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PREFACE

To make an up-to-date report on the present range problems of Oregon, it was necessary to get in contact with men who are closely connected with the livestock industry. It was impossible in the time the writer had to finish the report to contact the number of men needed to receive a good cross section of the state grazing problems. To replace the personal interview, a letter was sent to selected people.

A total of twenty letters was mailed, and ten replies were received. The letters were sent so that an even distribution of the area would be covered on the range grazing lands of Oregon. Thus, a good cross section was received.

The persons who made the replies were very conscientious when they stated their local community problems. Many of the letters were detailed and very complete, which was a great help in building a background for the report.

Of the four topics mentioned in the letter the last three were considered the most. The first one concerning speculators was discredited, and the replies indicated that it did not exist to any degree as compared to the amount of livestock numbers in Oregon today.

A copy of the letter mailed to the different individuals is appended.
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INTRODUCTION

Soil is the basic resource of the nation. From it grows forage which constitutes a great resource of the western range states of which Oregon is included. Therefore, it is the concern of the public to protect the soil. The productivity, an important factor in the nation's economy, would not then be impaired for present and future generations. If the ranges are abused, accelerated erosion sets in; if abuse continues, heavy erosion areas will change from an asset to an expensive liability to the user and the public. Devastation—floods and silt—comes from erosion areas. Silt is a menace that plugs irrigation ditches and fills reservoirs on the farms below. From their origins on eroded lands come flood-waters that plunge into the valleys below to inundate cultivated fields, destroy dams and bridges, ruin towns and cities, leaving an aftermath of misery and despair.

Resources should be protected for the good of the nation, but, to set up corrective measures, much time and thought is needed to make the undertaking intelligent. When action is taken time and earnings of ranchers should be considered and protected. Safeguarding the economy of the present users will tend to make sound communities.

One way to realize our basic objectives of building up and preserving the soil and of maintaining continuous range
production is by knowing and understanding prevailing problems stockmen face over the state. They are ever present. The purpose of this report will be to indicate the prevalent range problems and attempt to comment on them as would the people in the livestock industry.
CHAPTER I

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF OREGON GRAZING LANDS

HISTORY

To help realize and understand the existing range conditions today, a brief history will be given.

By its very nature, the Western United States is largely a grazing area. Grazing on the western range first began when the conquistadors from Spain brought livestock in large numbers to the North American continent. The first herds were established in Mexico, but migrations soon followed into the western range states.

When white men first invaded the west and what is now Oregon, they stood with awe admiring the endless miles of excellent grasslands. The bunchgrass was "like a sea of waving grain". The first introduction of cattle into Oregon was by the Hudson Bay Company; most of the original herd was trailed from California. From these original herds, trappers took a few head of stock for their own private use especially when the frontiernmen were stationed in coastal valleys 1/.

In 1862 congress passed a homestead law which accelerated the establishment of the livestock industry, for raising

livestock was one means of getting a subsistence from the arid, marginal lands. Discovery of gold in the middle 1800's drew people to Eastern Oregon to further swell the already growing population. By 1880, a cattle boom was underway in the midwest. This encouraged residents of Oregon to raise horses on the free range. Horses were sold in the midwest to cattle owners who were trailing their cattle on the famous herd trails.

During all this time, the old American tradition of exploitation was being pursued. Grasslands were being wasted with no thought of conservation for the future. The federal government created national forests in 1891 and passed the Taylor Grazing Act in 1934 putting government land under administration. This largely stopped the abuse of public domain. These, along with other changes, put the livestock industry into an age of conservation by forcing ranchers to follow approved practices on federal reserve lands and encouraging them to do the same on their own lands.

Today the livestock industry of Oregon is made up of numerous family-owned units with very few large ranch holdings as might be found in other grazing states.

**IMPORTANCE OF LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY**

Oregon is predominately an agriculture state, for it is continually shown by statistics the agriculture income is one of the greatest in the state. The Region Six Survey
Report 1/ points out that 32 per cent of all the people gainfully employed in Oregon are in agriculture. It further states the range livestock production is a major phase of agriculture, for 21 per cent of the total agricultural income comes from sheep and beef cattle production. This shows how highly important an industry has been built up by using the range for a foundation. This industry, like most other important industries, has made blunders and mistakes and experienced an exploitation period.

