

(Continued from Page 4)

Name	Description	Year	Value	Value	Value
Oscar R. & Ethel T. Rush c/o Buford L. & Clea M. Witherspoon (contract buyer)	E 1/2 NW 1/4 lying S of canal Sec 24 N 26 EWM Irrigon	1957-58 1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	.60 .71 .74 .76 .65 .53	.24 .23 .18 .12 .05 .01	4.82
Arnold & Mary Lou Braat	E 1/2 Sec 28 4N 27 EWM Irrigon	1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	233.62 237.38 242.53 197.85	56.84 38.76 20.20 2.30	1,029.48
Charles Wilson	All lots 13, 14 & 15, Blk 41 Irrigon	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	33.85 37.38 38.09 39.17 29.44	10.94 9.09 6.22 3.26 .34	207.78
Frank Edward Wiley-Floyd William Wiley-Frances Marie Wiley	All lots 13 to 21 inc, Blk 31 Irrigon	1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	27.53 54.42 55.62 46.72	6.70 8.89 4.63 .54	205.05
Ruth Umiker, Est.	All lots 1, 2 & 3, Blk 30 Irrigon	1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	17.80 26.30 27.42 19.20	4.33 4.29 2.28 .22	101.84
Lee J. & Ada Connor	N. E. 66' of lot 1, Blk 7 Lexington	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	2.07 2.07 2.70 3.09 2.78	.67 .50 .44 .26 .03	14.61
Frances McMillan	N. E. half of lot 10, Blk 10 Lexington	1957-58 1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	3.09 3.45 3.46 4.51 4.64 3.48	1.25 1.12 .84 .74 .39 .04	27.01
Delbert T. Vinson	All lot 7 Blk 4 Lexington	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	26.91 26.95 35.14 35.54 34.75	8.70 6.56 5.74 2.96 .40	183.65
Billy D. & Jo Ann Griffin	All lots 4 & 5, Blk 17 Lexington	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	20.01 20.04 26.13 27.04 33.36	6.47 4.88 4.27 2.25 .39	144.84
Guy E. Hastings	Lots 9 & 10, Blk 26 Penlands Addition to Lexington	1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	2.07 2.70 2.32 .70	.50 .44 .19 .01	8.93
R. E. & Josephine Rands	All N of OWR&N Co R/W Sec 10 4N 24 EWM Boardman	1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	5.08 5.34 5.36 4.05	1.24 .87 .45 .05	22.44
Frank & Mary Marlow	N 1/2 SW 1/4 SW 1/4 Sec 15 4N 24 EWM Boardman	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	37.68 79.52 141.26 152.22 131.45	11.34 18.55 23.07 12.68 1.52	609.29
Russell K. & Hazel H. Miller	S 1/2 S 1/2 Sec 11 4 N 24 EWM N 1/2 NW 1/4 less sold Sec 13 4N 24 EWM All SE 1/4 NW 1/4, S 1/2 NE 1/4, N 1/2 N 1/2 lying N of Hwy 30 Sec 14 4N 24 EWM Boardman	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	25.44 27.07 28.48 29.05 22.00	8.22 6.59 4.65 2.42 .26	154.18
Russell K. & Hazel H. Miller	SE 1/4 of Sec 12 4N 24 EWM Boardman	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	815.67 868.00 913.14 933.41 706.96	263.71 211.18 149.12 77.75 8.20	4,947.14
Leonard Bedford	House on Guy Ferguson land W 1/2 N 1/2 NW 1/4 SW 1/4 Sec 17 rN 25 EWM Boardman	1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	39.76 41.83 42.61 32.42	9.67 6.83 3.57 .38	177.27
A. E. & Cecil Stefani	W 5' lot 2, Blk 15 All lot 3, Blk 15 Wills Addition to Ione	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	47.25 49.56 58.14 54.55 40.65	15.28 12.06 9.49 4.54 .47	292.00
A. E. & Cecil Stefani	All lots 9 & 10, Blk 8 Sperry 2nd Addition to Ione	1955-56 1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	28.74 30.07 31.54 37.00 35.26 39.88	16.19 9.72 7.67 6.04 2.94 .46	245.51
Alice Wiles Est.	S. 80' lots 5 & 6, Blk 2 Cluffs Addition to Ione	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	39.51 41.45 48.62 46.17 30.68	12.77 10.08 7.94 3.85 .36	241.43
Adon & Eva M. Hamlett	All lots 4 to 7 inc, Blk 2 Halvorsens Addition to Ione	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	138.06 165.78 194.49 243.44 222.43	44.63 40.33 31.76 20.28 2.58	1,103.78
Gordon White	N 1/2 lots 9, 10 & 11, Blk 3 Ione	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	3.45 9.91 11.83 10.91 11.51	3.06 2.41 1.90 .91 .13	61.82
Gordon White	All lots 1 & 2, Blk 4 Sperry 2nd Addition to Ione	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	469.01 491.95 577.12 345.65 297.00	151.63 119.69 94.24 28.79 3.45	2,579.13
Gordon White	All lots 3, Blk 4 Sperry 2nd Addition to Ione	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	32.64 34.24 40.17 37.78 20.71	10.55 8.33 6.56 3.15 .24	194.37
Saben Hastings	All lots 3 & 4, Blk 3 Adams Addition to Hardman	1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	.65 .86 .75 .69	.16 .14 .06 .01	3.32
I. E. Morgan	All lots 5 & 6, Blk 2 Cluffs 8th Addition to Ione	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	56.69 59.47 69.76 66.32 61.36	18.33 14.47 11.39 5.52 .71	364.02
Lewis & Ann Ball	Tract No. 39, Bgn at S. W. cor of lot 3, Blk 1, Halvorsens Add. to Ione, Thence E 220', Thence S 200', Thence E 140' Thence S 32' to center of Willow Crk., Thence N along E line of A St. 420' to p.o.b.	1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	73.88 86.67 81.43 79.77	17.98 14.15 6.78 .73	361.59
Archle & Verona Esteb	Begn 42' S of the S E cor of lot 5, Blk 1, Town of Morgan, Thence W 300', Thence S 250', Thence E 300', Thence N 250' to p.o.b. 1.72 acres	1957-58 1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	11.30 12.49 13.16 15.95 14.52 12.94	4.56 4.04 3.20 2.60 1.21 .15	96.12
John C. & Hazel C. Jackson	N 1/2 NW 1/4 Sec 25 1S 24 EWM Ione	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	124.92 131.58 159.48 147.37 131.82	40.39 32.00 26.04 12.33 1.53	808.06
Oscar Rippee	Cabin on Claude White land Sec 32 5N 26 EWM Hardman	1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63	42.57 56.89 32.02 22.87	10.36 9.29 2.67 .27	176.94

