SB 193

T5

Hollinger Corp.
pH 8.5

The Practical Application of the Kent Grazing Bill to Western and Southwestern Grazing Ranges

An Address by Prof. J. J. Thornber, of Arizona Experiment Station, Tucson, Arizona

Delivered at the Seventeenth Annual Convention of the American National Live Stock Association, Denver, Colorado
January 22, 1914

The Bill Discussed by Prof. Thornber, H. R. 10539, Introduced in Congress by Hon. William Kent, and Pending before the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives, Is Printed Herein

PUBLISHED BY
AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION
909 SEVENTEENTH STREET, DENVER, COLO.
FEBRUARY, 1914

OFFICERS

OF THE

American National Live Stock Association

FOR THE YEAR 1914

H. A. JASTRO, President	-	-	Bakersfield, California
DWIGHT B. HEARD, First Vice-President	-	-	Phoenix, Arizona
Second Vice-Presidents:			
J. B. KENDRICK	-	-	Sheridan, Wyoming
C. M. O'DONEL	-	-	Bell Ranch, New Mexico
M. K. PARSONS	-	-	Salt Lake City, Utah
I. T. PRYOR	-	-	San Antonio, Texas
C. B. RHODES	-	-	Orchard, Colorado
WALLIS HUIDEKOPER	-	-	Wallis, Montana
JOHN W. SPRINGER, Treasurer	-	-	Denver, Colorado
SAM H. COWAN, Attorney	-	-	Fort Worth, Texas
T. W. TOMLINSON, Secretary	-	-	Denver, Colorado