The economy of the state would be badly disrupted if the industry should become weak. It is to the interest of all to see that the industry is maintained, but corrective measures from time to time must be put in practice to keep it stable and productive.

To further stress the importance of the range resources of Oregon, again Region Six Survey Report 2/ will be quoted. "The best gauge or measure as to the importance of the range livestock industry in a region is indicated by (1) the grass area of the land involved, (2) the number and area of livestock farms and ranches, and (3) the income derived from the industry."


2/ Ibid.
And these are all important physical and economical factors in Oregon.

The area of Oregon contains 61,188,000 1/ acres and of that acreage 41,383,000 is classified as grazing land. The bulk of the grazing area lies in Eastern Oregon. For this reason, most of the material in this paper will pertain to Eastern Oregon.

ECOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL FACTORS

Climate is a major factor in controlling vegetative growth on Oregon lands. In most of Eastern Oregon, the yearly precipitation is meager, thus making grazing the major land use. The records of the Government Weather Bureau show that a large section of Southeastern Oregon receives from five to fifteen inches of moisture per year, and in the mountains and the Columbia River Basin, the yearly precipitation will run to thirty inches. In addition to the precipitation being light, it fluctuates widely in amount from year to year making dry land farming and other allied land uses hazardous. Furthermore, most of the precipitation comes in the form of snow in the winter months. It blankets the ground, and the approach of warm weather melts the snow feeding numerous streams. The

streams egress the waters in the valleys below where it is used for irrigation or flood-water for tilled lands and meadows. From the irrigated and flooded lands, forage is grown to feed the domestic stock during the season of cold weather and snow.

Much of the soil is shallow and sterile. Over large areas soil is of such structure that only range plants are able to survive and produce a crop. Also there are large patches of land containing a high percentage of alkali making it difficult for vegetation to become established.

Furthermore, seasons are adverse. The summer seasons are short, dry, and moderately hot. Winter seasons are long, cold, and sunny. This makes it mandatory that stock be fed from two to four months out of the year in most sections of the grazing area.

Grazing areas extend from the rolling lands of the Columbia River Basin, a few hundred feet above sea level, to the juniper-studded rolling hills at four to six thousand feet elevation in Southeastern Oregon, to the steep slopes of the Rocky Mountain ranges that extend above ten thousand feet. With this wide latitude of elevation and ecological conditions, grazing lands fall into four vegetative types. The classifications are the ponderosa or open forests, bunchgrass, and sagebrush types. A visual description of the major types

This map was taken from the Region 6 Range Distribution Policy Survey Report, 1936.
of vegetation are shown on the accompanying map.

Generally one vegetative type is used for each season of the year. For example, summer ranges are largely included within open forests, and these are located in the mountain regions where moisture is abundant. Forage remains succulent until late in the summer. Bunchgrass and sagebrush types are found on the lower foothills. This is where spring and fall grazing is done. Some winter grazing is sustained in the semi-desert region where the sagebrush type is predominant, but most of the livestock are generally fed on the home ranches during the winter season.

On large areas of the range, rain limits the growing of forage. For this reason, some stock ranges look like they have been abused and over grazed even though the lands were under intensive range management. This must be kept in mind when an individual is appraising a rancher's holdings.
CHAPTER II

RANGE PROBLEMS

BIG GAME VS. DOMESTIC STOCK

Livestock producers are very much alarmed about the increasing number of big game in almost all grazing districts of Oregon. They should be concerned, for big game numbers have increased at an alarming rate in the past few years to the point where the animals have become a menace on some range lands.

The elk population in the northeastern part of the state has spread rapidly over the area since transplants were established from the Yellowstone National Park herd to increase the local number. The damage occurs when the elk invade home ranches tearing down fences, destroying crops, and ruining haystacks. Haystacks are intended for feed to carry domestic livestock over the winter. Also heavy competition for range forage occurs when the "happy medium" is overrun by big game. This happens in isolated cases where game outstrips its own feed supply, then moves on to the domestic stock range causing the forage to become overgrazed.

The same problem exists in the southeastern part of the state where deer are competing with sheep. This applies in a small degree to antelope that compete with livestock.
Stoddart and Rasmussen 1/ state: "The key area for domestic stock, spring range, and the key area for big game, winter range, are one and the same, since deer winter where domestic stock spend the spring." Since this range is largely in private ownership, problems will become increasingly worse until sportsmen and ranchers start working in harmony and fully understanding each other's views. A good place to start is for sportsmen to realize that range, over-populated with game, is endangering the livestock industry. Ranchers must realize that game grazing is here to stay, for wildlife has become an important land use and must be treated as a crop.