# Human Pressures Held Threat To Hunting Sport in Oregon

By JOHN MCKEAN  
Oregon State Game Commission

Will hunting continue to be one of Oregon's most popular sources of outdoor recreation, or will human pressures reduce the wildlife resources and hunting access until hunting is no longer attractive to the average citizen? This is a question that every hunter should ask himself—not the Game Commission, or the legislature, or Uncle Sam—for the answers rest largely with hunters.

Laws are enacted and agencies of government are created to provide services that are considered necessary for a majority of the people; therefore, it follows that the efficiency of governmental programs is directly affected by the knowledge and will of a majority of the people.

Perhaps an examination of our past and present conditions and a recognition of the trends in more populous states will give some insight into the future of hunting.

**Gig Game**

The deer is Oregon's most popular and productive game animal. Hunter participation and kill figures illustrate the increase in public enjoyment and annual yield of mule deer during the past decade. A similar trend has occurred with both the black-tailed deer and elk except that current inventories do not indicate a 1962 decline in those populations.

The fact that the number of persons hunting deer and elk has nearly doubled and the annual yield of those species has tripled during the past ten years is an enviable record, but there is no assurance that similar increases in yield will be possible in the next decade.

The principal factor contributing to the success of the last decade has been a public awakening to the fact that big game populations cannot be stockpiled. They can either be used as they are produced or be taken from the range by starvation, disease, predation, or other controls.

Ever since 1939, when the legislature delegated regulatory authority to the Game Commission, the Commission has been continuously seeking a level of harvest that would stabilize the big game herds in balance with winter forage supplies and minimize conflicts with agriculture, forestry, and other primary land uses. It now appears that after 25 years of cautious demonstration, full utilization of the annual production is being achieved on some ranges, and with the assistance of mother nature, who took her share last winter, desirable reductions in breeding populations have occurred on a few ranges.

Another factor contributing to the high yield of the past decade has been the fact that a series of mild winters permitted a higher carry-over of animals than should normally be expected.

With knowledge that much of the waste inherent in antiquated management concepts has been eliminated, and with no assurance that mother nature will be kind to game herds as she has been during the past ten years, it is probable that comparable increases in the public demand for big game hunting will have an effect upon the quantity of game available to each of us as individuals.

