

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA NEWS LETTER

The news in this publication is released for the press on receipt.

Published Weekly by the University of North Carolina for the University Extension Division.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1928

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

VOL. XIV, No. 44

Editorial Board: E. C. Branson, S. H. Hobbs, Jr., P. W. Wager, L. R. Wilson, E. W. Knight, D. D. Carroll, H. W. Odum.

Entered as second-class matter November 14, 1914, at the Postoffice at Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of August 24, 1912.

HUNTING LICENSE RECEIPTS

HUNTING LICENSES

The table which appears elsewhere shows the amount of state receipts from hunting licenses by counties for the season 1927-28, the first year that such license fees have been collected in this state. The net receipts from hunting licenses go to the State Department of Conservation and Development and are used entirely in developing and conserving the game resources of the state.

Forsyth county collected more in fees from hunting licenses than any other county, followed closely by Guilford county. More than four thousand two hundred people in Forsyth took out hunting license for the last season. Approximately three-fourths of the licenses issued were resident county, and one-fourth resident state. Other counties which took in large amounts from hunting licenses were Wake, Mecklenburg, Pitt, Buncombe, Wilson, and Durham.

The state total of receipts from hunting licenses was two hundred and four thousand dollars. More than one hundred and twenty-six thousand people took out resident county hunting licenses, 11,686 secured resident state licenses, while only 878 non-resident hunting licenses were issued. Among the counties issuing a fairly large number of non-resident hunting licenses were Carteret, Chatham, Guilford, and Randolph. The small number of licenses issued by Currituck surprises us, from all that we had heard about hunting in Currituck.

In Other States

Hunting and fishing licenses have long been a source of state revenue in practically all of the states. In 1926 there were only three states that did not report receipts from the issuance of such licenses. North Carolina was one of these three. In several states, many of them with hunting and fishing resources and possibilities inferior to those of North Carolina, large amounts of state revenue have been received annually from hunting and fishing licenses. Pennsylvania collects nearly a million dollars annually from these sources. New York, California, and Michigan collect more than a half-million dollars each. Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Missouri, and Oregon collect from three hundred thousand to a half-million dollars each. All told, the forty-five states issuing hunting and fishing licenses in 1926 collected more than nine million dollars from such licenses.

North Carolina has marvelous fish and game resources and possibilities. With our new state-wide fish and game law, and our new policy of conserving and developing our fish and game resources, North Carolina may readily become one of the leading hunting and fishing grounds in America. All we have ever needed in this state has been a little sensible cooperation with nature, and for the first time in our history this is being given.

COUNTY CONSOLIDATION

Mr. Lyda, of Buncombe county, who suggested to the state meeting of county commissioners the reduction of the number of counties in the state from 100 to 50 or 60, as a matter of economy and business efficiency, may be a little in advance but he is offering a sound and sensible business proposition that may eventually find support. Political and sentimental influence will be strong in opposition, especially the political. Also the matter of adjustment in case of consolidation, such as the proper place for the location of the county buildings in the territory combined, will suggest obstacles to strengthen the opposition of the county office-holders, who will view with alarm the proposal to deprive them of their living. But there are a number of small and poor counties in the state that are unable to meet expense necessary for the maintenance of modern schools, improved roads and other things that the people should have without imposing impossible burdens on the taxpayers. The only remedy is consolidation, even as school districts have been consolidated for similar reasons. The reasons for the multiplication of North Carolina counties

were in the main political, but the political purpose had the support of town boosters who considered in former times that a court house and jail were a valuable asset, whereas they are of little worth in community progress; and the hardship of getting to the county seat in the days when there were no roads and no automobiles, was a strong argument for more counties. Changing conditions have eliminated practically all the reasons for more counties and smaller ones except the political, which was basic. The question is whether economy and the desire for more wealth which will give the residents the things they should have, can overcome the political urge to retain jobs for placeholders. It can be done, but it will take time and much work to create the necessary sentiment.—R. R. Clark.

SMALL COUNTIES COSTLY

If there are any people in South Carolina who are thirsting to organize new counties they should study the experience of James county, Tennessee. Some time ago that little county of less than 6,000 souls got tired of the heavy expense of keeping up its separate identity. The taxes were hurting the farmers, and they sought relief by getting themselves annexed to Hamilton county, which contains the thriving city of Chattanooga.

And what has been the result? Recently Farm and Fireside, a New York publication, printed a striking interview with a leading citizen of the defunct county, who said: "Our tax rate has been cut from \$2.60 to \$1.80. We have eliminated our whole staff of county officials and are now using the courthouse as a school. Before the consolidation we had only one and a half miles of good roads, while we now have more than fifty miles of highway passable all the year round." He added that the schools have been greatly improved and extended.

And Farm and Fireside adds the following on its own account:

"James county, by joining with its neighbor, got rid of its overhead expense in the salaries of county officials and, with larger funds available, road building began, and the James county farmers were enabled to obtain the services of an agricultural agent. Better roads, better crops, and better schools naturally brought higher valuations on farms in the district so that almost the entire population gained in wealth."

