

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

Indian Working Arrangements on the California Ranchos, 1821-1875

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

History

by

George Curley

December 2018

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Steven W. Hackel, Chairperson

Dr. Juliette Levy

Dr. Alexander Haskell

Copyright by
George Curley
2018

The Dissertation of George Curley is approved:

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to offer my sincere appreciation to the following people who have provided endless guidance along with invaluable emotional support throughout this entire thesis process. I want to express a deep gratitude to Steven Hackel, Juliette Levy, and Alec Haskell, committee, for their commitment, support and advice. I am also indebted to the librarians at the Huntington Library whose assistance and cooperation often went well beyond the call of duty. I dedicate this work to my family who have supported and encouraged me throughout my entire tenure at UCR. To my wife and best friend, Betty, whose support in all of my life's endeavors, including this dissertation, has been infinite. To my children, Carol, Kristen, and Kevin who bring me joy every day. A special thanks to Kristen who, between working full-time and raising three young children, always found time to proofread my writing. Finally, to my nine grandchildren, Nathan, Jasmine, Jordan, Nicholas, Emma, Atlas, Annaleigh, Nadia and Storm; through their laughter and joy, I derive an enhanced sense of purpose in my life.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Indian Working Arrangements on the California Ranchos, 1821-1875

by

George Curley

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in History
University of California, Riverside, December 2018
Dr. Steven W. Hackel, Chairperson

While much of colonial California historiography includes detailed narratives of the mission Indian workers, very little is known regarding those Indians who moved from the missions to work on the large California ranchos and elsewhere. The stories of these Indian workers have often been ignored; further, the narratives which do exist contain some form of debt peonage to explain their working arrangement. This dissertation attempts to challenge these debt peonage theories and offer a more accurate account of the working arrangement that developed on the California rancho during the Mexican (1821-1848) and early American (1849-1880) periods. Employing important primary sources—including rancho account books, letters, court documents, census records, and probate inventories—this dissertation ventures to show that Indian labor arrangements on these ranchos were less repressive than previously presented. In addition, it reveals the misunderstood nature and importance of the rancho store to both the Rancho owners and their Indian workers.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE	8
The Evolution of Debt Peonage	8
Debt Peonage Scholarship	10
Latin American Hacienda Studies	12
Mexican California Historiography	16
Early America California Historiography	26
Mexican Haciendas and California Ranchos	32
CHAPTER TWO	35
The Mexican California Economy	35
A Case Study: Tomás Yorba and Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana	47
Los Angeles Court Records	54
Analysis and Conclusion	61
CHAPTER THREE	66
Early American California Economy	66
Case Study of Henry Dalton and Rancho Azusa	79
The Indian Workers of Rancho Azusa	85
Analysis and Conclusion	103
CHAPTER FOUR	108
Rancho Azusa Indian Origins	109
Indian Society and Economy on Rancho Azusa	113
Indian Rancho Life as Told by Consumption Patterns	117
Analysis	129

CONCLUSION	133
Bibliography	138
Appendix A	143
Appendix B	144
Appendix C	147

List of Tables

Table 1. Sample of Indian account book datasets.....	87
Table 2. Rancho Azusa products and codes.....	89
Table 3. Indian daily wages on Rancho Azusa.....	91
Table 4. Indian worker alcohol purchases on Rancho Azusa	93
Table 5. Indian worker indebtedness on Rancho Azusa	94
Table 6. Indian store credit and cash distributions on Rancho Azusa	96
Table 7. Indian clothing and cloth purchases on Rancho Azusa	98
Table 8. Indian foodstuff purchases on Rancho Azusa.....	99
Table 9. Indian soap purchases	100

List of Figures

CHAPTER TWO

Figure 2.1. Map of Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana and other ranchos located in Orange County	48

CHAPTER THREE

Figure 3.1. Map of the exterior boundaries and official locations of Ranchos San Jose addition	80
to San Jose and Azusa.....	80
Figure 3.2. The Dalton winery.....	80
Figure 3.3. The Azusa ranch bell and the Dalton family at Azusa.....	81
Figure 3.4. Rancho Azusa November 1856.....	82
Figure 3.5. Sample page of the Dalton account books.....	86
Figure 3.6. Sample of Dalton daily occurrences on Rancho Azusa.....	90

CHAPTER FOUR

Figure 4.1. Cahuilla chief Cabazon.....	111
Figure 4.2. Cahuilla migrant workers photographed on Dalton's Rancho Azusa circa 1860s.....	112

CHAPTER FIVE

Figure 5.2. Dalton-Rancho Map.....	114

INTRODUCTION

While much of colonial California historiography includes detailed narratives of the mission Indian workers, very little is known regarding those Indians who moved from the missions to work on the large California ranchos and elsewhere. The stories of these Indian workers have often been ignored; further, the narratives which do exist contain some form of debt peonage to explain their working arrangement.¹ This dissertation attempts to challenge these debt peonage theories and offer a more accurate account of the working arrangement that developed on the California rancho during the Mexican (1821-1848) and early American (1849-1880) periods. Employing important primary sources—including rancho account books, letters, court documents, census records, and probate inventories—this dissertation ventures to show that Indian labor arrangements on these ranchos were less repressive than previously presented. That is not to say that the respective colonizers did not exert strong economic, political, and social hegemony over their indigenous laborers; however, the rancheros (owners) desperately needed workers, and the ever-shrinking Indian labor pool at times accorded the Indian workers leverage over the California rancheros. And, on many occasions, when the Indian workers demanded higher wages and the ranchero refused, they were able to find higher wages and better working conditions elsewhere.

1. Debt peonage as defined by *The Encyclopedia of Latin American History and Culture* - Labeled “debt slavery” by those critical of it, debt peonage is a general term for several categories of coerced or controlled labor resulting from the advancement of money or goods to individuals or groups who find themselves unable or unwilling to repay their debt quickly. As a consequence, they are obliged to continue working for the creditor or his assignees until the debt is repaid, and are often further coerced to borrow more or to agree to other obligations or entanglements. According to the traditional view, these individuals, once indebted, whether because of inadequate wages or employer fraud, were reduced to servitude and, in theory, to an inability to leave the workplace to which they have contracted.

