

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

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA  
NEWS LETTER

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

OCTOBER 1, 1924

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

VOL. X, NO. 46

Editorial Board: E. C. Branson, S. H. Hobbs Jr., L. R. Wilson, E. W. Knight, D. D. Carroll, J. B. Bullitt, 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

STATE COLLEGE PROPERTIES

STATE COLLEGE PROPERTIES

The table which appears elsewhere shows how the states of the Union rank in the value of state-supported university and college properties, on a per inhabitant basis. The accompanying column shows the total value of all college-grade state-supported college properties in each state. The data are for the year 1922, the latest year for which comparable data are available. For North Carolina the statistics relate to the University, the State College of Agriculture and Engineering, and the North Carolina College for Women, and in other states to similar institutions of college grade. The table includes all college properties, buildings, grounds, farms, libraries, scientific apparatus, machinery, and furniture.

Nevada First

Nevada, with state-supported college properties valued at \$11.65 per inhabitant, ranks first in the United States. Pennsylvania comes last with a value of only 38 cents per inhabitant. However, this does not mean that Pennsylvania is deficient in colleges and universities. Penn State is the only college receiving state support, while the University of Pennsylvania and many other large colleges are abundantly supported by private endowments and incomes.

The same is true of Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island and in other states which rank low in state-supported college properties but which rank very high in college facilities. Brown, Princeton, Yale, Harvard, Columbia, the University of Pennsylvania, and literally scores of other large colleges in the North and East, receive no state support. The states which have such colleges and universities are extremely fortunate, at least the taxpayers are.

In the South and West college culture is mainly state-supported and the table gives a fair indication as to how southern and western states bulk up in college facilities.

The West Leads

The states which have a clear lead in state-supported college properties are found mainly in the central west and far west. Of the twenty-three states which have state college properties valued at more than three dollars per inhabitant, two are in the South, South Carolina and Mississippi, three are in the East, New Hampshire, Delaware, and Vermont, while the other seventeen are all in the West.

The states that rank below three dollars in value of state college properties per inhabitant fall mainly into two classes: northern and eastern states with excellent privately supported college facilities, and southern states which rank low not only in state-supported colleges, but low also in privately supported institutions of college grade. In the South the low rank of the states is not only apparent but real.

North Carolina

The rise of North Carolina in the value of state-supported college properties has been meteoric, and the table covering the year 1922 is itself somewhat out of date today, for since 1921 the state has been spending liberally on college buildings as a part of its general building program. At that time two southern states were ahead of North Carolina. At the present time, as a result of her recent building activity, it is probable that North Carolina and South Carolina are about tied for first place in the South in the value of state-supported college properties on a per inhabitant basis. The rank we now enjoy among southern states, all of which have inadequate college facilities, is entirely the result of our recent building activity. We still rank below the West in state college properties and far below the North and East in general college facilities.

As a matter of fact North Carolina is just getting to the point where she can with some degree of comfort care for her college students. When the building program was begun in 1921 our colleges were in a miserable situation. Classrooms were overcrowded, student beds were stacked three deep in the dormitories, and hundreds of high-school

graduates were unable to find a college that could take them.

The bulk of what has been spent so far has been necessary to make up for generations of neglect on the part of the state. Much money has gone into remodeling old buildings which had become physically dangerous and practically worthless, except for the sentiment which goes with age and association. In 1920 the state architect estimated that it would require two million dollars to enable the University to care adequately for the needs of students it then had, without adding a single student to its numbers.

Such was the general situation in all state colleges when the new building program began in 1921. The state college plants will soon be where they can take care of present needs, but to care for the needs of the increasing thousands who are being graduated from our high schools is going to necessitate the continuation of a building program adequate to care for the needs of the rapidly increasing numbers who will be seeking a college education. The increase in high-school graduates in North Carolina within recent years is probably without parallel in the United States. And the increase will continue unabated, for our elementary and high schools are just beginning to get under a full headway of steam. Our fifty thousand graduates annually will soon become a hundred thousand, and more. To care for the thousands who will be seeking a college education will require a permanent and adequate expansion in college facilities and college maintenance funds.

Some Interesting History

The value of state-supported college properties in North Carolina is not to be confused with state investments in college plants. The situation at the University presents some interesting sidelights on the interest the old state took in her State University.

In 1793 the Old East building, two sections two stories high, was erected through a loan by the state of twenty thousand dollars, which loan was finally made a gift. Later on a third story and a new section were added by private subscription. This was the first State University building to be erected in the United States, and today it stands remodeled and good for another century or two of service. The next building to be erected by the state was the Chemistry building in 1905, just one hundred and twelve years later, and at an expenditure of fifty thousand dollars.

Of the twenty-two buildings standing on the campus in 1917 when the first bond issue for new buildings was passed, six buildings, excluding a part of Old East, were built by the state, all during the preceding twelve years, while sixteen buildings, a part of Old East, and the athletic field were erected through private subscriptions and gifts.