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

HUGH CAMPBELL.....	Flagstaff, Ariz.	A. R. MODISETTE.....	Rushville, Neb.
J. M. CARTWRIGHT.....	Phoenix, Ariz.	ROBERT TAYLOR.....	Abbott, Neb.
F. T. COLTER.....	Springerville, Ariz.	WILLIAM MOFFAT.....	Reno, Nev.
E. H. CRABB.....	Flagstaff, Ariz.	HARRY PETRIE.....	Golconda, Nev.
L. L. HARMON.....	Phoenix, Ariz.	H. W. ADAMS.....	Vermejo Park, N. M.
C. P. MULLEN.....	Tempe, Ariz.	GEORGE W. BAKER.....	Folsom, N. M.
W. H. NEEL.....	McNeal, Ariz.	W. E. CURETON.....	Steeplerock, N. M.
M. A. PERKINS.....	Junction, Ariz.	VICTOR CULBERTSON.....	Silver City, N. M.
F. A. REID.....	Seligman, Ariz.	W. H. JACK.....	Folsom, N. M.
FRED H. BIXBY.....	Long Beach, Cal.	W. C. McDONALD.....	Carrizozo, N. M.
R. E. EASTON.....	Santa Maria, Cal.	C. W. MERCHANT.....	Roswell, N. M.
ROBERT FOSTER.....	Healdsburg, Cal.	G. H. WEBSTER, JR.....	Cimarron, N. M.
H. S. BOICE.....	Pasadena, Cal.	G. HOWARD DAVISON.....	Millbrook, N. Y.
O. B. FULLER.....	Los Angeles, Cal.	W. E. HALSELL.....	Vinita, Okla.
E. W. HOWARD.....	San Francisco, Cal.	JAMES G. KIDWELL.....	Portland, Ore.
ROMIE JACKS.....	Monterey, Cal.	O. M. PLUMMER.....	N. Portland, Ore.
H. W. KLIPSTEIN, JR.....	Maricopa, Cal.	WILLIAM POLLMAN.....	Baker, Ore.
H. S. STEPHENSON.....	Los Angeles, Cal.	BURTON C. MOSSMAN.....	Eagle Butte, S. D.
N. R. VAIL.....	Los Angeles, Cal.	P. H. O'NEIL.....	Faulton, S. D.
J. C. WALSER.....	Piute, Cal.	F. M. STEWART.....	Buffalo Gap, S. D.
ISAAC BAER.....	Meeker, Colo.	JULIAN M. BASSETT.....	Crosbyton, Tex.
D. D. CASEMENT.....	Colo. Springs, Colo.	L. C. BRITE.....	Marfa, Tex.
A. E. de RICQLES.....	Denver, Colo.	S. B. BURNETT.....	Fort Worth, Tex.
H. GLAZBROOK.....	Higbee, Colo.	JAMES CALLAN.....	Menardville, Tex.
WILLIAM GREEN.....	Trinidad, Colo.	J. D. JACKSON.....	Alpine, Tex.
JOHN MacBAIN.....	Trinidad, Colo.	JOHN LANDERGIN.....	Vega, Tex.
W. L. PETRIKIN.....	Denver, Colo.	J. H. NATIONS.....	El Paso, Tex.
M. J. GRAY.....	St. Anthony, Idaho	J. H. PARRAMORE.....	Abilene, Tex.
F. R. GOODING.....	Gooding, Idaho	AL POPHAM.....	Amarillo, Tex.
A. SYKES.....	Des Moines, Iowa	W. B. SLAUGHTER.....	Dallas, Tex.
HORACE ADAMS.....	Plains, Kan.	W. D. REYNOLDS.....	Fort Worth, Tex.
M. C. CAMPBELL.....	Wichita, Kan.	R. E. WARD.....	San Antonio, Tex.
T. M. POTTER.....	Peabody, Kan.	JAMES ANDRUS.....	St. George, Utah
W. J. TOD.....	Maple Hill, Kan.	LARS HANSEN.....	Ogden, Utah
E. C. HOUGHTON.....	Corralitos, Mexico	NEIL McMILLAN.....	Murray, Utah
C. K. WARREN.....	Three Oaks, Mich.	JOHN Y. RICH.....	Salt Lake City, Utah
W. D. JOHNSON.....	Kansas City, Mo.	B. E. FLOOD.....	Rosalia, Wash.
R. J. KINZER.....	Kansas City, Mo.	F. M. ROTHROCK.....	Spokane, Wash.
L. F. WILSON.....	Kansas City, Mo.	F. W. HARDING.....	Waukesha, Wis.
J. M. BOARDMAN.....	Helena, Mont.	ROBERT D. CAREY.....	Careyhurst, Wyo.
A. B. COOK.....	Helena, Mont.	W. C. IRVINE.....	Cheyenne, Wyo.
ROBERT JONES.....	Wisdom, Mont.	W. M. SPEAR.....	Sheridan, Wyo.
KENNETH McLEAN.....	Miles City, Mont.	J. C. UNDERWOOD.....	Underwood, Wyo.
D. W. RAYMOND.....	Helena, Mont.	C. N. WALTERS.....	Buffalo, Wyo.
E. L. BURKE.....	Omaha, Neb.	DR. J. M. WILSON.....	McKinley, Wyo.
W. G. COMSTOCK.....	Ellsworth, Neb.	B. F. YODER.....	Phillips, Wyo.
A. H. METZGER.....	Merriman, Neb.	MURDO MacKENZIE.....	Sao Paulo, Brazil

OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATION
909 SEVENTEENTH STREET
DENVER, COLO.

Source unknown
MAR 30 1914

THE PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE KENT GRAZING BILL TO WESTERN AND SOUTHWESTERN GRAZING RANGES

PROFESSOR J. J. THORNER: Mr. President, and Members of the American National Live Stock Association—My studies with grazing plants on the grazing ranges have brought me into close contact with the stockman. I have the greatest sympathy for him and his business. I am not a stockman, but, gentlemen, I will fight for a stockman every time, and I will trust to his being right. My interest in grazing plants led me to investigate other phases of the grazing problem, thanks to this American National Live Stock Association. I have come to appreciate to the depths of my heart some of the fundamental principles which underlie this grazing problem of the western prairies, hills, and mountains. Stockmen of the West have been asking for some kind of range administration for upwards of thirteen years, or ever since I have known them. Unfortunately, they could not agree in the beginning upon a measure that would work good for all concerned. The little stockman was afraid of the big stockman, the big stockman was afraid of the dry-farmer, and I guess the sheepman was afraid of everybody. We ought to congratulate ourselves today that we are united in our efforts and that we are committed to a definite policy. That policy is intelligent range administration. I need not tell you that for more than twenty years the carrying capacity of the western grazing ranges has been decreasing. I know that considerable areas of the better class of these lands have been homesteaded and brought under cultivation. In the aggregate, these cultivated lands carry as much stock now, along with the production of some agricultural crops, as they did in their uncultivated state, so that the decrease in beef cattle in the United States has been due to range deterioration, and not to the selection of homestead lands, as some have thought.