My interest in California Indian labor developed out of my Native American, California, Latin American, and economic history training. This dissertation draws on each field to create a unique Indian narrative, which, at the very minimum, provides a clearer representation of Indian workers' history. Like so many aspects of Native American studies, this dissertation includes few personal testimonies from Indian workers and relies heavily on the sources left by their colonizers. Conscious of this imbalance, I endeavored to filter out as much of this bias as possible. The evidence contained in rancho account books and court records provided invaluable empirical data to counter this bias.

Few scholars, with the exception of George Philips and Michael Magliari, have shown an interest in California Indian labor during the Mexican and Early American periods, at least in the same level of detail employed in this study.² This dissertation attempts not only to revise a somewhat dormant topic, but also to create new interest in the study of California Indian labor during the nineteenth century.³ The hypothesis of this dissertation includes the proposition that the California ranchos, much like the Mexican haciendas, operated large, complex enterprises, which required a strong symbiotic relationship between owners and workers, facilitated by credit and the rancho store. I argue that, as in Latin American hacienda studies, the hacienda store and its labor credit system

2. See George H. Phillips, *Vineyards & Vaqueros: Indian Labor and the Economic Expansion of Southern California, 1771-1877* (Norman: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 2010) and Michael F. Magliari, "Free Soil, Unfree Labor," *Pacific Historical Review* 73 (August 2005): 351-368.

3. It is important to point out that the Mexican hacienda and California rancho differed, most notably in their size. The Mexican haciendas in the nineteenth century were much larger than the California ranchos, some amassing over half a million acres. Most hacienda owners leased much of these large land holdings to others who ran smaller ranchos.

has been misinterpreted as a system intended to entrap Indian workers through insurmountable debt. This dissertation's more detailed examination of the operation of the California rancho stores reveals that this credit system worked to serve both worker and employer, and was not part of any elaborate scheme to exploit the Indian workers.

This dissertation relies strongly on the methodologies and directions offered in extant Latin American haciendas studies by scholars including: Arnold Bauer, Alan Knight, D. A. Brading, Herman W. Konrad, John Tutino, Eric Van Young, Herbert Nickels, and Harry Cross. Published more than thirty years ago, these works strongly contest the existence of any form of debt peonage on the Mexican haciendas during the colonial and early independence periods. More importantly, the results of these studies show that the hacienda store operation was much more complex than once thought. Their findings reveal that the labor credit system often served more as an enticement or fringe benefit to draw a much-needed labor pool, while at the same time providing the cash-strapped employers with cash-flow relief.

This dissertation offers an excellent example of the disconnect between Latin American and California scholars, and the consequences of this issue. For years, California scholars such as Herbert Bancroft, Herbert Bolton, Sherburne Cook, and others have pointed out the strong resemblance between the Mexican haciendas and California ranchos.⁴ David Weber considered colonial California part of the Mexican frontier. Yet,

4. See Herbert H. Bancroft, *The Works* (A. L. Bancroft and Company, 1884), Herbert E. Bolton, *The Spanish Borderland: A Chronicle of Old Florida and the Southwest* (Yale University Press, 1921), and David J. Weber, *The Mexican Frontier, 1821-1846: The American Southwest Under Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982).

somehow, both Latin American and California scholars seem to accept that their respective fields are mutually exclusive. I strongly argue that this separation works to the detriment of both disciplines. It is my intention that this dissertation will develop a renewed interest in the topic and move both sides to a closer working arrangement.

Harry Cross' "Debt-Peonage Reconsidered" is the most influential Mexican hacienda study for the purposes of this dissertation, as my research methodologies closely mirror those employed in the Cross study, especially in the use of the data extracted from the rancho store account books. Rancho store account books are the principal primary sources in this dissertation; the data compiled from those sources form the basis for the Indian worker narrative presented in this study. For each of the two case studies presented—Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana during the Mexican period and Rancho Azusa during the early American period—account books offer strong supporting evidence against the presence of debt peonage. In addition, they show that the operation of the rancho store and its credit system was much more complex than suggested in the California historiography. The more inclusive and more detailed account books from Rancho Azusa include critical information regarding Indian workers' purchasing patterns, duration of employment, and a detailed report of both worker debt and credit accumulated during their tenure. The rancho store account books employed also showed that the Indians worked to provide food, clothing, and household goods for their families and communities outside of Azusa. Unfortunately, the Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana account book consisted of only one book with limited Indian activity; however, it was also extremely useful in contesting the prevailing trend of Indian worker debt.

In order to extract as much information as possible from the Rancho Azusa account books, I carefully coded each line of the ledger pages into a 5737-row database. I indexed each entry by the date and workers' name, and the remaining columns contained such fields as days worked, wages earned, items purchased, quantity of items purchased, price of items purchased, and cash distributions for both loans and wages. I assigned each type of item purchased a numeric code linked to a texted description of the specific product or service. This database, when sorted, produced extremely valuable results related to such critical trends as worker debt, mobility, spending patterns, and employment history.

I employed other sources—such as census, court records, letters, and probate inventories—to supplement the information generated from the rancho account books. Mexican court records indicate very little evidence of the existence of debt peonage, especially during the Mexican period. Letters from the period present further evidence that little or no credit was ever offered to the Indians working on Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana. Letters also serve to show that the Indians possessed some leverage when negotiating terms of employment. In these specific letters, rancheros—such as Abel Stearns, John Bidwell, and John Sutter—all complained about Indian worker shortages and exorbitant wage demands from their prospective Indian hires.

