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

NEWS LETTER

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

MARCH 31, 1926

CHAPEL HILL, N C. THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS VOL. XII, NO. 20

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

CATTLE IN NORTH CAROLINA

The more we talk about the need for cattle, especially dairy cattle, in North Carolina, the fewer cattle we have. Every time the census takers make a count of our cattle the fewer they report. This condition has been going on long enough for us to be safe in declaring that in both beef and dairy cattle North Carolina is steadily losing ground. The 1920 census reported fewer cattle than the 1910 census. The 1925 census reports fewer than the 1920

During the last five years eighty-seven of the one hundred counties of the state have experienced a loss in cattle of all kinds.

Only thirteen counties showed an increase in cattle, and only seven counties showed gains that could be classed as creditable. See the table which appears elsewhere

Tidewater Last

New Hanover leads with an increase in all cattle of nearly 100 percent. this case the increase was mainly in dairy cattle, New Hanover being a city county offering a good market for milk. All of the geographic areas of the state experienced decreases in cattle. The greatest decreases occurred in the Tiderwater counties. With the expension water counties. With the exception of New Hanover and Chowan the Tide-water counties make a solid group at the end of the table, making the largest percent decreases in cattle. The recent tick eradication law does not seem so far to have stimulated the cattle industry in the Tidewater country.

All told the state lost slightly more

than one hundred thousand cattle during the last five years, decreasing from 644,779 to 544,512, or 15.5 percent. The 1910 census reported 700,861 cattle on the farms of the state.

Last in the United States

cattle state. This was especially true before the Civil War. See any census report up to 1860. But of all the states North Carolina today stands last in all cattle, and last in both beef and dairy cattle, on a per farm basis.

Needless to say it is not necessary in showing our position as a cattle state to of the geographic areas of the United States come ahead of the South in cattle between them. They can and must per farm. The following table shows the rank of the Southern states in cattle

For certain type

per tarm.		
State	All	Cattle
	cattle	per farm
Texas	,800,981	12 4
Florida	662,215	11.2
Oklahoma1	,694,616	8 6
Louisiana	703,245	5.3
Virginia	826,645	4.3
Tennessee1	,022,708	4.1
Arkansas	836, 557	3.8
Georgia	938,689	3.8
Kentucky	937,779	3.6
Mississippi	938,024	3 6
Alabama	840,030	3.5
South Carolina	340,151	2.0.
North Carolina	544,512	
United States61		
United Statesor	,011, 102	

respect. It will be noted that the United States average is 9.66 cattle per farm, or more than five times the average for North Carolina. Aside from South Carolina, and the states in this price.

A national program is essential. Great transportation systems, whether water, rail or road, must consist of main trunk North Carolina. Aside it in the line there is not another state in the Union that even approaches North Carolina in fewness of cattle per farm. This line in fewness of cattle per fart, and a layer furious expenses if it had sections is an immensely surprising fact, and a of narrow-gauge track in it. And our fact that involves worlds of sig which we cannot go into at this time. But it is worth thinking about.

We should like to point out, however, that North Carolina's exceedingly low rank is hard to explain. Tenancy cannot explain it, as our tenant rate is below the average for the South. Negro ratio cannot explain it, for our negro ratio is below the average for the South Geographic location cannot explain it, for our geographic location is very favorable, compared with states to the south Natural conditions cannot explain it, for it is said that we possess most admirable natural resources apace. for becoming a livestock state—excelnow the lent climate, splendid grazing grounds, down the expanse of steel from coast to

FEWER CATTLE IN CAROLINA | excellent location, abundant water, and so on and on.

Then what is the explanation? We think we know the main reason-our ability to produce both cotton and tobacco, both great ready-eash crops, but we confess that we are unable to ex-

plain fully why North Carolina should rank last of all the states in all cattle per farm, and last both in beef and dairy cattle per farm.

We do not produce one-sixth of the beef we need to consume, assuming that we need to consume as much as the average person in the United States actually did consume in 1925, which was 63.1 pounds. We do not produce in the state one-third of the milk or butter that we need to consume, assuming that we need to consume as much as the average person in the United States actually did consume in 1925. We do not say that we imported the balance. Very likely we did without much of the beef, milk, and butter we needed to consume, which is worse than if we had imported the entire deficit.

