RECEIVED
JUL 05 2006
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
RECEIVED
AUG 26 1914
92010

Copy

Aug. 19, 1914.

Mr. Harry Chandler,
Los Angeles Times.
Los Angeles, Calif.

Dear Sir:- I was in Los Angeles recently in connection with a report I was directed to make as to the condition of the small settlement of Indians who have lived on the Tejon Ranch for a long time, since the war came up the first time, the Indians say.

Report had reached our Office that these Indians had been ordered to vacate the ranch a few months ago and there was much anxiety among them and much uncertainty as to where they could find a place to live. The correspondence was sent to me with instruction to look into the condition carefully and report as to the status of their title, if they had any, the attitude of the company [illegible] toward them, the possibility of finding other land suitable for a home for them if they had to move, and all facts that would enable the Indian Bureau to protect their rights or secure a home for them.

I visited the Indians at their home and had a conference with your local manager, Mr. Lopez who assures me that no order looking to their removal has ever been given, that he regards them as an asset in that they are convenient laborers who can be had at any time much more conveniently than to bring laborers in from a distance, even if the job lasts but a few days. He says that they have been and are given the preference for any work that they can do and that the [illegible] are often employed for domestic work about the ranch for which it would be difficult to get other help if

[illegible] not there. He says, that so far as he knows, they [illegible] they are having the same privileges [illegible], opportunity to labor, etc as in [illegible] recognize the ownership of the Com- [illegible] reasonable requirements as to harboring [illegible] cutting timber, running stock outside the [illegible] seemed to be very friendly to the Indians [illegible] to doubt his sincerity.

[illegible] office of Mr. H.J.Whitley who was not in but [illegible] matter with me to report to his father and [illegible] to arrange a meeting with him, also went [illegible] office where we reviewed the matter with [illegible] who had handled the correspondence [illegible] to you as being more directly in [illegible] I called at your office and found you [illegible] that you had gone to Alaska.

[illegible] your associate, Mr. [illegible] who suggested [illegible] letter so it could be taken up by your [illegible]

[illegible] that Mr. Lopez was most familiar [illegible] that his opinion and recommendation [illegible] by the company.

[illegible] so far made it appears doubtful if the [illegible] to occupy the land now used as the [illegible] considered in [illegible], for the use of that bank of

[illegible] a small tract of land covering their present homes with [illegible] for their present gardens?

[illegible] you give us a long term lease on the same land?

[illegible] sell us other land along the same creek above [illegible] where they would have equally good land for [illegible] water right? Please give terms

[illegible] prefer to arrange for their continued use [illegible] as they have vines and trees there that produce [illegible] which would require many years to duplicate at [illegible]

[illegible] will agree that they are entitled to some con- [illegible] philanthropic standpoint, and charitable treatment [illegible] to whom the state, which formerly all belonged [illegible] been kind.

[illegible] to the above questions I would like to [illegible] your board as to your present attitude toward [illegible] prospect of their being allowed to live as [illegible] we may know whether it is necessary for [illegible] for them in the event we can not secure [illegible] your company.

[illegible] consideration of this matter, I am

Very Respectfully,

C Hasbury

Special Indian Agent.