While the design of this dissertation is chronological, to some extent it is also topical. Chapter one includes a review of the Latin American and Californian historiography as it relates to hacienda and rancho Indian labor arrangements. I also present a detailed examination of the etymology of the term “debt-peonage” to illustrate

how it gained popularity and acceptance into both Latin American and Californian historiography. Chapter two explores the working conditions and arrangements on the California ranchos during the Mexican period. I present a case study of one of the largest ranchos in Mexican California: Ranch Santiago de Santa Ana. Like chapter two, but moving to the early American period, chapter three investigates the working conditions and arrangements on the California rancho. It offers a case study of another very large California ranch: Rancho Azusa. This example serves to highlight the relationships among employer, worker, and company store. Chapter four explores the personal purchasing pattern of the Rancho Azusa Indian workers and, with the aid of some additional sources, attempts to delve deeper into the Indian workers' environment on the rancho. The conclusion presents a comparative analysis between the Indians' working conditions during the Mexican and early American periods. It is followed by an attempt to apply what was found in the two case studies of California ranchos—to the south and north—and finishes with a detailed summary of the dissertation's findings.

It is important to point out that this dissertation contains limitations, and certainly does not claim to have captured the entire narrative of the Indians who worked on the California ranchos. Primary sources related to this topic, such as the personal testimony of the Indians, are often limited, if they exist at all. Therefore, this project, like much other scholarship focused on Californian Indians, struggled to locate the Indians' voices and was left to attempt to project the Indian workers' voices with non-Indian sources. However, it is my hope that the use of empirical data compiled from the Dalton account books database compensates for some of this bias.

One further goal of this dissertation is to show that the California Indian workers in the post-mission era demonstrated agency and self-determination: qualities which are often missing in the California story presented by historians. While it is true that the spoils often go to the victors, the colonizers are too often accorded the privilege to write their own history. Hopefully, my study will, at a minimum, provoke re-thinking on the topic of Indian labor arrangements on the California rancho.

CHAPTER ONE:

Debt Peonage and Latin American and California Historiography

In the last two decades of the twentieth century, Latin America scholars actively engaged in the reexamination of Latin American haciendas. They concentrated on the Mexican hacienda workplace and, surprisingly, revealed a different work environment than presented by previous scholarship. They contested the long-held assumption that debt peonage arrangements prevailed in Mexican haciendas during the colonial and early independence periods. In fact, they argued that, in many cases, credit advances did not serve as a means of entrapment but acted as a tool to entice workers to remain. Collectively, hacienda studies scholars showed that labor supply and demand played a much greater role in determining employee-employer relationships and wages. This chapter evaluates the historiography of the term debt peonage and examines Indian labor arrangements on the California ranchos and the Mexican haciendas.

The Evolution of Debt Peonage

Before reviewing the related historiography, it is essential to examine the genesis of the term “debt peonage.” This term did not appear in an English dictionary until 1844; peonage is defined as: “the use of laborers bound in servitude because of debt.”¹ The term peonage meant the same as debt peonage, but the affix “debt” was added as a descriptor sometime in the early twentieth century. The one- and two-word versions appear interchangeably in this study, and have the same meaning.

1. *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 10th ed., s.v. “peonage.”

Latin America scholar Arnold Bauer noted that, unlike the formal institutions of *encomienda* and *repartimiento*, peonage was an informal device of labor coercion. Ironically, the word peonage has an English etymological history; it does not appear in Latin American scholarship until the second half of the nineteenth century. Bauer suggested that the greatest challenge to its definition was when the term debt peonage implied debt bondage. Bondage can stand alone without debt as debt can without bondage. In places where landowners wielded a strong influence over effective police control, they did not need debt to bind workers. Yet, except for extreme labor conditions in Mexico's Yucatán and the Southeast Mexican lowlands, the rest of colonial Latin American landowners were on their own when they negotiated with workers.²

Alan Knight has suggested that debt labor arrangements for most agricultural workers prevailed throughout Latin America during the colonial and independence periods. The problem with the term is that debt peonage connotes a restrictive and oppressive situation. Knight noted that debt labor recruitment varied across three types:

- (1) free wage labor linked to the payment of cash advances (a system associated with the creation of an incipient proletariat); (2) "traditional" peonage, examples of which have been given, and which is distinguished by the peon's voluntary commitment to the hacienda, debt often figuring as a perk rather than a bond; and (3) classic debt servitude, cases of which - certainly for the period c. 1600-1850 - are rather less common than once supposed.

Knight warned against contrasting coercive peonage labor with voluntary traditional peonage and recommended the comparison of coercive peonage and voluntaristic free-

2. Arnold J. Bauer, "Rural Workers in Spanish America: Problems of Peonage and Oppression," *Hispanic America Historical Review* 59 (February 1979): 34-35.

wage labor instead.³ Latin American haciendas scholars examined this relationship through the study of labor and revealed that debt peonage contracts were often free-wage agreements between worker and employer, rather than servitude or slavery.

Debt Peonage Scholarship

John Kenneth Turner was one of the first journalists to mention debt peonage labor in Latin America; he strongly condemned the malevolence of debt peonage during the final years of the Porfiriato.⁴ During this period, “there were 750,000 chattel slaves in Mexico.”⁵ In 1937, Eyler Simpson studied agrarian working conditions in 1930s Mexico, which reinforced Turner’s claim.⁶ Yet, Bauer contended that the general acceptance of the existence of peonage began with Silvio Zavala’s 1935 essay. In *New Spain’s Century of Depression*, Woodrow Borah closely followed Zavala’s discussion of Mexican peonage. Around the same time, Francois Chevalier published *Land and Society in Colonial Mexico* and suggested that the origins of debt peonage evolved from labor shortages in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Bauer asserted that most early scholarship of debt peonage in colonial Mexico represented a logical progression of

3. Alan Knight, “What Was It and Why was IT,” *Journal of Latin American Studies* 18 (May 1986): 41-48.

4. The Porfiriato (1876-1911) was the era during which Porfirio Diaz ruled Mexico.

5. Knight, 43; John Kenneth Turner, *Barbarous Mexico* (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr Cooperative, 1910), 110.