This decrease in beef cattle has taken place mainly during the last ten years, while population has ever been on the increase. I seldom quote statistics, because they are tedious and are apt to be misleading; but I cannot refrain from mentioning some here. The proportion of beef cattle to population in this country in 1890 was 84 per cent, while in 1910 it was 75 per cent. At this rate, can any of you tell me what it will be in 1920? Since 1910 the population has increased faster, and the ratio of decrease in beef cattle has been greater. In the last seven years the value of cattle in the United States, notwithstanding their decrease in numbers, has increased \$129,000,000, and the export of meat products has fallen from

\$72,000,000 to almost nothing. It is easy from this to see why the price of beef has been going up. You do not have to be a political economist to find that out.

Gentlemen, we have here in a condensed form the situation of the country as relates to its beef supply. Bad as your lot has been on the open range—and I appreciate something of your difficulties—the lot of the consumer is worse today; and it may be worse yet in three or five years. This decrease in the number of beef cattle in the country has to be stopped. It is a matter of national importance. Instead of a decrease there must be an actual increase in the number of beef cattle, and this increase must keep pace with the increase in population. I am not now speaking of meat supplies for foreign markets. I have in mind home consumption only. You know various would-be philosophers come forward from time to time with suggestions that we substitute for beef, horse flesh, goat meat, poultry, fish, and even peas and beans; but not any one of these, nor all of them combined, can take the place of beef as a staple food. We must have beef! Now, what is the simplest and most reasonable solution of this problem? I answer: Grow more beef, and grow it on these western ranges. There is not any other place to grow it, and, besides, there is not a thing that we can do half so well. I regard this as the only possible solution of the problem of the scarcity of beef. Think of the absurdity of a great agricultural nation like this, in the prime of its youth, calling upon Australia and Argentina for its meat supplies! I said to you last year at Phoenix that the western grazing ranges were the pastures of the nation, and we must make them so.

Now, with high prices for meat and this shortage of beef staring us in the face, let us look for just a moment at the awful condition which confronts the stockman today, with free and unrestricted grazing. He cannot fence part of the public domain. No, no, that is criminal! He is not allowed to count upon his grazing resources one month in advance. That is bad business management, due to our government's negligence. If he stacks up feed on the public domain for a famine period, develops additional water supplies, improves the quality of his herds, eradicates poisonous weeds, seeks to improve the carrying capacity of the land, or tries to prevent erosion or cutting and overgrazing, he does so at his own expense, and his neighbors may derive as much benefit from this work as he, without sharing any of the outlay. Gentlemen, I call this rank injustice. I condemn it. If the stockman has water and grass on the public domain for a thousand cattle, no matter how long he has been a resident, another stockman, and perhaps a non-resident, can put down there beside these cattle

another thousand head of stock, and the resident stockman can have no recourse. He must share, and share alike, his losses with the intruder, regardless of his improvements and his foresight.

Besides this injustice to the individual stockman, unrestricted grazing has done infinitely greater harm to our country as a whole. It has invariably resulted in overstocking and overgrazing, and in destroying the best and most nutritious grasses on the ranges, thereby reducing both the quality and quantity of the remaining forage from year to year. It also makes impossible the alternate grazing and resting of areas to insure natural seed production, and it has been directly responsible in the past, and it is no less responsible today, for the heavy losses of stock from starvation on the ranges. In Arizona more than three-quarters of a million head of cattle, to say nothing of sheep, have perished from famine in thirty years' time. I condemn free grazing as unsafe for that one awful truth alone.