Whether this condition is good or bad depends upon the adaptability and philosophy of the people. Perhaps it is time to quit looking at deer and elk hunting as a cheap source of meat and develop a greater appreciation of the fine recreation available in hunting. Observation of current hunting methods leads one to suspect that there are few hunters but lots of people with a vehicle, a gun, and a lust to kill something.

Everyone likes to be successful and by present standards is embarrassed if he isn't. This philosophy must change to one hunting for fun and greater emphasis on skill and ethics, if hunting is to maintain its present status in our variety of recreational opportunities.

For the benefit of the many persons who yearn for the good old days, when they had the woods to themselves and deer were so abundant that they ate themselves out of house and home, it should be explained that there is little chance to turn back to that era. Corrective action was too slow to save the forage resources that made those populations possible, and the demand for other products of the lands and waters of the state requires that the game resources be maintained at levels that are compatible with primary land uses. In the event this is not done, the landowner has the legal and physical means of reducing game production on his land.

For example, the Deschutes National Forest, after repeated failures, has found it necessary to fence the mule deer off of 4,266 acres of winter range in order to successfully re-establish a pine forest. These fences cost the taxpayers about \$65,000, and the end product is the complete loss of deer production and hunting opportunities inherent in those lands until the young forest grows beyond the reach of the deer. Similar examples can be cited on private timber and agricultural lands in other parts of the state. With these conditions it is obviously much better to maintain populations at reasonable levels than to

force landowners to use other means of controlling wildlife on their land.

The principal opportunity to increase big game production and hunting opportunities rests in constructive development of winter food supplies and more intensive management of every available acre of productive habitat. In some instances this will require acquisition and development of key tracts of winter range in order to attract animals away from areas of conflict and assure maintenance of a reasonable winter food supply for migrant herds. Research is needed to develop practical techniques for improving winter ranges and a greater knowledge of both the biological and social facts that are pertinent to the management of game.

**Game Birds**

Upland game birds and waterfowl are relatively short-lived and fluctuate in abundance annually in response to climate and other environmental factors. As with deer and elk, we are learning by experience that game birds cannot be stockpiled. They can either be used in the years they are available or mother nature will take them her way. Fortunately, nature's way of handling birds is not as damaging to other resources as with big game. The fact that the people fail to fully utilize a bird crop seldom jeopardizes the future production or seriously conflicts with primary land uses.

During the past decade the chukar has added much to Oregon's hunting opportunities, and the Commission is currently searching for an exotic that may fit the cutover forest lands of western Oregon. Merriam's turkey is another bird that has been recently introduced and shows great promise for the future.

These additions to the resource base, combined with the knowledge that quail, chukar, and pheasant populations are not being fully utilized with present seasons and pressures, provide much cause for optimism by bird hunters.

It also follows that bird hunters have not been plagued by a great increase in the number of people participating. During the past decade upland game hunters have only increased by about 20,000, and there are about one-third less waterfowl hunters than in 1952. Game birds provided approximately 1,083,000 man days of hunting in 1961 and a total of 1,545,700 birds were reported taken.

There are many opportunities to increase game bird hunting through more intensive management, development of habitat, and introduction of desirable exotics. The matter of landowner tolerance and access to productive bird hunting areas will be the principal limiting factor of bird hunting in the future.

**Hunting Access**

The real challenge to be faced in the future is maintenance of a reasonable access to the lands that produce the publicly owned wildlife.

With half of the state in public ownership and most landowners possessing a keen interest in the wildlife resources, Oregon is in a much better position to meet this challenge than most states. However, the forecast of a half-million more residents by 1975, combined with the probability that more leisure time and improved transportation will make Oregon more attractive to non-residents, is cause for advance planning and the initiation of constructive programs that will make the landowner's position more tenable.

The states that have failed to meet this challenge find that most of their productive game habitat is available only to those who are able to pay for access. These states have cause to welcome the new U. S. Department of Agriculture program which will subsidize commercialization of hunting, fishing and other forms of out door fishing opportunities available

to more people.

Perhaps this is the answer to Oregon's access problems, but a recent survey of over 1,700 farm landowners indicates that about 85 percent of Oregon's farmers allow free access to those who are considerate enough to ask for permission and only 4 1/2 percent sell access. This condition, combined with the fact that Oregonians enjoy free access to the half of the state that is in public ownership, gives cause to believe that with constructive programs a reasonable access to hunting areas can be maintained.

