

GENERAL LAND OFFICE,

Austin, February 15, 1893,

Sam'l T. Pepper, Esq., Plainview,
Texas—Dear Sir:—Replying to your
favor of the 24th ult., enclosing letter
from Mr. Knight, will say this office
is advised that the Mr. White has
complied with the law and is the sur-
veyor of Hale county. The blank
sent to Mr. White about which you
ask can be procured from him as it
was a letter written to him as to how
he should proceed in certain cases.
The sweeping change in the lines of
surveys complained of by you has
not taken place so far as this office is
advised. Concerning the J. D.
Presler survey, I have to say that
same appears to conflict with the J.
M. Carter, E. L. Jones, Z. T. Max-
well, J. W. Smylie, W. H. Bryan
and J. H. Bryan surveys, therefore
cannot patent. The sketch recently
furnished by surveyor White, claim-
ing that the position of block J, K. 2
established by Mr. Knight is errone-
ous would make room for the Presler
survey, but it is a question that this
office cannot now, if ever, determine
which is correct, Knight or White, but
Knight's work having been adopted
and several surveys patented in ac-
cordance therewith, Knight's sketch
will be held correct until the courts
hold otherwise.

*Part of sketch No 9
Hale County* Respectfully,
W. L. McGaughey.

(D) (X) Bx P. 8032.

counter 29730

100
339

Plainview Texas

Feb. 27th 1893

Hon. W. L. McLaughley
Austin

Dear Sir: - I forward you by this mail a map showing the difference in the lines of H. C. Knight and the original work on the ground. Now, the point in this controversy of Knight is that he only claims my work to be wrong in Blk. SK 2. As he wishes to pull SK 2 off from the other Blks. put in by J. Summerfield, in proof of this I call your attention to 3 surveys of Triplets west of surveys 14 & 15 - Blk. A 2 Highsmith's sur. east of surveys 7 & 8 Blk. SD. these 4 surveys were made by Knight's Deputy and are approved by Knight, if the variation given by Knight in SK 2 was used, every one of the above would be cut off by Blk. SD. moving east. Now, I wish here to give you a list of Homesteaders who will lose their homes if the original work should be disregarded and Knight's work hold:

Joe S. Baker, C. D. Sublette, E. N. Lerouch, J. M. Preder J. H. Williams and partially cut off W. P. Darby's P. N. Durham in Block SK 2 and SK 3 & D 4 then in the western Blks. of this system (and with these - idence we have here no court would in my opinion move one Blk without moving all) E. L. Vallade, Highsmith, J. L. Wagoner, G. W. Wagoner. R. S. Wagoner 3 Triplets & W. B. Blake whereas, if the work is left on the ground as it was originally surveyed J. C. Burch, Beasley & Leach would be the only losers and none of these would lose any improvement except a little wire fence.

I wish to show you the situation here, these controversies are very damaging to our

county as a great many people coming here for homes are afraid of these surveys, this question was about quieted when I came back from Austin but since your letter came to S. T. Pepper 'tis worse than ever before. Knight who lives in another county has no interest at stake and he don't care if we of Hale do stand a law suit for maybe two years before we could have these lines decided and mean time our ^{old} rival Crosby County may catch some of the people of Hale who are afraid of our unsettled lines.

Hoping that you may see proper to help us in this matter.

I am Very Respectfully
L. A. White
Co. Sur. Hale Co.

188
183
23
23
421

n²

State of Texas To the Hon. W. L. Mc
 County of Hall J. Langhey Com. of Genl.
 Land Office, J. L. & White Co. Sur.
 of Hale Co. do, hereby submit the following
 statement together with map showing the
 change of lines made by H. C. Knight Dist.
 Sur. of Crosby land Dist. Mr. Knight claims
 that I have changed the lines in this county
 I must deny the charge and believe that
 J. L. Crews, Ira Millington Saml. L. Chalk
 John R. Wright or any other competent
 surveyor who has tried to reconcile Mr. Knight's
 with the original work on the ground, will
 bear me out that Mr. Knight is the one who
 disregards the original work. I shall not try
 to give a reason for this unless it is because
 all of the original surveys of sections were made
 by good surveyors with fine transit instruments
 and Mr. Knight tries to work over the same ground
 with a common open faced compass.

As to the work in Blks. put in by
 J. Summerfield in the N. W. part of the County
 viz: S1, S4, C3, JK3, JK, O6, JK 2, D4, O, O2, JK4, & J.D.
 I, for some time after my election to this office
 only knew of one corner on the ground put in
 by Summerfield, the S.E. cor. of 11, Blk. J.K. but
 after finding the large mound at the N. W. cor.
 of Sur. 12 in Blk. S4, I ran a line from it east
 to the mound at the S.E. of 11, JK, and got the Var.
 between these mounds and I find that it
 fits all of the original corners in these Blks.
 of which there are many, also creek crossings
 rock bearing mounds.

