sales, and for this reason the decline in automobile sales had a negative effect on the business expansion.

Personal income has risen from $\$ 416.8$ billion in 1961 to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $\$ 609.9$ billion in February of this year, a phenomenal 46.3 -percent increase. Personal-consumption expenditures rose from $\$ 335.2$ billion in 1961 to $\$ 474.1$ billion in the fourth quarter of 1966. A comparison of annual personal income and personal-consumption expenditures from 1961 to 1966 is shown in the following table:

| Year | Personal income (billions of dollars) | Personal-consumption expenditures <br> (billions of dollars) | Consumption as a percentage of income |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1961 | . . . . . 416.8 | 335.2 | 80.4 |
| 1962 | . . . . . . 442.6 | 355.1 | 80.2 |
| 1963 | . . . . . 465.5 | 375.0 | 80.6 |
| 1964 | . . . . . 496.0 | 401.4 | 80.9 |
| 1965 | . . . . 5855.1 | 581.5 | 80.6 |
| 1966 | . . . . . . 5880.4 | 464.9 | 80.1 |

Source: Economic Indicators (Prepared for the Joint Economic Committee by the Council of Economic Advisers), February 1967.

The column of consumption expenditures as a percentage of income shows that consumers spent between 80.2 percent and 80.9 percent of their incomes for goods and services in the years 1961-65. The peak was 80.9 per-

## TEXAS BUSINESS ACTIVITY INDEX-ADJUSTED FOR SEASONAL VARIATION-1957-1959 $=100$



NOTE: Shaded areas indicate periods of decline of total business activity in the United States.
SOURCE: Based on bank debits reported by the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas and adjusted for seasonal variation and changes in the price level by the Bureau of Business Research.
cent of personal income spent for goods and services in 1964. During the fourth quarter of 1966 consumers decreased their expenditures to 79.3 percent of personal income, reducing the percentage for the entire year to 80.1, the smallest for the entire six-year period. This decrease in consumption expenditures during the fourth quarter of last year was accompanied by an increase in the percentage of income saved. While the increase in savings contributed to an easing in the tight credit conditions existing at the time, it also contributed to the slowdown in the sales of automobiles and other goods, notably color television sets.

Investment in new plant and equipment has proceeded at high levels during the current cyclical upswing. A comparison of gross national product and expenditures for new plant and equipment is shown in the following table:

| Year | Gross national product <br> (billions of dollars) | Expenditures for new plant and equipment (billions of dollars) | Expenditures as a percentage of gross national product |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1961 | . 520.1 | 34.37 | 6.6 |
| 1962 | ..... . 560.3 | 37.31 | 6.7 |
| 1963 | . . . . . 590,5 | 39.22 | 6.6 |
| 1964 | . 631.7 | 44.90 | 7.1 |
| 1965 | . 681.2 | 51.96 | 7.6 |
| 1966 | . . . . 739.6 | 60.56 | 8.2 |

Source: Economic Indicators (Prepared for the Joint Economic Committee by the Council of Economic Advisers), February 1967.

Investment in new plant and equipment rose from a substantial $\$ 34.37$ billion in 1961 to a record $\$ 60.56$ billion in '1966. It rose from 6.6 percent of gross national product in 1961 to 8.2 percent in 1966, almost one twelfth of gross national product. The same kind of analysis of the relationship between investment and national product for the 1958-60 cyclical upswing is shown below.

| Year | Gross national product <br> (billions of dollars) | Expenditures for new plant and equipment (billions of dollars) | Expenditures as a percentage of gross national product |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1958 | ...... 447.3 | 30.53 | 6.83 |
| 1959 | . ..... 488.7 | 32.54 | 6.73 |
| 1960 | . .... 503.7 | 35.68 | 7.08 |

Source: Economic Indicators (Prepared for the Joint Economic Committee by the Council of Economic Advisers), February 1967.

During 1958-60 investment in new plant and equipment rose from $\$ 30.53$ billion to $\$ 35.68$ billion, a 16.9 -

## CRUDE-OIL PRODUCTION IN TEXAS


percent jump. As a percentage of gross national product investment rose slowly from 6.83 to 7.08 , a modest rate of growth before the 1960-61 recessions intervened. This recession caused investment to decline from $\$ 35.68$ billion in 1960 to $\$ 34.37$ billion in 1961, a 3.7 -percent decline.

During the first three years of the current cyclical upswing investment in new plant and equipment rose from $\$ 34.37$ billion to $\$ 39.22$ billion, a 14.1 -percent rise. This was a slower rate of growth than during the 1958-60 upswing, when investment increased 16.9 percent. If we compare the rate of growth of investment as a percentage of gross national product for 1958-60 and 196163, we see that during the 1961-63 period there was no increase. The percentages were 6.6 in 1961, 6.7 in 1962, and 6.6 in 1963. Investment as a percentage of gross national product began its rise in the second threeyear segment of the current upswing. In 1964 it rose to 7.1 percent. In 1965 it rose another 0.5 percent to 7.6 percent. In 1966 it rose 0.6 percent to 8.2 percent. This was a rapid rise in investment relative to the rise in gross national product.

In the short run, investment in new plant annd equipment tends to have an inflationary effect. This is due to the fact that it takes an extended period of time to build new productive facilities. There is a long time lag between the date of inception of the project and its completion, with a resultant increase in the output of production as the new facilities go on-stream. During the construction period money is being paid out as wages to construction workers and machine-tool builders. This money goes into the income stream and augments consumer purchasing power. Consumer demand rises. Production increases. As production edges up toward maximum operating levels prices begin to edge upwards.

SELECTED BARQMETERS OF TEXAS BUSINESS
(Indexes-Adjusted for seasonal variation-1957-59=100)

| Index 1967 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jan } \\ & 1967 \end{aligned}$ |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } \\ & \text { 1967 } \\ & \text { from } \\ & \text { Jan } \\ & 1967 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year-to- } \\ \text { date } \\ \text { average } \\ 1967 \\ \text { from } \\ 1966 \end{gathered}$ |
| Texas business activity......... 181.0 | 185.9 | 183.5 | 3 | + |
| Crude-petroleum production ...103.3 * | 106.9 * | * 105.1 | - 3 | $+$ |
| Crude-oil runs to stills. ....... 119.1 | 117.4 | 118.3 | + 1 | + 3 |
| Total electric-power use . . . . . . 198.9 * | 193.5 * | * 196.2 | + 3 | $+10$ |
| Industrial electric-power use. ...189.0 * | 178.2 * | * 188.6 | $+6$ | $+10$ |
| Bank debits ................ 191.9 | 197.4 | 194.7 | 3 | + 10 |
| Ordinary-life-insurance sales . 187.4 | 161.9 | 174.7 | $+16$ | + 4 |
| Building construction authorized. 156.5 | 106.6 | 181.6 | $+47$ | - 8 |
| New residential . . . . . . . . . . 99.1 | 87.4 | 93.3 | $+13$ | $-19$ |
| New nonresidential . ...... 253.0 | 130.4 | 191.7 | $+94$ | +1 |
| Total industrial production.... 150.7* | 153.0 * | . 151.9 | $-2$ | + |
| Miscellaneous freight carloadings in S.W. district ......... 83.2 | 80.9 | 82.1 |  |  |
| Total nonfarm employment. . .129.8* | 129.8 * | . 129.6 | ** |  |
| Manufacturing employment ...132.3* | 131.0 * | * 181.7 | + 1 | + 7 |
| Total unemployment ......... 69.3 | 68.4 | 68.9 |  | - 14 |
| Insured unemployment ........ 51.5 | 54.2 | 52.9 |  | - 14 |
| Average weekly earningsmanufacturing ................ 126.0 * |  |  |  |  |
| Average weekly hours- manufacturing $\ldots . . . . . . .100 .8$ * | 100.0 * | * 100.4 | + 1 | - 2 |

[^1]Inflation begins unless a recession intervenes to cool demand. If a recession does not occur inflation proceeds until conditions build up to cause a classical cyclical downturn.
A high rate of investment in new plant and equipment has the effect of increasing demand for long-term loanable funds. Interim financing is usually provided by banks, but ultimately capital to pay for new productive facilities must be raised by sale of stocks or bonds to pay the banks. The rapid rise in investment during 1964-66 placed a severe strain on capital markets that were also supplying funds to pay for a strong rise in construction. Despite the decline in private nonfarm housing starts that began in early 1964, total new construction continued to rise until it reached a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $\$ 79.5$ billion in March 1966. A high and rising volume of construction also has an inflationary effect in the short run.

Defense needs added another inflationary element during the upswing. Expenditures for national defense declined from $\$ 46.0$ billion in 1959 to $\$ 44.9$ billion in 1960. They rose to $\$ 51.6$ billion in 1962 and stayed in a range of $\$ 50.8$ billion to $\$ 50.0$ billion during the $1963-65$ period. In 1966 they jumped $\$ 9.9$ billion to $\$ 60.0$ billion, a 19.8 -percent increase. This increase in military demand for goods and services, coming at a time when the economy was operating at capacity also fueled the inflation.

As a result of all of these factors prices began to rise. The following table shows the behavior of both the Bureau of Labor Statistics indexes of consumer prices and wholesale prices during the period since 1961.

| Year | Bureau of Labor Statistics Indexes of priees ( $1957.09=1.00$ ) |  | Annual difference in prices |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wholesale prices | Consumer prices | Wholesa | nisumer |
| 1961 | . 100.8 | 104.2 | $\cdots$ | - |
| 1962 | . 100.6 | 105.4 | $+.3$ | +1,2 |
| 1968 | . 100.8 | 106.7 | - 3 | +1.8 |
| 1964. | . 100.5 | 108.1 | + . 2 | +1.4 |
| 1965 | 102.5 | 109.9 | +2.0 | +1.8 |
| 1966 | . . 105.8 | 118.1 | +8.3 | $+3.2$ |

Source: Economic Indicatora (Prepared for the Joint Economic Committee by the Council of Economic Advisers). February 1967.

The index of wholesale prices showed very little change during 1961-64. In 1965 it rose 2 percent, a large change for this index, based as it is on average price changes in a list of more than 2,000 commodities. An even larger change occurred in 1966 as the index bounded upward from an average of 102.5 percent in the preceding year to 105.8 percent. This 3.2 -percent increase was a rate of rise that no economy can tolerate for any great length of time without serious damage.

Between 1961 and 1964 the consumer price index rose gradually but steadily from 104,2 percent in 1961 to 108.1 percent in 1964. The rate of increase accelerated in 1965 as the index rose 1.7 percent to 109.9 percent. In 1966 the rate of increase accelerated more rapidly as the index jumped 2.9 percent to 113.1 percent. With indexes of wholesale prices and consumer prices rising at increasingly rapid rates, something had to be done.

The response of the Federal Reserve Board was to allow a rise in the discount rate and to shorten the
supply of loanable funds by tightening bank reserves. As a result, the rapid rise in bank loans was arrested, Loans climbed to $\$ 206.6$ billion in August 1966, dropped to $\$ 206.1$ billion in September, and held steady at $\$ 207.3$ billion in October and November. They rose to $\$ 208.2$ billion in December, and jumped to $\$ 211.3$ billion as the Federal Reserve relaxed credit.

The response of the federal government to this potentially explosive inflationary condition was to remove the 7 -percent tax credit given on long-term investment in plant and equipment. The Department of Commerce estimates that the temporary suspension of the investment tax credit and of the accelerated depreciation allowances will have the effect of reducing 1967 expenditures on new plant and equipment $\$ 2.3$ billion below what they 'otherwise would have been.

The current slowdown in business is the result of actions taken to halt the inflation that posed a serious threat to the stability of the nation's economy and that would have adversely affected the state's economy as well, since growth in Texas personal income closely parallels growth in personal income in the nation.

After rising to 106.9 percent of average monthly production during the 1957-59 base period seasonally adjusted crude-oil production in Texas declined 3 percent in February to 103.3 percent. This was stifl a high level as compared with the reduced outpat of recent years. It was the largest February production since the 112.9 percent registered in 1957. Output in the state declined from an all-time peak of 119.0 percent of the 1957-59 base value in March 1957 to a low of 80.0 percent in April 1958. No subsequent year had an average monthly level of production above 100.0 percent until 1966. Average monthly production was 103.0 percent last year. Better highways, more vehicles on the road, and general prosperity have caused consumption of Texas crude pe-

BUSINESG-ACTIVITY INDEXES FOR 20 SELECTED TEXAS CITIES
(Adjusted for sersonal variation-1957-59=100)

| Index | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } \\ & 1967 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{Jan} \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | Year-todate average 1967 | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } \\ & 1967 \\ & \text { from } \\ & \text { Jgan } \\ & 1967 \end{aligned}$ | Year-to- date averase 1967 from 1966 |
| Abilene | 140.2 | 152.8 | 146.5 | $-8$ | $+$ |
| Amarillo | . 181.5 | 170.8 | 175.9 |  | * |
| Austin | 199.6 | 188,7 | 198.2 | + 7 | + 11 |
| Beaumont | . 181.5 | 176.0 | 178.8 | + 3 | $+$ |
| Corpus Christi | 140.7 | 140.5 | 140.6 | ** | $+$ |
| Corsicana | .148.3 | 142.9 | 145.6 | $+1$ | + 6 |
| Dallas | 213.4 | 208.7 | 211.1 |  | + 12 |
| Et Paso | 125.1 | 180.7 | 127.9 | - 4 | + 10 |
| Fort Worth | 187.0 | 138.0 | 18 T .5 | - 1 | + |
| Galveston | 114.9 | 120.6 | 117.8 | - 5 | + 5 |
| Houston | 190.6 | 208.4 | 197.0 | - | + 10 |
| Laredo | 174.7 | 179.2 | 177.0 | - 3 | + 8 |
| Lubbock | .147.3 | 163.4 | 155.4 | $-10$ | - 18 |
| Port Arthur | .127.0 | 108.8 | 117.9 | $+17$ | +10 |
| San Angelo | 147.6 | 150.8 | 149.2 | - 2 | + 4 |
| San Antonio | . 160.3 | 172.2 | 166.8 | - 7 | $+4$ |
| Texarkana | 213.0 | 207.1 | 210.1 |  | + 23 |
| Tyler | .142.9 | 152.0 | 147.5 | -6 | + |
| Waco | .151.2 | 159.7 | 155.5 | - 5 | + 4 |
| Wichita Falls | . 187.4 | 142.7 | 140.1 | - | - 2 |

** Change is less than one half of 1 percent.
troleum to climb slowly during the business expansion that began in 1961 . Average production during the first two months of this year was 7 percent above that of January-February 1966.
Seasonally adjusted crude-oil runs to stills rose 1 percent in February. Total demand for all oil has been above 1966 levels. Demand for gasoline and residual fuel oil has been well above year-ago levels.
Total seasonally adjusted electric-power use rose 3 percent in February. It averaged 10 percent above the comparable 1966 usage during the January-February

## POSTAL RECEIPTS <br> SELECTED TEXAS CITIES

|  |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jan } 28,1967- \\ & \text { Feb } 24.1967 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jan } 28,1967- \\ \text { Feb } 24,1967 \\ \text { from } \\ \text { Dec } 30,1966-1 \\ \text { Jan } 2 \pi, 1967 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jan } 28,1967- \\ & \text { Feb } 24,1967 \\ & \text { from } \\ & \text { Jan } 29,1966 \\ & \text { Feb } 25,1966 \end{aligned}$ |
| Alice | 19,929 | - 2 | + 5 |
| Alvin : ...... | . 12,580 | -9 | + 8 |
| Athens | .15,154 | + 27 | + 2 |
| Ballinger | . 5,573 | +11 | - 7 |
| Bonham | . 7,468 | + 17 | -7 |
| Breckenridge | . 8,248 | - 3 | $+11$ |
| Carrizo Springs | . 3,758 | + 12 | + 9 |
| Carthage ... | . 7,454 | + 13 | + 28 |
| Center . . . . . | . 9,041 | + 9 | $+34$ |
| Childress | . 5,185 | - 30 | - 24 |
| Cleveland | . 6,769 | - 5 | $+17$ |
| Coleman | . 8,129 | + 11 | + 3 |
| Columbus | . 4,622 | + 1 | - 5 |
| Commerce | . 11,124 | + 16 | + 21 |
| Crockett | . 7,842 | $+4$ | $+15$ |
| Cuero | . 6.860 | - 21 | - 22 |
| Dalhart | . 6,242 | - 9 | $-1$ |
| Dumas | . 9,113 | $-19$ | + 6 |
| Ei Campo | . 14,437 | + 11 | $+15$ |
| Electra | . 5,584 | + 22 | + 30 |
| Falfurtias | 5,850 | + 7 | - 5 |
| Freeport | 23,274 | ** | + 5 |
| Gainesville | . 16,182 | + 17 | - 4 |
| Galena Park | . 8,900 | + 21 | + 22 |
| Gilmer | . 5,691 | - 11 | + 19 |
| Gonzales | . 6,202 | -18 | - 13 |
| Groves | . 9,711 | + 2 | + 11 |
| Hale Center | 2,129 | - 18 | - 14 |
| Hearne | .. 5.723 | + 28 | $+40$ |
| Hempstead. | ... 6,072 | - 27 | - 6 |
| Hillsbora | . 8,683 | - 12 | + 10 |
| Hurst | . . 17,374 | + 14 | + 3 |
| Kenedy | . 4,379 | + 2 | - 7 |
| Kermit | . . 8,682 | - 4 | $+9$ |
| Kerrville | . .17,602 | + 16 | $+17$ |
| La Grange | . . . 6,286 | $-15$ | + 12 |
| Lake Jackson | . . 9,650 | $+21$ | + 33 |
| Levelland | . . 9,353 | -16 | -1 |
| Marlin | . 7,572 | - 14 | + 2 |
| Mathis | 3,079 | + 1 | - 1 |
| Navasota | . . 6,784 | + 19 | - 8 |
| Perryton . . | . 9,967 | + 1 | $+10$ |
| Pittsburg | . . 5,556 | $+17$ | +10 |
| Port Lavaca | . .13,487 | + 22 | + 18 |
| Port Neches | . 10,600 | + 26 | $+43$ |
| Refugio | ... 4,485 | - 8 | - 6 |
| Rockdale | . 4,882 | $-12$ | $-17$ |
| Rusk | . 4.545 | $-14$ | $-23$ |
| Seminole | 4,645 | - 8 | -18 |
| Taft | . 8,041 | - 16 | - 19 |
| Wharton | . . 10,118 | $+7$ | - 4 |
| Winnsboro | . 4,515 | $-2$ | + 4 |
| Yoakum | ....14,388 | + 8 | $-14$ |

[^2]period. Industrial power consumption contributed to the rise. It was up 6 percent in February, offsetting a decline in other uses of power. Industrial power use averaged 10 percent higher during the January-February period. Since industrial power use is strongly correlated with industrial production, this behavior of the index suggests underlying strength in manufacturing activity in the state.

February sales of ordinary life insurance rose 16 percent after seasonal factors were taken into account. The 187.4-percent value was the largest for any February in the history of the index. Insurance is a form of savings as well as a protection to the family of the insured. This rise in the index suggests that the rise in the propensity to save that occurred in the last quarter of 1966 is continuing. During the first two months of the year sales of ordinary life insurance averaged 4 percent, above sales in the corresponding period of 1966.

Urban building permita issued in February rose 47 percent after seasonal adjustment, A rise in both residential and nonresidential permits issued caused the gain in the total index. Residential permits rose 13 percent in February. Nonresidential permits rose 94 percent. Although the rise in residential permits was large, it was a gain from the January 1967 very low 87.4 percent of the 1957-59 monthly average. It boosted the index to 99.1 percent of the 1957-59 average, which is still a low value for permits. The decline in residential permits in Texas began in August 1963, after the index reached a peak of 149.1 percent of the 1957 59 base. The deciine was gradual until December 1965, when the credit shortage began to develop. It accelerated rapidly in 1966, with the index reaching a low of 64.0 percent in September. A gradual recovery in the index since September has been due to the increased availability of mortgage money to finance new homes and apartments.

Although wide fluctuations occur in the seasonally adjusted index of nonresidential building authorized in Texas, this sector of the economy did not slump in 1966. It seemed to be on a plateau with wide savings around an average value of 195.1 percent. The large rise to a value of 253.0 of the $1957-59$ base value was caused by a substantial rise in permits for industrial buildings, office-bank buildings, and public works and utilities.

The present lull in the economies of the state and nation are expected to give way to a revival of business expansion during the latter part of this year. Easier credit, a restoration of the 7 -percent tax credit on investment in new plant and equipment, and continued war demand are expected to supply the upward impetus.

WELL COMPLETIONS

| Region | February 1967 |  |  |  | Jan-Feb |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Oil | Gas | Dry | Total | 1967 | 1966 |
| TEXAS | . 466 | 82 | 329 | $87 \%$ | 1,607 | 2,186 |
| South | 63 | 9 | 52 | 124 | 223 | 342 |
| Gulfcoast |  | 28 | 43 | 123 | 278 | 833 |
| East | 40 | 16. | 50 | 106 | 118 | 199 |
| North | .117 | 8 | 102 | 227 | 334 | 542 |
| West | .173 | 16 | 76 | 265 | 488 | 604 |
| Panhandle | 21 | 5 | 6 | 32 | 71 | 116 |

Source: The Oil and Gas Jowrnal.

# THE PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRY OF EAST TEXAS* 

Edwin J. Foscue ${ }^{* *}$

Though the forest-covered portion of East Texas occupies more than 28,000 square miles and is larger than the combined area of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont, the general public knows relatively little concerning its productivity or its economic importance to the state. This is due largely to the fact that the grasslands of Texas, which make up the major part of its 263,513 square miles, have been so thoroughly publicized through fiction and through motion pictures and television that the names "Texas" and "the Wild West" have become almost synonymous. As a result this vast timbered section of the state has been almost completely ignored.
East Texas today is a thriving modern agricultural and industrial region with many diversified industries. In recent years it has become also one of the major cattle-producing regions of the state, although ranching as portrayed by the movies does not exist here. Inevitably, some of the key industrial activities of East Texas are associated with the great forest resources of the region; of these, pulp and paper manufacturing, although a relatively new industry, is one of the most important. Obviously this industry could not develop until the industries basic to its existence-logging and lumbering -had achieved some maturity.

The East Texas region was covered originally by a dense forest consisting largely, particularly in the river bottoms, of evergreen conifers interspersed liberally with hardwoods. The pine forests were composed of longleaf and slash pine in the southern part of the region (Figure 1 ) and loblolly and shortleaf pine in the northern part. Though pines occupy some of the low-lying plains of the coastal area, they are more generally found in the hilly interfluves, where they usually constitute a large part of the vegetation. Many species of hardwoods also flourish throughout this pine forest. In the better-drained interfluvial areas red oak, white oak, sweetgum, yellow poplar, and hickory are prominent members of the plant association, in some localities predominating over pines. In the swamp and bottom lands are dense stands of black gum, water tupelo, red maple, cottonwood, sycamore, cypress, and a variety of other trees, shrubs, and vines. ${ }^{1}$ Of the approximately 19 million acres of territory in the East Texas region, 11.6 million acres are in forest land. This means that more than 60 percent of the area is suitable or available for growing trees.

With the arrival of Anglo-Saxon pioneers in the East

[^3]Texas forested region in the early 1800 's, sawmills were built to produce lumber for house construction. The large lumber mills that ultimately were established in the region did not develop, however, until the latter part of the nineteenth century, when the lumber industry began moving south because the great northern forests were becoming depleted and because railroad building in the Gulf Southwest was making available to the mills large tracts of hitherto inaccessible virgin timber.