6. Knight, 43; Eyler N. Simpson, *The Ejido, Mexico’s Way Out* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1971).

indirect exploitation of indigenous workers, as found in *encomienda* and *repartimiento*, that paralleled Eastern Europe's "second serfdom."⁷

This prevailing notion—of a strong presence of debt peonage throughout the Mexican agrarian landscape—became a standard in college textbooks at American universities. Starting in the 1940s, students learned about the concept of debt peonage labor in the farmlands of Latin America, past and present. Simpson argued that peonage was unpopular throughout Mexico and that landowners employed it "to secure a cheap and constant supply of labor." In the mid-1970s, Cumberland echoed Simpson, but suggested that debt peonage was only pervasive during the nineteenth century. Semo agreed that debt peonage was an established labor model at nineteenth-century Mexican haciendas.⁸ Bauer noted that, prior to the new hacienda studies, Latin America scholars believed debt peonage findings applied throughout all of South America.⁹

California scholars made similar generalizations. Physiologist Sherburne F. Cook, a close associate of Borah, was one of the first scholars to mention debt peonage in California. Cook noted the presence of Mexican influence on California ranchos and claimed that "the hacienda-peon society was introduced without much modification from

7. Bauer, 35; Silvio Zavala, "Origenes coloniales del peonaje," *Trimestre Económico* 10 (1943-1944): 711-48; Woodrow Borah, *New Spain's Century of Depression* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951), 37-43; George McBride, "Peonage" in *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, XII (New York, 1934), 69-72; Francois Chevalier, *Land and Society in Colonial Mexico: The Great Hacienda* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963), 278-80.

8. Enrique Semo, *Historia del Capitalismo en Mexico* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 1973).

9. Bauer, 36; Andrew Pearse, *The Latin American Peasant* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1975); Rodolfo Stavenhagen, *Social Classes in Agrarian Societies* (New York: Anchor Press, 1975).

Mexico to California and was impressed thoroughly upon the thought of the state.”¹⁰

Unfortunately, California scholars have shown little interest in following Latin America scholars, and failed to explore Indian labor relations at California ranchos.¹¹ Following the lead of hacienda studies, the goal of this dissertation is to revisit the California rancho workplace and explore working arrangements between employer and employee.

Latin American Hacienda Studies

Research findings by scholars of Latin American haciendas during the 1970s and 1980s remain useful, especially regarding labor in Spanish colonial America. Latin America scholars revised theories on the inter-workings of the hacienda workplace to show that both workers and owners faced a constant state of uncertainty. Geography, religion, demographics, local and European politics, and microbes determined hacienda economics, social structures, and labor arrangements.

These studies produced distinctive narratives by employing unique methodologies to revise representations of the division of hacienda labor and demonstrate how *haciendas* and workers adapted to ever-changing social, political, and economic conditions during 300 years of colonization. Theorists during the 1970s and 1980s studied working conditions, especially wage arrangements, and effectively argued that

10. Sherburne F. Cook, *The Conflict Between the California Indian and White Civilization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 304.

11 Steven Hackel, “Land Labor, and Production,” in *Contested Eden: California before the Gold Rush*, eds. Ramón A. Gutiérrez and Richard J. Orsi (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998): 134-36; Douglas Monroy, *Thrown Among Strangers: The Making of the Mexican Culture in Frontier California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Stephen W. Silliman, *Lost Laborers in Colonial California: Native Americans and the Archaeology of Ranch Petaluma* (Tucson: University of Arizona, 2004); Weber, *The Mexican Frontier*.

haciendos frequently adapted to changing market and labor forces; they challenged the notion that a coerced debt atmosphere prevailed. Due to a shortage of hard currency, credit was important for haciendos and workers. Workers borrowed from their employers and haciendos borrowed from merchants, religious institutions, and even from their workers' labor.¹²

Yet, few scholars specifically studied the hacienda system with a central focus on the existence of debt peonage. In "Debt Peonage Reconsidered," however, Henry Cross strongly disputed the existence of a coercive and repressive employer-worker environment.¹³ Cross suggested that the *tienda de raya* benefitted Mexican haciendos and their workers equally. For the haciendos, the *tienda de raya* reduced the demand to maintain large amounts of hard currency and offered more attractive means to maintain the large pools of indigenous workers necessary to run a large hacienda. Workers could buy basic staples (e.g., food, clothing, alcohol) on credit and later settle their debts with accumulated earnings. A small number of administrative staff could take out loans. At the end of each year or working season, the employer and workers would reconcile the balance. The haciendos often made a modest profit from running the *tienda de raya*. The nearest competitor of the *tienda de raya* was usually many miles away, which presented an opportunity to exploit workers by inflating prices. Surprisingly, there is little evidence of price gouging.¹⁴ The *tienda de raya* benefitted workers and employers equally.

12. *Haciendos* means the owners of haciendas.

13. Henry E. Cross, "Debt Peonage Reconsidered: A Case Study in Nineteenth-Century Zacatecas, Mexico," *The Business History Review* 53 (1979).

14. Cross, 478-79.

The *tienda de raya* was also a bank and paymaster. For example, *tienda de raya* transactions from the Hacienda del Maguey reveal details of debt incurred by workers from 1825 to 1883. This twelve-year sample evidences the fact that both employee debt and the percentage of debts compared to annual earnings were quite low. The number of employees with debt at the end of the period only exceeded one-third of workers in three of the twelve years. In those three years, the percentage of workers with debt was 31%, 36%, and 46%, respectively. For the entire twelve-year period, the percentage of workers in debt was only 22.7%, a number that Cross suggested “bordered on insignificant.” The aggregate average of worker debt was 3.49 pesos.¹⁵ Considering that this equaled roughly 75% of the hacienda workers’ monthly wages, this was a very manageable situation for both employer and employee.

Cross also examined the repayment of debt, a topic central to understanding the complete dynamics of debt arrangements between employers and employees on Mexican haciendas. Contrary to past theories, only highly-skilled administrative staff had large debt liabilities. These large debts were often the result of loans that employers disbursed for worker entrepreneurial ventures. Lower skilled workers rarely amassed debt levels that they could not reconcile with less than a month of labor.¹⁶ Debt receipts accumulated by the workforce were not problematic and served to motivate workers.