Gentlemen, here we have the reason for the greatly lessened carrying capacity of your ranges, and likewise the reason for the decrease in numbers of beef cattle on these ranges. Are you surprised that there is a shortage of beef animals, that prices for meat are high, and that we have nearly stopped exporting meat supplies, and have begun to import them? Here is the key to the whole situation. This condition has been going on for more than twenty years, and it will continue until we get some relief from Congress. Think of the awful losses of stock on the ranges, of the devastation that has come to the country, and of the wanton waste of natural resources!

The operation of a federal lease law, similar to the Kent bill, granting to stockmen, both sheep- and cattle-growers, reasonable protection, would completely change this condition. Confidence in the grazing industry would be restored. The grazing ranges throughout the West would carry far more stock than they do now, and carry them safely, and beef cattle, instead of decreasing, would increase in numbers. I believe every practical stockman here will tell you that he can carry more animals on his range if he can have something to say about its management. I know he will say that his annual losses on ranges would be less if he could know his grazing resources six months in advance. I am sure his interest in his business will be infinitely greater if he can lease ranges for a period of years, with the privilege of fencing them.

During the last six years the American National Live Stock Association has devoted endless time and energy to secure the passage of a bill by Congress regulating, through federal control, grazing on the unappropriated public lands. It is a compliment to the ability and

integrity of this great Association that the bill which it originally adopted at its meeting in the city of Denver six years ago, and which has been before Congress ever since under one name or another, was so well drawn in its fundamental features, as also in most of its details, as to be practically unassailable, even by its occasional opponents. You stockmen should all get copies of this bill and study it carefully. If it meets with your approval, or if you believe that your present unsatisfactory condition will be improved by this bill, write your congressman now and tell him to get interested in it.

Among other things, this bill proposes to give stockmen permission to lease and fence portions of the public range for a period of ten years, to encourage development and improvement of these grazing lands. It gives preference to homesteaders and present occupants of the range who have provided water and other improvements on the public lands. It guarantees to stockmen a reasonable pro-rata value for improvements made on the land. It specifies that where improvements to the extent of one hundred dollars, including buildings, corrals, reservoirs, wells, etc., have been made on a forty-acre tract, such land shall not be open to settlement during the period of the lease, without the consent of the owner of these improvements. It provides for a maximum grazing fee of four cents per acre and a minimum fee of one-half cent per acre. While this is what the stockman pays for the grass, he gets in addition value received for protection in his business. It puts, as far as possible, the stockman's industry on a moderately safe basis. He is not looking for a famine. At the same time, this bill guards carefully the rights of bona-fide settlers to homestead lands for agricultural purposes, and makes provision for them to graze their domestic animals on adjacent public lands. Best of all, it secures a large amount of local government in the administration of these grazing lands. I believe it provides, as far as can be seen in advance, for every other legitimate feature connected with the public lands.

It has been suggested that the minimum rate of one-half cent per acre is too much for the poorest class of grazing lands in these western states. I am free to admit that there are bodies of land in Arizona and New Mexico that under present conditions are not worth one-half cent per acre for grazing purposes, and I have no doubt but that this is true in Colorado and other western states. I believe, therefore, it would be well to omit any mention of a minimum charge. I know this would help out very much the wool-growers in Arizona.

Gentlemen, before I leave this bill, I want to note a few of the advantages to stockmen of leasing and fencing over open range grazing, which will result from this bill. (1) To begin with, stockmen will be

able to handle the public range very much as they would their own land. They will know in advance how many animals they can feed, and how many to carry over. Yearling steers and two-year-olds can be kept for three- and four-year-olds. (2) The cost of handling stock, and the losses under fenced conditions, are less than on the open range. (3) During prolonged droughts, weak and emaciated animals can be kept nearer supplies of feed and water; likewise, better care can be given to the calf crop. (4) On enclosed ranges, the improvement of herds by breeding with high-grade animals is practicable. (5) There is no incentive to overstock protected ranges, since every man gets all that is coming to him all the time. (6) On protected ranges it is practicable to carry on a systematic alternate grazing and resting of the plants. This makes reseeding possible under natural conditions, and it is absolutely necessary for range improvement on a practical scale.