The State Game Commission representing the sportsmen is and will increasingly continue to work with the farmers and stockmen on the problem. The rancher's and sportsmen's first move should be to encourage state legislative action to make game laws more flexible. This will give the Game Commission more freedom to practice intensive game management. As a result, heavier kill in overcrowded areas and light kill in under-populated areas can be provided. This will eliminate any doubts sportsmen may have that game will be annihilated.

Before too much can be done, the State Game Commission will have to be endowed with larger appropriations of funds

1/ Deer Management and Livestock Production, Utah Agriculture Experiment Station Circular 121, June, 1945.
from the state to be able to put more technical men in the field to carry on the desired management efficiently. Furthermore, the State Game Commission should be provided with adequate funds to buy out isolated mountain ranches to provide the game, especially elk, with sufficient land for winter range \(^1\). Hunting seasons should be set up to keep game from spreading to other winter grounds in heavy numbers, and also to keep the animals from eating themselves out of "house and home" on the provided ranges. Along this same line, game should be encouraged to occupy the more inaccessible areas that are not used by domestic stock. Through this system the game population should increase sufficiently to satisfy the sportsmen's demand, and it also would keep stock and game grazing lands from overlapping where overgrazing tends to take place. Ranchers are not radically opposed to supporting big game on their lands as long as numbers are not increased to the point where they are taxing the forage crop. In fact most livestock operators will practice wildlife conservation if given help and encouragement from the Game Commission.

In consideration of big game problems, the Grant County Stockgrowers Association, on November 16, 1946, went on record as favoring the following resolutions. These same resolutions were also adopted by the Wheeler-Gilliam Stockgrowers

\(^1\) Suggested by Luman, Ira D., Medford, Oregon.
1. "We recommend that the State Legislature extend to the Game Commission authority to create emergency open seasons, if and when such a measure is essential for proper management of the game herds.

2. We recommend that legislature enactment provide for separation of the deer tag from the hunting license, in such a manner as to provide adequate information for determining the annual deer harvest and the number of deer hunters in the state of Oregon.

3. We favor hunting of elk of either sex for all of Eastern Oregon.

4. We favor management which will increase deer numbers on under-utilized ranges particularly in the Cascades and Coast Range."

Livestock operators would be practicing good ranching if they would provide suitable camping grounds on the home lands for hunters. When hunting season arrived, the ranchers could extend invitations to some of the sportsmen. This would give the hunters a chance to get first hand information of the problems involved in big game. Also, it would give the stock raiser a chance to control hunting on his property and help keep the Nimrod away from the stock. 1/

RANGE LANDS UNDER GOVERNMENT SUPERVISION

General discussion on government control of range lands

1/ The idea incorporated in the paragraph was taken from a lecture given by Johnson, R. G., Head of Animal Husbandry Department, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oregon.
and its relation to private interests occupies a part of every stockmen's meeting. Many of the livestock operators agree that most of the government action is following a definite purpose of range conservation. This is probably for the best. The fact remains that the government is taking action in some cases by reducing cattle numbers on government controlled land. Whether it is for the best or not the rancher objects whenever possible in the manner of expressing disappointment.

It is felt that the government is being forced to reduce livestock on public lands because of the replacement of stock forage with brush and noncommercial timber. These undesirable invaders followed devastating fires and heavy overgrazing. The unwanted species have reduced the valuable forage and concentrated the grazing on open meadows.

There seems to be two schools of thought among ranchers in regard to the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management administering range land. One attitude or the stockmen is that reduction of livestock on government lands unbalances the livestock industry tremendously when considering the large amount of money that is invested in the home ranch and all outlying land. Ranchers are organized to take care of so many livestock. If summer grazing lands (which are largely government owned) are taken away from the growers, it greatly reduces the value of an outfit from an income standpoint. Another attitude is that ranchers would have a much larger
investment in their outfit if they had to take over government range lands. Ranchers would have to own enough ranch land to run their own livestock throughout the year. The heavy investment would make additional expense in the form of taxes, interest, and upkeep. In addition to this there would be additional financing difficulties. Under government management, land used by ranchers is obtained by a fixed rental fee which is not carried by ranchers as an investment. This fee can be figured in the ranch budget without wide yearly variation.