The logging and lumbering industry grew steadily from 1879 to 1899 , when the annual production was more than 1 billion board feet. Although the figures are for the state of Texas as a whole, they actually measure the production of the East Texas region, since this area is the source of most of the lumber in Texas. In spite of a slight recession in 1905 production continued high for some time. In 1907, 1909, and again in 1913 annual production surpassed 2 billion board feet.
From that peak year to 1929 production gradually decreased, because the best of the virgin timber, especially the longleaf pine, had been cut and many large companies found it more profitable to move to other timbered areas of the United States than to reforest their holdings in East Texas. The big decline followed the Great Depression of the 1930's with lumber production for the next several years falling to its lowest level since 1889.

A revival of lumbering and woodworking industries began about the time of World War II. Production has continued to increase since then, although as yet no year since 1913 has shown the volume of some years in the first decade of the present century. During the Depression years of the 1930's many of the smaller sawmills closed-abandoning their holdings and destroying their installations. A few of the larger mills, however, continued to operate during the Depression, building up their holdings and restocking their forest lands.

The manufacture of pulp and paper from southern yellow pine and southern hardwoods did not start, however, until after the beginning of the twentieth century, with the establishment of the Orange Pulp and Paper Company on the lower Sabine River (Figure 2). In 1910 this mill began manufacturing unbleached pulp and paper from pine trees cut in East Texas. After operating for a number of years it closed, but recently reopened without pulp-making facilities. This mill now buys annually some 18,000 tons of unbleached wet sulfate pulp from the new East Texas Pulp and Paper Mill at Evadale, and it also imports from other sources small quantities of pulp. It specializes in the manufacture of lithographed kraft paper bags and sells practically the entire output to large department stores in New York and Boston. ${ }^{2}$

In 1937 Champion Papers Inc., constructed a large mill on the Houston Ship Channel at the industrial site

[^4]

Figure 1. The East Texas Timbered Empire. Scene along U. S. Highway 69 between Zavalla and Woodville at the Neches River Crossing. Courtesy Texas Highway Department.
of Pasadena, designed primarily to manufacture bleached sulfate pulp. The company had previously perfected a process for bleaching kraft paper made from southern yellow pine, and converting it into high-grade white book papers. Shortly thereafter Time Incorporated, which was having some difficulty securing coated book papers for its rapidly growing magazine Life, reached an agreement with the Champion mill to install a papermaking machine to produce coated paper for Life. This machine went into operation in 1941. Champion is still the largest mill in East Texas producing high-grade book, magazine, and writing papers from southern yellow pine. Additions, alterations, and improved technology have continued to boost the productive capacity of Champion's Texas Division pulp and paper mill. Within thirty years the Texas Division has grown from a 150 -ton mill employing 385 men and women to a plant producing 850 tons of pulp and 500 tons of paper a day, with more than $1,400 \mathrm{em}-$ ployees and an annual payroll of nearly $\$ 12$ million (Figure 3). Champion was one of the first (if not the first) to use bleached groundwood in publication grades of paper. ${ }^{3}$

For a long time southern yellow pine, because of its high resin content, was considered inferior to northern spruce in the manufacture of good-quality newsprint and white paper. Experiments conducted by Dr. Charles H. Herty in 1933 at the Wood Products Laboratory in Savannah, Georgia, proved that newsprint could be made from southern yellow pine if young trees were used. The unique feature of this experiment was the successful conversion of southern yellow pine into usable groundwood in spite of the presence of troublesome quantities of resinous matter. Newsprint derives its color from the natural color of the wood-it is unbleached pulp plus groundwood. When groundwood is made from pine the resinous matter that is in the pulp $\log$ comes through into the newsprint and causes considerable trouble. Dr. Herty's experiment proved that young trees (less than fifteen years in age), containing relatively small quantities of resin, could be used successfully to produce newsprint.

After the discovery of the process whereby good-quality newsprint could be made from southern yellow pine, a large newsprint mill was constructed and opened at Lufkin in 1940 by the Southland Paper Company. This pioneer mill began operating with a groundwood mill and one paper machine with a production capacity of 150 tons per day. Since then the mill has been enlarged until it now contains expanded groundwood mills and four paper machines with a daily production capacity of 1 thousand tons. It now makes both newsprint and kraft paper. Most Texas newspapers buy their stock from the Southland Paper Company, and many newspaper owners are stockholders in the firm. It is interesting, and significant, that the Southwest Color Printing Corporation was established in Lufkin to print the comic sections of Sunday editions of newspapers-after Southland was in operation. In Lufkin it was easy both to obtain the requisite newsprint and to distribute the printed comic sheets to Texas newspapers.

[^5]Recently Southland has acquired a site at Sheldon, in northeastern Harris County (near Houston), ${ }^{4}$ where a new mill, nearly completed, is scheduled to begin operation about July 1, 1967. The mill will offer employment for 325 hourly personnel, mainly mill workers, and 75 salaried staff members; some unskilled workers will be employed and put into the plant's training program. The plant, located on a 1,000 -acre site, is valued in excess of $\$ 12$ million. ${ }^{5}$

At the close of World War II, Time Incorporated began making plans for a mill in East Texas to supply the ever increasing demand for paper for Life and other magazines. In 1945 that company purchased a site on the Neches River some twenty-four miles north of Beaumont, in an ideal location for use of timber that could be cut from lands owned by a subsidiary of the Houston Oil Company. This acquisition led in turn to the construction of a large pulp mill at Evadale.

For years the Houston Oil Company had owned jointly with the Kirby Lumber Company large areas of cut-over and burned-over timber land in southeast Texas. In the early 1930's the Houston Oil Company had attempted to settle this land with farmers, but in 1938 had given up the idea and had begun to replant the land in pines. The mill at Evadale was to be built by Time Incorporated in partnership with the Houston Oil Company, which still owned the timber land that was to supply most of the pulpwood. In 1956 Time Incorporated bought out the interest of the Houston Oil Company and became the sole owner of the new Evadale Mill. Soon afterward it purchased the forest lands of the former Southwestern Settlement and Development Company, and thus acquired outright some 600,000 acres of pulpwood-producing territory. ${ }^{6}$ As yet the mill manufactures only bleached pulp and papers, while Time Incorporated continues to buy a large part of its magazine paper from other mills.

The East Texas Pulp and Paper Mill began operating in 1954 in a large, modern plant covering about a hundred acres of former forested lands near Evadale (Figure 4). This completely modern mill is capable of producing more than 800 tons of bleached market pulp and paper daily. Market pulp is shipped to paper mills that do not make their own pulp, while the heavy-weight paper is used primarily in the manufacture of milk containers, cups, cans, plates, trays, tags, folders, envelopes, and similar paper products. The mill uses annually more than 500,000 cords of pine and hardwood pulp logs cut from its own land or purchased from individual owners, and buys the equivalent of 100,000 cords in the form of chips from the nearby Kirby Lumber Mill at Silsbee. The more than 23 million gallons of water used daily in the mill are secured from eleven deep wells. No water is taken from the nearby Neches River, although the treated waste is returned to the river below the intake for the water supply of Beaumont. The mill employs
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FIGURE 2. The four primary currently operating pulp and paper mills of East Texas are shown on this map with solid black dots. The mills are represented by the names of the towns in which they are located, as follows: Lufkin-Southland Paper Company; Diboll..Southern Pine Lumber Company; Evadale..East Texas Pulp and Paper Company; and Pasadena.-Champion Papers. In addition, Orange (Orange Pulp and Paper Company--the first mill established in East Texas) is shown with a different symbol since it no longer produces pulp and now secures all of its wet pulp from the Evadale mill. The two mills under construction, but nearly ready for operation, are indicated by an asterisk: Sheldon.. Southland Paper Company; north of Orange..-Wwens-Illinois. Only those counties that are significant to the pulp and paper industry have been named on the map.
nearly 900 workers and has an annual payroll of over $\$ 6$ million. ${ }^{7}$

Eastex, as the company is now officially named, has recently launched a large expansion program, with an expenditure of $\$ 33$ million for plant facilities. Paperproduction capacity is being expanded from 800 tons daily to 1,150 tons daily; employment is expected to increase by 400 , with 200 new employees at the enlarged plant and another 200 in adjacent lumbering areas which supply pulpwood for the operations of the plant.*

With ample room for growth, and with a constantly increasing demand for paper products, this modern mill will undoubtedly continue to expand to meet demands for pulp and paper. The extensive holdings of the company, under scientific forest management, combined with the additional supplies of chips that can be secured from numerous East Texas sawmills, make the basic raw materials almost inexhaustible. Replanting of forest lands has made it possible to grow pulpwood timber faster than it is used.

In 1962 the Southern Pine Lumber Company of Diboll (Angelina County), which operates one of the largest lumber mills of East Texas, constructed a small pulp mill in connection with its large sawmill. At present it is producing daily some 156 tons of pulp products consisting of such items as wood-fiber insulation, sheathing, roof insulation, shingle backers, and building board. ${ }^{9}$

Plans are current for additional pulp and paper mills in Texas, to supplement the production of the four already operating-at Pasadena, Lufkin, Evadale, and Diboll. In 1960 plans were announced for a pulp and paper mill in the East Texas region. This mill was to have been built in the northeastern corner of the state by the Anglo-Southern Paper Corporation, a subsidiary of the Anglo-Canadian Pulp and Paper Mills, Ltd. Preliminary plans called for the construction of a $\$ 60$ million mill for the manufacture of both pulp and paper. The mill was to have a daily production of 600 tons of newsprint. The project lay dormant until very recently, when plans were reactivated by an Anglo-Southern petition to discharge effluent into the Red River. ${ }^{10}$

Two new plants are far beyond the planning stagealmost ready for operation. One is the new Southland Paper Company mill at Sheldon; the other is a plant in Orange County, also fast becoming a realization. Early in 1966 Owens-Illinois, Inc.-a leading producer of glass, plastics, and forest products-announced plans for building a 900 -ton-per-day pulp and paper mill on a 12,000 -acre site on the Sabine River, seven miles from the deep-water port of Orange. The mill will manufacture annually 325,000 tons of linerboard for the production of corrugated and solid-fiber shipping containers. Investments in the mill and related facilities, including Texas and Louisiana timber lands, will exceed $\$ 100$ million. As

[^7]the company's seventy-eighth domestic plant it is scheduled to be in operation late in 1967.11

The two nineteen-story skyscrapers already stretching above the pine woods will cook wood chips into a pulpy mixture, which after refinement will be moved to the paper machine. Several of the machine's 115 dryers have already been installed, even while work on the two-blockslong structure housing it continues. The mill in full operation will do an annual $\$ 17$-million business, contributing valuably to the Texas economy through expenditures for payrolls, pulpwood, gas, power, chemicals, and other goods and services. The mill, woodyard, woodlands management, and allied operations will employ more than 500 persons, while the raising, cutting, skidding, and transporting of pulpwood to the mill will create an additional 1,000 full-time jobs for Texas and Louisiana. The Owens-Illinois mill will contribute also to the national economy, through supplying the nation's growing needs for containerboard and through reducing, by substantial foreign sales, the unfavorable U.S. trade differential. ${ }^{12}$

With the establishment of five pulp and paper mills in East Texas during the past thirty years, with the construction of the fifth and sixth under way (though one has discontinued the production of pulp), and with the announced plans for other mills, the demand for pulpwood has increased greatly. Production has followed demand.

In 1946 total pulpwood production in Texas was about 600,000 cords, mostly pine, considerably under pine production alone in 1965. Volume of output increased until it attained the peak year of pulpwood production, nearly $1,600,000$ cords, in 1956, which was followed by a downward trend until 1964, when the peak was reattained. ${ }^{13}$ In 1965 fifty-one counties were producing pulpwood (Table 1). Of the total $1,156,161$ cords of all species of trees, three counties contributed 231,548 cords, or slightly under 20 percent. These counties were Angelina ( 69,800 cords), Jasper ( 67,731 cords), and Polk ( 94,017 cords). The total volume of pine produced ( 789,877 cords) was slightly more than double the total volume of hardwood $(366,284) .{ }^{14}$

Texas' increasing consumption of its own pulpwood product is another indicator of increasing pulp and paper production. In 1956 Texas mills consumed 59 percent of its total production; in 1964 Texas consumed 78 percent of its total production. ${ }^{15}$ No reason for a change in this trend in the foreseeable future is apparent, since neighboring states can readily satisfy their needs within a short radius of their mills, and since future increases in pulpwood demand will come primarily from Texasbased industry.

The increasing demand for pulpwood in Texas is explained further by the increasing number of paper-
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Figure 3. The headbox, Fourdrinier section and dryer section of one of the large paper machines in the Pasadena mill of Champion Papers. This machine complex, which is 912 feet in overall length, can produce 275 tons of fine printing papers per day. Courtesy Champion Papers, Texas Division.


Figure 4. The East Texas Pulp and Paper Mill at Evadale. This modern mill, a subsidiary of Time, Incorporated, has increased its capacity more than 150 percent during the ten years it has been in operation and has plans to more than double its present capacity within the next ten years. Its daily production is now in excess of 800 tons of bleached pulp and paper. Courtesy East Texas Pulp and Paper Company.
product plants in the state. Even over a brief five-year period this expansion is obvious. The 1958 Census of Manufactures lists 121 paper-product plants in Texas, employing more than 10,000 persons and having an annual production valued at over $\$ 120$ million; the 1963 Census of Manufactures lists 152 paper-products plants in Texas, employing more than 11,560 persons and having an annual production valued at over $\$ 150$ million. Most of these, however, are only converting plants that do not manufacture pulp, making their products out of old paper and other waste materials. These usually small plants are scattered throughout the state but are found largely in or near the major cities.
The ever increasing demand for pulpwood in Texas has been met in part by the rapid rate of tree growth in the southern forests, but large companies are now systematically planting new trees and the "Tree Farm" is becoming an important item in the economy of the region. In 1957 the East Texas Pulp and Paper Company established a large nursery at Bon Weir in Newton County, on the Sabine River, where the annual rainfall is almost 57 inches, and planted twenty million pine seedlings annually for the next five years. Barren areas are now covered, and the annual planting is about five million seedlings. Results of research on the possibilities of more extensive use of hardwoods for paper manufacturing now seem so encouraging that it may not be long before hardwoods will supplement pines extensively as material for pulping operations. Champion Papers, who pioneered in the use of cottonwood, is now growing this species in plantations and has more than 3,000 acres of planted cottonwood under cultivation. The East Texas Pulp and Paper Company is also growing cottonwood on an experimental basis.

The production of paper and paperboard in East Texas based on the local timber resources has increased faster than the national average in recent years, according to a report published by the University of Texas Bureau of Business Research in 1959.

The manufacture of pulp and paper products in East Texas is an important and thriving industry. As demand increases with the growth of the consuming markets in the Gulf Southwest other mills will be built. The supply of rapidly growing pines, and perhaps hardwoods, should make this region one of the country's major producers not only of pulp but also of newsprint and fine book papers. This region should continue to supply highquality papers, such as those now produced for Life magazine and many other book and magazine publishers throughout the nation.

Table 1
ROUND PULPWOOD PRODUCTION IN TEXAS, 1965
(In standard cords)

| County ${ }^{1}$ | All species | Pine | Hardwood |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sqrt{\text { Anderson }}$ | 1,547 | 1,547 | ...... ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Angelina | 69,800 | 46,469 | 23,331 |
| Austin | 24 | . . . . | 24 |
| Bowie | 19,271 | 14,462 | 4,809 |
| Brazos | 446 | 50 | 396 |
| Burleson | 505 | . | 505 |
| Camp | 1,375 | 3 | 1,372 |
| Cass | 52,829 | 36,282 | 16,547 |
| Chambers | 1,719 | 1,516 | 203 |
| Cherokee | 26,211 | 25,536 | 675 |
| Colorado | 200 | . . . . . . | 200 |
| Ellis | 104 | .... . . | 104 |
| Fort Bend | 43 | . $\cdot$. . . . | 43 |
| Franklin | 58 | - . . . | 58 |
| Freestone | 146 | . | 146 |
| Gregg | 1,599 | 38 | 1,566 |
| Grimes | 8,516 | 8,032 | 484 |
| Hardin | 47,166 | 22,228 | 24,938 |
| Harris | 36,803 | 29,185 | 7,618 |
| Harrison | 24,157 | 14,753 | 9,404 |
| ¢ Henderson | 3 | 3 | . . . . . |
| Hopkins | 3 | 3 | . . . . . |
| Houston | 32,451 | 25,199 | 7,252 |
| Jasper | 67,731 | 43,008 | 24,723 |
| Jefferson | 191 | 153 | 38 |
| Lamar | 891 |  | 891 |
| Leon | 658 | ..... | 658 |
| Liberty | 65,344 | 37,293 | 28,051 |
| Marion | 22,228 | 11,295 | 10,983 |
| Montgomery | 63,103 | 44,959 | 18.144 |
| Morris | 3,835 | 63 | 3.772 |
| Nacordoches | 40.797 | 34,020 | 6,777 |
| Newton | 47,298 | 22,172 | 25,126 |
| Orange | 17,447 | 7,469 | 9,978 |
| Panola | 39,834 | 29,716 | 10,118 |
| Polk | 94,017 | 72,507 | 21,510 |
| Red River | 22 | 19 | 3 |
| Robertson | 280 | . . . . . . | 280 |
| Rusk | 18,448 | 10,118 | 3,335 |
| Sabine | 29,602 | 27,187 | 2,415 |
| San Augustine | 45,363 | 26,542 | 18,821 |
| San Jacinto | 33,746 | 18,195 | 15,551 |
| Shelby | 63,003 | 47,270 | 15,733 |
| Smith | 1,330 | 1,058 | 272 |
| Titus | 52 | . . . . | 52 |
| Trinity | 54,940 | 47,366 | 7,574 |
| Tyler | 60,115 | 41,119 | 18,996 |
| Upshur | 81,140 | 19,018 | 12,122 |
| Walker | 31,590 | 22,150 | 9,440 |
| Waller | 520 | 54 | 466 |
| Wood | . 2,660 | 1,830 | 830 |
| All counties | . 1,156,161 | 789,877 | 366,284 |

${ }^{1}$ Counties with no pulpwood production are omitted.
Source: Richard L. Welch, Southern Pulpwood Production, 1965, p. 18.
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Figure 5. Pulp-producing Counties of Texas

# TEXAS BUILDING CONSTRUCTION IN FEBRUARY 

Robert H. Ryan

Authorization in February of several large-scale industrial and public-construction projects was a major factor in raising the seasonally adjusted index of building authorized in Texas by 47 percent from January to a level approximately equal to that of February 1966. As the first hint of some recovery in residential building, new residential authorizations rose 13 percent from January to February but were still 16 percent below the February 1966 total. On the other hand, nonresidential construction was being authorized in February at a rate 153 percent higher than the 1957-59 average.

For the first two months of 1967 new one-family dwelling units authorized were down 17 percent in value from the first two months of last year. The decline in multiplefamily dwelling construction has been even sharper, with two-family dwellings down 32 percent and apartments down 26 percent in value authorized.

By contrast, a comparison of January-February totals indicates that nonresidential buildings have been authorized in greater total value so far this year than last. Not all categories of nonresidential building, by any means, have been increasing; authorizations of office, bank, and store buildings and of hotels, hospitals, and motels are all down substantially from last year. However, massive increases have been registered in authorizations of industrial buildings, up from $\$ 17.3$ million in January-February 1966 to $\$ 26.1$ million the first two months of this year. A similar increase, from $\$ 27.1$ million to $\$ 35.8$ million, was registered for educational buildings.

Specifically, major expansion projects in the Richardson Independent School District ( $\$ 2.1$ million), the Houston Independent School District ( $\$ 1.5$ million), and at Abilene Christian College ( $\$ 1.5$ million) added substantially to authorizations in the educational category. But the largest permit issued in Texas during February was a $\$ 12$-million authorization for new manufacturing facilities at the Grand Prairie plant of LTV-Aerospace Corporation.

Of the $\$ 152.7$ million in new construction authorized in Texas in February, the major portion, $\$ 134.6$ million, was recorded in the metropolitan areas of the state, mainly in their central cities. The heavily publicized recession in residential construction actually represents a retreat from some extraordinarily high levels of building activity seen in Texas during the past few years. For example, last year's residential authorizations were the lowest since 1960 but, even so, were higher than in any year prior to 1958. It is significant, however, that the dollar figures for building activity have been biased upward during the long period of intermittent inflation. The number of dwelling units provided for each million dollars spent has declined fairly consistently.

Nonresidential building in Texas has been undergoing an authentic boom in recent months. In volume of nonresidential building authorized February 1967 was the third highest month on record, and a variety of public
construction projects give evidence of continuing highlevel nonresidential activity.

For some time nonresidential building has been trending upward more rapidly than residential construction. Nationally, 1966 was the first post-World War II year in which nonresidential construction put in place more than matched residential building. The gap will probably be still wider in 1967. In Texas nonresidential building was considerably ahead of the residential category in 1966 and will probably be even farther ahead in 1967, at least if current indications continue. Even so, the demographic patterns of the state and nation during the
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next few years will tend to favor a swing back toward the preponderance of residential building. Youngsters born of the postwar baby boom are babies no more but young married couples, who are now entering the market for new homes in increasing numbers. While high interest rates may deter already established families from investing in new homes, they may be somewhat less likely to discourage new families from acquiring homes for the first time. Economic uncertainties have deterred commercial builders, badly hurt in 1966, from ambitious planning thus far in 1967. But the fairly certain availability of more money for housing this year seems sure to be followed after a time by increases in homebuilding.

With the beginning of a new construction season in Texas came indications of revised governmental policies and plans that will influence building here and throughout the nation. Among the soft spots in the economy, one of the softest and most disturbing has been the homebuilding business. To help rescue this industry before the spring building season is too far under way, the President authorized a massive transfusion of federal funds$\$ 380,000,000$-from the Treasury to the Federal National

Mortgage Association (Fanny Mae). The sum is expected by Administration officials to increase homebuilding by 20,000 units during the year.

Conventional home-loan-mortgage interest rates dipped very slightly in January, according to the Federal Home Loan Bank Boards, the first time in more than a year that rates have not increased. This decline and other indicators appear to reflect recent easing in credit markets. Even so, the interest rates for first-mortgage loans on new single-family homes in Texas citien were still far higher in January 1967 than a year earlier. The Dallas rate was up over the year from 5.80 percent to 6.80 percent, and the Houston rate from 6.13 percent to 6.69 percent. In both cities the rates were considerably above the national average for January, 6.43 percent. The loan-to-price ratios in Texas were also significantly higher than in most parts of the country, with the 85.9percent ratio in Houston leading all the nation's largest metropolitan areas. Dallas, with 78.2 percent, was not far behind. On the other hand, the average purchase price for new homes in Houston in January 1967 was only $\$ 23,100$, well below the $\$ 28,900$ for Dallas and lower than the average in most major metropolitan cities.