Cross also investigated the effects of labor supply and demand on debts between employers and employees. At Hacienda del Maguey, debt rates usually remained low,

15. Ibid., 482-86.

16. Ibid., 491-94.

hovering between three and four pesos. In 1834, the average rate of employees holding debts increased to 6.03 pesos. During this period, an episode of cholera ravaged Mexico. Between 1831 and 1836, new Zacatecas mining ventures close to the hacienda made it difficult for the hacienda to retain workers. Employee rates of debt increased significantly during these times. The years when the employee debt burden was the lowest were periods when neighboring mining labor demand was at its lowest.¹⁷

Worker debt was not problematic on Hacienda del Maguey, and account book records reveal that workers benefitted from a liberal labor-credit arrangement. The employer also took advantage of the credit market. In 1825, 10.7% of workers carried debt at the end the year; during the same period, the employer owed over 68% of the workers at an average twice that of the average worker debt. In 1829, employer debt rose to 94.7%; the number of workers with debt was only 5.3%. Only in 1860 did this worker-to-employer debt trend shift in favor of the employer. The account book records indicate that the Hacienda del Maguey employer also benefitted from this labor debt.¹⁸ Therefore, labor arrangements on Mexican haciendas were much more complex than theorists originally thought. The prevalent belief regarding the presence of debt peonage on most Mexican haciendas, especially those in Northern and Central Mexico, is inaccurate.

Other hacienda studies researchers found that wage advancements and liberal credit from employers usually maintained an adequate supply of labor through incentives rather than entrapment. Unless employers could strongly enforce debt payment, as in the

17. Ibid., 484-85.

18. Ibid., 493.

Yucatan, worker debt could not coerce workers. The credit and debt system benefited employers as well, especially during difficult economic periods when they struggled to pay workers.

Mexican California Historiography

This section examines current historiography of Indian labor during the Mexican period. While Bolton and Cook influenced many scholars, most adopted a middle-ground approach and considered California Indians as active participants and contributors to the Spanish, Mexican, and early American colonization processes.¹⁹ In addition to the Latin American haciendas literature addressed here, California scholarship provides a critical framework for the present study. The most accomplished and acclaimed California scholars include David Weber, Douglas Monroy, Stephan Silliman, George Philips, and Steven Hackel.

In 1982, Weber presented the Southwest as the collective Mexican frontier rather than isolating and segregating individual territories of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California. Weber identified similarities and differences between the individual regions as each responded socially, economically, and politically to Mexican independence. Throughout this period, the government ignored people living on the Mexican frontier.²⁰ Many Californians thrived due to this freedom and lack of interference. They received

19. Weber, 107-22; Middle-ground is understood as a frontier land where American Indians, national powers, and settlers attempted to persuade each other by appealing to the values and practices of each other. Through these creative misunderstandings, they developed shared meanings and new practices; see Richard White, *The Middle Ground Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

20. Weber, 107-21.

generous land grants, while missionaries and Indian residents struggled to navigate the secularization process.²¹

Weber suggested that, as the beneficiaries of large land grants from Californian Governors grew, so did their exploitation of the lower class, including Indian workers. The secularization of missions in California created an exodus of cheap Indian labor to the ranchos, which supplied the growing demand for hide and tallow in the new global economy. Weber argued that Mexican independence and the consolidation of capital in the hands of a few strengthened an already popular institution of debt peonage.²²

Weber contended that nowhere was the practice of debt peonage more prevalent than in California: “The conversion of former missions Indians into peons was rapid and widespread in California.” Without the “protection” of missionaries, Indian workers were easy prey for rancheros’ debt schemes. Outside of Los Angeles, in 1833, between two and three hundred Indians were unable to pay off debts to their employers for goods, liquor, and cash advances. Indian workers’ debts kept them from moving on to better working opportunities. Weber quoted Franciscan Father Narciso Durán, who reported that: “all in reality are slaves, or servants of white man who know well the manner of securing their services by binding them for a whole year for an advance trifle.” Father Durán claimed that if Indian workers attempted to flee, they would “experience the full rigor of the law.” Weber warned against comparing debt peonage with slavery in the

21. Ibid., 50-67. The term *Californio* means a Spanish-speaking, Catholic person of Latin American origin born in Alta, California between 1769 and 1848.

22. Weber, 211-12.

American South. The Indian peon was not a slave and could move on after settling debt obligations: “peonage was viewed as a condition of class and bad fortune.”²³

In 1990, Monroy offered a new idea about the relationship between Californios and Indians during the Mexican period. Unlike Weber, he suggested that Indian working arrangements were like those on American cotton plantations. Monroy adopted Edward Genovese’s concept of *seigneurialism*, a term for Middle Age manorialism and feudalism. Monroy argued that the term could also be used to describe the social and economic relationships between Californios and Indians in Mexican California. The California rancheros represented the class of lords, and the dependent Indians were serfs. Monroy claimed that: “the worldwide view of the rancheros fundamentally differed from the men on the ships who sold them manufactured commodities, though perhaps not so much from that of the cotton producer.” Monroy concluded that the California rancho workplace was absent of modern employer-employee relations and more closely resembled a lord-serf relationship.²⁴

Monroy suggested that this relationship developed as early as the arrival of the first Spanish missionaries and soldiers, and continued to grow stronger throughout the Mexican period. As the Spanish colonists settled, they developed a lifestyle with well-defined social hierarchies based on landholdings. Kinship and mutual interest created a strong bond among winners of the on-going land grab during the Spanish and Mexican periods. California ranchos somewhat resembled the socioeconomic characteristics of

23. Ibid., 211-13.

24. Douglas Monroy, *Thrown Among Strangers: The Making of the Mexican Culture in Frontier California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 100-2.