Maybe the government has reduced numbers too far or maybe they have reduced the numbers to the right point, but there is an increasing tendency for livestock operators to improve home pastures to the point where they will not be dependent upon government range land. When home pastures are improved the tendency is to increase the livestock numbers; therefore, overgrazing might exist.

Many stockmen feel that local representatives of the Forest Service and other government agencies are very cooperative with them, and that most of the land administrators are practical men. It is believed the fault lies in the higher officials who cannot get out on the range and view the situation from a practical standpoint. The higher officials draw conclusions or at least part of the ultimate ideas from reports that are not always accurately made, especially those reports that are sent in by stockmen and their employees. From the
reports, blanket rules are laid down which cannot be applied in every local community without undue hardship. For example Thompson states 1/:

"For instance their (Forest Service) bedding out system is a good idea, but it cannot be done successfully and is not practical on much of my range. If I were compelled to live up to regulations in handling my sheep, I would not be able to obtain competent herders to handle them."

It is believed that if a few helpful, well placed suggestions or examples were made on the part of technical range men with practical experience much more good would result than with hard, steadfast rules.

The Forest Service could greatly help the private operator if hard fast rules were not laid down on opening dates for grazing. This restriction fully protects public lands from too early grazing and keeps the lands in tiptop shape. But the Forest Service could probably do more good by fluctuating the opening dates from year to year. This would help to spread the grazing load on the spring range. Privately owned spring ranges would be given some rest periodically from heavy early grazing, allowing vegetation to recover some of the original density and vigor. 2/

There would probably be less clamor among the ranch

1/ Suggested by Thompson, R. S., Heppner, Oregon.
operators if the Forest Service would allow grazing permits to be transferable when base property changed hands 1/. The value of the home ranch that is dependent upon forage on government lands a part of the year would be greatly increased. Should the operator want to retire from the livestock business, he would be able to sell his holdings for a higher price if the new investor was assured that he would receive ample range for his yearlong needs. This would not only be of benefit to the buyer and seller but also to the community. Transferring the permit might prevent the private holding from becoming an uneconomical unit. If this was done greater profits to the community would be realized.

The Forest Service and other government agencies interested in grazing set up restrictions from time to time on the grazing lands and enforce certain policies that on a long time trend will better the nation. Should these actions restrict the permittees' rights in the immediate future, ranchers will loudly disclaim that the enforced policy is doing harm for he is unable to see the ultimate outcome. Now, a lot of this trouble could be avoided if the Forest Service, through local representatives, would send out personal news letters or notes to local ranchmen in the community. In this news letter the Forest Service could explain what they are

1/ Suggested by Cawlfieid, Harold L., Burns, Oregon.
doing on the local users' range, why, and what good the new policy would eventually yield to range owner and community. The efforts would be well rewarded in creating closer harmony between government range controllers and the private ranchers. Furthermore, this would provide an easy outlet for new research developments that would be of interest to stockmen.

PREDATORS TO LIVESTOCK

In recent years predators, especially coyotes, have fast become a serious problem to sheepmen and cattlemen alike. The general feeling among the operators is that predators increased tremendously during the war period because there was a shortage of manpower to combat the menace, and that predators, mainly coyotes, are in the top of prosperity in the cycle of numbers.

Stockmen, in discussing possible control of this problem, put forth some ideas. One thing that did not seem to be approved was a county bounty system. For the size of the problem, a county bounty system could not cope with the menace. A better plan would be to set up a state wide uniform bounty system. For funds to make the bounty effective, the state would provide appropriations for the control. Counties would match the state funds. To supplement this bounty system, Federal Government trappers would be employed. The trapper's job would be to trap out local infested areas where
loss among livestock and game existed.

A more advanced form of control that has great possibilities is spreading poison bait by airplane. There is some fear that a great many of the non-predators would also be victims of the bait, and this would cause undue harm. To eliminate this danger, material used for the bait could be so designed that with the approach of warm weather it would melt into the ground leaving no trace of poison. To further minimize the danger of poisoning wrong animals, this project should be under the supervision of the County Agent and the Wildlife Service.

A complete effective control could be set up by coordinating all of these predator controls together.