Nearly all of Oregon's access problems are the direct result of abuses the landowner has suffered from either wildlife or recreationalists. As previously pointed out, a landowner who awakens to the fact that his land is producing more deer than cows has a real incentive to capitalize on the deer, and the landowner who finds cut fences, dead livestock, and littered property during hunting season logically feels that the users should help repair the damage. It, therefore, follows that if the people of Oregon want to continue to enjoy the landowner's hospitality during hunting seasons, they will have to show greater respect for his rights both in terms of their personal conduct while hunting and in terms of the abundance of game they expect to be produced on his property.

More aggressive enforcement, management, and educational programs and an expansion of services to landowners are essential.

In conclusion, the future of hunting rests with the people of Oregon, and particularly the 300,000 persons who directly participate in hunting. They will either awaken to the fact that both wildlife numbers and hunter conduct will be compatible with other land uses or, as in Europe, hunting will become the sport of kings and beyond the means of the average citizen.

The Game Commission is fully aware of the challenges ahead, and will make full use of the authority and financial means delegated to it for the promotion of Oregon's wildlife resources and hunting opportunities, but it cannot do the job alone. The understanding and cooperation of the people of Oregon are the essential forces.

## Ontario Girl Wins Betty Crocker Award

Delores Mae Overman of Ontario high school has been named State Betty Crocker Homemaker for Oregon and will receive a \$1,500 scholarship from General Mills. Miss Overman, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Overman of 985 S. W. Second Street, Ontario, ranked first among 4,673 girls in 151 high schools in the state.

Linda Louise Blackwelder of The Dalles Senior high school ranked second in Oregon and will receive a \$500 scholarship. Eight other senior girls in Oregon received honorable mention in the Homemaking test. They are: Nancy Ellen Crossgrove, McMinnville high school, McMinnville; Mary Jo Fitzpatrick, Sacred Heart Academy, Salem; Marlene Kay Fowler, Crater high school, Central Point; Alice Neale Kaseberg, Sherman County high school, Moro; Cathy Frances Krahl, Sunset high school, Beaverton; Carolyn Lee Paynter, Sutherlin high school, Sutherlin; Carolyn Perry, La Grande Senior high school, La Grande and Marion Flowerree Theus, Parkrose Senior high school, Portland.

If you typewrite but don't type right, you may need some of the new "magic" Ko-Rec-Type to correct your errors. It's inexpensive; drop in to the Gazette-Times for a demonstration.

**NEW for you in PORTLAND OREGON**

**EXECUTIVE SUITES**  
**ALL KING - LENGTH BEAUTYREST BEDS**  
**COMPLETELY AIR CONDITIONED**  
**DIRECT DIAL PHONES**  
**ALL CHANEL T. V. . FAMILY UNITS**  
**INDIVIDUAL ELECTRIC HEAT**  
**PRIVATE LANAIS & POOL . MOUNTAIN VIEW**  
**EXCELLENT RESTAURANT . ROOM SERVICE**

CLOSE TO CITY CENTER  
 BANQUET FACILITIES  
 MEETING & DISPLAY ROOMS



CARAVAN

MOTOR HOTEL

2401 S. W. 4th AVE. PORTLAND 1, OREGON  
 PHONE CA 6-1121

You and each of you are further notified to appear within thirty days from the date of the first publication of this summons and defend this suit or pay the amount provided by law for the redemption of said properties, and if you so appear you are further notified to serve a copy of your appearance, objections or answer on the undersigned at his post office address as herein below stated.

If you fail so to do, judgment and decree will be entered in the above entitled Court foreclosing the liens of said taxes as shown by the said tax foreclosure list, together with interest and all costs as shall be due upon each of such properties. Said judgment and decree will order that the Clerk of this Court shall deliver a certified copy of said judgment and decree to the Tax Collector of Morrow County, Oregon, and said judgment and decree shall be considered as all intents and purposes a certificate of sale to the County of each of the properties therein described.

And you further are notified that plaintiff will apply to the Court for such other relief as may be just and equitable in the premises.

C. J. D. Bauman, Sheriff and Tax Collector  
 For Morrow County  
 Herman W. Winter, District Attorney  
 For Morrow County, Oregon, and  
 Attorney for Plaintiff  
 Post Office Address: Heppner, Oregon

Date of First Publication: March 14, 1963.  
 Date of Last Publication: April 4, 1963.