cotton plantations with regard to divisions of labor, but their market structures and chattel slavery models were different. Likewise, the relationships between Californios and Indians were unlike slavery in the American South. The Russian intrusion, the rise and fall of the mission system, European diseases, the transformation of Spanish soldiers who received land grants for elite status, new capitalistic world markets, and liberalism contributed to the formation of a new socio-economic system. This was all due to the efforts of missionaries' indoctrinations "to discipline the body vis-à-vis labor and sexuality, to alter the native people's relationship to nature and its spirits, and to gain access to land." This combination resulted in *seigneurialism*, rather than slavery, in Mexican California.²⁵

Bernardo Yorba, brother of Tomás Yorba, owned Rancho Cañada de Santa Ana. By the end of the Mexican period, this Yorba rancho included many industries, and its workers included: wool combers, seamstresses, shoemakers, tanners, and washerwomen. Bernardo Yorba and his supervisors managed workers who waited on him and his family and provided labor to maintain production levels. In return, Yorba provided workers with a steady supply of food: "Ten steers a month were slaughtered to supply the hacienda." A descendent remembered that "the Indian peons lived in a little village of their own." The rancho was quite a self-sustaining enterprise and "the social and business center of the Santa Ana Valley."²⁶ This situation occurred while California hide, tallow, and wine transformed into commodities for North Atlantic markets. The labor arrangements on the

25. Ibid., 100-1.

26. Ibid., 101.

Yorba's rancho resembled slavery on American plantations. Carey McWilliams contended that: "The Indians were the slaves, the gente de razón were the plantation owners or 'whites,' and the Mexicans (Yorba's majordomos and artisans) were the poor whites." Monroy argued that both systems were *seigneurial* in nature and contained distinctive elements of racism and sartorial appearances that clearly identified who owned the land and who worked on it. Yet, rancho managers did not physically coerce Indian workers to work or treat them as assets that they could buy or sell, making this a unique *seigneurial* relationship that developed from mutual dependency between Yorba and Indian workers on his rancho.²⁷

Stephen W. Silliman moved past the notion of "dependency" to explain Indian workers' positions. He argued for a "peopled version of past" and attempted to determine what drew workers to the rancho organization and division of labor. He suggested that five distinct forces were responsible for the arrival of the Indian on the rancho: legislation, indebtedness, capture by force, military alliance, and social incorporation.²⁸ Only indebtedness connoted an element of dependency, as previously proposed by Monroy.

Silliman argued that these five forces supplied the ranchos with an adequate skilled and unskilled workforce. In 1836 and 1844, the Los Angeles Pueblo laws required all Indian males to have gainful employment and prohibited public intoxication, which was punishable by forced labor on public projects and private ranchos. Some Indians,

27. Ibid., 101-2.

28. Silliman, *Lost Laborers in Colonial California*, 27-28.

especially ex-mission inhabitants, became indebted to rancho employers as peon laborers. These workers often resided on missions; after secularization, they adapted the same work-subsistence relationship with the rancheros, who received mission land from the Padres. At times, kidnapped Indians became part of the labor force because of wrongful accusations that Indians stole cattle or similar unsubstantiated charges; this practice was a scheme to enslave defenseless free labor. Political or military alliances also provided rancheros with Indian workers when seasonal or temporary labor required. These arrangements protected groups of Indians from hostile neighboring villages in exchange for delivering a pool of workers to the rancheros. Finally, Silliman explained that, as Indians incorporated rancho settlement territory into their social rounds, ranchos became stopover grounds for groups taking advantage of new hunting and gathering opportunities. These stays often precipitated exchanges of goods and labor between the two parties.²⁹

Silliman noted that most of large California ranchos that employed sizable Indian labor forces were in Southern California. Like Monroy, Silliman relied on Bernardo Yorba's Rancho Cañon de Santa Ana as an example. During 1830 and 1840, more than one hundred Indians labored in one of Yorba's home-grown industries as permanent or temporary workers. What distinguishes Silliman's discussion of Yorba from that of other scholars was that he revealed the fact that Indians received pay in material goods, and that part of their wages came in the form of silver currency, a finding which emerged through examination of Tomás Yorba's rancho. Thus, silver may have been in greater

29. Ibid., 27-30.

supply in California during this period than most scholars have acknowledged.³⁰ A surplus of silver may have obviated the need to pay Indian workers in store credit during the hide-and-tallow boon.

George Philips investigated Indian labor conditions in the Los Angeles pueblo; while confirming many widely held positions throughout the historiography, Philips also offered new thoughts on Indian labor during the Spanish and early American periods. Philips acknowledged that Indian labor was in great demand during the Mexican period; often, Indian workers had the upper hand when negotiating working arrangements. The most highly skilled and reliable Indian workforce resided in Southern California.³¹ Philips also warned against relying too heavily on foreign writers, especially their depictions of California ranchos.³²

Philips showed that working environments differed significantly between the Los Angeles Pueblo and the surrounding ranchos. In the post-secularization period, ranchos grew in size and number; neophytes from the southern missions provided much of the labor pool.³³ The development of the rancho system precipitated a new social, political, and economic community formed, which was paternalistic and hierarchical. Unlike the Padres who sought the Indians' labor as well as their souls, rancho employers only cared about the workplace with little regard for Indian workers' other activities. Successful

30. Ibid., 25.

31. Philips, *Vineyards & Vaqueros*, 29.

32. Ibid., 23-27.

33. Ibid., 333; neophyte here means a Indian who has been baptized at a California Mission.

ranchos secured and maintained an adequate and reliable workforce through a system of economic and social reciprocity. The relationship between the two parties extended beyond labor. Owners might be companions, kinsmen, military leaders, or proxy chiefs; this relational system produced mutual interest and loyalty to protect the rancho from raiders and hostile Indian intruders. Philips suggested that life on the rancho provided Indians with a new sense of freedom and independence. On the larger ranchos, they made better use of the land than the owners, and often grew their own plots of vegetables and grain, which they consumed, sold, and traded; a vast portion of the grain, meat, and alcohol went to the Indian workers.³⁴

Philips argued against comparing these conditions with slavery or debt peonage and refuted the work of Charles Dwight Willard, who determined that the Indians in California were in servitude much like the African slaves in the American South in 1901. Decades later, the same slave narrative continued through modern scholar Tomás Almaguer. Philips acknowledged that debt peonage remained the most popular description of Indian labor on the California rancho. He claimed that Sherburne Cook pioneered the idea and strongly believed that, to maintain a reliable pool of Indian labor from an undependable and transient Indian population, a mechanism of coercion was necessary. This often came “in the form of innocent persuasion, or economic pressure through control of food reserves, or out-and-out kidnapping and slavery.”³⁵

34. *Ibid.*, 334.