ONE-FAMILY, TWO-FAMILY, AND APARTMENT-BUILDING DWELLING UNITS IN METROPOLITAN AREAS, FEBRUARY I967
(Value in thousands of dollars)

| Metropolitan area | ONE-FAMILY DWELLING UNITS |  |  |  |  |  | TWO-FAMILY DWELLING UNITS |  |  |  |  |  | APARTMENT-BUILDING DWELLINGUNITS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Feb 1967 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jan F Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ |  | Percent <br> change <br> Jan-Feb <br> 1967 <br> from <br> fan-Feb <br> 1966 |  | Feb 1967 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jan-Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ |  | Percent <br> change <br> Jan-Feb <br> 1967 <br> from <br> Jan-Feb <br> 1966 |  | Fel 1967 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jиn-Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ |  | Percent <br> change <br> Jan-Feb <br> 1967 <br> from <br> $\mathrm{Jan}-\mathrm{Feb}$ <br> 1966 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Value | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { units } \end{aligned}$ | Value | No. of units | Value | No. of units | Value | No. of units | Value | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { units } \end{aligned}$ | Value | No. of units | Value | No. of units | Value | No, of units | Value | No. of units |
| Abilene | 274 | 11 | 434 | 18 | - 40 | -49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $-100$ | -100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - $\cdot$ |  |
| Amarillo | 572 | 30 | 1,384 | 68 | -28 | -32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 40 | 8 | $\sim 65$ | $-43$ |
| Austin | 8,102 | 145 | 6,159 | 295 | + 12 | + 19 | 324 | 26 | 602. | 50 | ... 15 | $+4$ | 2,040 | 211 | 2,230 | 281 | -58 | -64 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur Orange | $764$ | 42 | 1.187 | 68 | $+18$ | $-9$ | 0 | 0 | 35 | 2 |  |  | 1,189 | 145 | 1,189 | 145 | +110 | $+38$ |
| Brownsville-Harlingen- <br> San Benito | 71 | 6 | 182 | 11 | - 58 | -68 | 85 | 30 | 127 | 44 | . . | $\cdots$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ... |  |
| Corpus Christi | 965 | 80 | 1,872 | 155 | - 34 | - 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $-100$ | $-1.00$ | 0 | 0 | 365 | 64 | $+120$ | +191 |
| Dallas | .11.082 | 698 | 20,440 | 1,265 | 1 | - 1 | 295 | 24 | 789 | 62 | $+43$ | $+35$ | 3.378 | 458 | 4,868 | 768 | -33 | -46 |
| El Paso | 1,648 | 96 | 3,932 | 226 | - 7 | 9 | 11 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 31 | * 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $-100$ | $-100$ |
| Fort Worth | 4,745 | 314 | 8,153 | 555 | + 2 | $-2$ | 145 | 14 | 247 | 28 | + 11d | $+40$ | 1. 567 | 266 | 2,580 | 458 | +483 | +805 |
| Galveston-Texas City | 513 | 29 | 945 | 55 | $+14$ | - * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 100 | $-100$ | 0 | 0 | 30 | 8 |  |  |
| Houston | 9,022 | 510 | 16.681 | 946 | - 36 | -33 | 55 | 8 | 105 | 14 | - 79 | $-85$ | 1,121 | 189 | 4,984 | 892 | $+18$ | + 42 |
| Laredo | 29 | 8 | 59 | 14 | -. 67 | - 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Lubbock | 752 | 36 | 1.483 | 71 | - 53 | - 60 | 44 | 6 | 44 | 6 | - 86 | --75 | 0 | 0 | 235 | 36 | $-90$ | $-93$ |
| McAllen-PharrEdinburg | $267$ | 32 | 527 | 66 | - 29 | $-27$ | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | - 99 | -99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Midland | 427 | 21 | 824 | 40 | - 49 | - 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ... | ... | 0 | 0 | 70 | 12 | -93 | $-86$ |
| Odessa . | 247 | 18 | 428 | 24 | - 38 | - 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . . | $\ldots$ | 0 | 0 | 70 | 14 | - 72 | - 73 |
| San Angelo | 316 | 25 | 637 | 49 | + 36 | + 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | :.. |  |
| San Antonio | 2,277 | 202 | 4,470 | 405 | - 21 | $-18$ | 43 | 4 | 149 | 20 | $+1890$ | $+400$ | 933 | 153 | 1,377 | 205 | -46 | - 41 |
| Texarkana | 112 | 9 | 158 | 13 | --54 | - 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . . | . . . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . . |  |
| Tyler | 386 | 19 | 673 | 34 | - 51 | -48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |  | 0 | 0 | 400 | 50 | ... |  |
| Waco .. | 285 | 17 | 585 | 35 | - 85 | -33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 100 | $-100$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | ... |
| Wichita Falis ..... | 308 | 17 | 592 | 87 | $+15$ | + 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | . . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -100 | $-100$ |
| TOTAL METROPOLI <br> TAN AREAS | $.38,164$ | 2,360 | 71.705 | 4.435 | - 18 | - 18 | 1,002 | 114 | 2.111 | 280 | - 37 | $-36$ | 10,178 | 1,422. | 18,888 | 2,891 | $-27$ | - 27 |
| TOTAL NONMETROPOLITAN AREAS | $8,291$ | 455 | 12,448 | 899 | $\rightarrow 16$ | - 19 | 174 | 23 | 288 | 39 | $+3$ | - 2 | 872 | 182 | 1,719 | 387 | -15 | - 6 |
| TOTAL FOR STATE | .44,455 | 2,815 | 84,153 | 5,334 | - 18 | -18 | 1.176 | 187 | 2,398 | 269 | - 34 | -. 32 | 11,050 | 1,604 | 20,107 | 3,228 | - 26 | - 26 |

[^9]
## bUILDING AUTHORIZED IN TEXAS selected cities

| City | Residential |  |  | Dwelling units (number) |  |  | Nonresidential |  |  | Total construction * |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | January-February |  | Percent chanco | Jan-Feb |  | Percent change | January-February |  | Percent change | January-February |  | Percent change |
|  | 1967 | 1966 |  | 1967 | 196 G |  | 1967 | 1966 |  | 1967 | 1966 |  |
| Abilene | 423,902 | \$ 757,657 | ...- 44 | 17 | 41 | - 59 | \$ 3,522,074 | \$ , 235,500 | +1,396 | \$ 4,027,736 | \$ 1,106,337 | + 264 |
| Amarillo | 1,295,800 | 1,772,300 | - 27 | 65 | 93 | - 30 | 838,985 | 398,870 | + 111 | 2,458,500 | 2,372,170 | $+\quad 4$ |
| Arlington | 3,424,500 | 2,455,800 | + 39 | 253 | 157 | + 61 | 875,600 | 1,333,700 | 34 | 4,384,816 | 8,908,420 | + 12 |
| Austin | 8,859,000 | 11,405,000 | - 22 | 568 | 938 | - 89 | 7,956,700 | 8,521,520 | + 126 | 17,359,700 | 1.5.745,941. | $+10$ |
| Beaumont | 1,991,715 | 628,668 | $+217$ | 1.91 | 47 | +306 | 281,204 | 648,482 | 57 | 2,487,885 | 1,386,183 | + 79 |
| Corpus Christi | 1,933,569 | 1,965,288 |  | 190 | 168 | + 17 | 2,649.742 | 4,680,887 | 48 | 5,225,996 | 7,106,724 | 26 |
| Dallas | 18,596,360 | 14,320,653 | 5 | 1.042 | 1,512 | $-31$ | 10,599,697 | 29,462,801 | 64 | 27,328,540 | 46,695,959 | 41 |
| Denton | 1,090,590 | 1,059.000 | + 3 | 118 | 64 | + 84 | 335,238 | 147.575 | + 127 | 1,425,828 | 1,224,575 | $+16$ |
| El Paso | 3,981,700 | 4,383,511 | - 10 | 227 | 266 | -- 15 | 5,292,704 | 4,938,672 | + | 10,093,876 | 10,428,285 | 8 |
| Fort Worth | 4.845,526 | 2,509,195 | + 98 | 544 | 251. | +117 | 7,231,827 | 2,214,682 | + 226 | 13,913,224 | 6,891,382 | $+186$ |
| Galveston | 114,862 | 400.930 | + 3 | $2 \sqrt{1}$ | 18 | + 39 | 359,676 | 355,700 | + | 1,090,367 | 1,059,614 | + 3 |
| Garland | 2,523,314 | 1,785,556 | + 41 | 346 | 238 | + 45 | 109,590 | 1,086,928 | 90 | 3,093,719 | 2,967,394 | + 4 |
| Grand Prairie | 1,106,350 | 719,939 | $+54$ | 56 | 38 | $+47$ | 14,500,910 | 345,300 | +4,100 | 15,810,226 | 1,284,209 | +1,131 |
| Houston | 15,994,302 | 23,115+695 | - 31 | 1,960 | 1,656 | --18 | 12,266,099 | 22,300,028 | 47 | 45,404,999 | 58,322,199 | 22 |
| Irving | 1,606,013 | 2.104,032 | -.. 24 | 111 | 155 | - 28 | 1,727,121 | 1,768,481 | - 2 | 3,403,773 | 3,957,114 | 14 |
| Killeen | 516,225 | 299,280 | + 72 | 39 | 15 | +160 | 460,000 | 471,908 | - 3 | 1,057,789 | 1,104,297 | - 4 |
| Longview | 653,000 | 2;021,000 | - 68 | 33 | 196 | -83 | 917.300 | 207,000 | + 348 | 1,759,800. | 2,325,000 | 24 |
| Lubhork | 1,727,400 | 5,917,275 | --71 | 112 | 684 | -- 84 | 525.723 | 7,707,148 | 93 | 2,5184, 813 | 14,680,5758 | 82 |
| Mesquite | 978,855 | 1,471,971 | - 34 | 70 | 176 | --. 60 | 1,012,275 | 568,500 | + ${ }^{\text { }} 78$ | 2,112,521 | 2,160,607 | 2 |
| Midland | 894,400 | 2,645,000 | -66 | 52 | 167 | $\cdots 69$ | 904,100 | 3,415,100 | 74 | 1,880,650 | 6,175,925 | 70 |
| Odessa | 497,250 | 936,000 | $-47$ | 38 | 89 | $-57$ | 367,906 | 1,178,128 | 69 | 1,033,089 | 2,299,239 | 55 |
| Pusadena | 1,881,400 | 1,716,250 | 47 | 206 | 101 | +104 | 234,500 | 1,745,545 | 87 | 2,976,150 | 3,844,350 | 23 |
| Port Arthur' | 37.000 | 167,673 | $-78$ | 2 | 15 | - 87 | 813,692 | 148.798 | + 447 | 932.029 | 402,418 | + 132 |
| Richardson | 1,111.440 | 2,727,899 | - 59 | 63 | 217 | $-71$ | 3,361;031 | 3,889,240 | 1 | 4,508.956 | 6,175,217 | 27 |
| San Angelo | 687,186 | 467,000 | $+36$ | 49 | 40 | + 23 | 225.043 | 48,272 | + 366 | 988,384 | 740,412 | + 83 |
| San Antonio | 5,275,262 | 7,508,448 | -30 | 598 | 800 | -25 | 14,419,209 | 3,575,860 | + 308 | 20,834,889 | 11,985,329 | + 75 |
| Tyler | 1,049,300 | 1,340,400 | $-22$ | 82 | 68 | + 80 | 1,430,230 | 862,900 | + 66 | 2,581,415 | 2,300,434 | + |
| Waco | 510,300 | 820,500 | - 88 | 29 | 50 | $-42$ | 166,000 | 1,282,425 | - 87 | 1,005,153 | 2,322,334 | - 57 |
| Wichita Falls | -661,490 | 996,640 | -44 | 32 | 85 | $-62$ | 286,000 | 788.476 | - 61 | 1,049,504 | 1,980,566 | - 47 |

* Includes additions, alterations, and repaira.

In February the seasonally adjusted annual value of all new private construction put in place in the nation amounted to $\$ 40.3$ billion, 11 percent less than a year earlier. However, nonfarm residential building was down 23 percent from February to February. It was only the nonresidential sector of the construction industry that helped maintain some semblance of normalcy in the industry.
New public construction in February showed considerable strength throughout the nation, as it proceeded at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $\$ 23.4$ billion, slightly above the rate for the entire year in 1966. Generally, construction of public buildings accounts for about one third of the public-construction sector, and construction of streets and highways for another third of the total.

The largest single public project under way in Texas currently is the development of San Antonio's 1968 HemisFair. Builders, racing against time, must start and complete an estimated $\$ 50,000,000$ worth of building at the downtown San Antonio site within the current twelvemonth period. Among the publicly financed projects under way or due to be started on the ninety-two-acre fairgrounds are:

## Federal Exhibit Building, $\$ 6.7$ million

Foreign Exhibit Building, $\$ 1.5$ million or more
Civic Convention Center for San Antonio, $\$ 10.5$ million
Institute of Texan Cultures, a state exhibit building, $\$ 10.5$ million
A 622 -foot tower, $\$ 4.5$ million
The HemisFair will give Texas businessmen an unusual opportunity to exhibit their products to out-of-state and out-of-country visitors, possibly becoming to some degree a Texas trade fair. Nearly half of the forty-eight foreign-government exhibit structures are due for completion in April and the remainder by late summer. Altogether, about thirty foreign exhibitors are expected and nine domestic industrial fixms have already leased exhibit space. The results of the entire project will be revealed to the public on the HemisFair's opening day, April 6, 1968.

Another major category of public construction in Texas, flood control and navigation works, will be financed to the extent of $\$ 60,000,000$ during the year by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Some of the major contract
lettings scheduled include a $\$ 2.9$-million improvement of the Fort Worth Floodway Clear Fork Extension and another $\$ 1$ million for clearing excavation levees on the west fork of the Fort Worth Floodway project. Channel improvement on San Pedro Creek and on the San Antonio River, both phases of the Corps's San Antonio Floodway project, will cost about $\$ 1.9$ million.

About $\$ 32$ million is allocated for 1967 contract work in connection with the Port Arthur Hurricane-Flood Protection site. A similar hurricane-flood protection project at Texas City is budgeted for some $\$ 6$ million during the year. Navigation channel-improvement projects to be financed in 1967 by the Corps of Engineers will be in the Sabine-Neches Waterway District and on the Gulf intracoastal waterway channel to Victoria. The 1967 budget for construction at the Wallisville Dam and Reservoir in Liberty and Chambers Counties will total some $\$ 4$ million.

Twenty-nine Texas airports will receive construction and improvement funds from the Federal Aviation Agency through its 1967 Federal Aid Airport Program. Over one third of the total $\$ 5.6$ million allotted to Texas will be spent on clearing, grading, and drainage at the site of the new Dallas-Fort Worth regional airport. Substantial federal financing will also be granted other airports: at Abilene, for approach lighting and extension of runway length to 72,000 feet; at Dimmitt and at Dublin, in both cases for the construction of runways and associated facilities; at El Paso, for runway improvement; at Galveston, for new lighting and sign systems; at Harlingen and Houston, for extensive improvement of facilities; at Kenedy, Levelland, and Littlefield, airport development and runway construction; at McAllen, relocation of highway and levee obstructions; at San Angelo and San Antonio, runway and taxiway improvements; at Slaton, airport development and airway construction; and at Waco, general improvements. Lesser sums will be allocated to still other Texas airports.

The largest single category of public construction in 1967, as in every recent year, is highway development. The federal highway program, recently trimmed somewhat by budget cutbacks, was augmented at the end of February by $\$ 175$ million, and a $\$ 4.4$-billion federal highway budget is tentatively projected for 1968. Federal highway spending may be enlarged during the year if highway-construction bids continue their current downtrend. Meanwhile, cutbacks in the federal funding of highway projects have delayed some highway work in Texas.

Two new objectives are being given increased emphasis in the federal highway programs-safety and beautification. The National Highway Safety Agency has released an elaborate schedule of new highway-safety standards during the past month. Lighting is to be provided in urban and suburban areas at expressway interchanges, at crossings of arterial streets, and at other hazardous locations. Skid-resistance specifications are to be included in highway-surfacing contracts. Construction detours are to meet reasonable safety standards. And bridge railings, guard rails, curbs, and other design features must be provided to minimize impact damage and to contain out-of-control vehicles. In addition to the safety program, highway beautification is under study in Congress this
year; however, the details of the program are not yet clearly in focus.

With continuing substantial industrial construction, with more favorable conditions for residential building, and with numerous large-scale public projects under way, prospects for a rising level of construction in Texas seem brighter than in several months.

ESTIMATED VALUES OF BUILDING AUTHORIZED IN TEXAS

| Classification (ther | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jan-Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Feb <br> 1967 <br> from <br> Jan | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jan-Feb } \\ 1967 \\ \text { from } \\ \text { Jan-Feb } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | (thousands of dollars) |  | 1967 | 1966 |
| AT,L PERMITS . . . . . . . . . . | . 152,746 | 261,271 | $+41$ | - 9 |
| New construction | 137,745 | 233,354 | $+44$ | $-10$ |
| Residential (housekeeping) | g) 58.149 | 109,430 | $+13$ | -19 |
| One-family dwellings . | . 45.848 | 86,787 | $+12$ | $-17$ |
| Multiple-fumily dwellings | 12,301 | 22,643 | +19 | $-27$ |
| Nonresidential buildings. | . 79,596 | 123,924 | $+80$ | + 1 |
| Nonhousekeeping |  |  |  |  |
| Amusement buildings . | .. 874 | 991 | +647 | $-1$ |
| Churches . ............ | . 3,129 | 5,721 | $+21$ | $+30$ |
| Industrial buildings ... | - 19,268 | 26.162 | +179 | $+51$ |
| Garages (commercial and private) | 898 | 1,215 | +183 | - 40 |
| Service stations | . 1,386 | 3,174 | $-22$ | + 8 |
| Hospitals and institutions | $2,227$ | 4,085 | $+20$ | $-35$ |
| Office-bank buildings. | ․ 9,969 | 13,415 | +189 | $-55$ |
| Works and utilities.... | - 8,716 | 9,629 | $+855$ | +233 |
| Educational buildings - | - 19,375 | 35,899 | + 18 | $+32$ |
| Stores and mercantile buildings | $7,437$ | 15,058 | - 2 | $-29$ |
| Other buildings and structures | $5,766$ | 6,647 | $+563$ | $+34$ |
| Additions, alterations, and repairs | . 15.001 | 27,917 | $+16$ | - 4 |
| METROPOLITAN vs. NONMETROPOLITAN $\dagger$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total metropolitan . . | . 134,652 | 224,046 | + 51 | $-10$ |
| Central cities | . 97,448 | 164,920 | $+44$ | $-16$ |
| Outside central cities.... | .. 37,204 | 59,126 | + 70 | + 9 |
| Total nonmetropolitan .... | - 18,094 | 37,225 | - 5 | 1 |
| $10,000 \text { to } 50,000$ population | $10,031$ | 21,963 | $-16$ | $+12$ |
| Less than 10,000 | . 8,063 | 15,262 | $+12$ | $-15$ |

† Defined according to the 1960 Census as revised in 1966.
Source: Bureau of Business Research in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.


TOTAL UNEMPLOYMENT IN TEXAS

# PASSENGER AIRLINE PATTERNS IN TEXAS <br> Warren Rose ${ }^{*}$ 

## Introduction

The past decade has witnessed unparalleled economic growth and productivity in the United States. The airline industry has contributed largely to this dynamic development. Measured in terms of investment, traffic, employment, and earnings, the industry has made dramatic achievements. Because of technological advances, population increases, and personal-income gains, this expansion is likely to continue.

Passenger movements confirmed the expansion of air travel in this country. The scheduled airline industry attracted more than 95 million travelers in 1965, more than double the figure reported ten years earlier, the annual growth rate equaling 14 percent since 1950 . The airlines also were the leading common carriers for intercity passenger travel. Revenue passenger miles recorded by the air industry in 1965 amounted to one and one-half times the combined total for railroads and motor buses, reversing almost completely the traffic pattern in $1955 .{ }^{1}$

To ascertain the extent of Texas' participation in the growth of passenger air traffic is the purpose of this study. The enplaned airline traffic in Texas, the Southwest, ${ }^{2}$ and the United States for the years 1959 through 1965, with trend projections extended through 1970, will be comparatively analyzed. The traffic generated by the individual airline stations in Texas also will be examined, for presentation of traffic flows.

The air-passenger data represent the revenue (paying)
air travelers boarding aircraft of the domestic certificated carriers at each on-line station. These airlines have been granted authority by the Civil Aeronautics Board to engage in air operations over specified routes, on either a scheduled or a nonscheduled basis. The traffic count includes those persons who originate, stopover and reboard, or transfer to other flights from a given airline station. Thus, some double counting exists, because the duplication of passengers between airlines has not been eliminated. The data are based upon periodic reports to the Civil Aeronautics Board by the carriers.

## Passenger Air Traffic in Texas, the Southwest, and the United States

All three geographical regions under consideration displayed growth tendencies in passenger-air traffic between 1959 and 1965, as shown in Table 1. Originations in Texas rose from 2.9 million persons in 1959 to 5.7 million in 1965 , with a gain of 97 percent. The Southwest participated in the growth, increasing its total from 5.2 million to 9.7 million during the period, with a gain of 88 percent. The nation's passenger air traffic also advanced, soaring from 50.6 million air travelers in 1959 to 95.9 million in 1965, with a gain of 89 percent. The rate of increase for Texas thus exceeded the rates for the region and for the nation.
Texas' share of the air originations of the United States and the Southwest remained relatively unchanged

Table 1
ENPLANED PASSENGER AIR TRAFFIC FOR TEXAS, THE SOUTHWEST, AND THE UNITED STATES 1959-1965

| Region and type of data | Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1959 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 1968 | 1964 | 1965 |
| Airline passengers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas | 2,920,747 | 3,045,391 | 3,431,788 | 3,832,930 | 4,339,383 | 4,874,685 | 5,741,609 |
| Southwest . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 5,167,082 | 5,323,633 | 5,872,496 | 6,503,172 | 7,460,001 | 8,255,426 | 9,727,235 |
| United States ............................................... | 50,637,504 | 52,027,928 | 56,563,115 | 63,002,191 | 72,026,431 | 82,236,610 | 95,854,062 |
| Expansion index ( $1959=100)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas . .............. | 100 | 104 | 117 | 131 | 149 | 167 | 197 |
| Southwest . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 100 | 103 | 114 | 126 | 144 | 160 | 188 |
| United States . . . . . ...................................... | 100 | 103 | 112 | 124 | 142 | 162 | 189 |
| Annual percentage change over previous year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas ..................................................... |  | 4.3 | 12.7 | 11.7 | 13.2 | 10.3 | 17.8 |
| Southwest . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | $\cdots$ | 3.0 | 10.8 | 10.3 | 14.7 | 10.7 | 17.8 |
| United States .............................................. |  | 2.7 | 8.7 | 11.4 | 14.3 | 14.2 | 16.6 |
| Percentage relationship of Texas to: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Southwest . . ............................................ | 56.5 | 57.2 | 58.4 | 58.9 | 58.2 | 58.0 | 59.0 |
| United States ............................................. | 5.8 | 5.9 | 6.1 | . 1 | 6.0 | 5.8 | 6.0 |

Sources: Federal Aviation Agency, Air Commerce Traffic Pattern, 1959-1961; and Civil Aeronautics Board and Federal Aviation Ageney, Airport Activity Statistics of Certificated Route Air Carriers, 1962-1965.

[^10]during the period. Six percent of the nation's air travelers began their trips in Texas, while almost 60 percent of the originations in the Southwest were derived from the Lone Star State. These figures, supported by the annual percentage changes in air traffic, indicated that Texas was participating in the growth of air travel at approximately the same rate as that of the United States and of the Southwest.

Positive growth rates were recorded by geographical area between 1959 and 1965. Texas reported the highest growth rate, as enplaned passenger air traffic produced an annual increase of 12 percent. An almost identical growth rate was attained by the United States, 11.6 percent, while the Southwest registered annual increases of 11.4 percent. The similarity of expansion patterns suggested that the growing popularity of air travel was a common phenomenon.