Quite recently two other bills, looking toward a solution of the grazing problem on the public lands, have been introduced in Congress. One of these, known as the Gronna bill, provides for leasing of the public grazing lands in suitable areas for periods of five years, during which time such land shall not be subject to homestead entry for agricultural purposes. After this lease has expired, the land may be homesteaded for a limited time by bona-fide settlers. Failing in this, it is again leased for a similar five-year period. This bill is dangerous, because it practically prohibits permanent settlement of the land, and this settling of the land is the identical thing that we most of all desire and strive for. I believe that such a bill is unwise, and I feel assured that Congress could not be induced to pass it.

The other bill is known as the Mondell bill. This is an attempt at long range to provide in the West a grazing homestead of sufficient size to support an ordinary family. The minimum entry for this shall be 640 acres, and the maximum entry 1,280 acres, or two sections. The land shall be valuable chiefly for grazing, and shall not contain commercial timber nor be susceptible of irrigation from known water supplies. There is little grazing land in the western and southwestern states that has a stock-carrying capacity such that even four sections of it would maintain a family in ordinarily comfortable circumstances. To make this bill acceptable, the entries must be much larger, and the lands should first of all be classified carefully. This could be done best after the lands had been under lease for ten years, as provided for in the Kent grazing bill. Again, in Arizona and New Mexico it is not possible to say at this time whether or not land is susceptible of irrigation from one or more of the proposed irrigation projects. There-

fore, while this bill has a splendid object in view, it is in advance of the times, and it is not practicable now.

Now, with the Kent bill in mind, concerning what the stockman may do with a piece of grazing range under his control, I invite your attention briefly to some things that have actually been done in a practical way in range improvement in Arizona. Through co-operation with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, the Arizona Agricultural Experiment Station obtained permission to enclose with fence an area of fifty square miles in a diversified grazing country. This land varied in altitude from 2,900 feet to nearly 4,800 feet, and in rainfall from twelve inches to about twenty inches. The land is typical, in a general way, of large areas of the better class of grazing lands in Arizona. With the exception of the upper part of it, which consists of foothills, it was extremely badly overgrazed. The lower one-third of it was also badly eroded. It had been in this condition for at least fifteen years, being grazed by sheep, horses, and cattle. When the fence was constructed, there was not enough grass anywhere on it to feed a horse, and when I drove the old gray university horse across it to study the grass, I had to carry baled alfalfa for my horse. There were occasional, closely grazed, half-dead bunches of perennial grasses scattered here and there over the surface, and some grass, principally black grama, among the shrubs and cacti. Of course, there was six-weeks grass, which never amounts to very much. Altogether, the proposition was a very uninviting one. In fact, after one year we issued a statement warning people not to expect too much from the work.

With protection, the bunches of grass grew up, increased in size, and matured seed. This dropped and found its way into the ground without any assistance, though I think that harrowing the surface would have been a good thing after the first seed crop was matured. The next year there were anywhere from five to twenty-five seedling plants for every old one. The old plants continued growth and seeded heavily, and, likewise, the young plants matured a crop of seed, so that now there was a good amount of seed for further growth. You know in our southwestern country, where there is plenty of warmth, perennial grasses will mature a crop of seed at the end of their first season's growth. This continued for several years, every season the stand of grass getting heavier and the seed crop larger. At five years the grass covering was practically restored. There are more than thirty species of perennial grasses growing in this pasture now, chief of which are black grama, hairy grama, side-cats grama, Havard's grama, low grama, spruce-top grama, and wire grama; also about an equal number

of triple awn grasses, and spreading mesquite or southwestern buffalo grass, galleta grass, blue stem, fox-tail, and other miscellaneous grasses. You see, in the Southwest we have the finest grama-grass country in the world, and these grasses are a very important feature on this range. Naturally there are other forage plants, including browse and cacti, but perennial grasses are the important plants.