35. *Ibid.*, 327.

Philips contended that Cook's argument—that Indian workers were hostages of debt peonage—was seriously flawed. According to Philips, Cook failed to account for the early development of the ranchos. In the early American period, rancheros reaped most of the capital improvements, but Indians received some of the mutual benefits of the ranchos' successes. Indians grew their own crops and often sold them for a profit. Most of the rancheros controlled the distributions of commodities, which often forced Indians into debt. However, debt peonage was not widespread. Philips strongly contested Cook's notion that coercion was the only way to control an undependable and unreliable lot of Indian workers. This may have been the case for a few ranchos, but Indian workers were, in large part, reliable and loyal.³⁶ Unfortunately, many of Philips' claims are based on limited primary sources. The present study will address this gap with a more detailed examination of working arrangements and conditions on California ranchos.

Steven W. Hackel's work encompassed the entire political, social, and economic landscape of Spanish California, Mexican California, and early American California. His contribution to California historiography is unique, due to his commitment to present Indians as equal contributors in the colonial California narrative.³⁷ Hackel claimed that the hide-and-tallow trade during the Mexican period resulted from strong interest on the part of Anglo-American entrepreneurs. Yet, the production of goods depended largely on the rancheros' ability to acquire a pool of Indian labor. On the ranchos, Indians performed many of the same tasks they performed for the padres on missions (e.g.,

36. *Ibid.*, 328.

37. Hackel, 111-37.

herding and slaughtering cows, processing hide, and rendering tallow). Smaller ranchos hired only a few Indians, but larger ones (e.g., Bernardo Yorba's Rancho Cañada de Santa Ana) employed over one hundred Indian workers. The division of labor comprised a well-defined, gendered workforce; men attended to the fields and slaughter houses and women handled domestic duties of cooking, sewing, and washing clothes. Indian ranch hands lived in groups in makeshift provisional dwellings and retained many of their past customs and rituals.³⁸

At the California rancho, Hackel claimed, Indians rarely received cash payments for services; compensation came in the form of a "complicated system of reciprocal obligation that scholars variously described as 'peonage,' 'seigneurialism', or 'paternalism.'"³⁹ In this arrangement, Indians worked for daily rations of food and basic supplies. They supplemented food from the rancho with crops from their own vegetable gardens and stray cattle pilfered from the rancho herd. Some Indian workers bought goods from their employers on credit and became bound to them through debt. In a few extreme cases, unscrupulous rancheros captured raiding Indians and enslaved them. More often, rancho owners developed innovative working arrangements with combinations of many systems to ensure production levels. Hackel concluded that very few rancheros became rich from their Indian workers' labor, but many accumulated enough wealth to

38. Ibid., 134.

39. Ibid., 134.

purchase luxurious consumer goods (e.g., fine cloth, extravagant clothing) that helped them “distinguish themselves as the elevated class.”⁴⁰

Early America California Historiography

This section examines current historiography of Indian labor during the early American period. The scholars included in this section have all attempted to piece together a narrative regarding the working conditions of the Indians, especially those who labored on the California ranchos. Each has offered distinctly different arguments related to the opportunities and challenges the Indians faced when the Anglo-Americans arrived in California. These scholars include: Douglas Monroy, Richard Street, George Philips, and Michael Magliari.

Monroy argued that the arrival of the Americans and their “liberal worldview” spelled an end to the “tradition of reciprocal obligation,” between the Indians and both padres and rancheros. The Spanish promoted the mixing of the two races and offered eternal salvation to the Indians who embraced Catholicism. While the relationship between the Californios and Indians was never equal during the Mexican period, new laws awarded the Indians full citizenship; as a result, they could own property, testify in court on their own behalf, and participate in civic and political events.⁴¹

Monroy pointed out that “the difference between the market-oriented Anglo and seigneurial Californio in their labor relations with ‘their’ Indian corresponds to the cultural differences.” The new American ranchero evaluated success purely in terms of

40. Ibid., 134.

41. Monroy, *Thrown Among Strangers*, 237-38.

profit and loss. Indian labor value was now based on productivity, and workers were compensated accordingly. The Indians could no longer expect any employer to act in a paternalistic manner. The Americans also complained that the Indians were not capable of self-help and remained dependent on their respective employers. In addition, they demonstrated poor work habits, drank too much, and were often unruly (especially on Sunday, which was their only day off). Yet, while these new capitalists showed little regard for the Indians, they had little choice but to court them to work on their ranchos. Monroy argued that, to entice the Indian workers, the rancheros paid the workers in alcohol and consumer store credit: “In the remarkable conjuration characteristic of debt peonage, those who worked came to owe those receiving the product of their labor.”⁴²

Street suggested that the California Indian worker faced the most extreme forms of exploitation during the early American period. In his study of the history of the Californian farm worker, Street strongly argued that Indian workers consistently labored under a system where they were bound by either slavery or debt. Street also pointed out that, during the American transition period, the new laws guiding the civil rights and social standings of the Indians closely mirrored those put in place by the Mexican authorities; however, this was short lived. Initially, the transitional American authorities made it clear that slavery, regardless of race (including Indians), was forbidden. But, as the demand for Indian workers on the ranchos and at the gold mines quickly grew, the practice of binding or, worse, enslaving the Indians quickly became law.⁴³ To support his

42. Ibid.

43. Richard S. Street, *Beasts of the Field: A Narrative of California Farmworkers, 1769-1913* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 108-14.

oppression thesis, Street provided a number of individual cases, mostly from the north, where the Anglo-American presence and influence was much greater than that in the south.

