

THE BEND BULLETIN

"For every man a square deal, no less and no more."

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

One year \$1.00
Six months .50
Three months .25
(Invariably in advance.)

FRIDAY, JANUARY 25, 1907.

THE DEMANDS OF PROGRESS.

It is folly to expect the large counties of Eastern Oregon to retain their present boundaries when settlers occupy and develop them. These large areas must be divided up so that there may be reasonably close contact between the people and their local government. Here is a fact that must be recognized. It may also be taken for granted that the old interests will resist any division—it is more profitable to them, of course, to hold their clench on the new development and compel it to pay tribute to them. Therefore the political and business and social progress of these remote but rapidly growing communities must be in the face of opposition of the old interests, which are admittedly selfish, by breaking up these county empires. We can not get around this stern fact.

The cry so often raised by those opposed to progress is that dividing the county will make taxes higher. Those who do not think or understand, who merely use the surface drift of words, proceed on the assumption that "two county governments will cost twice as much as one, therefore taxes must be higher." If this were true it is a one-sided or half view of the case. The great question with reasonable men is not "What do we pay?" but "What do we get for our money?" The spirit of American citizenship is not to be stingy in paying out money if it brings adequate benefits.

It is quite important to keep in mind that the tax paid into the public treasury is not always the heaviest we are called upon to pay—indeed it rarely is. Probably the average citizen of the Deschutes valley pays out of his own private pocket in getting to and from the county seat for the transaction of necessary business twice as much as the public taxgatherer collects from him. This is just as much a tax on business, on industry, on property, as that which is levied by the sheriff. And it is the most unequal of any for it falls heaviest on the fellow who happens to live farthest from the county seat, and is usually least able to pay it, instead of being based on the magnitude of the interests or value of the property involved. So we say it is not the money which goes legitimately into the public treasury that the property owners generally regret, but the payment of any money without reasonable benefit. In other words, it is not reasonable taxation, but unreasonable taxation, that is objected to. And this is right.

Taxation without representation has made a lot of trouble in times gone by and it is no more welcome today than it was in the days of the British Stamp Act. To apply the idea to our home affairs, how is the Deschutes valley represented in the expenditures from the Crook county treasury—the expenditures within the control of the county court? Where are the bridges which our money has paid for? Where are the roads which the rapid new development here has made so essential? Why, it takes a year to get a deed or mortgage recorded after we have gone 25 or 75 miles to the county seat to do the business!

Of course, the people of the new county would say whether they want high taxes or low—and it is pretty safe to assume they would want them low—but here is the central idea of this matter:

THE AREA WITHIN THE PRO-

POSED NEW COUNTY OF DESCHUTES WILL SUPPORT A GOOD COUNTY GOVERNMENT, AND GET MORE ROAD AND BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS THAN IT NOW GETS, WITHOUT ANY INCREASE IN TAXATION. Indeed, it can do this easily with even less taxation. And, besides there will be large saving to private pockets in the nearness of county records and ease of consulting them, in having the instruments and means of justice at hand. In short, there will be every advantage of close contact with local government, and not one single valid objection—not a penny of additional expense. Instead of using the money to pay for fancy court houses, and expensive roads and bridges that do us no good—in a remote part of the county as large as the state of Massachusetts—we will put it into improvements in the region that pays the bill.

Who is there to complain, except those who fatten on our money and wish to continue "on velvet"?

NO EXTRA COST FOR COURT.

The chief expense of our criminal courts is made up of salaries of judge and district attorney and the mileage of witnesses and jurors. The salaries of judge and attorney are paid by the state—not by the county—and it is the long distances traveled by witnesses and jurors that make those charges so high. These come out of the county treasury and in the proposed new county would be less than now because of shorter distances to travel. The per diem of such witnesses and jurors would cost us no more in Deschutes county than they would in Crook county. The civil cases will take care of themselves, the litigants having to bear the expenses. These will be lighter, however, in a smaller county. The sheriff and clerk to attend court would be salaried officers. The saving in mileage in the new county would offset any little extras like heat and light and bailiff for the court two or three weeks in the year. Therefore there would be no extra court expense for the new county.

This brief statement is made to correct an impression that is somewhat prevalent among those unfamiliar with such matters or with conditions here, to the effect that our circuit court expenses would be burdensome. The cost would be no more and the efficiency of the court would be vastly increased.

Prineville people, consistent with the range instinct, have from the beginning fought development of the Deschutes country. Their lips have occasionally professed love, but their hearts and hands have been uniformly against us. They "knocked" our irrigation enterprises and organized a movement to kill them. They "knocked" the soil and climate of this section and even its timber. The county judge and sheriff, public officers paid with our money (but Prineville partisans) on their lobbying trip to the legislature in 1905 stopped long enough to turn back at Shaniko a lumberman on his way to build a saw-mill in the Sisters country. A leading Prineville merchant desired his show window to be embellished with the work of a photographer formerly at Bend. When it was found that the most striking and interesting views were of scenes in the Deschutes valley he ordered the collector out, saying he "had no use for the Bend country." This merchant is now lobbying against us. And so on to infinity.