It would be difficult to say how much the carrying capacity of this range had been raised, but it is certainly much more than 100 per cent. After five years' protection on the better class of this land we gave stockmen permits to cut hay over considerable areas, which yielded anywhere from 500 to 2,000 pounds of hay to the acre, though the latter figure is much in excess of the average. Perhaps 1,000 to 1,200 pounds of hay per acre would be a fair average for the better land. I feel sure we can duplicate this work over large areas in Arizona. I refer now to our vast areas of grama-grass and mesquite-grass lands. I think this can be done also in New Mexico and other western states.

Further work showed us conclusively that there was no occasion, nor good reason, for excluding entirely grazing animals from such an enclosure after the second year at most, so long as they are kept off the land until the grass makes its growth, matures its seed, and the seed falls to the ground. Of course, one must not overgraze. The secret of the success of this experiment lay in the fact that the grass plants were allowed to mature their growth and also their seed, ungrazed and undisturbed. This growth strengthened the plants themselves, and in addition kept the seed from blowing away. You can protect your grazing areas from now until doomsday without results, if you do not make provision for the seed to ripen and fall to the ground before stock get to it. Most of you know how cattle eat grass heads and seed in the late summer and fall. The damage from this source is as great as from their hoofs. This is why I insist upon the grazing ranges being fenced. Now, I can see nothing difficult about this experiment. It is practical. I believe it can be applied to a large percentage of the grazing ranges in the West and Southwest. I have often been asked why there should be any difference between winter grazing and summer grazing on the ranges, in connection with range improvement. My answer is that in order to have grass you must have plants, and plants, you know, grow from seed. Therefore, the maturing of seed under natural conditions on the range is fundamental and basic in principle. A reduced seed production means fewer plants the following year to take the places of the older ones that have died out, or that have been grazed or trampled out. When this reduction of plants continues for some years, the carrying capacity of your range is permanently low-

ered, perhaps entirely through lessened seed production. You may have the soil, you may have the rainfall and the sunshine, but you cannot have grass without seed.

Gentlemen, to summarize: I have noted briefly the ever-decreasing beef supply of the country. I have examined your condition on the open range today, and I have shown you why the grass is disappearing, and why it has disappeared in the past. I am sure you are convinced that under present conditions you have nothing to hope for in the way of improvement. There has been no change for the better during the past twenty years with the open range, and you have no reason to look for any now. It does not matter to you from this time on—except as you consume meat—how high the price of beef goes; if you do not have any grass, you will not have any stock to sell. If you are going to do anything, you had better do it right now. The longer you put it off, the worse it is going to be for you.

I have noted some of the advantages that would certainly come to you as stockmen, if the principles of the Kent grazing bill were applied to your grazing ranges. I have called your attention to the advantages of the Kent bill over those of others now pending in Congress. Finally, I have shown you what has actually been done in a practical way on an arid grazing range in Arizona. My friends, we have the goods to show for it. This range has been examined by scores of people interested in grasses—people from Australia, South Africa, our various states, and the Department of Agriculture; and they all pronounce it a splendid example of successful range restoration under arid conditions. Any stockman, with intelligent management, can get the same results. I could cite you a score more similar cases, though on a smaller scale. I need go no farther than to mention the advantages of grazing on the forest reserves under federal control, as compared with grazing on the open range.

The many fine advantages of this federal lease law would apply to approximately 400,000,000 acres of grazing lands in the West and Southwest—an area equal in extent to one-fifth of that of the United States. If the carrying capacity of but one-half of this magnificent grazing empire were increased 25 per cent—and I believe it can be made fully 50 per cent—enough more beef would be produced annually in this country to take care of all of our wants for many years to come; and, gentlemen, I argue that this is the logical solution of this vexed problem of the importation of meats from foreign countries. Build up these ranges as it is possible to build them up, and we shall begin once more to ship beef products out of this country, instead of shipping them in. I sincerely believe that this is the greatest question before the

American people today, and I will make no exceptions. It affects both the East and the West, the consumer and the producer. It threatens the future economic policy of this country. It is all-important to you stockmen. It lies with you to go before Congress now and demand reasonable legislation. If you continue to show indifference in the future as you have in the past, if you refuse to get together and lend your hearty support to the passage of this federal lease law, we shall buy more of our meat products abroad every year, and we shall permit, knowingly, under our very eyes, the dissipation of the wealth of our own states, and the destruction of one of the most valuable of our natural resources—a national asset—the grasses of these western plains and hills, which have no equal in any country anywhere, either north or south. (Applause.)