The continuation of present growth rates through 1970 should provide substantial traffic gains for each area. Originations in Texas should total 9.7 million persons in that year, representing an increase of 231 percent over 1959. Enplanements from the Southwest should reach 15.9 million air travelers, and from the United States, 158.2 million, achieving gains of 208 and 226 percent respectively over the base year. The realization of these projected figures should enable Texas to account for 61 percent of the passenger air traffic in the Southwest and 6.1 percent of the nation's total in 1970.

## Passenger Air Traffe at Stations Enplaning Tèn Percent or More of the State's Total

Turning from the role of Texas in regional and national air-passenger movements, one can analyze also the traffic generated by the individual airline stations in the state. This microcosmic approach aften permits a more meaningful assessment of growth. To develop a workable framework and to recognize differences in traffic potential among the stations, three classification groups have been established: stations which account for 10 percent or more of the passenger air traffic in Texas for any one year of the period; stations which supply between 1 and 10 percent of the total; and stations which provide less than 1 percent of the state's originations annually.

Stations contributing 10 percent or more of the passenger air traffic in Texas greatly infuenced the airtraffic pattern. This information is shown in Table 2.

Although Dallas and Houston were the only two centers which placed in this category, their combined traffic totals significantly influenced passenger enplanements in the state. From 60 to 72 percent of 'Texas' originations occurred at these stations annually. The relative importance of the group, furthermore, increased each year, reaching a peak in 1965. This concentration was one of the prominent characteristics of airline-traffic patterns in Texas.

Dailas was the leading traffic-generating center in Texas between 1959 and 1965. Enplaning more than 1 million passengers each year, this station reported a peak of 2.8 million persons in 1965. Its share of the state's total increased annually, ranging from 40 to 49 percent. Confirming this growth was the fact that passenger air traffic from Dallas more than doubled ${ }_{8}$ between 1959 and 1965, with annual percentage increases varying from 11 to 21 percent.
Houston was the second most important airline station in Texas. Accounting for 616 thousand air travelers in 1959, this center originated 1.3 million passengers in 1965. More than one fifth of the state's total was obtained from Houston annually, the relative importance of this station increasing slightly during the period. Traffic indices, with 1959 as the base year, and year-to-year percentage changes further corroborated Houston's air-passenger growth.
The annual growth rates for Dallas and Houston also emphasized the dynamic trend of passenger air traffic. Dallas achieved an annual growth rate of 15.6 percent for the period, while Houston reported a 13.6-percent increase each year. Both centers surpassed the state's growth rate of 12 percent annually, indicating that these stations were primarily responsible for the development of passenger air traffic in Texas.

If these rates of growth continue, Dallas should originate 5.8 million air passengers in 1970 , or 60 percent of the total for the state. Houston should enplane 2.3 million air travelers in that year, accounting for 24 percent of the enplaned passenger traffic in Texas. Thus, the

Table 2
AIRLINE STATIONS ACCOUNTING FOR TEN PERCENT OR MORE OF THE ENPLANED PASSENGER AIR TRAFFIC IN TEXAS

1959-1965


Sources: Federal Aviation Agency, Air Commerce Trafic Pattern, 1959-1961; Civil Aeronautics Board and Federal Aviation Agency, Airport Activity Statistics of Certificated Route Air Carriera, 1982-1965.
concentration of air traffic at these stations should become even more pronounced.

## Passenger Air Traffic at Stations Enplaning between One and Ten Percent of the State's Total

Airline centers in Texas which generated between 1 and 10 percent of the state's total were more numerous and more geographically dispersed than the cities in the group enplaning 10 percent or more. Classified as medium-sized traffic hubs, these stations played a significant role in the development of air traffic.

Substantial passenger gains were recorded by the group during the period, although their relative contribution to Texas' traffic declined steadily, as shown in Table '3. The nine stations in the 1-to-10-percent group originated over 1.25 million air travelers in 1965 , compared with fewer than 1 million air passengers in 1959. Accounting for one third of the passenger enplanements in the first year of the period, the group fell continuously in relative importance until fewer than one fourth of the total traffic originations in Texas occurred in these centers in 1965. The reason for relative decline in the group was the higher growth rate for Dallas and Houston. Both

Table 3

## AIRLINE STATIONS ORIGINATING BETWEEN ONE AND TEN PERCENT OF THE ENPLANED PASSENGER TRAFFIC IN TEXAS

1959-1985

| Station and type of data | Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1959 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 1968 | 1964 | 1965 |
| Alrline passengers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| San Antonio . | 225,347 | 226,743 | 243.840 | 309,211 | 342.616 | 338,502 | 462,670 |
| El Paso | 196,992 | 198,801 | 211,577 | 210,624 | 236,53a | 261.502 | 275,647 |
| Fort Worth ${ }^{\text {t }}$ | 174,240 | 148,615 | 113,020 | 57,101 | 46,312. | ... | . . . |
| Austin | 79,677 | 77,034 | 81,223 | 87,408 | 101,677 | 118,858 | 139,164 |
| Amarillo | 75,767 | 80.254 | 82,955 | 84,160 | 97,612 | 112,170 | 121,690 |
| Corpus Christi | 65,306 | 63,198 | 62,443 | 65,760 | 74,649 | 87,378 | 101,347 |
| Midiand/Odessa | 63,059 | 68,959 | 88,197 | 94.676 | 103,285 | 104,261 | 125,086 |
| Beammont/Port Arthur ${ }^{2}$ | 44,348 | 42,814 | 43,854 | 40,015 | 43.892 | 46,149 | ... |
| Lubbock | 50,261 | 53,314 | 56,373 | 62,308 | 72,100 | 85,138 | 98,850 |
| Group total ${ }^{8}$ | 974,997 | 954.236 | 977.982 | 1,011,258 | 1,118,126 | 1,148,718 | 1,324,454 |
| Expansion index ( $1959=100$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| San Antonio | 100 | 101 | 108 | 137 | 152 | 148 | 205 |
| El Pabo | 100 | 101 | 107 | 107 | 120 | 133 | 140 |
| Fort Worth ${ }^{1}$ | 100 | 85 | 65 | 33 | 27 | ... | ... |
| Austin | 100 | 97 | 102 | 110 | 128 | 149 | 175 |
| Amarilio | 100 | 106 | 109 | 111 | 129 | 141 | 161 |
| Corpus Christi | 100 | 97 | 96 | 101 | 114 | 134 | 156 |
| Midland/Odessa | 100 | 101 | 132 | 150 | 164 | 165 | 198 |
| Beaumont/Port Arthur ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ | 100 | 95 | 98 | 90 | 98 | 104 | ... |
| Lubbock | 100 | 106 | 112 | 124 | 143 | 169 | 197 |
| Group total | 100 | 98 | 100 | 104 | 115 | 118 | 136 |
| Annual vercentage change over previous year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| San Antonio | $\cdots$ | 0.6 | 7.5 | 26.8 | 10.8 | -2.7 | 38.7 |
| El Paso | $\ldots$ | 0.9 | 6.4 | 0.6 | 1.2 .3 | 10.5 | 5.4 |
| Fort Worth ${ }^{1}$ | . . | $-14.7$ | -24.0 | $-49.5$ | $-18.9$ | ... | ... |
| Austin |  | -3.3 | 5.4 | 7.6 | 16.3 | 16.9 | 17.1 |
| Annual percentage change over previous year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amarilla |  | 5.9 | 3.4 | 1.5 | 16.0 | 14.9 | 8.5 |
| Corpus Christ1 | . . . | -3.2 | $\cdots-1.2$ | 5.3 | 13,5 | 17.1 | 16.0 |
| Midland/Odessa | . . | 1.4 | 30.1 | 13,8 | 9.0 | 1.0 | 20.0 |
| Reaumont/Port Arthur ${ }^{3}$ | $\ldots$ | -4.6 | - 2.5 | $-7.7$ | 8.4 | 6.4 | ... |
| Lubbock | . . | 6.1 | 5.7 | 10.5 | 15.7 | 18.1 | 16.1 |
| Group total |  | 2.1 | 2.5 | 3.4 | 10.6 | 2.4 | 15.8 |
| Percentage relationship to the state of Texas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| San Antonio | 7.7 | 7.4 | 7.1 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 7.0 | 8.1 |
| El Paso | 6.7 | 6,5 | 6.2 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 4.8 |
| Fort Worth ${ }^{1}$ | 6.0 | 4.9 | 3.3 | 1.6 | 1.1 | . . | $\cdots$ |
| Austin | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.4 |
| Amarillo | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.1 |
| Corpus Christi | 2.2 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| Midland/Odessa | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| Beaumont/Port Arthur ${ }^{2}$ | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | . |
| Lubbock | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.7 |
| Group total ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 33.4 | 31.3 | 28.5 | 26.4 | 25.8 | 24.0 | 23.1 |

${ }^{1}$ This airline station enplaned less than one percent of the state's total after 1963 ,
${ }^{2}$ This airline station enplaned less than one percent of the state's total in 1965.
${ }^{*}$ Totals may not add because of rounding.

[^11]groups generated additional air passengers during the period, but the faster growth rate for the 10 -percent-andover stations resulted in a smaller share of the state's market for the 1-to-10-percent group.

San Antonio and El Paso were the major group centers in originating air passengers. They individually enplaned more than one fourth of a million persons annually after 1963 . These stations were the only two in the group to contribute more than 5 percent of the total enplanements in the state. San Antonio, Midland/Odessa, and Lubbock registered the greatest increases for the period, achieving respective percentage gains of 105,98 , and 97 percent between 1959 and 1965. Fort Worth was the only station in the group to suffer substantial traffic losses. The fact was the result of its proximity to Dallas and the reluctance of the airlines to land at both airports. The increased operating costs of serving both centers were not accompanied by additional revenues, thus the concentration of flights to the more lucrative Dallas market. A decision by both cities in 1966 to establish a huge regional airport which will incorporate the present Great Southwest International Airport in Tarrant County should provide satisfactory facilities to accommodate air passengers from both areas.

## Passenger Air Traffic at Stations Enplaning Less Than One Percent of the State's Total

Completing the airline-traffic pattern in Texas were those stations which originated less than 1 percent of the total enplanements. Twenty-one of these small-sized hubs comprised the group in 1965, linking the smaller communities in Texas to the major airports by feeder airline service. Their major function was to provide the benefits of air travel to persons who otherwise would be deprived of these advantages.

This group played a modest role in air-passenger movements in Texas, as seen in Table 4. Annual originations ranged from 145 thousand to 302 thousand persons during the period, approximating 5 percent of the state's total. No appreciable change occurred in the relative contribution of this group to Texas enplanements, and, although the stations should register traffic gains by 1970, their combined output should be rather limited. Among the leading traffic centers in this group were Abilene and Wichita Falls, joined by Fort Worth and Beaumont/Port Arthur in 1965.
texas labor-force estimates and forecast

| Category | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb * } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Jan}^{*} \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb r } \\ & 1966 \end{aligned}$ | Anticipated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\underset{1967}{\text { April }}$ |
| Total civilian labor fore | 4,144.5 | 4,130.7 | 3,977.9 | 4,195.0 |
| Employment-total | 4,016.1 | 4,003.0 | 3,833.7 | 4,077.0 |
| Agricultural | 279.1 | 270.9 | 287.3 | 299.0 |
| Nonagricultural | 8,787.0 | 3,732.1 | 3,546.4 | 3,778.0 |
| Manufacturing | 659.6 | 653.8 | 618.6 | 668.0 |
| Nonmanufacturing | 3,077.4 | 3,078.3 | 2,927.8 | 3,110.0 |
| Unemployment-total | - 125.0 | 122.5 | 142.5 | 118.0 |

[^12]
## Summary and Conclusions

The state of Texas contributed largely to origination of passenger air traffic in the Southwest and the United States. Equally important was the fact that the state was keeping pace with the region and the nation in terms of growth rate. Trend projections indicated that Texas should account for 60 percent of the total enplanements in the Southwest and 6 percent of the United States total in 1970.

Air-traffic patterns within the state showed high concentration. The group of stations enplaning more than 10 percent of the total dominated the market. Approximately two out of every three air travelers in Texas originated their flights at these centers, and if the present growth rates are maintained this group should enplane four out of every five air passengers in 1970. Exceeding the rate of growth for the state, these stations provided the nucleus for expanded air travel from Texas.

The relative importance of stations supplying between 1 and 10 percent of the state's air traffic declined during the period. Although passenger enplanements rose, the group contributed less than one fourth of Texas originations in 1965, compared to one third of the total in 1959. The remaining group, composed of stations generating less than 1 percent of the state's total, accounted for one twentieth of the total.
A close correlation was observed between the population of an airline station and its ability to originate traffic. Dallas, Houston, and San Antonio were the leading traffic centers as well as the major population areas of the state. More importantly, these stations were assuming an increasingly greater role in air-passenger movements.

To continue receiving the benefits of air travel, however, an area must utilize the data as a basis for planning and development. The enormous amount of public investment in air facilities to meet public needs suggests a study to determine future airport and route requirements. Examination should be made of the feasibility of regional airports, of the carriers' route systems, and of the efficacy of serving small traffic-generating centers. The intelligent use of air-transport resources warrants immediate consideration of these factors if Texas is to attain its potential in air transportation.

## INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT



Table 4

## AIRLINE STATIONS ACCOUNTING FOR LESS THAN ONE PERCENT OF THE ENPLANED PASSENGER TRAFFIC IN TEXAS

1959-1965

| Station and type of data | Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1959 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 1968 | 1964 | 1965 |
| Airline passengers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abilene | 16,679 | 16,560 | 16,135 | 16,436 | 17,532 | 23,835 | 30,534 |
| Beaumont/Port Arthur ${ }^{1}$ | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 48,940 |
| Big Spring | 1,222 | 856 | 725 | 816 | 957 | 2,290 | 2,552 |
| Borger | 1,921 | 1,827 | 2,034 | 1,952 | 2,106 | 1,639 | 1,454 |
| Brownsville | 16,602 | 13,537 | 12,015 | 9,797 | 6,939 | 8,055 | 11,382 |
| Brownwood | 1,537 | 1,598 | 1,510 | 1,618 | 1,682 | 2,107 | 2,589 |
| College Station/Bryan | 3,734 | 3,581 | 3,480 | 3,592 | 3,610 | 4,785 | 6,816 |
| Fort Worth ${ }^{2}$. ${ }^{\text {a }}$.... | … | , ... | . | ... | ... | 36,961 | 29,131 |
| Galveston | 1,521 | 1,038 | 802 | 465 | 369 | 1,520 | 1,900 |
| Harlingen/San Benito | 8,370 | 9,197 | 10,482 | 11,273 | 13,515 | 15,625 | 16,468 |
| Laredo | 4,905 | 5,128 | 4,904 | 6,001 | 6,567 | 7,418 | 9,096 |
| Longview/Kilgore/Gladewater | 8,452 | 8,013 | 8,214 | 8,558 | 10,256 | 12,122 | 12,672 |
| Lufkin . ................. | 2,209 | 2,073 | 2,020 | 1,822 | 2,034 | 1,956 | 2,505 |
| Mission/McAllen/Edinburg | 11,271 | 11,604 | 10,310 | 12,929 | 14,243 | 15,835 | 19,025 |
| Paris | 1,827 | 1,656 | 1,508 | 1,535 | 1,429 | 1,441 | 1,424 |
| San Angelo | 12,911 | 12.255 | 13,469 | 15,887 | 17,837 | 17,481 | 17,826 |
| Temple | 8,283 | 9,304 | 6,503 | 8,795 | 8,103 | 11,998 | 18,138 |
| Tyler | 9,768 | 9,150 | 9,796 | 10,887 | 11,943 | 10,708 | 12,122 |
| Victoria | 3.628 | 3,344 | 3,518 | 8,551 | 3,730 | 2,548 | 3,430 |
| Waco | 15,495 | 14,928 | 14,173 | 15,567 | 13,846 | 16,539 | 19,879 |
| Wichita Falls | 21,395 | 21,427 | 23,520 | 24,047 | 29,752 | 31,205 | 33,913 |
| Group total | 151,730 | 147,076 | 145,113 | 155.528 | 166,450 | 226,068 | 301,746 |
| Expansion index ( $1959=100)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abilene ............... | 100 | 99 | 97 | 99 | 105 | 143 | 183 |
| Beaumont/Port Arthur ${ }^{1}$ | $\ldots$ | . | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | +... | +.. | 110 |
| Big Spring | 100 | 70 | 59 | 67 | 78 | 187 | 209 |
| Borger | 100 | 95 | 106 | 102 | 110 | 85 | 76 |
| Brownsville | 100 | 82 | 72 | 59 | 42 | 49 | 68 |
| Brownwood | 100 | 104 | 98 | 105 | 109 | 137 | 168 |
| College Station/Bryan | 100 | 96 | 93 | 96 | 97 | 128 | 183 |
| Fort Worth ${ }^{2}$....... | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ... | $\cdots$ | 21 | 17 |
| Galveston .......... | 100 | 68 | 53 | 31 | 24 | 100 | 125 |
| Harlingen/San Benito | 100 | 110 | 125 | 185 | 161 | 187 | 197 |
| Laredo . . . . . . . . . . . . | 100 | 105 | 100 | 122 | 134 | 151 | 185 |
| Longview/Kilgore/Gladewater | 100 | 95 | 97 | 101 | 121 | 143 | 150 |
| Lufkin . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 100 | 94 | 91 | 82 | 92 | 89 | 113 |
| Mission/MeAllen/Edinbury | 100 | 103 | 91 | 115 | 126 | 140 | 169 |
| Paris | 100 | 91 | 83 | 84 | 78 | 79 | 78 |
| San Angelo | 100 | 95 | 104 | 123 | 138 | 135 | 138 |
| Temple . | 100 | 112 | 79 | 106 | 98 | 145 | 219 |
| Tyler | 100 | 94 | 100 | 111 | 122 | 110 | 124 |
| Victoria | 100 | 92 | 97 | 98 | 103 | 70 | 95 |
| Waco | 100 | 96 | 91 | 100 | 89 | 107 | 128 |
| Wichita Falls | $100$ | 100 |  | 112 | 139 | 146 | 159 |
| Group total | 100 | 97 | 96 | 103 | 110 | 149 | 199 |
| Annual percentage change over previous year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abilene | ... | $-0.7$ | $-2.6$ | 1.9 | 6.7 | 36.0 | 28.1 |
| Beaumont/Port Arthur ${ }^{1}$ | . .. | ... | ... | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ... | 6.0 |
| Big Spring | $\cdots$ | -30.7 | -15.3 | 12.6 | 17.3 | 139.2 | 11.4 |
| Borger .... | .. | -4.9 | -11.3 | -4.0 | 7.9 | 22.2 | -11.3 |
| Brownsville | $\cdots$ | -18.5 | -11.2 | $-16.0$ | -31.3 | 16.1 | 40.7 |
| Brownwood | . | 4.0 | $-5.5$ | 7.2 | 4.0 | 25.3 | 22.9 |
| College Station/Bryan | $\cdots$ | -4.1 | $-2.8$ | 3.2 | 0.5 | 32.5 | 42.4 |
| Fort Worth ${ }^{2}$. ${ }^{\text {a }}$. . | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... | $-20.2$ | -21.2 |
| Galveston ......... | $\ldots$ | -31.8 | -22.7 | -42.0 | -20.6 | 811.9 | 25.0 |
| Harlingen/San Benito | $\cdots$ | 9.9 | 13.9 | 7.5 | 19.9 | 15.6 | 5.4 |
| Laredo . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | ? | 4.5 | -4.4 | 22.4 | 9.4 | 13.0 | 22.6 |
| Longview/Kilgore/Gladewater | $\cdots$ | $-5.2$ | 2.5 | 4.2 | 19.8 | 18.2 | 4.5 |
| Lufkin ................ | ... | $-6.2$ | -2.6 | -9.8 | 11.6 | $-3.2$ | 28.1 |
| Mission/McAllen/Edinburg | ... | 3.0 | $-11.2$ | 25.4 | 10.2 | 11.2 | 20.1 |
| Paris ...... | $\cdots$ | -9.4 | -8.9 | 1.8 | -6.9 | 0.8 | -1.2 |
| San Angelo | . $\cdot$ | $-5.1$ | 9.9 | 18.0 | 12.3 | -2.0 | 2.0 |
| Temple .... | $\cdots$ | 12.3 | -30.1 | 85.2 | -7.9 | 48.0 | 51.2 |
| Tyler .. | ... | $-6.3$ | 7.1 | 11.1 | 9.7 | -10.3 | 13.2 |
| Victoria | ... | -7.8 | 5.1 | 1.1 | 5.0 | $-31.7$ | 34.6 |
| Waco . . . . . . | $\ldots$ | -3.7 | -5.1 | 9.8 | -11.1 | 19.4 | 20.2 |
| Wichita Falls | - | 0.1 | 9.8 | 2.2 | 23.7 | 4.9 | 8.7 |
| Group total | $\cdots$ | $-3.1$ | $-1.3$ | 7.2 | 7.0 | 35.8 | 33.5 |


${ }^{1}$ This airline station enplaned between 1 and 10 percent of the state's total prior to 1965 , ${ }^{2}$ This alrine station enplaned between 1 and 10 percent of the state's total prior to 1964.
${ }^{s}$ Totals may not add because of rounding.
Sources: Federal Aviation Agency, Air Commerce Traffe Pattern, 1959-1961 and Civh Aeronauties Board and Federal Aviation Agency, Airport Aetivity Statiatics of Certificated Route Air Carriers, 196 \$1965.