Since Prineville cannot live in the same family with us without "fighting like brothers" perhaps we may be peaceable neighbors.

That a new county must sooner or later be established covering the upper Deschutes valley is inevitable. Common sense would dictate that

it be done now. The only plausible argument advanced by the Prineville ring for a new court house is for more room for the record office. This business comes mainly from our valley. If we have our separate court house at home for our business, it will not only relieve the congestion at Prineville and necessity of building the palatial court house but will be vastly more satisfactory.

Every one not a fool knows they want that court house, not for county reasons, but primarily to build up and embellish the town. Their own citizens admit it, and fair minded ones are privately opposed, but are silent lest they incur displeasure of the ring.

Should they ultimately build the proposed building (which is doubtful since the taxes are to be resisted) when a division does take

place they will have another spell of indigestion at being required to pay back to the new county its proportion of the value of the county property.

We hear that the Prineville ring intends to fight the proposed division. It is refreshing to see how intensely attached to us they suddenly have become at prospect of losing our taxes. Do they think if they send a lobby to Salem to defeat division the expenses can be defrayed as usual out of the county treasury while we pay the taxes? If they could succeed in defeating the bill do they think the people of Western Crook who can out vote them 2 to 1 will let them long retain the county seat?

When people of the Deschutes valley journey to Prineville who makes the profit? When they do not go there, whose loss is it?

Problems That Confront The Irrigator.

Growing Alfalfa.

PREPARATION OF SOIL AND SOWING—Alfalfa is most commonly irrigated by being flooded from field laterals. In certain localities it is irrigated by checks, in others by borders, and in a few localities by furrows. Sowing alfalfa seed with a nurse crop like oats or wheat was more common fifteen years ago than it is at the present. The prevailing usage now, except in Utah and parts of Colorado, is to sow only alfalfa seed. The soil should be thoroughly prepared. Alfalfa is a tender plant for the first few months of its growth and requires favorable conditions. The soil when the seed is sown should contain sufficient moisture to nourish the plant until it is several inches high and covers the ground fairly well. In the colder and higher states of the West the necessary moisture may be secured by preparing the fields the previous fall and permitting the deeply plowed land to absorb a large part of the rainfall. Then in the spring, as early as the ground is fit to work, it is again cultivated, after which the seed is sown. In the warmer states the fields are likewise prepared in the fall, but instead of depending on rain from passing clouds the soil is well irrigated, and this added moisture sinks deep into the soil, which is subsequently cultivated and seeded.

EARLY TREATMENT OF CROPS.—It is used in providing an ample supply of moisture before the seed is sown there will be no need of early irrigation. Mistakes are frequently made by sowing the seed on too dry soil and then applying water at frequent intervals when the plant is young. This practice causes the roots to branch out near the surface and to depend for food and moisture on the top layers of soil, which are subjected to extremes of drought and moisture. When the soil is fairly moist at time of planting and the surface is thoroughly cultivated so as to retain the moisture there will be no need of applying more until the crop shades the ground. Meanwhile the alfalfa may suffer slightly, the leaves, and even the stems, may become brown, but in its effort to survive by getting moisture it will extend its taproot far down into the subsoil. Forcing the plant to hunt for moisture from beneath and keeping the surface layer dry and well pulverized, without any crusting or baking, produces a fine root development which will not be affected by the alternate droughts and saturations of the surface layers.

IRRIGATION BY FLOODING.—In irrigating alfalfa by flooding, field laterals are run out from the head ditch 75 to 100 feet apart on a grade of one-half to three-fourths of an inch to the rod, or from 3 to 4 inches fall in each 100 feet. These laterals are large enough to carry the head used, which may vary from 50 to 100 miner's inches, and should be made at the time the crop is planted. One irrigator can attend to two streams which are kept running in adjacent laterals. At given distances, varying from 75 to 150 feet, he places some temporary dam in the channel, which stops the flow in that direction and causes it to flow over low places in

the bank. The dam used may be of canvas or metal or it may consist of a pile of coarse manure faced with earth. If the seed drill has been run in that direction which the water takes after leaving the laterals it will help to distribute it evenly and quickly. The water is allowed to run until the upper foot of soil is saturated, any excess which runs off being caught by the lower lateral. By this method one man in 10 hours will irrigate from 2 to 5 acres.

IRRIGATION BY THE CHECK SYSTEM.—When the land is checked, the labor and expense of irrigating are much reduced. A large head of water is used, which is turned into a check by simply raising a wooden gate. When sufficient water has been admitted, a gate to the next check is opened and the first one closed. Two men in twelve-hour shifts should irrigate, on an average, 15 acres per day. Assuming that their wages, board, and implements cost the owner \$5 per day, the cost of applying water by this method would be 33 1/3 cents per acre for each irrigation.