The buildings erected by the state are part of Old East in 1793, and from 1905 to 1917, Chemistry, Davie, Swain, Caldwell, Infirmary, and Battle-Vance-Pettigrew, at a total cost to the state of \$285,000.

The buildings erected through private means are part of Old East, South, Gerrard, Old West, Smith Dormitory, Smith Hall, Person, New East, New West, Memorial Hall, Library, Peabody, Y. M. C. A., Alumni, Carr, Gymnasium, and Emerson Athletic Field.

The New Campus

In 1917 the state began to take a new interest in her University, and the passage by the Legislature of a five-hundred-thousand-dollar bond issue for new buildings marks the beginning of the new University. Out of this bond issue came Phillips Hall, the Power Plant, the Laundry, Steele Dormitory, and many improvements about the campus. Thus from 1793 to 1921 the State had invested \$785,000 in University buildings and permanent improvements.

In 1921 when other southern states were crying bankruptcy, North Carolina had the courage to bond herself for sixty-five million dollars for roads, common schools, benevolent institutions, and colleges. Of that sum the University received, for a two-year

COUNTY GOVERNMENT

The Department of Rural Social Science of the University of North Carolina is undertaking a field study of county government and county affairs within the state to cover a period of three years. Three research students are being added to the staff and will be provided with traveling expenses in order that they may do first-hand, out-door investigating. The purpose is to dig out the facts which directly concern the people of the state and to interpret them by graphic and intelligible means. Upon the basis of the information thus assembled, a form of county government will be worked out which will place the county under a definite, responsive headship. The effort will be to accomplish this with as few changes as possible over the present system of county commissioners.

North Carolina has already attracted nation-wide attention by her investigations into county affairs and the practical program developed thereby, and we shall look forward with keen interest to this intensive exploration into what is still an unknown land.—National Municipal Review.

building period, \$1,490,000. From that sum came four modern dormitories, three modern classroom buildings, and many needed improvements about the campus.

In 1923 the Legislature continued the general building program, the University getting for a second two-year period \$1,650,000. Of this sum over half has been spent to date on remodeling old buildings, in the erection of three new dormitories, on permanent improvements and on buildings under construction, notably the Chemistry building.

A new college term has already begun, and the University, along with every other college in the state is crowded to the hilt. The state recently has been and is still faced with the necessity of making up for generations of neglect. Her college building program must be continued if she is to have college facilities comparable with those of other states, and adequate to the needs of her sons and daughters who are seeking college training.—S. H. H., Jr.

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

Many voters will not have time to read the report of the State Ship and Water Transportation Commission on the Bill to be voted on November 4th. A Port Terminals and Water Transportation Bureau has been established with headquarters at Raleigh. A main object of this Bureau is to give the folks the facts about Port Terminals and Water Transportation, and to do it in simple abc ways. It has established a question-and-answer column for busy voters. The questions are those asked and debated in the newspapers and legislative sessions during the last two years, and the answers are not propaganda. Mainly, but not entirely, these are details of the Commission Report and the Bill. Here are the questions that will be answered in sections during the next six weeks.

1 What is the Port Terminals bill the voters are asked to vote for on November 4? Where can a copy of the bill be obtained?

2 What does the bill to be ratified provide? What was the basis of the bill?

4 Who are the State Commission on Port Terminals and Water Transportation? What are their duties? What is their compensation? What money will they have to spend?

4 Where will the money come from? How much for port terminals? How much for state-owned boats and barges?

5 What is a first-class ocean port? Essential requirements?

6 Is such a port possible or practi-

cable in North Carolina? How could it rank with other ocean ports?

7 What is the maximum draft of coastwise freighters? Of overseas freighters? Could North Carolina hope to develop ports equal to the business of such water traffic?

8 Will it be necessary for the state to own and operate boat lines?

9 Will the Commission employ engineers?

10 Will the Commission create just one or more than one port?

11 What places will be selected for port terminals?

12 Will the port terminal towns and cities be benefited, and how? Why do not the coast cities of North Carolina now serve this state as the coast cities of other Atlantic states serve those states?

13 Will public port terminals benefit the Tidewater region alone? Will the entire state be benefited?

14 Will state-owned terminals and water transportation lower freight rates in North Carolina? Have they done so in other states? Has any state suffered a loss by establishing terminals?

15 What states with ocean fronts do not have port terminals? What disadvantages do such states suffer, and why?

16 What part may the federal government be expected to have in the development of public port terminals in North Carolina?

17 If established, will the port terminals be self-supporting or not? What is the history of such terminals in other states?

18 Will it be necessary for the state to purchase or lease and operate ships, vessels and boats? Has it been necessary in other states owning port terminals?

19 Why does water transportation lower freight rates?

20 Why are freight rates based on port rates?

21 Why are freight rates in North Carolina based on Norfolk and Charleston rates? Why not on Wilmington rates?

22 What would be the effect of establishing adequate public port terminals in North Carolina?

23 What is the Inland Water Route in North Carolina? How far completed? If completed, what would be the effect on business in the Tidewater towns and cities?