HOURS ANB EARNINGS IN TEXAS $\dagger$

| Industry | Averape weekly earnings |  |  | Average weekly hours |  |  | Average hourly earnings |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } \\ & 1967 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jan * } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Feb} \mathrm{r} \\ 1966 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb }{ }^{0} \\ & 1967 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Jan}^{*}{ }^{*} 967 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } Y \\ & 1966 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Feb}{ }^{*} \\ & 1967 \end{aligned}$ | $\operatorname{Jan}_{1967}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Febr } \\ & 1966 \end{aligned}$ |
| Manufacturing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Durable goods | 110.39 | 110.66 | 107.87 | 41.5 | 41.6 | 42.8 | 2.66 | 2.66 | 2:55 |
| Lumber and wood products. | 76.62 | 74,27 | 67.97 | 42.1 | 42.2 | 41.7 | 1.82 | 1.76 | 1.68 |
| Furniture and fixtures. | 78.01 | 79.20 | 72.74 | 39.4 | 39.8 | 38.9 | 1.98 | 1.99 | 1.87 |
| Stone, clay, and glass products. | 98.98 | 90.98 | 89.04 | 43.2 | 40.8 | 42.4 | 2.29 | 2.28 | 2,10 |
| Primary metal industries...... | 124.42 | 128.35 | 121.01 | 41.2 | 41.7 | 41,3 | 3.02 | 3.08 | 2.93 |
| Fabricated metal products | 114.28 | 113.78 | 112.01 | - 42.8 | 43.1 | 44.1 | 2.67 | 2.64 | 2.54 |
| Machinery, except electrical. | 118.43 | 118.48 | 112,28 | 43.7 | 43,7 | 43.5 | 2.71 | 2.71 | 2.58 |
| Oil-field machinery | 126.00 | 128,04 | 122.39 | 43.6 | 44.0 | 43,4 | 2.89 | 2.91 | 2.82 |
| Transportation equipment | 131.29 | 132.52 | 139.17 | 40.9 | 40.9 | 42.3 | 3.21 | 8.24 | 3.29 |
| Nondurable goods | 104.09 | 102.87 | 102.84 | 40.5 | 40.5 | 41.1 | 2.57 | 2.54 | 2.49 |
| Food and kindred products. | 90.32 | 98.41 | 89.45 | 40.5 | 41.7 | 41.8 | 2.23 | 2.24 | 2.14 |
| Meat products | 92.92 | 101.09 | 93.84 | 40.4 | 43.2 | 40.8 | 2.30 | 2.84 | 2.30 |
| Textile-mill products | 78.55 | 76.96 | 77.23 | 43.4 | 42.9 | 44.9 | 1,81 | 1.78 | 1.72 |
| Broad-woven-fabric mills | 81.47 | 79.12 | 78.05 | 43.8 | 48.0 | 44.6 | 1.86 | 1.84 | 1.75 |
| Apparel and other finished-textile products. | 62, 75 | 60.80 | 59.75 | 37.8 | 38.0 | 38.8 | 1.66 | 1.60 | 1.54 |
| Paper and allied products. | 116.76 | 116.76 | 115.67 | 42.0 | 41.7 | 48.0 | 2.78 | 2.80 | 2.69 |
| Printing, publishing, and allied industries. | 107.17 | 103.14 | 99,20 | 39.4 | 38.2 | 38.6 | 2.72 | 2.70 | 2.57 |
| Chemicals and allied products. | 146.16 | 148.38 | 145.61 | 42.0 | 42.5 | 42.7 | 3.48 | 3.49 | 8.41 |
| Petroleum refining and related industries, | 158,47 | 147.97 | 149.84 | 42.6 | 40.1 | 41.6 | 8.72 | 3.69 | 9.59 |
| Leather and leather products. . . . . . . . . . . | 63.60 | 69.21 | 66.16 | 39.5 | 38.7 | 44.4 | 1.61 | 1.53 | 1.49 |
| Nonmanufacturing (selected segments) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mining | 183.98 | 187.69 | 128.53 | 42.4 | 43.3 | 42.7 | 3.16 | 3.18 | 3.01 |
| Crude petroleum and natural gas. | 185.46 | 139.97 | 131.09 | 42.2 | 43.2 | 42.7 | 8.21 | 3.24 | 3.07 |
| Salphur | 164.06 | 157.32 | 130.47 | 45.7 | 45.6 | 40.9 | 3.69 | 3.45 | 3.18 |
| Public utilities | 111.32 | 118.32 | 108.81 | 89.9 | 39,9 | 40.3 | 2.79 | 2.84 | 2.70 |
| Wholesale trade | 109.65 | 109.65 | 109.87 . | 42.5 | 42.5 | 48.6 | 2.68 | 2.58 | 2.52 |
| Retail trade | 70.50 | 68.82 | 69.55 | 87.7 | 37.0 | 37.8 | 1.87 | 1.86 | 1.84 |

$\dagger$ Data cover wage and salary workers only.

* Preliminary, subject to revision upon receipt of additianal reports.
$r$ Revised.
Source: Texas Employment Commission.


Indicators of business conditions in Texas cities published in this table include statistics on banking, building permits, employment, postal receipts, and retail trade. An individual city is listed when a minimum of three indicators is available,

The cities have been grouped according to Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. In Texas all twenty-two SMSA's are defined by county lines; the counties included are listed under each SMSA. The populations shown for the SMSA's are estimates for April 1, 1966, prepared by the Population Research Center, Department of Sociology, The University of Texas. Cities in SMSA's are listed under their appropriate SMSA's; all other cities are listed alphabetically. The population shown after the city name is the 1960 Census figure, unless otherwise indicated.

Retail-sales data are reported here only when a minimum of five stores report in the given retail area sales category. The first column shows an average percent change from the preceding month. This is the normal statewide seasonal change in sales by that kind of busi-ness-except in the cases of Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, and San Antonio, where the dagger ( $\dagger$ ) is omitted because the normal seasonal changes given are for each of
these cities individually. The second column shows the percent change in actual sales reported for the month, and the third column shows the percent change in actual sales from the same month a year ago. A large variation between the normal seasonal change and the reported change indicates an abnormal sales month.

Symbols used in this table include:
(a) Population Research Center data, April 1, 1966.
$(\dagger)$ Average statewide percent change from preceding month.
(r) Estimates officially recognized by Texas Highway Department.
(rr) Estimate for Pleasanton: combination of 1960 Census figures for Pleasanton and North Pleasanton.
(*) Cash received during the four-week postal accountjng period ended January 27, 1967.
$(\ddagger)$ Money on deposit in individual demand deposit accounts on the last day of the month.
(§) Data for Texarkana, Texas, only.
(**) Change is less than one half of $1 \%$.
(\|) Annual rate basis, seasonally adjusted.
(\#) Monthly averages.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{City and item} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Feb } \\
1967
\end{gathered}
$$} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Percent change} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{City and Item} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Feb } \\
& 1967
\end{aligned}
$$} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Percent change} <br>
\hline \& \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Feb } 1967 \\
& \text { from } \\
& \text { Jan 1967 }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Feb } 1967 \\
& \text { from } \\
& \text { Feb 1966 }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \& \& Feb 1967 from Jan 1967 \& Feb 1967 from Feb 1966 <br>
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{ABILENE SMSA
(Jones and Taylor; pop.}} \& AMARILLO (pop. 155,205 r) \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& Retail sales ......... \& \& \& - 11 <br>
\hline Building permits, less federal contracts \$ \& 2,793,350 \& $+85$ \& +315 \& Automotives stores ................. \& - ${ }^{-17}$ ¢ $\dagger$ \& + 2 \& $-14$ <br>
\hline Bank debits (thousands) \|........... \& 1,925,136 \& $+\quad 2$ \& +7 \& Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . S \& 277,279
$1,034,630$ \& - 6 \& +

-25 <br>
\hline Nonfarm employment (area) \& 37,000 \& ** \& + 1 \& Buiding permits, less federal contracts \$
Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . \& $1,034,630$
349,530 \& -27
-7 \& <br>
\hline Manufacturing employment (area). \& 4,280 \& $-1$ \& + 5 \& End-of-month deposits (thousands) 4.8 \& 127,108 \& 5 \& <br>
\hline Percent unemployed (area). \& 3.5 \& + 13 \& $-15$ \& Annual rate of deposit turnover..... \& 32.2 \& 3 \& + 1 <br>
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{ABILENE (pop. 110,049 r)} \& \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Canyon (pop. 6,755 r)} <br>
\hline Retail sales \& - 4 中 \& 2 \& - 8 \& Postal receipts * ..................... \& 9,684 \& + 14 \& $+10$ <br>
\hline Apparel stores \& - 23 \% \& - 14 \& - 10 \& Building permits, less federal contracts \$ \& 71,400 \& - 78 \& - 91 <br>
\hline General merchandise stores. \& - $9 \dagger$ \& -27 \& + 3 \& Bank debits (thousands) ............. $\$$ \& 8,057 \& - 29 \& <br>
\hline Postal receipts \% . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ \& 148,946 \& $+8$ \& + 13 \& End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ \& 7,046 \& $-7$ \& 7 <br>
\hline Building permits, lese federal contracts \$ \& 2,516,665 \& +67 \& +289 \& Annual rate of deposit turnover. $\therefore$. . \& 18.2 \& -27 \& <br>
\hline Bank debits (thousands) ............. ${ }^{8}$ \& 126,877 \& $-18$ \& + 6 \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline Endoof-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. $\$$ \& 74,692 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{$+\quad 2$
-17} \& +1
$+\quad 6$ \& \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{ALPINE (pop. 4,740)} <br>
\hline Annual rate of deposit turnover... \& 20.5 \& \& \& Postal receipts* $\square$ \& 6,689 \& + 6 \& + 13 <br>
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow{3}{*}{ALAMO: See McALLEN-PHARR-EDINBURG SMSA}} \& Building permits, less federal contracts \$ \& 42,150 \& +199 \& $+904$ <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . . \& 3,987 \& - 5 \& +12 <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& End-of-month depasits (thousands) \$. \$ \& 4.627 \& - 10 \& - 11 <br>
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{AMARILLO SMSA} \& Annual rate of deposit turnover. \& 9.7 \& ** \& $+21$ <br>
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{(Potter and Randall; pop. 169,527 a)} \& \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{ANDREWS (pop. 11,135)} <br>
\hline Building permits, less federal contracts \$
Bank debits (thousands) \& 1,106,030 \& $-37$ \& - 49 \& Postal receipts * . .................. $\%$ \& 9,036 \& + 14 \& + 8 <br>
\hline Bank debits (thousands) ||...........\$ \& 4,706,520 \& + 12 \& ** \& Building permits, less federal contracts \$ \& 41,875 \& -88 \& - 36 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Nonfarm employment (area) Manufacturing employment (nrea).} \& 59,700 \& ** \& \& Bank debits (thousands)............. \$ \& 6,228 \& - 14 \& ** <br>
\hline \& 5,640 \& + 1 \& + 2 \& End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ \& 8,110 \& \& + 17 <br>
\hline Percent unemployed (area).......... \& 3.5 \& + 9 \& ** \& Annual rate of deposit turnover. \& 9.2 \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

| Local Business Conditions |  | Percent change <br>  <br> City and item |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

ANGLETON: see HOUSTON SMSA
ARANSAS PASS: see CORPUS CHRISTI SMSA
ARLINGTON: see FORT WORTH SMSA

| AUSTIN SMSA <br> (Travis; pop. 256,581 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$12,367,950 | +140 | $+84$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) \||......... \$ 4,409,316 | - 4 | +18 |
| Nonfarm employment (area)........ 106,900 | $+2$ |  |
| Manufacturing employment (area). 7,100 | $+1$ | + 5 |
| Percent unemployed (erea)......... 1,9 | - 21 | - 21 |
| AUSTIN (pop. 212,000 r) |  |  |
| Retail. sales . ........................ - - $^{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  |
| Apparel stores ................... - 28 ¢ | + 2 | $+14$ |
| Automatives stores ............... - $4 \dagger$ | + 9 | - 11 |
| Eating and drinking places........ - 11 4 |  | $+10$ |
|  | - 5 |  |
| Furniture and household- <br> appliance stores ................. $\quad$ - $\ddagger$ | + 18 | $+17$ |
| General-merchandise stores ....... - $9 \dagger$ | $+10$ | $+27$ |
| Postal receipts* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \% 611,075 | $-10$ | $+4$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$12,261,350 | +140 | + 33 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . . $\%$ 372,005 |  | + 18 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ (\$ 186,443 | - 3 | - 1 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover...... 23.6 | + 1 | $+19$ |


| BAY CITY (pop. 11,656) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts * .................. \$ | 15,176 | $-24$ | ** |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 94,500 | + 44 | -49 |
| Bank debits (thousands) | 19,565 | - 20 | $+17$ |
| End-of-month denosits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ | 26,982 | - 2 | ** |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 8.6 | -18 | $+16$ |
| Nonfarm placements | 69 | - 33 | -84 |
| BAYTOWN: see HOUSTON SMSA |  |  |  |


| BEAUMONT-PORT ARTHUR-ORANGE SMSA |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Jefferson and Orange; pop. 322,259 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) . |  |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | \$2,582,120 | +60 |  | 61 |
| Bank debits (thousands) !\|........... 8 | \$5,586,256 | $+4$ |  | 12 |
| Nonfarm employment (area). | 110,000 | 44 |  | 1 |
| Manufacturing employment (area). | 38,700 | + 12 |  | 3 |
| Percent unemployed (area) | 4.2 | - 25 |  | 2 |

## BEAUMONT (pop. 127,500 r)

| Retail sales | 4 † |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apparel stores | -23 中 | $+$ | + 29 |
| Antomotives stores | $4 \dagger$ | + | - a |
| Lumber, building material; and hardware stores. | $+6 \dagger$ | +24 | -9 |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 267,951 | $+10$ |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 1,886,303 | +214 | +119 |
| Bank debits (thousands).............. $\%$ | 278,192 | 8 | $+10$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | 133,002 | + 7 | + 10 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 25.9 | $-11$ | + 2 |
| Nederland (pop, 15,274 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal recelpts * . . . . ............... \% | 9,970 | ** | - 13 |
| Building.permits, less federal contracts \$ | 108,260 | +326 | 40 |
| Bank. debits (thousands)............... \$ | 7,400 |  |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ ( $\$$ | 5,308 |  |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 16.5 |  |  |

[^13]|  |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City and item | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | Feb 1967 from Jan 1967 | 'Feb 1967 from <br> Feb 1966 |
| Orange (pop. 25,605) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 38,895 | - 3 | + 16 |
| Building permits, less federal contraets \$ | 153,889 | +183 | $+8$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . . $\$$ | 37,703 | - 19 | $+10$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $4 . \$$ | 27,862 | $-5$ |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 15.8 | - 19 | + 9 |
| Nonfurm employment (area) | 172 | + 22 | -14 |


| Port Arthur (pop. 66,676) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retail sales | $-4 \dagger$ | + 7 | + 12 |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 48,287 | - 28 | $-38$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 306,948 | - 51 | $+36$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 82,742 | + 8 | +21 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 43,965 | $-18$ | $\cdots 1$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 21.0 | + 11 | + 12 |
| BEEVILLE (pop. 13,811) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* ..................... 8 | 14,883 | - 5 | + 8 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 45,137 | -77 | - 40 |
| Bank debits (thonsands) .............. 8 | 11,508 | $-12$ | + 9 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 14,931 | - 2 | - 5 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 9.1 | - | + 14 |
| Nonfarm placements | 73 | - | $-17$ |
| BELTON (pop. 8,163) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * ...................... \$ | 20.711 | +120 | $+25$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 59,650. | - 11 | - 20 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 9.100 | - 1 | + 2 |
| BIG SPRING (pop. 31,230) |  |  |  |
| Retall sales | - $4 \dagger$ | - 14 | ** |
| Postal recelpts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 8 | 40,259 | -17 | $+10$ |
| Building permita, less federal contracte \$ | 57.895 | $-87$ | +128 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 40,310 | - 22 |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. W | 27,614 | -6 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 17.0 | - 22 | - 5 |
| Nonfarm placements | 167 | + 10 | - 16 |

## BISHOP: see CORPUS CHRISTI SMSA

## BORGER (pop. 20,911)

| Postal receipts * | 22,431 | $+15$ | $+13$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 22,650 | 69 | -88 |
| Nonfarm placements | 72 |  | 3 |

BRADY (pop. 5,338)

| Postal receipts * | . | 5,621 | $-16$ | $+12$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts | \$ | 81,550 | - 10 | +152 |
| Bank debits (thousands) | \$ | 6,037 | - 29 | -11 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. | . | 7,085 | - 8 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover |  | 9.9 | $-27$ |  |

BRENHAM (pop. 7,740)

| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 11,269 |  | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Euilding permits, less federal contracts \$ | 37,185 | -43 | - 70 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. | 13,068 | 11 | $+6$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 15,518 | + 1 | $+6$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnove | 10.1 |  | ** |

BROWNFIELD (pop. 10,286 )
Postal receipts : . ...................... Building permits, less federal contracts \$ Bank debits (thousands)............... End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\$ . \$$ Annusl rate of deposit turnover.

| 11,473 | - | 9 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 24,251 | - | +4 |
| 18,712 | -34 | -16 |
| 14,701 | -8 | - |
| 14.7 | - | 90 |
|  | -6 |  |


|  |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City and |  |  |  |
| BROWNSVILLE-HARLINGEN-SAN BENITO SMSA (Cameron; pop. 141,778 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) |  |  |  |
| Building permite, less federal contracts Bank debits (thousands) \|\{. | 300,3 |  | 50 |
| Nonfarm employment (area) $\ldots . .$. ....Manufacturing employment (area) | 87,800 | + 2 |  |
|  | 7,280 | + 14 | + 28 |
| Percent unemployed (area)..... | 5.8 |  |  |

## BROWNSVILLE (pop. 48,040)

| Retail sales | 4 | $+4$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Automotives stores | - $4 \dagger$ | + 15 | 8 |
| Postal receipts* ...................... \$ | 44,407 | - 5 | + 2 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 130,250 | - 11 | 62 |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............s | 36,125 | - 29 | - 11 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$ . ${ }_{\text {p }}$ | 24,557 | -- 3 | $+13$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 17.3 | -- 28 |  |
| Nonfarm placements | 664 |  | - 8 |

## Harlingen (pop. 41,207)

| Retail sales |  | + 5 | - 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lumber, building material, and hardware stores. | + 6i $\dagger$ | 1 | 10 |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 47,058 | + 11 | $+23$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 92,300 | - 26 | -48 |
| Bank debits (thousanđs) .............. ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 40,1.52 | -.. 15 | 2 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$. ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 21,910 | - 8 | 7 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 21.1 | $+10$ | + 2 |
| Nonfarm placernents | 478 | + 9 |  |

## La Feria (pop. 3,047)

| Postal recejpts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 3,501 | + 89 | $+40$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 0 |  |  |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . . . \% | 1,217 | $-16$ | - 42 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ | 1,718 | ** |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 8.5 | - 18 | - 89 |


| Los Fresnos (pop. 1,289) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal reeeiptg * .................... \$ | 1,299 |  | + 18 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............ | 1,043 | - 31 |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 1,113 | $-10$ | 15 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 10.6 | - 25 |  |

## Port Isabel (pop. 3,575)

Postal receipts *......................... Building permits, less federal contracts $\$$ Bank debits (thousands) ................ .
End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$
Annual rate of deposit turnover. .

| 4,260 | +51 | +3 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 19,000 | +19 | +23 |
| 1,965 | -10 | +23 |
| 1,778 | -5 | +20 |
| 12,9 | -3 | -1 |

## San Benito (pop. 16,422 )

| Postal receipts * .................... \$ | 9,209 |  | $+$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts ${ }_{\text {a }}$ | 58,825 |  | - |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. \$ | 5,683 | -. 15 |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 6,217 | 3 | $+$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 10.8 | $-13$ | - |

## BROWNWOOD (pop. 16,974)

| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $\$$ | 25,754 | $-4$ | $-27$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 1,509 | $-97$ | - 98 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. \$ | 17,505 | $-12$ | 8 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 13,302 | 7 | 7 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 15.2 | $-10$ | - 4 |
| Nonfarm placements | 117 | $+16$ | - 11 |

For an explanation òf symbols, please see p. 124,

| Local Business Conditions <br> City and item | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } \\ & 1967 \end{aligned}$ | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Feb 1967 from Jan 1967 | Feb 1967 from Feb 1968 |
| BRYAN (pop. 27,542) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 37,252 | $+16$ | + 25 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 232,380 | -64 | - 11 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . 8 | 37,023 | - 8 | + 2 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) 4.8 | 23,732 | - 3 | + 5 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 18.4 | - |  |
| Nonfarm placements | 386 | $+27$ | + 14 |
| CALDWELL (pop. 2,202 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $\$$ | 2,992 | $-18$ | --16 |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............. | 2,828 | $-17$ | + 1 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $4 . \$$ | 4,629 | - | - 1 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover...... | 7.8 | $-17$ | $* *$ |
| CAMERON (pop. 5,640) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . .................... ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 18,877 | +182 | $+119$ |
| Bullding permits, less federal contracts \$ | 1,100 | - 67 | - 78 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. \$ | 5,145 | - 26 | $-10$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 5,934 | - 8 | $+6$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 10.2 | $-21$ | $-15$ |

## CANYON: see AMARILLO SMSA

## CARROLLTON: see DALLAS SMSA

CISCO (pop. 4,499)

| Postal receipts* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 5,068 | - |  | + | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............. \$ | 4,181 | - | 8 | $+$ | 9 |
| End-of-month deposits (thoutsands) $\ddagger$ | 4,115 | $+$ | 2 | + | 1 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 12.3 | - | 9 | + | 8 |

## CLEBURNE: see FORT WORTH SMSA

## CLUTE: see HOUSTON SMSA

## COLLEGE STATION (pop. 11,396)

| Postal receipts * | 28,322 | - 26 | - 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 320,427 | $-17$ | +126 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............ . | 7.687 | - 1 | + 19 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 4,918 |  | + 2 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 18.7 |  | + 14 |
| COLORADO CITY (pep. 6,457) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 8 | 5.504 | 3 | - 15 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 4,991 | $-35$ | - 38 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$. \$ | 6,950 |  | - 13 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 8.3 | $-35$ | - 27 |

## CONROE: see HOUSTON SMSA

## COPPERAS COVE (pop. 4,567)

| Postal receipts * | 5,617 | $+10$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contraets \$ | 13,785 | 71 | $-20$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . . | 2,296 | $+28$ | + 69 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. $\$$ | 1,290 | 5 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 20.9 | + 27 | $+$ |

## CORPUS CHRISTI SMSA

(Nueces and San Patricio; pop. 278,535 a)

| Building permits, less federal contracts | 3,098,006 | + 16 | $-40$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bank debits (thousands) \||. | 3,920,352 | 3 | $+6$ |
| Nonfarm employment (area) | 83,800 | +1 | $+3$ |
| Manufacturing employment (area). | 10,490 | + 1 | + |
| Percent unemployed (area) | 4.0 | + 21 |  |

## Aransas Pass (pop. 6,956)

Postal receipts * . ......................... $\$$
Brnk debits (thousands) ............