Following is the Kent grazing bill :

H. R. 10539

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

December 15, 1913

MR. KENT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands and ordered to be printed:

A BILL

For the Improvement of Grazing on the public Lands of the United States and to Regulate the Same, and for Other Purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

That the unreserved, unappropriated public lands of the United States shall be subject to the provisions of this Act, and the President of the United States is hereby authorized to establish from time to time, by proclamation, grazing districts upon the unreserved, unappropriated public lands of the United States, conforming to State and county lines so far as practicable, whereupon the Secretary of Agriculture, under rules and regulations prescribed by him, shall execute or cause to be executed the provisions of this Act, appoint all officers necessary for the administration and protection of such grazing districts, regulate their use for grazing purposes, protect them from depredation, from injury to the natural forage crop, and from erosion; restore and improve their grazing value through regulation, by the eradication of poisonous plants, and by the extermination of predatory animals and otherwise; eradicate and prevent infectious and contagious diseases injurious to domestic animals; issue permits to graze live stock thereon for periods of not more than ten years, which shall include the right to fence the same, giving preference when practicable to homesteaders and to present occupants of the range who own improved ranches or who have provided water for live stock grazed on the public lands; and charge and collect reasonable fees for such grazing permits, based upon the grazing value of the land in each locality: *Provided*, That for ten years after the passage of this Act such charge for grazing shall not exceed 4 cents per acre *nor be less than one-half cent per acre*, or the equivalent thereof on a per-capita basis, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall revise and re-establish maximum and minimum rates of charge for grazing for each succeeding period of ten years.

Sec. 2. That homestead or other settlement, location, entry, patent, and all other disposal of public lands under the public-land laws shall be in no wise restricted, limited, or abridged hereby; nor shall anything herein be construed to prevent bona-fide settlers or residents from grazing their stock used for domestic purposes, as defined under the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, on the public lands affected hereby: *Provided*, That after the establishment of any such grazing district no form of location, settlement, or entry thereon shall give a right to grazing privileges on public lands except when

made under laws requiring cultivation or agricultural use of the land: *Provided further*, That permits to graze live stock upon land which is subsequently appropriated under any public land law shall not be affected by such subsequent appropriation, except as to the land actually appropriated, until the end of the current annual grazing period: *Provided further*, That no permit shall be issued which will entitle the permittee to the use of any buildings, corrals, reservoirs, or other improvements owned or controlled by a prior occupant until he has paid such prior occupant a reasonable pro-rata value for the use of such improvements. If the parties interested cannot agree, then the amount of such payment shall be determined under rules of the Secretary of Agriculture: *And provided further*, That when buildings, corrals, reservoirs, wells, or other improvements, except fences, shall have been established on any forty-acre tract to the value of more than \$100, as determined by rules of the Secretary of Agriculture, such forty-acre tract shall not be subject to settlement or appropriation under the public-land laws during the permit period without the consent of the owner of such buildings, corrals, reservoirs, wells, or other improvements.

Sec. 3. That all water on public lands or subject to the jurisdiction of the United States within such grazing districts may be used for milling, mining, domestic, or irrigation purposes under the laws of the State or Territory wherein such grazing districts are situated, or under the laws of the United States and the rules and regulations thereunder.

Sec. 4. That no grazing permits issued under this Act shall prohibit settlers, prospectors, and others from entering upon such grazing districts for all proper and lawful purposes, including the use and enjoyment of their rights and property, and prospecting, locating, and developing the mineral resources of such districts; and wagon-roads or improvements may be constructed thereon, in accordance with law, and all persons shall have the right to move live stock from one locality to another within such grazing districts under such restrictions only as are necessary to protect the users of the land which will be driven across.