That paper goes further and urges the inhabitants of other small counties to study the situation and see whether they would not derive advantages from consolidation with some neighboring county; and it sums up its conclusion thus:

"No one knows how many needless sets of county offices and unnecessary courthouses are keeping farm taxes high and delaying improvements. Automobiles and telephones nowadays make a county seat every few miles a senseless incumbrance upon the public purse."

Which suggests the inquiry whether it is not about time for some of the infant counties created in South Carolina since the beginning of the century to take their first steps toward going home to mother?—The State, Columbia, South Carolina.

NORTH CAROLINA LEADS

Due to the efforts of H. M. Rhodes, secretary-treasurer of the Raleigh Postal Credit Union, North Carolina was the first state to organize its quota of 20 new credit unions during March and April, according to an announcement from the Credit Union Extension Bureau, of Boston, Mass.

This bureau, financed by Edward A. Filene as a public service from which he receives no return, has been promoting the credit union idea for several years. Recently it launched an expansion campaign calling for 20 new unions in each of 20 states that have credit union laws. North Carolina was the first over and was followed by Massachusetts, Georgia, and Missouri.

The Raleigh Postal Credit Union was one of the first of such organizations to be established by postal employes

THE THING THAT COUNTS

"We are all blind until we see
That in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making if
It does not make the man."

and one of the first to be started by any group in this state. Mr. Rhodes, the secretary-treasurer, was recently given a leave of absence from his desk at the postoffice in order that he might assist in the organization of other such groups.

Of the 21 new unions recently organized, he secured 19. They are:

Durham postoffice; Seaboard Air Line Railway clerks of Raleigh; Atlantic Coast Line clerks, at Wilmington; Wilmington postoffice; Fayetteville postoffice; Rocky Mount postoffice; Western Union of Charlotte; Gastonia postoffice; Asheville postoffice; Hendersonville postoffice; Southern Railway clerks, at Charlotte; Statesville postoffice; Burlington postoffice; High Point postoffice; Winston-Salem postoffice; Wilson postoffice; Greenville postoffice, and New Bern postoffice. Unions were established with the Greensboro postoffice employes and the railway employes at Hamlet, with other assistance. Other groups are contemplating joining. "Just another example of the North Carolina progress Will Rogers talks about," said Mr. Rhodes.

Credit unions are simply banks in miniature and most essentially are thrift organizations. They are well-balanced and are organized under a state law and the supervision of a state department within a specific group of people for the two-fold purpose of supplying the members of that group with a plan of systematic saving and of making it possible for them to take care of their own credit problems conveniently and at a legitimate rate.

The North Carolina law was enacted in 1915 and is one of the similar laws operating in 26 other states. Jurisdiction for the operation of the Unions in this state is vested in the State Department of Agriculture, the movement having been confined mostly to agricultural groups since the enactment of the law. Miss H. M. Berry is the State Credit Union Superintendent, working under George R. Ross, head of the Division of Markets, which will have the direct charge of all Unions in North Carolina. Mr. Rhodes has been cooperating closely with these officials.—News and Observer.

LAYING SOLID FOUNDATION

The "ballyhoo" days of agricultural cooperation have passed. No longer is the "sign 'em up" campaign the chief aim of farmer business organization. Agricultural cooperation today, says Chris L. Christensen, of the United States Department of Agriculture, is emphasizing better marketing services and increased business efficiency.

Three distinct phases of agricultural cooperation since 1905 are cited by Mr. Christensen, who is in charge of the Division of Cooperative Marketing in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. In the 15 years from 1905 to 1920, he says, large gains were made in the number of farmers' elevators, livestock shipping associations, cooperative creameries, fruit-packing associations fluid-milk organizations, and the like. These were typically local in nature and relatively small in annual turnover. They were designed to perform the first stages of the marketing process.

From 1918 to 1925 the formation of large scale marketing organizations was a striking feature of cooperative development. Some of these attempted the performance of more advanced stages of the marketing process, even going into terminal market operations. Others attempted regional pools, large in volume and in the area covered. Still others sought to improve marketing services and promote payment of differentials for quality, standardization of reliable products, and study of and response to consumer preferences. A feature of this growth was the prevalence of "ironclad" and long-term contracts providing heavy penalties for selling outside the pool. Some of these organizations have failed, others have modified their practices.

"Members of present-day organizations," Mr. Christensen says, "are being selected rather than merely signed-

up wholesale. Membership contracts are being modified to meet the financial and other economic conditions of the grower. Notions of arbitrary price fixing by cooperative organizations have been abandoned in favor of efficient business practices. Cooperative managers, directors, and leading growers, instead of merely admiring the beauties of cooperation, are thinking of its problems—financing, management, better grading and standardization, and getting a product of uniform quality to market. They are thinking of ways by which cooperative business can be made efficient and are giving attention to better balanced production programs. The associations are growing in experience, in financial strength, and in the confidence of their members. Generally, they are getting on a better business basis."