Annual rate of deposit turnover.

| 4,672 | -18 | +6 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 4,575 | - | 4 | -10 |
| 12.0 | - | 1 | +19 |


| Local Business Conditions | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Feb } \\ 1967 \end{array}$ | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Feb 1967 from Jan 1967 | Feb 1967 from Feb 1966 |
| Bishop (pop. 3,825 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * ..................... \$ | 2.332 | - 23 | .... 85 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 10.000 | - 53 | - 50 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 2,141 | .. 15 | + |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .9$ | 2.505 | - 11 | + 7 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 9.7 | - 14 | - 1 |
| CORPUS CHRISTI (pop. 204,850 r) |  |  |  |
| Retail sales | - $4 \dagger$ | - 4 | + 1 |
| Apparel stores | --.- 23 † | --18 | + 15 |
| Automatives stores | -- 4 ¢ | + 1 | - 1 |
| Drugstores | - 11 ¢ | -.. 5 | - |
| General-merchandise stores | - $9 \dagger$ | - 11 | $+$ |
| Postal receipts ${ }^{\text {t }}$. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 246,739 | + 6 | + 7 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts $\$$ | 2,849,868 | +20 | --. 41 |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............. ${ }^{\text {8 }}$ | 260,262 | - 14 | + 5 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$. \$ | 139,861 | - 2 | + 8 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 22.1 | $-10$ | + 3 |
| Robstown (pop. 10,266) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * ..................... 8 | 8.654 | - | + 2 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 45,730 |  | -74 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. 8 | 10.195 | - 13 | *** |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 9,853 | w* | + 4 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 12,4 | $-13$ | * |
| Sinton (pop. 6,008) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * ..................... ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 8,642 | - 21 | + 59 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 19,090 | -- 86 | +105 |
| Bank debits (thoskands) . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 4,451 | -33 | - 1 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$.\$ | 4,697 | - | $\cdots 22$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 11,0 | - 29 | + 17 |
| CORSICANA (pop. 20,344) |  |  |  |
| Retail sales | - $4 \dagger$ | - 9 | + 23 |
| Postal receipts * .................... \$ | 26,998 | + 15 | - 13 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 198,806 | +111 | 739 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 23,096 | $-19$ | + 7 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 22,992 | - 7 | 2 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 11.6 | $-17$ | + 6 |
| Nonfurm placements | 179 | $-18$ | $-13$ |
| CRYSTAL CITY (pop. 9,101) |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 51,224 | - 7 | + 15 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 8,534 | $-21$ | + 5 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$. \$ | 3,301 | + 6 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover..... | 12.2 | - 23 |  |

## DALLAS SMSA

(Collin, Dallas, Denton, and Ellis; pop. 1,334,101 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) Building permits, less federal contracts $\$ 39,161,918 \quad+$ 5h Bank debits (thousands) ||........... $866,838,256-2+10$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Nonfarm employment (area) ........ } & 583,600 & \text { ** } & + & 6 \\ \text { Manufacturing employment (area) } & 188,200 & \text { - } & 1 & + & 7\end{array}$ Percent unemployed (area)........... $2.0 \quad+\quad 5 \quad-23$

| Carroliton (pop. 9,832 r) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts * .................... | 12,255 | + 2 | 4 |
| Building vermits, less federal contraets \$ | 603,930 | $+156$ | $\rightarrow 19$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. | 8,897 | --17 | $+20$ |
| End-ofumonth deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 3,988 | 8 | +8 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 25.6 | $-18$ |  |
| Denton (pop. 26,844) |  |  |  |
| Postad receipts* ................... ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 6B,085 | + 35 | $+28$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | 938,528 | + 93 . | $+40$ |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. \$ | 31,084 | $-16$ |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\$ . \$$ | 26,184 | $+2$ |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 14.4 | - 17 |  |
| Nonfarm placements | 118 | - 20 | -48 |

For an explanation of symbols, please see p. 124 .

| Local Business Conditions <br> City and item | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Feb 1967 from Jan 1967 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } 1967 \\ & \text { from } \\ & \text { Feb } 1966 \end{aligned}$ |
| DALLAS (pop. 679,684) |  |  |  |
| Retail sales |  | + 3 | $+$ |
| Apparel stores | -20 | - 9 | $+$ |
| Automatives stores | + | + 24 | - 7 |
| Eating and drinking places | - | - | - 1 |
| Florists | ** | + 13 | + 2 |
| Furniture and houseboldudpliance stores | $-10$ | -- 15 | + 11 |
| General-merchandise stores | 8 | - | -- 5 |
| Lamber, building material, and hardware stores. | $+6$ |  | + 2 |
| Postal receipts * .................... | \$ 3,628,788 | + 6 | + 8 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | \$13,309, 505. | - 占 | $-57$ |
| Bank debits (thousands).............. | \$ 4,954,666 | -- 17 | $+10$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | \$ 1,460,642 | \% | +5 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 40.8 | - 10 |  |
| Ennis (pop. 10,250 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* | 11,349 | ** | 3 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. | * 7,167 | - 18 | - 8 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ | \% 7,075 | - 4 | $-10$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. . | 11.9 | $\rightarrow 14$ | + 1 |
| Garland (pop. 50,622 r) |  |  |  |
| Retail sales | - $4 \dagger$ | *** | - 17 |
| Postal receipts* . ................... \$ | \$ 59,686 | - 13 | + 5 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | \$ 1,626,411 | + 11 | + 61 |
| Bank debits (thousands).............. . | . 42,204 | - 10 | + 8 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. | \$ 19,958 | -- 9 | $+3$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 24.1 | 7 | + 3 |
| Grand Prairie (pop. 40,150 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipta* . ................... | \$ 38,443 | + 9 | + 7 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts | \$18.656,614 | +534 |  |
| Bank debits (thousands) ........... | \$ 17,618 | -- 14 | - 5 |
| End-af-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. \$ | \$ 13.075 | + 3 | $+1$ |
| Annual rate of deposit tornover. | 16.4 | $-15$ | + 5 |
| Irving (pop. 60,136 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal reveipts* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | \$ 63,119 | + 5 | + 10 |
| Building permits, less federal contrants \$ | \$ 1,488,648 | - 22 | - 44 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. | \$ 45,184 | -8 | + 8 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ | \$ 22,340 | * | + 3 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 24.3 | - 2 | + 5 |
| Justin (pop. 622) | - |  |  |
| Postal receipts* . ................... | \$ 811 | + 5 | +5 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts | \$ 15,000 | --34 |  |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. | \% 885 | - 27 | -.- 16 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) 4 . | \$ 913 | - 1 | + 4 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 11.6 | $-27$ | - 29 |
| McKinney (pop. 13,763) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . .................... | - 16,057 | - 11 | $-7$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts | \$ 49,800 | + 62 | - 61 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . . | \$ 10,573 | - 14 | - 9 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. | \$ 11,467 | - 1 | + 28 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 10.8 | - 11 | - 22 |
| Nonfarm placements | 144 | + 82 | $+24$ |
| Mesquite (pop. 27,526) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | \$ 26,427 | $+10$ | $+20$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts | \$ 678.506 | - 53 | - 23 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. | \$ 10,281 | - 48 |  |
| End-of-morth deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. | \$ 8,331 | + 1 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover...... | 14.9 | - 47 |  |
| Midlothian (pop. 1,521) |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts | 1 33,265 |  | +283 |
| Rank debits (thousands) ............. | \$ 1,071 | - 16 |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. | \$ 1,567 | - 5 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover..... | 8.0 | $-12$ |  |

## Irving (pop. 60,136 r)

## Justin (pop. 622)

Euilding permits less federal contracto
Bank debitg (thousands) ...............
a-month deposits

## Mesquite (pop. 27,526)

## 21)

$\begin{array}{lrrrr}\text { Rank debits (thousands) ............. \$ } & 1,071 & -16 & + & 6 \\ \text { End-of-month deposits (thousands) } \ddagger . \$ & 1,567 & -5 & - & 1 \\ \text { Annual rate of deposit turnover. .... } & 8.0 & -12 & + & 3\end{array}$

| Local Business Conditions | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | Pereent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Feb 1967 from Jan 1967 | Feb 1967 from Fels 1966 |
| Pilot Point (pop. 1,254) |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \% | 20,000 | $+100$ | $+54$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............. ${ }_{\text {g }}$ | 1,308 | -- 26 | +3 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ | 2,008 | - 5 | +1 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 7.6 | -.. 28 | - 3 |
| Plano (pop. 10,102 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 11.783 | + 3 | + 14 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 608,778 | - 34 | + 35 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . $\$$ | 6,438 | - 4 | $+26$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) 4.8 | 3,929 | - 1 | + 3 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 19.6 | $\cdots$ | + 23 |
| Richardson (pop. 34,390 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * .................... $\$$ | 55,569 | -.. 10 | $+19$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ 3 | 3,690,384 | +351 | +271 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 29,474 | - 22 | +22 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) 4.8 | 13,838 | - 3 | + 8 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 25.1 | --22 | + 18 |
| Seagoville (pop. 3,745) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * .................... ${ }_{\text {\% }}$ | 8,507 | + 19 | + 29 |
| Building permits, less federal contraets ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 25,999 |  | +125 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 4,854 | - 19 | + 54 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ | 2,254 | - 10 | + 7 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 24.5 | - 4 | +31 |
| Waxahachie (pop. 12,749) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* .................. ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 20,274 | + 23 | + 16 |
| Building permits, less federal contraets \$ | 83,984 | $-47$ | $-42$ |
| Bank depits (thousands) ............. \$ | 11,874 | -14 | + 2 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .4$ | 10,679 | $+1$ |  |
| A nnual rate of deposit turnover | 13.4 | $-12$ | + 6 |
| Nonfarm placements | 81 | $-12$ | $\cdots 25$ |

## DAYTON: see HOUSTON SMSA

## DEER PARK: gee HOUSTON SMSA

| DEL RIO (pop. 18,612) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts * ..................... \$ | 20,825 | $+14$ | + 15 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 50,424 | $-57$ | $-77$ |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. \% | 14,925 | 6 | +9 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$. \$ | 17,509 | S | ** |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 10.1 | 5 |  |
| DENISON (pop. 25,766r) |  |  |  |
| Retail sales | - ${ }^{4} \dagger$ | +9 | + 18 |
| Postal receipts* ..................... . ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | 22,955 | $-12$ | + 1 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 565.899 | $+178$ | $+160$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. . | 20,457 | - 5 | $+10$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\$ . \$$ | 17.593 |  | $+6$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 14.4 | -8 | + 11 |
| Nonfarm placements | 195 | - 5 | $+19$ |

## DENTON: see DALLAS SMSA

## dONNA: see McALLEN-PHARR-EDINBURG SMSA

## EAGLE PASS (pop. 12,094)

| Postal receipts * | 10,56i | + |  | +11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 52,760 |  |  | 65 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. \$ | 7.634 | - | 8 | + 20 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 4,580 | - | 9 | - 17 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 19,0 | - |  | +36 |

For an explanation of symbols, please see $\mathbf{D}$. 124.

| Local Business. Conditions |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City and item | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Feb} \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | Feb 1967 Jan Jan 1967 | Feb 196 <br> from <br> Feb 196 |
| EDINBURG: see McALLEN-PHARR-EDINBURG SMSA |  |  |  |
| EDNA (pop. 5,038) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $\$$ | 5,194 | -24 |  |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . $\%$ | 6,654 | - 9 | $+16$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ | 7,100 | - | - |
| Annual rate of deposit turnaver...... | 11.0 | - | $+18$ |

## EL. PASO SMSA

(El Paso; pop. 352,637 ${ }^{*}$ )
Building permits, less federal contracts \$ 8,406,502 - 49 - 32

| Bank debitg | ,040 | - 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nonfarm employment (area) | 106,800 | * | + 9 |
| Manufacturing employment (area) | 20.250 | + | +14 |

Percent unemployed (area).......... $\quad 4.0 \quad+\quad 3 \quad-17$

EL PASO (pop. 276,687)

| Retail saleg | - $4 \dagger$ |  | $+$ | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apparel stores | --. $23 \dagger$ | $-18$ |  | 9 |
| Automatives stores | $4 \dagger$ |  |  | 16 |
| Food stores | $6 \dagger$ |  | $+$ | 3 |
| Postal receipts* .................... ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 390,481 | + 2 | + | 6 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts | 3,406,502 | - 49 |  | 32 |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............. \$ | \$ 394,246 | -14 | $+$ | 7 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | - 234,087 | $+10$ | $+$ | 8 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover..... | 21.2 | - 18 |  | * |

ENNIS: see DALLAS SMSA

## EULESS: see FORT WORTH SMSA

## FORT STOCKTON (pop. 6,373)

| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 7.024 | - | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 1,399,380 |  | +532 |
| Eank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 6,904 | - 20 | $+15$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. $\$$ | 8,737 | - 3 | + 11 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 9,3 | $-18$ | +1 |

## FORT WORTH SMSA

(Johnson and Tarrant; pop. 640,414 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ )
Building permits, less federal contracts $\$ 14,294,625+48+96$
Bank debits (thousands) ||............ \$14,524,632 ** +

| Nonfarm employment (area) | 260,900 | ** |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manufacturing employment (area) | 70,725 |  | $+17$ |
|  |  |  |  |

Percent unemployed (area)........... 2.5 +26 -17

| Arlington (pop. 53,024 r) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts ** .................... ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | \$ 112,460 |  | $+28$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | \$ 2,228,890 | + 3 | + 22 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | \$ 57,015 | $-18$ | + 12 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | \$ 28,566 | ** | $+5$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover...... | 28.9 | - 16 |  |
| Cleburne (pop. 15,381) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * .................... \$ | \$ 21,462 | $+4$ | +28 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | \$ 162,750 | - 22 | - 68 |
| Bank detrits (thousands)............ . | \$ 14,186 |  | $+7$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | \$ 13.504 | 2 | + 8 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 12.5 |  | * |
| Euless (pop. 10,500 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * .................... ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | \% 11,142 | -12 | $+29$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | \$ 229,400 | $+15$ | +16 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | \$ 9,991 |  | $+20$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | \$ 4,056 |  |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 28,6 |  |  |


| Local Business Conditions |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gity and itera | $\underset{1967}{\stackrel{\mathrm{Feb}}{ }}$ | Feb 1967 <br> Jan 1.967 | Feb 196 from Feb 196 |
| FORT WORTH (pop. 356,268) |  |  |  |
| Retait sales |  |  |  |
| Apparel stores | - 23 | - 30 |  |
| Automotives stores |  |  | - 18 |
| Eating and drinking places |  |  |  |
| Food stores |  |  |  |
| General-merchandise stores | 14 | - 21 | $+$ |
| Lumber, building material, |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . "*k | 1,076,882 | $+11$ | $+13$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 8,695.871 | + 67 | +214 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 958,496 | - 18 |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ | 431,379 | ** |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 26.6 | $-14$ |  |
| Grapevine (pop. 4,659 r) |  |  |  |
| Pobtal receipts * ................... \& | 6,877 |  | $+30$ |
| Building permits, less federal contriacts \$ | 750,630 |  | +682 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. | 4,393 | $-15$ |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ | 4,347 |  |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 12.8 | - 19 |  |
| North Richland Hills (pop. 8,662) |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 781,766 | +689 | +451 |
| Bank debits (thoasands) ............ss | 9,828 | 13 |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 5,770 | $-2$ |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 20.2 | - 19 |  |
| White Settlement (pop. 11,513) |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contraets \$ | 15,900 | - 42 | -86 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. | 2,734 |  | + 48 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ | 1,719 |  | + 11 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 18.7 |  | + 26 |
| FREDERICKSBURG (pop. 4,629) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* . . . . . . . ..........8 | 7,430 | - 15 |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 186,435 | $+76$ | +385 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 10,769 | - 16 | + 21 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands)乐.\$ | 9.678 | - 5 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnove | 18.0 | 15 | + 17 |
| FRIONA (pop. 3,049 r) |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contraets \$ | 900 |  | -98 |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............s | 7,760 | -- 84 |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \%$ | 5,601 | $-12$ |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 15.6 | - ${ }^{2}$ |  |

## Galveston-TEXAS City SMSA

(Galveston; pop. 161,854 a)

| Building permits, less federal contracts | 735,384 | 33 | 46 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bank debits (thousands) | 2,258,940 | $+$ | $+10$ |
| Nonfarm employment (area) | 55,600 |  | + 4 |
| Manufacturing employment (area). | 9,970 |  | ** |
| Percent unemployed (area) | 3.6 | - 5 |  |


| La Marque (pop. 13,969) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts \% .................... Q $^{\text {d }}$ | 12,785 | $-13$ | 8 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts | 31,314 | --45 | $-84$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 12,869 | - 4 | $+40$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) (. ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | 7,155 | $-29$ | + 3 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 1.8.4 | - 1 | +23 |
| GALVESTON (pop. 67,175) |  |  |  |
| Retail sales | - $4 \dagger$ | - 3 | - 10 |
| Apparel stores | - 23 † | $-16$ | - 11 |
| Automotives stores | - $4 \dagger$ | $+1$ | -- 28 |
| Postal receipts* ..................... \$ | 128,121 | + 22 | + 45 |
| Building permits, less federal contructs \$ | 492,870 | - 18 | $-24$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 102,696 | -. 14 |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 58,854 | 4 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 20.5 | - 9 |  |

For an explanation of symbols, please see p. 124.

| Local Business Conditions |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City and item | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } 1967 \\ & \text { from } \\ & \text { Jan } 1967 \end{aligned}$ | Feb 1967 from Feb 1966 |
| TEXAS CITY (pop. 32,065) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* .................... 8 | 28,752 | $-18$ | + 5 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 211,200 | - 62 | -60 |
| Pank debits (thousands) ............ \$ | 36,272 | + 28 | + 11 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \%$ | 15.745 | -... 7 | $+8$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover..... | 26.7 | +24 |  |
| GARLAND: see DALLAS SMSA |  |  |  |
| GATESVILLE (pop. 4,626) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * ...................... ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 7,214 | $-26$ | + 27 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . $\%$ | 6,030 | - 21 | + 4 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | 6,665 | - 1 | $+3$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 10,8 | - 20 | + 1 |
| GEORGETOWN (pop. 5,218 ) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* ..................... ${ }^{\text {\$ }}$ | f,656 | - 39 | - 5 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. \$ | 5.291 | -14 | + 12 |
| Erd-offmonth deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. | 6,780 | + 7 | - 1 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 9.7 | - 16 | + 18 |
| GIDDINGS (pop. 2,821) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipta * ..................... \$ | 4,793 | $+48$ | + 4 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 12,000 | $-90$ | $+300$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............. \$ | 4,009 | $-17$ | + 15 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) 4 . ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 4,866 | - 3 | + 2 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 9.7 | --14 | $+10$ |
| GLADEWATER (pop. 5,742) |  |  |  |
| Postal reeeipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $\$$ | 9,36.7 | $+10$ | + 13 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 85,900 | +163 | +427 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. $\%$ | 4,465 | - 21 | - 4 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) 4.8 | 4,86a | - 1 | ** |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 10.9 | $-23$ | - 6 |
| Nonfarm employment (area) | 33,000 | * | $+$ |
| Manufacturing employment (area) | 8,680 | ** | + 8 |
| Percent unemployed (area). | 2.8 | - 3 | - 28 |
| GOLDTHWAITE (pop. 1,383) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * .................... . 8 | 2,094 | --8 | - 25 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............ | 3,504 | - 36 | + 11 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$ \$ | 6,580 | - 1 | - 5 |
| Annual rate of deposit tarnover. | 7.5 | - 32 | + 15 |
| GRAHAM (pop. 8,505) |  |  |  |
| Postal recelpts * ..................... \$ | 9,354 | $-13$ | + 14 |
| Building permits, less federal contraets \$ | 1.200 | - 98 | - 98 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 8,380 | $-26$ | - 7 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. $\$$ | 10,238 | $+1$ | - |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover...... | 9.9 | - 27 | - 7 |
| GRANBURY (pop. 2,227) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 3,973 |  | + 11 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 2.183 |  | + 26 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | 2,626 |  | + 9 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 9.5 |  | +13 |

## GRAND PRAIRIE: gee DALLAS SMSA

## GRAPEVINE: see FORT WORTH SMSA

## GREENVILLE (pop. 22,134 r)

| Retail sales | $4 \dagger$ | + 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 28,942 | + 2 | 2 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 601,944 | +167 | + 67 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 22,106 | $-22$ | + 21 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 16,672 | - 1 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 15.8 | - 19 |  |
| Nonfarm placements | 105 | $-18$ | - |


| Local Business Conditions |  | Percent change <br>  <br> City and item |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

HARLINGEN: see BROWNSVILLE-HARLINGEN-SAN BENITO SMSA

| HENDERSON (pop. 9,666) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipta * ..................... \$ | 13,398 | - 4 | 8 |
| Building permits, Iess federal contracts \$ | 45,200 | + 21 | --45 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. 8 | 8,530 | $-17$ | - 3 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\$ . \$$. | 20.027 |  | $+$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 5.0 | - 15 | 7 |
| HEREFORD (pop, 9,584 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * ..................... \$ | 15,883 | + 8 | 6 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 477,700 | +189 | +94 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. | 25,303 | - 23 | $+10$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\$$ \$ | 16,221 | - 9 | 3 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 17,9 | $-20$ |  |

## HOUSTON SMSA

(Brazoria, Fort Bend, Harris, Liberty and Montgomery; pop. $1,717,116^{2}$ )
Buitding permits, less federal contracts $832,914,720+54-5$
Bank d

| Nonfarm employment (area) ........ | 710,600 | - | +3 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Manufacturing employment (area). | 129,650 | + | 1 | +3 |
| Percent unemployed (area) ......... | 2.0 |  | -23 |  |

Percent unemployed (area) ....... 2.0 - 28

| Angleton (pop. 9,131) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts* ..................... | 10,252 | -15 | + 39 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 154,150 | -28 |  |
| Bank debits (thousands) | 12.455 |  | $-16$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | 12,970 | 2 | + 7 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 11.4 | 9 | - 19 |
| Baytown (pop. 38,000r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * ..................... ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 37,679 | $+6$ | $+14$ |
| Building permits, Jess federal contracts \$ | 897,190 | +109 | $+70$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. | 41,642 | - 10 | +14 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$ \$ | 28,384 | - 6 | 6 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 17.1 | - | + 21 |
| Bellaire (pop. 21,182 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * .................... ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 198,452 | + 99 | +285 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 15,449 | + 4 | $-97$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 26,115 | $-12$ | $+16$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. | 16,128 |  | + 1 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 10.1 |  | + 14 |


| Clute (pop. 4,501) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts* .................... \$ | 3,789 | $\pm \mathbf{3}$ | + 15 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 37,700 | $+108$ | $+81$ |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. 8 | 2,551 | $-21$ | $+37$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. \$ | 2,694 | +31 | + 28 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 14.8 | $-21$ | + 9 |
| Conroe (pop. 9,192) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \% | 25,118 | $-13$ | + 27 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 24,000 | $-69$ | -76 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 14,525 | - 9 | ** |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. $\$$ | 13,540 | $+1$ | + 3 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 12.9 | $-10$ | 2 |
| Dayton (pop. 3,367) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * .................... | 3,607 | - 5 | $+8$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 15,000 | - 90 | $-57$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. | 5,678 | - 5 | + 18 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $4 . \$$ | ${ }^{3,761}$ | - 12 | + 5 |
| Anpual rate of deposit turnover. | 17.0 | - 4 | + 6 |

For an explanation of symbols, please see p. 124.

| Local Business Conditions <br> City and item | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Feb 1967 from Jan 1967 | Feb 1967 from Feb 1966 |
| Deer Park (pop. 4,865) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* ...................... | 9,544 | + 19 | $+20$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts | 283,300 | + 42 | 8 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............ | 6.920 | - 28 | $+16$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ ( | 3,389 | - 10 | $+26$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 23.2 | - 15 | -15 |
| HOUSTON (pop. 938,219) |  |  |  |
| Retail sales | 5 | $+$ | + |
| Apparel stores | - 14 | - 7 | + 19 |
| Automotives stores | -3 | ** |  |
| Drugstores | 6 | 7 | + 2 |
| Eating and drinking places. | -5 | $+$ | + 7 |
| Food stares | 5 | - | $+10$ |
| General-merchandise stores | $\longrightarrow 7$ | + 24 | $+20$ |
| Liquor stores | - 4 | - 12 | + 23 |
| Lumber, building material, and hardware stores............. $*+8$ - 14 |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 2,740,364 | + 3 | + 9 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts | 8,318,584 | + 66 | - 5 |
| Bank debits (thousands)........... | 4,402,984 | $-19$ | $+9$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$. \$ | 1,695,144 | + 2 | 标 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 31.4 | $-16$ |  |
| Humble (pop. 1,711) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \& | 6,252 | $+14$ | $+30$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts 8 | 89,200 | $+$ | +131 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............ . 8 | 4,151 | ** | + |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ (\$ | 3,840 |  |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 13.1 | - 2 | + |

## Katy (pop̀. 1,569)

| Building permits, less federal contracts $\$$ | 60,800 | +4 | +11 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............ | 2,906 | -16 | +9 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger \$ \$$ | 2,819 | -6 | +8 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover..... | 12.1 | -14 | +8 |

La Porte (pop. 7,250 r)
Building permits, less federal contracts \$
Bank debits (thoossands) ..............
End-of-month deposits (thoussads) $\$ . \$$
Annual rate of deposit turnover.

| 8,000 | -88 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 6,980 | +13 | +1 |
| 3,385 | -2 | +1 |
| 17.8 | +13 | +5 |

Liberty (pop. 6,127)

| Postal receipts* | 8,240 | - 13 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 115,767 | $+477$ | +224 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 11,219 | $-12$ | $+14$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) 4.9 | 11,160 | - 2 | + 4 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 11.9 | $-13$ |  |

Pasadena (pop. 58,737)

| Postal receipts * | 71,198 | +24 | $+28$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building dermits, less federal contracts | \$ 1,559,250 | $+10$ | + 9 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. | \$ 73,210 | 1 | - 4 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | \$ 34,070 |  |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 25,7 |  |  |