UNBALANCED SEASONAL GRAZING LANDS

Balance in range land in regard to seasonal (spring, summer, and fall) forage is badly out of step. The scarcity lies in summer range. The bulk of the summer range lies in the high mountain ranges that are largely dominated by the Forest Service. The Forest Service figures show that less than 40 per cent of the total sheep and less than 25 per cent of the total cattle were moved to national forest ranges in

Oregon in 1936. To aggravate this situation, during that year it became necessary for the Forest Service 1/ to reduce present use by another 14 per cent on government lands. This eliminated more stock from the high ranges. In order to care for the full number of stock, it is necessary to summer the domestic animals on range that is best suited for spring or fall grazing. This accounts for some of the abuse spring-fall range has been subject to, and it becomes badly overgrazed if not intensively managed.

At the present time, there is an all time high so far as cattle are concerned. During the last ten-year period sheep reduction has amounted to about 58 per cent 2/. Putting it on an animal unit basis (five sheep or one cow is equivalent to one animal unit), cattle numbers have increased somewhat more; thus, still widening the spread in proper balance between livestock numbers and summer grazing lands. This out of balance situation has not been helped by allotting excess natural sheep range to cattle for summer use. Steep and rough terrain of sheep summer range accounts for most of the trouble for cattle can not fully utilize forage on this type of ground. At the present, many stockmen are increasing winter

---


feed supply and consequently increasing the numbers on the home ranches without attention being given to improving or increasing summer feed. This is a very grave situation, and there is much concern over the trend for many of the stockmen are bringing up this matter at community meetings.

**TAXATION**

Range land taxation for the past few years has adjusted itself in line with valuation as long as the present level of livestock prices remain, and under these conditions a full tax load is being carried. Some of the ranchers are showing some concern over the two school bills passed by the 1946 Oregon voters. The rangemen fear that part of the tax load to provide funds for these school bills will come from the range land. This will narrow the margin for profit and risk and capital value will be greatly reduced. Any heavy reduction in cattle prices would be hard on the owners, especially those owning low valued land.

Should this possibility be carried on far enough, along with other rising costs and taxes, once again many of the range lands would be going back to the counties, tax delinquent, or the rancher might attempt to bring livestock numbers up to offset overall costs. This will temporarily bring high costs in balance with investment in livestock numbers. Increasing the numbers would probably overstock
the range and overgrazing would result. The conditions described above may be exaggerated, but could easily happen. It will be up to the ranchers to watch the trend closely and do something about it before the damage has gone too far.

DISEASES AMONG DOMESTIC STOCK

The lack of control of disease may not be classed as a problem, although problems accompany them whenever preventions are not taken.

Cattle diseases, especially in connection with Bang's disease, are getting rather close to us now, and some effective measures must be taken. The second largest industry in the state of Oregon is the livestock industry, and at the present this industry only rates sixth or seventh in appropriations for research on diseases 1/. Therefore, it is justifiable to increase appropriations for research to such a point that they are in line with the importance of the industry to the state. In allotting money for research problems, consideration should be given to the matter of parasite control and other locally troublesome diseases along with the above mentioned diseases that enroach on the rancher's profit through death loss.

Money would be well spent if it provided for Bang's

disease vaccine and for establishment of a state veterinarian service, in cooperation with county agents, to properly administer the vaccine and provide other technical services to livestock operators.

Another important matter brought up by the Wheeler-Gilliam Livestock Association 1/ was that breeding stock, when shipped for long distances, are required to be unloaded and fed after thirty-six hours of traveling. Often breeding stock are placed in stockyard enclosures which have recently been occupied by diseased cattle going to market. This condition must be corrected. To eliminate this source of infection, Oregon should have laws and efficient inspectors to correct the trouble, for this problem largely exists in intrastate movement of animals.

Auction rings play an important part in handling livestock of Oregon, and also here it is necessary to control the spread of livestock diseases 2/. With some legislative action and close cooperation between stockmen and operators of auction rings this problem can easily be solved.

TRANSPORTATION LAWS

In recent years livestock operators have found it to

1/ Ibid.

their advantage to ship sheep and cattle by motor truck and the demand is still growing. Oregon laws have different restrictions on the overall dimensions of trucks from adjoining states, and this restricts the free movement of cattle in and out of the state. The restrictions also make an added expense in transportation charges because of extra handling. Idaho, Washington, and California permit the use of trucks with sixty foot lengths on state highways. Oregon, in ordinary times, will not permit trucks of this length to travel the highways. During the war a temporary permit in Oregon allowed out of state trucks to operate unhindered, but now the emergency is over it is expected the temporary permit will be discontinued. If other states permit the use of such trucks and apparently with no undue harm to the roads, Oregon should revise its laws so the legal rules will be uniform with adjacent states. This will allow free movement of stock by trucks between the states.