24 What coastwise traffic would naturally flow into public port terminals in North Carolina, and why?

25 Have the states maintaining public port terminals been benefited by coastwise traffic and open sea trade, and how?

26 Is direct, throughfare railway traffic from our own state ports to the middle west necessary to lower freight rates?

27 Does North Carolina at present enjoy direct traffic with the Middle West and the Lake cities? Why not, and what penalties does the state therefore pay? How will state-owned terminals be instrumental in making such direct traffic possible?

28 Will water transportation and state-owned port terminals in North Carolina lower freight rates all over the state? If not, what other relief is possible?

29 What chance has North Carolina to lower freight rates without state-owned port terminals?

30 What chance at present has North Carolina at direct traffic with the Middle West and the Lake cities on a fair and equal basis with Virginia?

31 Is it possible for port terminals receipts to pay the interest and sinking-fund charges on port terminals bonds? What is the experience of other states?

32 Once the terminals are established, how will further expansion and improvements be provided for?

33 Why have boat lines been established and then failed to operate at a profit?

34 Why does the northeastern part of our state fail to receive the advantages of Norfolk rates?

35 Will the advantages of water transportation show in a fairer freight rate in any other respect than a shorter rail haul?

36 Will towns closer to Norfolk than to Wilmington be directly benefited or will they receive only the indirect benefit of increasing prosperity in North Carolina?

37 Would the passage of the proposed bill aid river traffic?

38 Provided the bill were passed, would North Carolina ports be as close and as cheap to middle-western producers as other Atlantic ports?

39 Why does not the Interstate Commerce Commission lower freight rates as conditions now stand?

40 If water competition is established, will rates have to be lowered or can the Interstate Commerce Commission still discriminate against North Carolina cities?

VALUE OF STATE-SUPPORTED COLLEGE PROPERTIES  
Per Inhabitant In 1922

Based (1) on Statistics of State Universities and State Colleges, Bulletin No. 49, 1923, of the Federal Education Bureau, and (2) on the census estimate of population for 1922.

The figures for each state cover (1) the total value of State University and State College plants, buildings, grounds, farms, libraries, scientific apparatus, machinery, and furniture, for the year 1922, the latest year for which comparable data are available, and (2) divided by the population so as to put the states on a comparable basis.

In North Carolina the figures refer to the State College for Women, the State College of Agriculture and Engineering, and the State University; and in other states to similar state institutions of liberal learning and technical training of college grade.

The total value of such state-supported college properties in North Carolina in 1922 was \$7,799,703, or a per inhabitant value of \$2.94, and our rank twenty-fourth in the United States. In the South, only South Carolina and Mississippi ranked ahead of North Carolina.

Department of Rural Social Economics, University of North Carolina

Rank	State	Total Value	Value Per Inhab.	Rank	State	Total Value	Value Per Inhab.
1	Nevada	\$893,858	\$11.55	25	Virginia	\$6,451,036	\$2.72
2	Wyoming	1,683,512	8.15	26	Oklahoma	5,423,058	2.55
3	Delaware	1,816,000	7.97	27	Florida	2,544,000	2.48
4	Oregon	5,297,933	6.52	28	Texas	10,511,661	2.16
5	Colorado	5,906,496	6.06	29	Illinois	12,374,916	1.85
6	Vermont	2,129,200	6.05	30	Ohio	11,412,528	1.79
7	Minnesota	14,749,640	6.00	31	West Virginia	2,690,266	1.76
8	Utah	2,680,970	5.72	32	Rhode Island	1,039,613	1.69
9	Nebraska	6,948,748	5.26	33	New Mexico	619,120	1.68
10	New Hampshire	2,324,568	5.21	34	Georgia	4,810,796	1.62
11	Arizona	1,870,800	5.12	35	Connecticut	2,266,000	1.57
12	Iowa	11,244,735	5.09	36	Indiana	4,575,660	1.53
13	South Carolina	8,532,312	4.94	37	Maryland	2,228,402	1.50
14	Washington	6,970,170	4.93	38	Missouri	5,087,035	1.48
15	California	17,782,497	4.81	39	Alabama	3,429,512	1.45
16	North Dakota	3,045,835	4.58	40	Maine	1,125,011	1.44
17	Wisconsin	11,545,886	4.27	41	Tennessee	3,288,486	1.38
18	Michigan	16,526,004	4.25	42	New York	11,553,244	1.08
19	Idaho	1,820,326	3.97	43	New Jersey	3,028,442	.91
20	Kansas	6,578,061	3.79	44	Louisiana	1,545,344	.85
21	Montana	2,193,912	3.70	45	Kentucky	1,927,748	.77
22	South Dakota	2,331,900	3.67	46	Massachusetts	2,939,170	.74
23	Mississippi	5,696,663	3.18	47	Arkansas	1,028,611	.57
24	North Carolina	7,799,703	2.94	48	Pennsylvania	3,414,783	.38