## Kichmond (pop. 3,668)

| Postal receipts* .................. \$ | 4,181 | $\rightarrow 28$ | - 17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 43,800 | +175 | + 53 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. \$ | 7,851 | --18 | + 12 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 9,542 | $-1$ | + s |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover...... | 9.8 | $-16$ | $+9$ |

## Rosenberg (pop. 9,698)

| Postal receipts* .................... ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 10,554 | $-10$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 54,000 | 61 |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousends) $\$$ | 10,760 |  |  |


| Local Business Conditions |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local Business Conditions Oity and item | Feb 1967 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } 1967 \\ & \text { from } \\ & \text { Jan } 1967 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } 1967 \\ & \text { from } \\ & \text { Feb } 1966 \end{aligned}$ |
| South Houston (pop. 7,253) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 8,949 | $\therefore 9$ | -.. 10 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 127,000 | + 74 | - 19 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. | 8,389 | - | + 9 |
| End-of-tnonth depasits (thousends) $\ddagger$ \$ | 6,226 |  | + 6 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 16.6 | 6 | + 5 |
| Tomball (pop. 2,025 r) |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contraets \$ | 0 |  |  |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . . | 10,871 | + 16 | + 86 |
| End-or-month deposits (thousands) $4 . \$$ | 10,196 | ** | 4 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 12.8 | + 20 | + 41 |
| HUMBLE: see HOUSTON SMSA. |  |  |  |
| HUNTSVILLE (pop. 11,999) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 16,973 | - 14 | ** |
| Building permita, less federal contracts \$ | 265,172 | $-51$ | +323 |
| Bank debits (thousands) | 14,945 | + 4 | + 46 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. | 12,901 | ** | + 7 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 13.9 | + 2 | + 32 |
| IOWA PARK: see WICHITA FALLS SMSA |  |  |  |
| IRVING: see DALLAS SMSA |  |  |  |
| JACKSONVILLE (pop. 10,509 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 21,673 | - 4 | - 9 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts | 86,050 | + 41 | -48 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 15,595 | - | + 15 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 11,347 | - | - 6 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 16.4 | - | $+21$ |
| JASPER (pop. 5,120 r) |  |  |  |
| Retail sales | - $4 \dagger$ | - | - |
| Postal receipts* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 11,751 | $+6$ | $+17$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 39,325 | +97 | +146 |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............. | 11,321 | - 10 | + 9 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | 8.551 | - 1 | + 2 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 15.8 | - 11 |  |
| JUSTIN: see DALLAS SMSA |  |  |  |
| KATY: see HOUSTON SMSA |  |  |  |
| KILGORE (pop. 10,092) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 16,845 | + 6 | $-13$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 59,850 | $+79$ | $+78$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............ . ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | 12,934 | $-15$ | + 6 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\$ . \$$ | 13,101 | $-1$ | $-10$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover..... | 11.8 | $-15$ | +16 |
| Nonfarm employment (area)....... | 33,000 | ** | + 1 |
| Manufacturing employment (area) | 8,580 | ** | + 8 |
| Percent unemployed (area) | 2.8 |  | - 28 |
| KILLEEN (pop. 23,377) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts.* . .................... $\%$ | 60,606 | + 16 | $+40$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 647,842 | + 58 | -18 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. \$ | 17,702 | - 2 | + 5 |
| Eind-of-month deposits (thousands) $\$ . \$$ | 11,121 | + 8 | -18 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 19.4 | + 13 | $+80$ |
| KINGSLAND (pop, 150) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * : . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 1,681 | + 5 | + 48 |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............. $\$$ | 1,831 | - 31 | - 58 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) 4.8 | 1,280 | + 24 | + 41 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover...... | 13.7 | - 42 | -64 |

[^14]| Local Business Conditions |  | Percent/change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City and item | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | Feb 1967 from Jan 1967 | Feb 1967 from Feb 1966 |
| KINGSVILLE (pop. 25,297) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 20,347 | - 10 | ** |
| Building pernits, less federal contracts | 256,697 | - 52 | +356 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . \% | 16,132 | - | $+16$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | 16,776 | - 9 | - 4 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 11.0 | + 2 | $+16$ |
| KIRBYVLLLE (pop. 2,021 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * .................... ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 4;035 | + 16 | + 3 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . \% | 2,115 | -14 | + 7 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ | 4,117 | - | - 3 |
| Annual, rate of deposit turnover. . | 6.1 | $-13$ | $+11$ |

## LA FERIA: see BROWNSVILLE-HARLINGEN-SAN BENITO SMSA

## LA MARQUE: see GALVESTON-TEXAS CITY SMSA

| LAMESA (pop. 12,438) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts* | \$ | 12,768 | 16 | $+23$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts |  | 26,950 | - 18 | +259 |
| Bank debits (thousands) | - | 18,138 | - 45 |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ |  | 19,578 | $-10$ |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. |  | 10.5 | -44 |  |
| Nonfarm placements |  | 65 | + 49 | - 28 |
| LAMPASAS (pop. 5,670 r) |  |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * | \$ | 5,085. | -39 |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts |  | 29,000 | $+$ | - 60 |
| Bank debits (thousands) | \$ | 6,867 | $-24$ |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ |  | 6,849 | - 4 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover |  | 11.8 | - 21 |  |
| LA PORTE: see HOUSTON SMSA |  |  |  |  |
| LAREDO SMSA (Webb; pop. 77,006 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts |  | 441,010 | $\cdots 26$ | + 38 |
| Bank debits (thousands) \\|. |  | 585,984 | $s$ |  |
| Nonfarm ernployment (area) |  | 22,400 | ** |  |
| Manufacturing employment (area). |  | 1,260 | ** |  |
| Percent unemployed (area). |  | 9.9 | - ${ }^{18}$ | - 15 |
| LAREDO (pop. 60,678) |  |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * | . | 61,021 | $+11$ | + 16 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts | \$ | 441,010 | - 26 | + 38 |
| Bank debits (thousands) |  | 43,844 | $-17$ |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ |  | 34,357 | ** | + 12 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover |  | 15.7 | $\rightarrow 17$ |  |
| Nonfarm placements |  | 604 | + 66 | + 14 |

## LIBERTY: see HOUSTON SMSA

LITTLEFIELD (pop, 7,236)

| Postal receipts* ...................... $\$$ | 6,697 | $-24$ | - 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 25,000 |  | - 65 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 9,776 | - 35 | 9 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 9,499 | - 7 | -13 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 11.9 | - 88 |  |

LLANO (pop. 2,656)

| Postal receipts* | 3,420 | - 19 | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 1,000 | $-98$ |  |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............ \$ | 2,810 | - 18 | $\cdots$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 4,385 | - 5 | - |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 7.5 | - 16 |  |


| Local Business ConditionsCity and item | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } 1967 \\ & \text { from } \\ & \text { Jan } 1967 \end{aligned}$ | Feb 1967 from Feb 1966 |
| LOCKHART (pop. 6,084) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts ${ }^{\text {t }}$. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 4,788 | -- 11 | 8 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 50,290 | - 76 | - 50 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ...f.......... | 5,458 | ... 25 | - 4 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) 7.1 | 7,297 | - 2 | $+17$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 8.9 | - 29 | -- 16 |
| LONGVIEW (pop. 40,050) |  |  |  |
| Retail salles | $4 \dagger$ | $\cdots$ | -.- 14 |
| Automotives stores | - $4 \dagger$ | - 13 | -- 19 |
| Postal receipts* .................... 8 | 64.483 | - 2 | $+10$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \& | 1,204,200 | +117 | $-19$ |
| Nonfarm employment (area) | 33,000 | ** | $+1$ |
| Manufacturing employment (area). | 8,580 | ** |  |
| Percent unemployed (area)... | 2.8 | - | -28 |

## LOS FRESNOS: see BROWNSVILLE-HARLINGEN. SAN BENITO SMSA

| LUBBOCK SMSA (Lubbock; pop. 181,591 ${ }^{\text {® }}$ ) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 1,397,648 | $+14$ | $-87$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) \||........... \$ | 3,248,484 | + 2 | $-12$ |
| Nonfarm employment (area) | 62,600 |  |  |
| Manufacturing employment (area) | 6,880 | 2 | - 6 |
| Percent unemployed (area) | 8.0 | - 19 | $-23$ |
| LUBBOCK (pop. 155,200 r) |  |  |  |
| Retail sales | $4 \dagger$ | $-13$ | -3 |
| Automotives stores | $4 \dagger$ | 4 | ** |
| Postal receipts* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ${ }^{\text {\$ }}$ | 240,862 | - 6 | + 2 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | \$ 1,397,448 | + 18 | $-87$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . | 262,818 | - 35 | - 12 |
| -End-of-month deposits (thousands) \% \$ | 138,472 | - 3 | - 5 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 22.4 | - 38 | - 5 |
| Slaton (pop. 6,568) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* .................... 8 | 4,975 | $+10$ | $+1$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | \$ 200 | -96 | $-99$ |
| Bank debits (thousands)............ \$ | -4,401 | - 37 | - |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. ${ }_{\text {W }}$ | - 3,990 | - 10 | $-13$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 12.5 | - 86 |  |
| LUFKIN (pop. 20,756 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * ..................... ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | - 31,263 | $-14$ | $-15$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | - 223,325 | + 82 | $-42$ |
| Nonfarm placements | 105 | - 19 | +188 |

## McALLEN-PHARR-EDINBURG SMSA <br> (Hidalgo; pop. 182,008 a)

Building permits, less federal contracts $\$ \quad 396,885 \quad-73 \quad-73$

| Bank debits (thousands) | 60 |  | + 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nonfarm employment (area) | 42,500 | * | ** |
| Manufacturing employment (area) | 4,110 | - 3 | 4 |

Percent unemployed (area) .......... 5.8 - $5 \quad-15$

| Alamo (pop. 4,121) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. | 2,624 | $+16$ | +69 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) it. | 1,449 | - 8 | + 1 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 21.4 | + 14 | +62 |
| Donna (pop. 7,522) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * .................... 8 | 4,56. | + 16 | $-3$ |
| Building yermits, less federal contracts \$ | 37,400 | $-91$ | + 91 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 3,008 |  | $+14$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ | 4,704 |  | $+16$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 7.7 |  | -1 |

For an explanation of symbols, please see p. 124.

| Business ConditionsCity and item | $\underset{1967}{\mathrm{Feb}^{2}}$ | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } 1967 \\ & \text { from } \\ & \text { Jan } 1967 \end{aligned}$ | Feb 1967 from <br> Feb 196 |
| Edinburg (pop. 18,706) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * | 13.738 | $-16$ | - 14 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 112,020 | - 59 | - 24 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . $\%$ | 20,074 | - 10 | ** |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | 11,996 | - 14 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 18.6 | - 10 |  |
| Nonfarm placements | 349 | - | + 18 |


| Elsa (pop. 3,847) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, leas federal contracts \$ | 1,716 |  |  |  | 57 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. $\%$ | 2,202 | - | 4 | + | 2 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .1$ | 1,716 | $+$ | 5 | + | 2 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 15.8 | - | 8 | - | 3 |

## McALLEN (pop. 35,411 r)

| Retail sales | $4 \dagger$ | -- | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Automotives stores | - $4 \dagger$ | $+$ | $-17$ |
| Furniture and householdappliance stores | 5 * | 7 | + 11 |
| Postal receipts* ................... | 41,043 | - 9 | $+1$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 125,140 | - 80 | - 48 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. | 39,993 | $-16$ |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ | 26,898 | * 1 | 3 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 18,6 | - 14 |  |
| Nonfarm placements | 924 | +106 | + 42 |

## Mercedes (pop. 10,943)

| Postal receipts *................ | 6,154 | -7, | +9 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts | 27,300 | +209 | +41 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............ | 6,871 | +3 | +11 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger \$$ | 4,148 | +1 | -10 |
| Atnual rate of deposit turnover...... | 20.0 | +8 | +20 |

## Mission (pop. 14,081)

| Pos | 10,276 |  | + 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 25,565 | + 4 | 55 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............ 8 | 12.860 | -11 | - 8 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | 0,851 | - 1 | ** |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 15.6 |  | - 9 |

## Pharr (pop. 15,279 r)

| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 8 | 9,642 | + | 6 | $+26$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contratts \$ | 18,976 | - | 59 | -98 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. \$ | 5,522 | - | 3 | + 24 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ | 5.475 | - | 6 | + 25 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 11.7 | - | 1 | 0 |

San Juan (pop. 4,371)

| Postal r | 3,148 | ** | $+16$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contraets \$ | 575 | -97 | . 94 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. . | 2,965 | + 12 | - 4 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 2,671 | - 5 | $+$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 12.9 | +11 | - 8 |


| Weslaco (pop. 15,649) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retail sales |  |  |  |
| Food stores | $6 \dagger$ | -5 | $+2$ |
| Postal receiptis* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 12,828 | - 7 | + 3 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 48,145 | + 88 | +211 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............ 8 | 9,265 | $-10$ | $+1$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 9,245 | - | 2 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 11.8 | -16 | 1 |

## MISSION: see McALLEN-PHARR-EDINBURG SMSA

## McCAMEY (pop. 3,350 r)

| Postal receipts* | 3,856 | 9 | $+29$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 2,000 | -87 |  |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. \$ | 1.712 | 7 | 8 |
| Eind-of-month deposits (thousands) \$. | 1,670 | * |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 12.3 | - 7 |  |


| Local Business Conditions City and jtem | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Feb 1967 from <br> Jan 1967 | Feb 1967 from Feb 1966 |
| McGREGOR : see WACO SMSA |  |  |  |
| McKINNEY: see DALLAS SMSA |  |  |  |
| MARSHALL (pop. 25,715 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* . ................... ${ }^{\text {\& }}$ | \$. 35, 137 | + 13 | $+25$ |
| Building permits, less federal contraets \% | - 141,920 | - 30 | 15 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............ ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | * 21,723 | -- | + |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \% | \% 25,754 | - | + 11 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 9.9 | $-28$ | $\cdots$ |
| Nonfarm plecements | 482 | + 43 | +98 |
| MERCEDES: see McALLEN-PHARR-EDINBURG SMSA |  |  |  |
| MESQUITE: see DALlas SMSA |  |  |  |
| MEXIA (pop. 7,621 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . \% | 8 5,829 | - 20 | - 9 |
| Building permits, leas federal contracts \$ | \$ 36,300 | + 44 | + 82 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | \$ 5,186 | - 29 | + 21 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. | \$ 5,563 |  |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 10.9 | $-27$ | + 14 |

## MIDLAND SMSA

(Midland; pop. 68,230 a)

| Building permits, less federal contracts $\$ 1,269,400$ | +108 | -44 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Bank debits (thousands) \|l.......... $\$ 1,471,572$ | -11 | -8 |  |
| Nonfarm employment (area) ........ | 58,200 | -1 | +2 |
| Manufacturing employment (area). | 5,180 | +1 | +8 |
| Percent unemployed (area) .......... | 3.9 | +18 | +22 |


| MIDLAND (pop. 62,625) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts * | 112,779 | - |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts | \$ 1,269,400 | +108 | 4 |
| Eank debits (thousands) | 109,502 | $-27$ |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousamds) 1 | . 117,243 | + 3 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 11.4 | - 25 | $-10$ |
| Nonfarm placements | 617 | $+10$ | 22 |

## MIDLOTHIAN: see DALLAS SMSA

| MINERAL WELLS (pop. 11,053) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal recelpts * .................... | 20,503 | $-10$ | $+2$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts $\$^{\text {\% }}$ | 317,875 | --68 | + 2 |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............. ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 17,744 | -- 17 | +23 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. ${ }_{\text {\% }}$ | 13,888 | - | + 13 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 15.3 | - 15 | + 11 |
| Nonfarm placements | 80 | - 13 | - 38 |
| MONAHANS (pop. 9,252 r) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * .................... \$ | 10.751 | - 1 | $+12$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 39,500 | + 12 | - 68 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 10,598 | $-11$ | + 9 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 8.003 | - 4 | -- 1 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 15.6 | -- 10 | +10 |
| MOUNT PLEASANT (pop. 8,027) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . .................. \$ | 10,407 | $+7$ | --7 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 29,750 | -35 | - 13 |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............. $\$$ | 10,985 | - 17 | $+5$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \% \$ | -9,226 | -1 | + 5 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 14.2 | - 16 | ** |
| MUENSTER (pop. 1,190) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,620 | - 81 | - 39 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 15,000 |  |  |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. $\%$ | 2,365 | - 32 | "* |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$ \$ | 2,144 | $-4$ |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 13.0 | $-29$ |  |

For an explanation of symbois, please see p. 124.

| Local Business Conditions | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City and item |  | Feb 1967 from <br> Jan 1967 | Feb 1867 from Feb 100 |
| NACOGDOCHES (pop. $15,450 \mathrm{r}$ ) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * | 30,459 | +16 | + 42 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 115,584 | -48 | 60 |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............\$ | 25.784 | $-4$ | + 17 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) i. ${ }_{\text {a }}$ | 21,900 | -- 4 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover...... | 13.8 | - $\quad$ 6 | + 16 |
| Nonfarm placements | 142 | - | +12 |

NEDERLAND: see BEAUMONT-PORT ARTHURORANGE SMSA

| NEW BRAUNFELS (pop. 15,631) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts* .................... | 21,949 | $+3$ | +18 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 448,291 | +276 | +120 |
| Bank debita (thousands)............. | 14,970 | - 25 | + 8 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$ \$ | 14,375 | - 8 | 2 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover..... | 12.3 | - 24 | $+10$ |
| NORTH RICHLAND HILLS: see FORT WORTH SMSA |  |  |  |
| ODESSA SMSA (Ector; pop. 89,437 a) |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 588,264 | + | -66 |
| Bank debits (thousands) \\|........... | 1,175,244 | - | + 1 |
| Nonfarm employment (area) | 58,200 |  | + 2 |
| Manufacturing employment (area) | 5,130 | + 1 | + 8 |
| Percent unemployed (area) | 3.9 | $+18$ | $+22$ |
| ODESSA (pop. 86,937 r) |  |  |  |
| Retril sales | $-4 \dagger$ | $-18$ |  |
| Furniture and householdappliance stores | - $5 \dagger$ | $-20$ |  |
| Postal receipta* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ${ }_{\text {\% }}$ | 95,287 | ** | + 6 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 538,264 | + 9 | $-66$ |
| Eank debits (thousands)............. $\$$ | 94,241 | - 11 | $+16$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$. | 67,964 | ** | - 5 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 16.6 | -18 | + 19 |
| Nonfarm placements | 334 |  | $-27$ |
| OLNEY (pop. 4,200 r) |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 0 |  |  |
| Bank debits (thousands)............ \% | 4,695 | $-19$ | + 5 |
| End-of-month denosits (thousands) $\ddagger$. | 5,030 | + 1 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 11.8 | - 19 |  |

## ORANGE: see BEAUMONT-PORT ARTHUR-

 ORANGE SMSA| PALESTINE (pop. 13,974) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 16.174 | $-12$ | B |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 50,985 | - 48 | -63 |
| Brak debits (thousands) ............. 8 | 12,694 | 4 | + 2 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousamds) $\ddagger$ | 16,549 | 6 | 5 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 8.9 | 2 |  |
| PAMPA (pop. 24,664) |  |  |  |
| Retail sales | - 4 † | - 9 | - 19 |
| Postal receipts * .................... 8 | 27,659 | - 4 | + 2 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 102,300 | + 58 | - 11 |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............. $\$$ | 27,119 | -16 | - 1 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) 4. ${ }_{\text {a }}$ | 20,800 | -- 1 | + 2 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 15.6 | $-17$ | 2 |
| Nonfarm placements | 128 | 7 |  |
| PARIS (pop. 20,977) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $\$$ | 29.392 | - 1 | + 1 |
| Building permits، less federal contraets \$ | 121,445 | - 65 | - 56 |
| Nonfarm placernents | 146 | - 5 | $+26$ |

PASADENA: see HOUSTON SMSA

| Local Business Conditions | $\underset{19 \mathrm{kf}}{\mathrm{Feb}}$ | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } 1967 \\ & \text { from } \\ & \text { Jan } 1967 \end{aligned}$ | Feb 1967 from Feb 196 |
| PECOS (pop. 12,728) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * | 11,473 | + 11 | + 21 |
| Bannk debits (thousands) | 17,510 | --- | $+$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\$ . \$$ | 11,998 |  |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 18.2 | - |  |
| Nonfarm placementa | 58 | + 18 | - 60 |

## PHARR: see McALLEN-PHARR-EDINBURG SMSA

## PILOT POINT: gee DALLAS SMSA

| PLAINVIEW (pop. 23,703 r) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts* ................... | 30,803 | $-18$ | -- 18 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 498,200 | + 995 | $-16$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 41,965 | - 41 | $-10$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. $\$$ | 26,182 | - 11 | -19 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 18.2 | -41 | + 11 |
| Nonfarm placements | 230 | $+47$ | + 31 |
| PLANO: see DALLAS SMSA |  |  |  |
| PLEASANTON (pop. 5,053 r) |  |  |  |
| Building perraits, less federal contracts * | 27:040 | +230 | - 28 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . . ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 8,559 | - 24 | *** |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 4,183 | - 3 | ** |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. .... | 10.1 | - 24 | 5 |

## PORT ARTHUR: see BEAUMONT-PORT ARTHURORANGE SMSA

PORT ISABEL: see BROWNSVILLE-HARLINGEN. SAN BENITO SMSA

## PORT NECHES: see BEAUMONT-PORT ARTHURORANGE SMSA

| QUANAH (pop. 4,564) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts* . ..................\$ | 4,685 |  | - |
| Building permita, less federal contracts \$ | 0 |  |  |
| Bank debits (thousainds) ............ \$ | 6,275 | $-13$ |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | 5.360 | $-12$ |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 11.0 | - |  |
| RAYMONDVILLE (pop, 9,385) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* . .................. | 6,894 |  | $-13$ |
| Building permits, less federal contraets \$ | 36,500 | $+52$ | +861 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............ \$ | 7,034 | + | +13 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. | $8 ; 801$ | - | + 17 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 9.4 | $+16$. |  |
| Nonfarm placements | 60 | - 19 |  |
| RICHARDSON: see DALLAS SMSA |  |  |  |
| RICHMOND: see HOUSTON SMSA |  |  |  |
| ROBSTOWN: see CORPUS CHRISTI SMSA |  |  |  |
| ROSENBERG: see HOUSTON SMSA |  |  |  |
| SAN ANGELO SMSA <br> (Tom Green; pop. 74,127 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 472,240 | -- | $+10$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) \|f. ......... $\$$ | 973,428 | + 7 |  |
| Nonfarm employment (area) | 22,150 | *0 | + 3 |
| Manufacturing employment (area). | 3,670 |  | $+9$ |
| Percent unemployed (area). | 3.4 | - 19 | $-11$ |

[^15]|  |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City and item | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | Feb 1967 <br> from <br> Jan 1967 | Feb 1967 from Feb 1966 |
| SAN ANGELO (pop. 58,815) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* .................... \$ | 113,575 | + 6 | $+4$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 472,240 | -9 | + 10 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . . \% | 71,868 | $-14$ | + 9 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) 1.8 | 55,472 | --- 8 | ** |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover.... | 14.9 | - 12 |  |

## SAN ANTONIO SMSA

(Bexar and Guadalupe; pop. $838,572^{\text {a }}$ )

| Building permits, less federal contracts | 5,006,921 | +127 | + 98 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bank debits (thousands) | ,682,792 | 5 | + 1 |
| Nonfarm employment (area) | 253,200 | ** |  |
| Manufacturing employment (area) | 27,700 | ** |  |
| Percent unemployed (area) | 3.5 |  | - 19 |