Sec. 5. That the users of the public lands under the provisions of this Act may select a committee of not more than four members from the users of any such grazing district, which committee shall represent the owners of different kinds of stock, and, with the officers appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture in charge of such grazing district, shall constitute an executive board, which shall determine whether the permits for such grazing districts shall be issued upon an acreage or upon a per capita basis, shall make such division of the range between the different kinds of stock as is necessary, and shall decide whether the distribution of the range shall be by individual or community allotments. The executive board shall also determine the total number of animals to be grazed in each grazing district and shall decide upon the adoption of any special rules to meet local conditions and shall establish lanes or driveways and shall prescribe special rules to govern the movement of live stock across the public lands in such districts so as to protect the users of the land in their rights and the right of persons having the necessity to drive across the same. The executive board, after thirty days' notice by publication, shall also determine the preference in the allotment of grazing privileges provided for in section one of this Act, and shall, under rules of the Secretary of Agriculture, determine the value of the improvements and the use of the

same whenever that may become necessary under the provisions of this Act in the administration of the same. Fences, wells, and other improvements may be constructed with the permission of the Government officer in charge, who shall record the ownership and location of such improvements. Any differences between a majority of the executive board and the officer in charge shall be referred to the Secretary of Agriculture and shall be adjusted in the manner prescribed by him. Any interested party shall have the right to appeal from any decision of the board to the Secretary of Agriculture. If the users of the land fail to select the committee as herein provided the President of the United States shall name such committee from such grazing districts, representing the owners of the different kinds of stock, as above provided.

Sec. 6. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall fix a date which shall not be less than one year from the establishment of any grazing district, and after such date the pasturing of any class of live stock on public land in said grazing districts without a permit, or in violation of the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, as herein provided, shall constitute a misdemeanor and shall be punishable by a fine of not less than \$10 nor more than \$1,000, or by imprisonment for not less than ten days nor more than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment in the discretion of the court.

Sec. 7. That twenty-five per centum of all moneys received from each grazing district during any fiscal year shall be paid at the end thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State or Territory in which said district is situated, to be expended as the State or Territorial legislature may prescribe for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which the grazing district is situated: *Provided*, That when any grazing district is in more than one State or Territory, or county, the distributive share to each from the proceeds of said district shall be proportional to its area therein. The sum of \$500,000 is hereby appropriated, to be available until expended, for the payment of expenses necessary to execute the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 8. That the President is hereby authorized to modify any proclamation establishing any grazing district, but not oftener than once in five years, to take effect in not less than one year thereafter, and by such modification may reduce the area or change the boundary lines of each grazing district.

Urging Federal Control of the Unappropriated and Unreserved Semi-Arid Grazing Lands

The American National Live Stock Association, in convention assembled, at Denver, Colorado, January 20-22, 1914, hereby declares that:

We believe that the prosperity and development of the stock-raising industry on the public grazing lands of the arid and semi-arid West are seriously threatened by the present indiscriminate methods of grazing, and that thereby the permanent value of such lands is greatly impaired; and we strongly recommend the early passage by Congress of a bill providing for federal control of these unappropriated public grazing lands, and a just and reasonable method of leasing such lands.

We favor the adoption of the Kent Bill, House Bill No. 10539, now before Congress, as the best possible measure to protect and build up the live-stock industry, except that we recommend that the words "nor less than one-half cent per acre" (in section 1, italicized) be stricken from said bill.

"Build up these ranges as it is possible to build them up, and we shall begin once more to ship beef products out of this country instead of shipping them in. I sincerely believe that this is the greatest question before the American people today, and I will make no exceptions. It affects both the East and the West, the consumer and the producer. It threatens the future economic policy of this country. It is all-important to you stockmen. It lies with you to go before Congress and demand reasonable legislation."—Extract from Professor Thornber's address.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

0 002 765 963 9

Hollinger Co
pH 8.5

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

00027659639

Hollinger Corp.
pH 8.5