The principal corners on the line run
 by Summerfield from Castro County when he
 first put in these Blks. are shown in the ac-
 companying map and you will note that 4

73

of these corners are of surveys in Blk. JK2, (the only block by the way, that Mr. Knight seems to object to my work in) Mr. Knight says that JK2 should be run on a different variation to the other Blks. west. now, I find this impossible as these Blks. are all thoroughly tied together and I don't find one reason why they should not be surveyed on the same variation and I find 4 original corners of Summerfield's on the North line of JK2

This work of Summerfield's was all put in as one system of work and all the Blks. & surveys tied together. I wish to call your attention especially to such calls in the original field notes as this: Sur. No. 10 Blk. S4 beginning at a mound the S.E. cor. of Sur. No. 9 same Blk. Thence East 1900 ors, a mound 5 miles west of the S.W. cor. of Sur. No. 16 in Blk. JK. By examining the records you will find other calls like this and in fact these blocks are just the same as belonging to one Blk. being so thoroughly tied together.

You will find that the West & North lines of the county are tied to this system of work, from sur. 18 Blk. JD, all along to N. line of 5 in Blk. S4 on the west and from sur. 25-31, to sur. 24 JK2 (here a line was run from N.E. cor. of 24 in JK2 to county line) so that if Knight's work is right our County lines are wrongly located as T.L. Crews & myself tied the county lines to this system of work as originally put in by Summerfield.

Mr. Hill, of your office, told me that the difficulty he found in J. M. Presler Sur. was that the Homesteads of Carter, Lowe, Maxwell, Smylie & Bryans might move with the

sections west but I assure you that if you will examine the records you will find that these Homesteads are thoroughly tied on the ground to bearings on trees Delgouts, wells & Creek Crossings and nearly all of the corners are plain on the ground. I wish you to notify me which you think I should do, (with the records of Original work before me I find the corners on the ground with bearings Creek Crossings and other objects, Natural and artificial as called for in the Original work so as to plainly show the work done by the Original Surveyor (Summerfield) follow the original work as plainly shown on the ground or accept Mr. Knight's as correct although he does not agree with the Original work and has but few corners of sections on the ground? The sections supposed to have been surveyed by Knight I don't think have more than one corner in ten that can be identified on the ground as to having issued Patents on Mr Knight's Survey which are now in conflict, Patents have also been issued on Summerfield's and more Homesteads will be seriously affected by Knight's work than by letting the Original work of J. Summerfield stand.

In conclusion: when I came into this Office after obtaining all the data I could I went to work on Knight's Variation not knowing of any corner in the above system of Blocks. Except the S.E. Corner of 11 in Blk. JK and I was naturally along time finding other corners, running on a Variation $10\frac{30}{4}$ greater than the one as found by the Original work on the ground —

and was only through an accident that I found my mistake by working from the NW Cor of 12 in Blk. 54 which Summerfield wrote in a private letter to his agent here was the first large corner put up by them in this County, then when this Cor was found and the variation between this and the SE of 11. I ran East as Summerfield directed and found nearly all the corners for 17 miles, four of them being in Blk. 72 and. After careful work of over one month I found the Creek Crossings and many corners & bearings & mounds of Rock as shown in the accompanying map to which I L Cross after careful examination tied the West & North line of the County - Now, I am satisfied that Mr Knight has made the mistake he did by supposing that this work was like the most of the work done here on the Plains at an early day, only Platted in the Surveyors office and no corners to be found on the ground (I have heard Mr Knight say that where the field notes called for a mound he never looked for it for he knew it was not there) Hoping that I have made the above plain to you & that you may approve of the work that I have done for. I have been at a very great expense & much loss of time in adjusting these lines to the original work, and that after examining the above you will find the J. M. Presler Survey is not in conflict with Homesteads of Carter, Lorr, Maxwell, Smylie & Bryan and that if you find the original work of J. Summerfield correct, then the J. M. Presler Homestead can be patented for the conclusion drawn from your supposed ruling is injurious to my work, as County Surveyor

Respectfully Submitted
 L. A. White
 County Surveyor of Hale
 County Texas.
 Filed to day.
 as shown on
 what's map
 of corners from
 Surveyors State
 Hale County
 9-

Plainview Tex
 July 29th 1893

Copy Book

Shelton
 the Survey
 L. A. White
 Clerk
 Nov 6th 1893