Cheap range-fed production of beef reached the pinnacle a quarter-century ago, and the eastward march of meat production began early in the present century. Following in wake of the boll weevil the states to the south of us have been forced to produce their own meat and milk in larger quantities or starve. What we want to emphasize is the neces sity for a milk cow or two on every farm. The ideal is a few cattle on every farm, instead of a thousand on every range, but North Carolina is further than ever from this ideal. S. H. H., Jr.

HOOVER ON WATERWAYS

One fundamental need of American agriculture is cheaper transportation.

Our railways are being worked to an efficiency never before equalled in his-There have been times in our history tory, but with the increased cost of when North Carolina was an important labor and supplies, due to the war, cattle state. This was especially true pect for rate reductions by rail.

Improvement of the inland waterways offers a large measure of help. A wise, comprehensive, national program, pushed rapidly to completion, is required.

Utilization of all of the major trans

portation agencies of the country-railinclude other than Southern states. All ways, waterways, and highways-is

For certain types of goods water carriage has proven itself to be by far the cheapest. Water transportation is pe-culiarly adapted to the primary agricultural products. On the sea or on the Great Likes, 1,000 bushels of wheat can terransported 1,000 miles for twenty to thirty collars. Using the modern equipped Mississippi barges, 1,000 bushdollars. Using the modern els of wheat can be transported 1,000 miles for sixty to seventy dollars. It costs from \$150 to \$200 to carry 1,000 bushels of wheat for 1,000 miles by rail.

Our farmers have the highest standard of living in the world. That standard must be maintained. In order, therefore, to compete on an equitable basis nothing must be left undone to economize in the costs of transportaranks last among the Southern states in cattle per farm, and very naturally ranks last among all the states in this respect. It will be noted that the United in a foreign market the facility from the farmer is a competitive seller in a foreign market the facility.

aterways systems with stretches uncompleted are exactly in that condition.

ortunately the members of Congress, officials of the federal and state governments, and the people of the inland territory now appreciate the necessity for a unified national program.

Room for Both

When we stress the necessity for improvement of waterways, there is no reflection on the great railway systems of America. There must be constant development of the railroads. But the cost of such development increases Land values are much higher now than when the empire builders laid

HISTORY'S LESSON

If there is one lesson taught by history, it is that the permanent greatness of any state must ultimately depend more upon the character of its country population than upon anything else. The problems of farm life have received very little consideration and the result has been bad for those who dwell in the open country and, therefore, bad for the whole nation. I am well aware that the working farmers themselves will in the last resort have to solve this problem for themselves .- Theodore Roosevelt.

The railroads will always be needed first. Obviously they reach millions of people untouched by waterways.
They handle many sorts of commodities We must see that the earnings better. of the railroads are safeguarded so that they can continue to provide everincreasing facilities and increasing efficiency.

We have had most bitter controversies between the railroads and the waterways. But the railroads are now made in filling state applications and the the more economical waterways.

It is folly to say that the prosperity of our railroads will be jeopardized by the improvement of the waterways.

The improvement and development of year. our highways did not stifle the railroads, our highways did not stine the tenfold increase in traffic. have fish for their ponds, lakes, or the railroads could not today handle the streams should send in their application. So it took in due time. State application traffic of the highway transport. So it will be with the waterways. All are

A Practical Demonstration

We have now had some real experi ence in operating modern constructed and equipped waterways, so we are not proceeding on theory alone. The Government itself, in 1918, established the Mississippi-Warrior river barge line service, which has proven to the satisfaction of everyone that it can be operated at a profit. Moreover, the freight rates are 80 percent of the rail rates. The equipment has been limited, work of clearing the river channels has been slow. Nevertheless, the demonstration has been most satisfactory.