PUBLIC-UTILITY POWER

North Carolina ranks second among the states in the production of electric power by public-utility power plants by water power, according to a recent report by the United States Geological Survey. Only New York with her Niagara Falls ranks ahead of North Carolina in this respect. The survey shows the amount of public-utility power produced by water power and by fuel for the months of April, May, and June, 1928. The production by means of water power for North Carolina for these three months was: April 143,509,000 kilowatt-hours, May 176,827,000 kilowatt-hours, and June 168,362,000 kilowatt-hours. New York's production for June was 476,746,000 kilowatt-hours. Ranking after North Carolina come Alabama, South Carolina, and Maryland.

Only a very small proportion of the electric power produced by public-utility power plants in North Carolina is produced by fuel, the amount being 5,606,-

000 kilowatt-hours for June. This amount increases considerably during periods of small rainfall and consequently small stream flow.

For the United States for the month of June only 40 percent of the electric power produced by public-utility power plants was produced by water power. For North Carolina 96 percent of such electric power was produced by water power.

TOBACCO INDUSTRY GROWS

Cigarettes and cigars manufactured in North Carolina during 1927 were valued at eighty million dollars more than those manufactured in 1925, according to figures from the 1927 census of manufactures announced yesterday by Wade H. Phillips, director of the Department of Conservation and Development. Cigarettes and cigars manufactured last year were valued at \$392,000,000, as compared with \$312,000,000 in 1925.

The manufacture of chewing and smoking tobacco and snuff showed a decrease almost as large as the increase in the cigars and cigarettes. About one-third less establishments reported during 1927, and the amount of wages paid and the value added by manufacture also decreased about one-third. This division of the tobacco industry reported twenty-five percent less wage earners employed than during the year 1925, a twenty percent decrease in expenditures for material and thirty percent less in value of products produced.

The number of cigarette and cigar manufacturing establishments increased by twenty-five percent during the two-year period. Almost one thousand workers were added to the payrolls with an increase of more than a million in wages paid out during the last census year over the preceding one. Thirteen million dollars more were paid out for materials and power in 1927 than in 1925.

The Federal census for 1927 is being made this year through the cooperation of the State Department of Conservation and Development.

RECEIPTS FROM HUNTING LICENSES

For the Season 1927-28

The following table, based on Conservation and Industry, shows the amount received by the state Department of Conservation and Development from hunting licenses for the season 1927-28. This income is all used in further developing the game resources of the state.

Forsyth leads with a contribution of \$8,469.00 from hunting licenses. Dare is lowest with only \$84.00.

For the season a total of 126,035 resident county, 11,686 resident state, and 878 non-resident hunting licenses were issued. The grand total income from hunting licenses was \$204,000.00.

Department of Rural Social-Economics, University of North Carolina

County	Receipts	County	Receipts
Alamance	\$3,141	Johnston	3,712
Alexander	524	Jones	846
Alleghany	421	Lee	1,232
Anson	1,747	Lenoir	3,192
Ashe	952	Lincoln	1,309
Avery	375	Macon	619
Beaufort	3,075	Madison	432
Bertie	3,644	Martin	2,427
Bladen	974	McDowell	1,474
Brunswick	828	Mecklenburg	5,927
Buncombe	5,667	Mitchell	269
Burke	484	Montgomery	769
Cabarrus	2,549	Moore	263
Caldwell	1,040	Nash	4,721
Camden	870	New Hanover	3,080
Carteret	3,034	Northampton	1,936
Caswell	979	Onslow	1,658
Chatham	2,927	Orange	1,817
Catawba	2,629	Pamlico	713
Cherokee	1,352	Pasquotank	1,625
Chowan	779	Pender	934
Clay	250	Perquimans	979
Cleveland	2,309	Person	1,208
Columbus	2,690	Pitt	4,869
Craven	3,805	Polk	578
Cumberland	1,909	Randolph	2,587
Currituck	1,148	Richmond	1,762
Dare	84	Robeson	2,868
Davidson	3,912	Rockingham	3,047
Davie	1,314	Rowan	3,109
Duplin	2,639	Rutherford	1,499
Durham	4,185	Sampson	1,479
Edgecombe	2,083	Scotland	834
Forsyth	8,469	Stanly	2,512
Franklin	1,733	Stokes	1,216
Gates	1,067	Surry	2,199
Gaston	2,760	Swain	619
Graham	686	Transylvania	228
Granville	1,680	Tyrrell	277
Greene	1,337	Union	1,716
Guilford	7,831	Vance	1,617
Halifax	4,123	Wake	5,799
Harnett	1,874	Warren	1,395
Haywood	1,200	Washington	1,053
Henderson	1,074	Watauga	849
Hertford	1,866	Wayne	3,350
Hoke	297	Wilkes	1,577
Hyde	628	Wilson	4,228
Iredell	2,340	Yadkin	727
Jackson	1,104	Yancey	463