SAN ANTONIO (pop. 655,006 r)

| Retail sales | - 6 | - 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apparel stores | - 16 | $-15$ |  |
| Automotives stores | - 1 | - 8 | - 5 |
| Eating and drinking places |  | - 4 | + 12 |
| Furniture and householdappliance stores | +3 | + 41 | +13 |
| Gasoline and service stations. |  | - 5 | - 21 |
| General-merchandise stores | - 4 | - 4 | - 12 |
| Lumber, building material, and hardware stores. |  | $+10$ | $-2$ |
| Postal receipts* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | \$ 1,039,745 |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | \$14,705,841 | $+140$ | +106 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | \$ 8058,454 | $-17$ |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .1$ | - 488,440 |  |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 21.4 | $-17$ | * ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |


| Schertz (pop, 2,281) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal recelpts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 2,085 | - |  |  |  |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \& | 587 | - | 8 | + | 4 |
| End-oi-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | 1,071 | - | 1 |  | 5 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 6.6 | - | 7 | + | 8 |
| Seguin (pop. 14,299) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* .................... \% | 15,797 | + | 2 |  | 10 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 93,801 |  | 7 |  |  |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . . ${ }_{\text {, }}$ | 13,387 | - | 6 | - | 8 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$ \$ | 1,5,595 |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 10.2 | - | $\mathrm{f}^{6}$ |  | 6 |

SAN BENITO: see BROWNSVILLE-HARLINGEN-SAN BENITO SMSA

SAN JUAN: see McALLEN-PHARR-EDINBURG SMSA

| SAN MARCOS (pop. 12,713) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postal receipts* .................... \$ | 17,629 | + 5 | + 24 |
| Building permits, less federal eontracts \$ | 202,474 | $-24$ | - 51 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. | 14,425 | + 2 | $+26$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$. \$ | 16,668 | + | $+10$ |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 10.7 | - 1 | $+16$ |
| SAN SABA (pop. 2,728) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 3,229 | 9 | $-18$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 0 | $\ldots$ |  |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . . . \% | 4,749 | $-24$ | $+30$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$. \$ | 5.128 | - 5 | + 8 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 10.9 | - 21. | $+22$ |


| Local Business Conditions |  | Feb <br> City and ite-n | Febcent change <br> from <br> fag7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

SCHERTZ: see SAN ANTONIO SMSA

## SEAGOVILLE: see DALLAS SMSA

SEGUIN: see SAN ANTONIO SMSA

## SHERMAN (pop. 30,660 r)

| Retail sales | $4 \dagger$ | + 3 | $+8$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Automotives stores | - 4 中 | $+17$ |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 41.145 | + 8 | + 7 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 523,810 | $-14$ | *** |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. $\$$ | 35,457 | $-24$ | + 5 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger .8$ | 24,642 | + 2 | 2 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 17.4 |  | + 7 |
| Nonfarm placements | 159 | + 48 | 2 |

SILSBEE (pop. 6,277)

| Building permits, less federal contracts $\$$ | 16,800 | $\ldots$ | -90 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Bank debits (thousands) ....................... | 5,325 | -8 | +16 |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands)' $\ddagger \$$ | 6,630 | - | 4 | +10 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover..... | 9,5 | -7 | +1 |  |

SINTON: see CORPUS CHRISTL SMSA

## SLATON: see LUBBOCK SMSA

SMYTHVILLE (pop. 2,933)

|  | 2,742 | -- 24 | $-18$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 775 | $-69$ |  |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . \& | 1,368 | -.. 84 | $+12$ |
| Fnd-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | 2,479 | $+$ | + 1 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 6.6 | - 33 | + 10 |

SN YDER (pop. 13,850)
Postal receipts * ......................... Building permits, less federal contracts $\$$ Bank debits (thousands) End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$ \$ Annual rate of deposit turnover.

| 12,994 | -1 | +10 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 22,050 | +21 | -56 |
| 17,273 | -6 | +8 |
| 18,678 | -10 | -9 |
| 10.5 | -4 | +8 |

## SOUTH HOUSTON: see HOUSTON SMSA

## SULPHUR SPRINGS (pop. 9,160)

| Postal receipts* | 17,935 | $-16$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Buitding permits, less federal contracts \$ | 198,600 | 60 | +176 |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 18,201 | 5 | + 22 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$, \% | 17,889 |  | + 19 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 12.3 | - 6 |  |

STEPHENVILLE (pop. 7,359)

| Postal receipts * | 11,550 |  | $+$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 58,850 | +755 |  |
| Bank debits (thousands) . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 8,776 | - 25 | $+$ |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. | 10,347 |  | + |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 9.9 | - 84 |  |

For an explanation of symbols, please see p. 124.

| Local Business Conditions | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Feb 1967 from Jen 1967 | Feb 1967 from Feb 1966 |
| STRATFORD (pop. 1,380) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts \% . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $\%$ | 1,780 | $-24$ | - $26^{\circ}$ |
| Bank debits (thoussnds) .............. ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 6,692 | - 29 | 7 |
| Find-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. | 5.862 | - 6 | + 3 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 13,3 | - 29 | $-10$ |
| SWEETWATER (pop. 13,914) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 16,589 | - 14 | $+7$ |
| Building permite, less federal contracts \$ | 157,750 |  | $+81$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 13,706 | $-85$ | - 1 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 9,748 | $-17$ | - |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 15.3 | - 32 | - 3 |
| Nonfarm placements | 98 | -- 13 | $-31$ |
| TAYLOR (pop. 9,434) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts**.................... | 10,567 | + 2 | $+6$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 70,535 |  | $+118$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 9,819 | --.. 26 | + 8 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | 17,587 | - 4 | + B |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 6.2 | - 25 | t* |
| Nonfarm placements | 10 | - 29 | - 47 |
| TEMPLE (pop. 34,730 r) |  |  |  |
| Retail sades | ... 4 † | + 1 | + 8 |
| Furniture and householdappliance stores | - 5 † | + 8 |  |
| Postal receipts* .:................... | 43,924 | $-.16$ | -- 4 |
| Building permits, less federal cotitracts \$ | 675,687 | $+27$ | $+108$ |
| Bank debits (thousamds)............ . \$ | 33,878 | - 14 | + 3 |
| Nonfiarm placements | 182 | + 1 | - 22 |

TERRELL (pop. 13,803)

| Postal r | 10,229 | - | 5 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts 8 | 100.125 |  | 12. |  | 10 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. \& | 11,704 | - | 4 |  | 13 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. $\$$ | 10,492 | + | 7 |  |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 13.8 | - | 3 |  |  |

## TEXARKANA SMSA

(Bowie, excluding Miller, Ark.; pop. 67,206 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ )
Building permits, less federal contracts $311,850+88+19$
Bank debits (thousands) |]........... 1,286,016 $+5 \quad+28$ Nonfarm employment (area) $\ldots \ldots \ldots$. $38,800+8+15$
Manufacturing employment (area). $10,830+8+47$
Percent unemployed (area) $\ldots \ldots \ldots$. . $3.3 \quad-3 \quad-38$

TEXARKANA (pop. 50,006 r)

| Retail sales | $4 \dagger$ | - 11 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Automotives stores | $4 \dagger$ | $-12$ | 11 |
| Postal receipts * . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ${ }_{\text {\% }}$ | 83,521 | 4 | $+14$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts 8 | 293,300 | $+77$ | + 74 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. \$ | 86,808 | $-10$ | + 29 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\$ . \$$ | 24,464 | --6 |  |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 21.7 | 8 |  |

TEXAS CITY: see GALYESTON-TEXAS CITY SMSA

## TOMBALL: see HOUSTON SMSA

| TYLER SMSA <br> (Smith: pop. 99,142a) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Euilding permits, less federal contracts | \$1,727,790 | + 93 | $+43$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) \\|. | \$1,5159,916 | - 6 | -4 |
| Nonfarm employment (area) | 34,250 | \% |  |
| Manufacturing employment (area). | 9,520 |  |  |
| Percent unemployed (area) | 3.5 |  |  |


| Local Business Conditions |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local Business Conditions | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb } \\ 1967 \end{gathered}$ | Feb 1967 from Jan 1967 | Feb 1967 from Feb 1966 |
| TYLER (pop. 51,230) |  |  |  |
| Retaíl sales | - $4 \dagger$ | - 12 | + 3 |
| Postal receipts* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \$ | 112,329 | - 3 | $+$ |
| Building permits, less federal contracts 1 | 1,695,790 | +91 | + 41 |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............. . . | 117,066 | - 19 | - 5 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 75,137 | + 1 | .. 3 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 18.8 | - 14 | - |
| Nonfarm placements | 566 | + 6 | $-26$ |
| UVALDE (pop. 10,293) |  |  |  |
| Postal receipts* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 16,054 | + 32 | 8* |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 69,346 | +66 | -- 27 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 14,782 | - 22 | + 8 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$ \$ | 9.084 | - | 8 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 19.0 | -20 | + 11 |
| VERNON (pop. 12,141) |  |  |  |
| Postal recelpts* .................... ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 12,466 | -1 | -. 4 |
| Building permits, less federal contraets \$ | 38;800 | + 16 | + 18 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. | 14,574 | -28 | - 8 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$ \$ | 21,100 | - 2 | + 4 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 8.2 | $-25$ | -. 12 |
| Nonfarm placements | 68 | - 15 | $-17$ |
| VICTORIA (pop. 33,047) |  |  |  |
| Retail sales | $4 \dagger$ | $+$ | + 11 |
| Automotives stores | - 4 ¢ | + 7 | + 6 |
| Postal receipts* .......... .......... \% | 57,043 | + 18 | + 21 - |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 189,100 | - 72 | -66 |
| Bank debits (thousands) .............. | 72,592 | - 25 | + 3 |
| End-of-rronth deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. | 90.447 | ** | 2 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 9.6 | -21 | + 7 |
| Nonfarm placements | 451 | + 19 | - 21 |
| WACO SMSA |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts is | 617.894 | --. 21 | - 28 |
| Bank debits (thousands) \|f.......... | 2,069,964 | - 6 | + 3 |
| Nonfarm employment (area) | 54,700 | ** | + 2 |
| Manufacturing employment (area). | 11,920 | - 1 | + |
| Percent unemployed (area). | 4.6 | - 4 | -2 |
| McGregor (pop. 4,642) |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 3.800 | -18 | -86 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. \$ | 3,830 | --28 | - 88 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) \$ \$ | 7,508 | + 5 | + 8 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 6.3 | - 22 | $-88$ |
| WACO (pop, 103,462) |  |  |  |
| Retuil sules $\dagger \uparrow$ | - $4 \dagger$ | $-10$ | -26 |
| Automotive stores $\dagger \dagger$ | - $4 \dagger$ | - 10 | - 31 |
| Furniture and householdappliance stores $\dagger \dagger$ | - 5 + | $-23$ |  |
| Postal receipts* .................... \% $\%$ | 223,788 | $+10$ | + 7 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 482,494 | - 8 | $-27$ |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............ \$ | 146,166 | - 17 | + 4 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger . \$$ | 96.817 | + 1 | + 4 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 18.2 | - 18 | - |

$\dagger \dagger$ Reported in cooperation with the Baylor University Bureau of Research.
For an explanation of symbols, please see p. 124.

Local Business Conditions

| City and item | Feb <br> 1967 | Feb 1967 <br> from <br> $J$ ann 1967 | Feb 1967 <br> Frob 1966 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## WAXAHACHIE: see DALLAS SMSA

## WEATHERFORD (pop. 9,759)

| Postal receipts" ................... ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 12,411 | $-17$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts $\$$ | 21,450 | - 66 |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ | 15,520 | - 2 |  |

WESLACO: see McALLEN-PHARR-EDINBURG SMSA

WHITE SETTLEMENT: see FORT wORTH SMSA

| WICHITA FALLS SMSA |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Archer and Wichita; pop. 128,508 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) |  |  |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 684,610 | + 56 | - 63 |
| Bank debits (thousands) \|| ........... | 2,062,440 | - 2 | * |
| Nonfarm employment (area) | 49,100 | ** |  |
| Manufacturing employment (area) | 4.400 |  |  |
| Percent unemployed (area) | 8.1 |  |  |


| Iowa Park (pop. 5,152 r) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 10,225 | $+93$ | -96 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............ \$ | 8,148 |  | - 6 |
| End-of-month deposits (thoussads) $\ddagger$. $\$$ | 3.714 |  | - 13 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover | 9.8 |  |  |

## WICHITA FALLS (pop. 101,724)

| Retail steles | $4 \dagger$ | -18 | -- 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Automotives stores | $4 \dagger$ | - 13 | -22 |
| General-merchandise stores | $9 \dagger$ | - 30 | 18 |
| Postal recelpts* ${ }^{*}$. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $\$$ | 137,662 | + 4 |  |
| Building permits, less federal contracts \$ | 640,385 | + 57 | - 59 |
| Bank debits (thousands) ............. $\%$ | 142,299 | - 18 |  |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$ \$ $\$$ | 98,148 | $-1$. | - 2 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. | 17.8 | $-16$ |  |

## LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY

| Retail sajes | $-4 \dagger$ | \% ${ }_{\text {\% }}$ | $\cdots$ | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apparel stores | - $23 \ddagger$ | $-13$ | $+$ | 7 |
| Automotives stores | $-4 \dagger$ | + 7 |  | 8 |
| Drupstores | $-114$ | $-7$ |  | 7 |
| Eating und drinking places. | $-114$ | $+3$ |  | 1.5 |
| Food store | -6i | $\cdots$ | - | 3 |
| Furniture and householdappliance stores | -- 5 † | 4 |  |  |
| Gasoline and service stations. | + 1 † | 5 | $+$ | 5 |
| General-merchandise stores | - $9 \dagger$ | -5 | + | 9 |
| Lumber, building material, and hardware stores. | +6才 | -6 | - | 5 |
| Postal receipts * |  | * | $+$ | 8 |
| Building permits, less federal contracts |  | - 50 | - | 65 |
| Bank debits (thousands)............. |  | - 4 | $+$ | 3 |
| End-of-month deposits (thousands) $\ddagger$. |  | - 13 | - | 3 |
| Annual rate of deposit turnover. . | 16.0 | - 12 | - | 4 |

# BAROMETERS OF TEXAS BUSINESS 

## (All figures are for Texas unless otherwise indicated.)

All indexes are based on the average months for $1957-59$ except where other specification is made; all except annual indexes are adjusted for seasonal variation unless otherwise noted. Employment estimates are compiled by the Texas Employment Commission in cooperation with the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor. The symbols used below impose qualifications as indicated here: *-preliminary data subject to revision; r-revised data; \#-dollar totals for the calendar year to date; \&-dollar totals for the fiscal year to date; $\dagger$-employment data for wage and salary workers only.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } \\ & 1967 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{ar}} \\ & 1967 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb } \\ 1966 \end{gathered}$ | Year-to-date average |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 1967 | 1966 |
| GENERAL BUSINESS ACTIVITY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Business activity (index) | 181.0 | 185.9 | 169.0 | 183.5 | 168.5 |
| U.S. wholesale prices (unadjusted index) . . . . . | 106.0 | 106.2 | 105.3 | 106.1 | 105.0 |
| Consumers' prices in Houston (unadjusted index) |  | 113.0 |  | 113.0 | 110.0 |
| U.S. consumers' prices (unadjusted index) ....... | 114.8 | 114.7 | 111.6 | 114.8 | 111.3 |
| Income payments to individuals in U.S. (billions, at seasonally adjusted annual rate) | \$ 609.9* | \$ $607.5^{*}$ | \$ 564.7 r | $\begin{array}{rr}\$ \quad 608.7 \\ & 37\end{array}$ | \$ $\quad 562.5$ |
| Business failures (number) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 40 | 34 | 56 | 37 | 50 |
| Business failures (liabilities, thousands) | \$ 4,622 | \$ 3,788 | \$ 5,264 | \$ 4,205 | 3,675 |
| Newspaper linage (index) ............ | 120.5 | 119.5 | 116.0 178.9 | 120.0 | 118.1 |
| Ordinary-life-insurance sales (index) | 187.4 | 161.9 | 178.9 | 174.7 | 167.8 |
| Miscellaneous freight carloadings in S.W. District (index) TRADE | 83.2 | 80.9 | 79.8 | 82.1 | 79.8 |
| Total retail sales (millions) | \$1,245.0 | \$ 1,282,0 | \$1,210.0 | \$2,527.0 \# | \$2,396.0 \# |
| Durable-goods sales (millions) .... | \$ 436.0 | \$ 428.0 | \$ 455.0 | \$ 864.0 \# | $\$ 854,0 \#$ |
| Nondurable-goods salcs (millions) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | \$ 809.0 | \#854.0 | \$ 755.0 | $\$ 1,663.0 \text { \# }$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1,542.0 \text { \# } \\ 64.8 \end{array}$ |
| Ratio of credit sales to net sales in department and apparel stoxes. | $65.4{ }^{\text { }}$ | 62.2* | 66.6 r | 63.8 84.1 | 64.8 34.8 |
| Ratio of collections to outstandings in department and apparel stores. PRODUCTION | \$4.7 ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | 33.5* | 34.7 r | 34.1 | 34.3 |
| Total electric-power use (index) | 198.9* | 193.5* | 181.1 r | 196.2 | 178.9 |
| Industrial electric-power use (index) | 189.0 * | 178.2** | 169.3 r | 183.6 | 167.4 |
| Crude-ail production (index) ....... | 108.3* | 106.9 * | 98.0 r | 105.1 | 98.5 |
| Average daily production per oil well (bbl.) | 14.6 | 14.8 | 14.2 | 14.7 | 14.2 |
| Crude-oil runs to stills (index) .......... . . | 119.1 | 117.4 | 113.1 | 118.3 | 115.2 |
| U.S. industrial production (index) | 155.9* | $158.0{ }^{*}$ | 152.4 r | 157.0 | 151.5 |
| Industrial production-total (index) | 150.7** | 153.0** | 140.8 r | 151.9 | 141.6 |
| Industrial production-total manufactures (index) | 169.0* | $170.5{ }^{*}$ | 156.7 r | 169.8 | 157.4 |
| Industrial production-durable manufactures (index) | 189.5* | 193.7** | 170.5 r | 191.6 | 172.1 |
| Industrial production-nondurable manufactures (index) | $155.3^{*}$ | 155.1** | 147.5 r | 155.2 | 147.6 |
| Industrial production-mining (index) .................. | 115.7** | 120.0** | 109.8 r | 117.9 | 111.1 |
| Industrial production-utilities (index) | 194.5* | 192.8* | 182.7 r | 193.4 | 182.0 |
| Building construction authorized (index) | 156.5 | 106.6 | 157.1 | 131.6 | 143.8 |
| New residential building authorized (index) | 99.1 | 87.4 | 117.9 | 93.3 | 115.5 |
| New nonresidential building authorized (index) | 253.0 | 130.4 | 214,9 | 191.7 | 188.9 |
| AGRICULTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prices received by farmers (unadjusted index, 1910-14=100) | 242 | 241 | 266 | 242 | 263 |
| Prices paid by farmers in U.S. (unadjusted index, 1910-14=100) | 339 | 340 | 329 | 340 | 328 |
| Ratio of Texas farm prices received to U.S prices paid by fammers. FINANCE | 71 | 71 | 81 | 71 | 80 |
| Bank debits (index) | 191.9 | 197.4 | 178.0 | 194.7 | 176.9 |
| U.S. bank debits (index) | 226.0 | 222.0 | 195.1 | 224.0 | 193.5 |
| Reporting member banks, Dallas Federal Reserve Itisttict |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans (millions) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | \$ 4,768 | \$ 4,826 | \$ 4,676 | \$ 4,797 | \$ 4,661 |
| Loans and investments (millions) | \$ 7,052 | \$ 7,053 | \$ 6,847 | \$ 7,043 | \$ 6,852 |
| Adjusted demand deposits (millions) | \$ 2,928 | \$ 2,911 | \$ 2,721 | \$ 2,920 | \$ 2,766 |
| Revenue receipts of the state comptroller (thousands) | \$181,198 | \$1.81,687 | \$176,132 | \$181,413 | \$159,730 |
| Securities registrations-original applications |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mutual investment companies (thousands) | \$42,338 | \$ 15,850 | \$49,600 | \$ 99,708 § | \$128,124 8 |
| All other corporate securities |  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas companies (thousands) | \$ 3,122 | \$ 7,694 | \$ 4,336 | \$ 21,7238 | $\$ 13,148 \$$ |
| Other companies (thousands) | \$ 9,595 | * 7,074 | \% 970 | \$ 32,1068 | $\$ 33,950 \text { § }$ |
| ecurities registrations-renewals |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mutual investment companies (thousands) | \$ 9,126 | \$ 20,542 | \$ 12,340 | \$ 86,149 § | \$ 71,3318 |
| All other corporate securities (thousands). | \$ 0 | \$ 586 | \$ 508 | \$ 2,639 § | \$ 4,280 § |
| LABOR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing employment (index) $\ddagger$ | 132.3* | 131.0** | 123.8 r | 181.7 | 123.2 |
| Total nonagricuiltural employment (index) $\dagger$ | 129.8* | 129.3** | 122.3 r | 129.6 | 121.9 |
| Average weekly hours-manufacturing (index) $\uparrow$. | 100.8* | $100.0^{*}$ | 102.7 r | 100.4 | 102.2 |
| Average weekly earnings-manufacturitg (index) $\dagger$ | 126.0 * | 125.0* | 123.6 r | 125.5 | 123.5 |
| Total nonagricultural employment (thousands) $\ddagger$. | 3,169.2 * | 3,164.5* | 2,984.4 r | 3,166.9 | 2,978.8 |
| Total manufacturing employment (thousands) $\dagger$ | 636.6* | 630.9 * | 595.9 r | 633.8 | 598.2 |
| Durable-goods employment (thousands) $\dagger$. | 340.5 ${ }^{*}$ | 338.7 * | 311.0 r | 339.6 | 309.0 |
| Nondurable-goods employment (thousands) it. | 296.1* | 292.2 * | 284.9 r | 294.2 | 284.3 |
| Total civilian labor force in selected labor market areas (thousands).. | 2,986.9 | 2,985.1 | 2,852.0 | 2,985,0 | 2,850,1 |
| Nonfarm exployment in selected labor market axeas (thousands) | 2,823.1 | 2,819.4 | 2,677.1 | 2,821.3 | 2,675.1 |
| Manufacturing employment in selected labor market areas (thousands) | 540.2 | 554.2 | 500.8 | 537.2 | 498.6 |
| Total unemployment in selected labor market areas (thousands). | 86.0 | 85.2 | 100.0 | 85.6 | 100.8 |
| Percent of labor force unemployed in selected labor marke areas | 2,9 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 3.6 |



## New Publication

The Highland Lakes of Texas
A Study in Econmic A Study in Economic Development

by<br>Charles T. Clark, James E. Willis, and<br>Charles A. Pieper

This study of the economic development resulting from the recreational and tourist attractions of the Highland Lakes along the Colorado River attempts to measure economic growth primarily in terms of subdivisions and houses, and to forecast population and housing for the year 1975.

It gives a comprehensive picture of the physical and economic setting, the historical development of the Lakes, transportation patterns, utilities, and recreational facilities.

Numerous tables, charts, diagrams, and maps illustrate the text.
$\$ 2.50$ - Texas residents pay a 2 -percent sales tax.
Bureau of Business Research
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712
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