It is not necessary to cite many figures on the traffic now moving on the Ohio, for instance. Steel pipe, nails, farm fences, and other products of the Pittsburgh mills are moving regularly in tows of steel barges, carrying from 5,000 to 10,000 tons each. Coal is being shipped in the same way. Because of unfinished segments, it is not possible to transport these products all the way down the river except at high water. But the time is soon at hand when that can be done. It is interesting to note that the freight transported on the Ohio, Monongahela and Allegheny rivers in 1923 exceeded that of the Panama canal by 3,173,455 tons and exceeded that of the Suez canal by 5,457,000 tons.

Will Benefit All

It is a national problem. Though it will benefit the farmer greatly, it will benefit the nation as a whole. It should bring better distribution of population and industry. That helps the farmer. It will bring markets closer to him.

The cities of the Eastern seaboard are congested. The waterways will place many inland cities on an equality from the standpoint of transportation. Better living conditions for workers, proximity to some of the sources of raw materials will make it to the advantage of many industries to transfer activities inland

This wiser and better distribution will redound to the benefit of both industry and agriculture. Greater diffusion of our people can be materially aided by waterways improvement.

Consider the providential possession of a network of great natural water ways, the advance of engineering science which renders feasible their completion to the cheapest form of transportation for primary goods, the moderate capital outlay required for so reproductive The recovered economic strength of our nation places us in a new era in this great project—and it bids that we provide for the increasing traffic of our country; that we set in motion the economic forces that will tend to a better distribution of our increasing population and the wider diversification of our industries.

Thus only, will what God has given us become a blessing to every cottage.

try Gentleman.

YOUNG FISH TO BE HAD

ton, Marion, and Fayetteville have on hand more than two million eggs and fry, and unless the loss between now and time for distribution to begin is much larger than is normally expected WHAT A DOLLAR WILL BUY they should have for distribution this spring and summer quite a number of brook and rainbow trout, certainly a million and eight hundred thousand.

hundred thousand this season, and, in addition to the number that will be distributed from our state owned and operated hatcheries, we have by cooperating with the federal Bureau of Fisheries arranged to get the whole output from the U.S. Hatchery located at Edenton, N.C., for distribution in North Carolina waters, one-half of which distribution will be other half to fill applications made to the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries. Not less than three hundred thousand bass, twenty million shad, and quite a number of various other species should be distributed from the Edenton station this year.

People in the state who would like to have fish for their ponds, lakes, or streams should send in their applications in due time. State application blanks will be furnished upon application in the state who would like to have fish for their ponds, lakes, or streams should send in their applications in due time. State application blanks will be furnished upon application in the state who would like to have fish for their ponds, lakes, or streams should send in their applications in due time. State application blanks will be furnished upon applications in the state who would like to have fish for their ponds, lakes, or streams should send in their applications in due time. State application blanks will be furnished upon application in the state who would like to have fish for their ponds, lakes, or streams should send in their applications in due time. State application blanks will be furnished upon application blan reaching a point of full load and they can well yield certain commodities to U. S. Bureau of Fisheries. Not less than

And God has given to us greater re- tion by the Fisheries Commission Office, sources in waterways than to any other Morehead City, N. C., or by either of people of the earth.—Brief of article of the Hatchery superintendents, and fed-Secretary Herbert Hoover, in The Country Gentleman.

eral application blanks may be had by writing the U. S. Bureau of Fisheries, Washington, D. C. Write for blanks at once. Applications on file that could not be filled last year will receive atten-The bass and trout hatcheries of tion first this season, and such as we the state at Waynesville, Boone, Dough- cannot fill this year will be filed for first attention next season. - Fisheries Commission, Morehead City, N. C.

The age-old difficulty of securing the just purchasing power of a dollar is again under discussion. The National Industrial Conference says in its study The distribution from our two bass that the purchasing power of a dollar stations should not be less than five has declined to about 60 percent of its pre-war value. It says that "a dollar in October, 1926, would buy on the average only 43.7 percent of the amount of labor it would have commanded in 1914, in other words, the board says, while the employe's dollar, spent for general living expenses, has decreased only about 40 percent since 1914, the employer's dollar spent for wages has declined 56.3 percent and is worth considerably less than half of what it was

CATTLE ON FARMS IN NORTH CAROLINA Percent Increase and Decrease 1920-1925

In the following table, based on U. S. Census of Agriculture, the counties are ranked according to increase and decrease in all cattle on farms from 1920 to 1925. The parallel column shows the number of all cattle on farms in each to 1925. county in 1925.