BRAND INSPECTION

Many of the livestock growers express their disappointment in the ineffectiveness of brand inspection. The inspection of brands on cattle that are being transported are lax. With livestock at a premium, there are great temptations among some unscrupulous individuals to dispose of stock, especially cattle, other than their own. The Wheeler-Gilliam Livestock
Association 1/ recommends every seller should draw up a Bill of Sale covering a description of the stock sold, with all brands included. The Bill of Sale would go with the shipment and it would be subject to inspection by authorized inspectors to determine if everything is in order. To increase the effectiveness of the above measure, it would be necessary to increase the number of livestock truck inspectors. This would give more complete control on the transportation of stock.

Another good prevention of selling illegal stock would be to set up rigid laws demanding good brand inspection and identification of livestock being handled in auction yards 2/. As it has been said before, auction yards are now taking an important part in the marketing of livestock. There is definitely a need for some legal control to protect the legitimate grower.

MARKET REPORTS

A few of the Oregon ranchers feel they are not receiving adequate reports of livestock marketing in the papers. Although this is not a serious problem, it is


2/ Suggested by Jamison, C. L., Secretary-treasurer of Cattle and Horse Raisers Association, Pendleton, Oregon.
important enough to warrant mentioning. The ranchers might be better informed of market trends if more complete market reports were issued on commercial grades of cattle. The problem would easily be solved if daily and weekly papers, especially the Portland Oregonian, Portland Journal, Western Livestock Journal, and East Oregonian, were to print reports including representative sales that were made in the Portland sales yards as well as the present market reports. 1/

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY OF PROBLEMS

The past chapter dealt at length with the more important range problems of Oregon. Here in the summary the problems are listed in order of importance; that is, the problems most mentioned and commented on by the individuals contacted.

1. There is great concern over the conflict between big game and domestic stock. The quickest way to solve this problem is closer cooperation between sportsmen and stockmen.

2. The policy of control of government range lands were often commented on. A large part of the operators generally approved most of the government actions, although it is increasingly restricting the operator's freedom. The permittees feel that if the higher officials were out in the field more often and better informed on local problems, there would be less tendency to draw up the rigid blanket rules that now prevail.

3. Predators are making heavy inroads on the profits of the livestock industry by causing heavy death losses. Control of this menace could be partially overcome by having a state wide bounty and also trappers employed by the government. Spreading poison bait by airplane has great possibilities.
4. There is a decided lack of balance between summer and spring range areas. This condition is difficult to improve.

5. Taxes on lands have been increasing the last few years, but this has been satisfactorily met by increased prices for stock. If stock prices should drop it might prove very difficult for the operator holding low valued land to continue in business.

6. The problem of diseases still exists among commercial grades of livestock. There is a feeling that more money should be appropriated for research in this field to overcome the difficulties of the problems.

7. Oregon should make trucking laws uniform with adjacent states so there would be more freedom in state movement of livestock.

8. There is need for tightening of the inspection of brands. This improvement is needed where stock are moving by trucks and going through the auction yards, for illegal stock can now be moved without detection.

9. Ranchers need to be better informed on representative sales of commercial grades of stock going through sales yards. Some revisions are needed in daily and weekly papers to include such sales. Ranchers are demanding information on complete sale of livestock in the main sales yards.
Gentlemen:

I am a student at Oregon State College and in order to complete my work I am required to write a detailed paper on some pertinent subject. The subject I have chosen concerns the stockmen's views on their present day problems, however large or small.

To make this paper complete I would appreciate your help by submitting any problems which confront you or your community. These problems may range from government control or regulations to those concerning the home ranch itself.

To give you some idea of what I am interested in, here are a few topics that I have listed.

1. Speculators entering the livestock industry, tending to make it unstable.

2. The payment of heavy taxes on over-assessed range lands.

3. The gradual reduction of livestock numbers grazing on government controlled land.

4. The increased nuisance of big game invading the home ranch lands.

I would like to thank you for any help you may be able to give me by just stating your ideas, similar to the list above.

Yours truly,

Albert G. Oard