FURROW IRRIGATION.—Some soils can not be successfully irrigated by flooding or in checks, for the reason that very light soils wash when flooded and a crust forms on the surface of other soils after each wetting. When alfalfa is grown on soils that bake, it is usually watered by furrows. These furrows are from 3 to 6 inches deep and from 2 to 4 feet apart. Each furrow is fed by a wooden spout placed in the head ditch. The cost of irrigating by this method is about the same as by flooding from field laterals, or from 50 cents to \$1.25 per acre.

IRRIGATION AFTER FIRST CROP.—In many sections the rainfall during the spring months supplies sufficient moisture for the first crop. Each subsequent crop is irrigated once, as a rule. Opinions differ as to the proper time to irrigate. The custom in the Yellowstone valley, Montana, is to irrigate the land before the crop is cut. The grower decides upon a date a week or ten days in advance when his alfalfa will be ready to cut. He likewise estimates the number of days it will require the soil to dry out sufficiently after an irrigation to enable the mower and wagon to pass over the surface without any injury to the field or the next crop. The field is accordingly first watered and then the crop is cut and stacked. The custom in Utah is to harvest the crop first and then apply water to the stubble. What would be good practice in one locality might be bad practice in another. The size of the farm has much to do with the case. On small farms the crop may be removed in the forenoon and the water applied in the afternoon. On large farms several days may intervene, and by that time the stubble is withered to such an extent that it may take a week to restore the lost vigor of the crop. The main thing to keep in mind is the necessity of keeping the plant growing vigorously all the time. Any practice which checks the growth should be modified.

You ought to read The Bulletin. It gives the NEWS.

Delinquent Tax Notice

STATE OF OREGON, COUNTY OF CROOK.

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to a tax execution issued out of the County Court of the State of Oregon for Crook County, on the 10th day of December, 1906, and to me directed commencing me to collect all the taxes charged against the several delinquent taxpayers who are delinquent on the assessment roll for the year 1906, I will on Monday, the 10th day of February, 1907, at the front door of the court house in the city of Prineville, Crook county, Oregon, offer for sale at public auction, and will sell all the real estate of the delinquent taxpayers for the amount of taxes charged together with the penalty, interest and costs.

And take a certificate therefor at the lowest rate of interest, not exceeding ten per cent per annum.

The name of the owner of the land, when known, the description of the land, the amount of the taxes, penalty, interest and costs are as follows:

Wm P. Arnold, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$4.00
Penalty and interest .50
Total \$4.50

G. W. Barnes, lots 2-3 blk 8 M. Hodges add to Prineville, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

R. H. Barnett, et al, a parcel of land commencing by rods West and 124 rods south of the corner of the sec 24-10-11, thence west 12 1/2 rods thence north 12 1/2 rods thence east 12 1/2 rods north 12 1/2 rods to place of beginning, etc 1/4 acre, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

A. J. Black, 1/2 sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

C. J. Breeding, 1/2 sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

Geo. Brinson, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

C. B. Burrows, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

Richard Burton, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

L. Burton, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

D. A. Cady, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

D. M. Carr, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

Wm H. Cashin, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

T. S. Childers, lot 3 blk 8 in Ashwood, Ore Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

Hans Christensen, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

C. A. Cline, all sec 24-10-11, lots 1-2-3-4 sec 24-10-11, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

C. A. Cochran, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

J. P. Conington, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

F. J. Connelly, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

M. C. Curry, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

J. H. Dero, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

F. D. Dwyer, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

J. M. Egan, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

L. K. Elliott, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

A. L. Ellison, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

E. C. Fennell, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

B. W. Flinders, lot 12 blk 12 in Ladlow, Ore Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

L. Fordick, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

C. W. Gendrickson, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

Genie G. Fry, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

John G. Fry, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

J. D. Gibson, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

A. M. Gibson, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

A. M. Gibson, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

J. R. Grant, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

H. P. Guimier, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

John Guimier, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

Chas. C. Haines, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

E. J. Hardy, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

W. Hardy, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

J. R. Hartley, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

J. D. Harrison, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

J. D. Harrell, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

W. H. Harris, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

A. H. Hays, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

Wm. H. Hays, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

Geo. W. Hayes, lot 14 sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

H. H. Hendrix, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

Heinemann & Eckenbarger, lot 12 blk 12 in Prineville, Ore Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

A. T. Holmes, lot 2 sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

Herbert Howe, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

Helen T. Hudson, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

T. A. Hudson, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

F. L. Hudson, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

K. C. Hyde, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

R. H. Johnson, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

R. F. Johnson, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

G. W. Jones, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

S. A. Jones, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

R. D. Joslin, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

J. B. Kelly, parcel of land beginning at the corner of lot blk 4 running thence north 10 ft thence east 120 ft thence north 10 ft thence west 24 ft to place of beginning, etc 1/4 acre, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

J. J. Kende, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

M. S. Kennedy, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

J. C. King, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

J. H. Lamm, lot 12 blk 12 in Prineville, Ore Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

C. C. Landon, et al, sec 24-10-11, Tax \$1.00
Penalty and interest .10
Total \$1.10

Penalty and interest .10

Get on the band wagon and read The Bulletin—everyone does.