In only 13 counties did the number of all cattle increase during the five-year period. Eighty-seven counties showed losses.

Except for New Hanover county which ranks best, and Chowan, the entire

Tidewater country falls in a block at the end of the table, suffering large losses in cattle, both beef and dairy.

State total of cattle on farms in 1926 was 544,512. State total in 1920 was 644,779. The decrease was 100,287 or 15.5 percent.

George M. Stephens, Buncombe county
Department of Rural Social-Economics, University of North Carolina

-			Percent				
	1 (7	Mumbor	increase or	Ran	k County	Number	Percent
Ran	k County	cattle	decrease			cattle	decrease
		1925	1920-1925			1925	1920-192
ļ		1940	Increase	49	Vance		15.2
		1 454		51	Harnett		
1	New Hanove	10.450		51	Transylvania		
2	Yancey	12,470		53			
3	Durham	4,805			Forsyth		
4	Avery	6,112	19.8	58	Lincoln		
5	Cherokee	8,543	13.5	53	Edgecombe.		
6	Hoke	1,940	13.1 -	56	Johnston		
7	Chowan	1,562	12.8	57	Burke		
8	Davie	5,446	4.1	58	Iredell		
9	Halifax	6,396	4.0	59	Polk		
10	Jackson	9,346	3.8	60	Moore		
11	Mecklenburg	13,985	3.3	61	Cleveland	10,339	18.3
12	Nash	4,344	3.1	62	Franklin		
13	Bladen	3,899	1.7	63	Stanly		
			Decrease	64	Wayne	4,020	20.1
14	Mitchell	4,645	1,1	65	Anson	6,178	20,6
15	Randolph	8,613	1.6	66	Montgomer	y 3,017	22.1
16	Warren	5,961	1.9	67	Pasquotank	3,326	22.3
17	Person	5.114	3, 2	68	Alexander	3,877	22.9
17	Swain	4.990	3.2	69	Yadkin	4,461	23.1
19	Orange	4.866	4.1	70	Wilson	1,804	23.9
20	Çlay	3.476	4.5	71	Duplin		
21	Union	12 689	5.4	72	Sampson		
22	Madison	12.845	6.1	73	Chatham		
23	Davidson	9 021	6.7	73	Pender		
	Wake	10.890	7.6	75	Scotland		
24	Lenoir	9 604	7.9	76	Richmond		
25	Lee	9.659	8.3	77	Rockinghan		
26	Macon	0 999	8.4	78	Pamlico		
27	Surry	9 020	0.5	79	Haywood		
28	Surry	7 609	0.8	80	Caswell		
29	Catawba	7,054	0.0	81	Dare,		35.6
29	Cabarrus	7,354.	10.0	82	Gates		
31	Ashe	20,049.		82	Graham		
32	Greene	1,752.	10.5				
33	Alleghany			84	Washington Tyrrell		
34	Wilkes	12,499.		85			
35	Henderson	6,983.	11.8	86	Perquimans		
36	Gaston	7,449.	12.1	87	Camden		
37	Rowan	9,775.	12.5	88	Pitt		
38	Robeson	5,372.	12.6	89	Columbus		
39	Stokes	5,784.	12.7	90	Craven		
40	Cumberland	3,694.	12.8	90			
41	Watauga	9,615.	12.9	92			
42	Guilford	11,373.	13.1	93			
42	Granville	6,049.	13.1	94			
44	McDowell	3,979.	13.2	95			
45	Caldwell	5,640.	13.9	96			
46	Buncombe	18, 203.	14.2	97	Jones		
46	Northampto	n 4,120.	14.2	98			59,4
48	Alamance	7,220.	14.5	99			
49	Rutherford			100	Brunswick	31,439	69,1
1 40	1000001310			l			