Street pointed out that, while the new American laws regarding Indian labor strongly prohibited the rancheros and employers from forcing Indians to work against their will, the “vagrancy” clause nullified enforcement of this proscription. Unemployed or vagrant Indians were arrested, fined, and offered work assignments to local rancheros as a means to repay their fines. Street concluded that: “In effect this made any Indian available for farm labor and while field hands were supposed to be treated humanely and properly fed and clothed, there were no provisions to enforce those provisions. And since no white farmer could be convicted of mistreatment on the testimony of any Indian, field hands obtained in this way were in effect, slaves.” Further, Street argued, these working arrangements were very prevalent in Los Angeles County, where the rancheros and employers depended on a consistent pool of cheap, available labor from the jail on Monday mornings.⁴⁴

Yet, Street contended that the most egregious Indian workplace arrangement came in the form of debt peonage. It was not bad enough that the Indian workers were exploited and bound by debt, but employers also relied on the Indians’ addiction to alcohol to keep balance sheets in their favor. Street argued that, while the Indians purchased consumer goods like clothing, sugar, and soap, these purchases represented a

44. Ibid.

very small portion of their debt as compared to alcohol. These Indians were not allowed to leave the rancho until the debt was settled. If Indians left prematurely, the rancheros easily apprehended them and dragged them back to the workplace, where they would continue to work off their debt. Street further concluded that crime, Indian worker auctions, liquor, epidemics, and hard work contributed to the Indian depopulation of Los Angeles County, leaving only 219 Indians in 1870.⁴⁵

Philips, on the other hand, suggested that the relationship between the rancheros and Indian workers was less-one sided than Monroy and Street have contended. On a number of occasions, the Indians held the upper hand when negotiating their terms of employment. While Californian Indians during the Spanish, Mexican, and early American periods have been labeled as “slaves,” “vassals,” “peons,” “serfs,” or “inmates,” these terms focus on degrees of exploitation and ignore the Indians’ contribution and productivity. In addition, Philips argued that scholars, in their continued efforts to craft an “oppression” narrative, have neglected and hindered “an understanding of the initiative the Indians exhibited in seeking work, the changing relationships between the workers and their employers, and the freedom to simply leave if they chose.” Philips further contended that, by emphasizing exploitation and ignoring Indian worker productivity, scholars have missed the opportunity to present the Indians’ participation in and contribution to the success of the ranchos during a time when they represented the majority of available skilled and non-skilled labor in California.⁴⁶

45. Ibid.

46. Philips, 329.

Philips furthered showed that, during the early American Period, working conditions on the Los Angeles ranchos differed from those for the jobs performed in town. While the conditions found on the missions motivated many Indians to leave, Los Angeles employer enticements convinced many more to move to the city. There, they found work in settlers' homes and local vineyards; rather than being collectively governed on the mission, then, they were individually managed by their respective employers. Philips suggested that, while this relationship worked well during the Mexican period, the excess of locally produced wine and brandy, and the Indians' tendency to overconsume it, led to exploitation by the Americans. New state and local laws regarding Indian drunkenness and vagrancy ensured that there was a steady supply of Indian workers available at Monday's prison auction. Philips argued that "this kind of system could not be maintained over the long run, because labor recruitment depended in large part on the perpetuation of Indian instability."⁴⁷

Yet, Philips posited that working conditions on the large Los Angeles ranchos differed greatly from those in the Los Angeles village. As the ranchos developed and grew in size, they formed social, economic, and political systems guided by well-defined hierarchy and paternalism. Under a system of economic and social reciprocity, most rancheros successfully recruited and maintained Indian laborers. Philips showed that the Indian employers served many roles, including friend, fictive chief, military leader, and kinsman. And, rancheros not only employed Indians, but also allowed workers to live on their land and grow their own crops. The Indians made great use of their small farms and

47. Ibid., 331-33.

often raised enough not only to feed their kin, but also, in the entrepreneurial spirit, to sell the surplus back to their boss or in the free market. Finally, Philips concluded that, unlike the Indian working conditions on some ranchos in Northern California, there is little evidence to suggest that the ranchos in Los Angeles County were oppressive workplaces.⁴⁸

Magliari has also investigated the California rancho working conditions during the early American period. With the support of account books and court records, Magliari carefully attempted to determine whether Indians worked under free or bound conditions. Much of his research centered on how certain California employers, in an effort to acquire cheap Indian labor, took advantage of the Indian Act of 1850 to maintain adequate supplies of labor. Magliari argued that the act allowed white employers to legally engage in indentured servitude, convict-leasing, and, to some extent, debt peonage and slavery. Further, the employers who readily adopted many of these practices were not the Californios, but newly arrived Americans from the south who brought with them a long history of slavery.

In his study of Cave Johnson Cout's Ranchos Guajome, Magliari focused on how some rancheros attempted to exploit the provisions of the Indian Act of 1850 to supply their labor needs. Magliari argued that both Anglo and Hispanic ranchers wasted no time in engaging in bound labor through "a brutal combination of legalized debt peonage and convict leasing, backed by an extralegal slave trading and conscriptions." To validate these assertions, Magliari presented a case study of Cout's strong-arm tactics and

48. Ibid., 333-35.

strategies. Coutts, a former United States officer of the Mexican-American War and Tennessee slave owner, attempted to manage his workforce with a whip. While, at times, Coutts could rely on the new American courts to support him when workers complained, keeping employees remained a challenge. Magliari considered Coutts quite successful in adapting to the new options for procuring Indian labor; however, this assertion is somewhat questionable when reviewing his runaway rates and costs. Between 1853 and 1861, an average of twenty percent of the Indian force escaped from the ranchos with only six Indian runaways per year brought back. Further, Coutts lost an average of \$316 per year on Indian debt. Regardless, Magliari concluded that Coutts and other California rancheros found the Indian Act of 1850 and its bound Indian labor options and provisions the mainstay of the Indian worker recruitment process.⁴⁹

Mexican Haciendas and California Ranchos

This dissertation evolved from my exposure to Latin American scholarship and my strong interest in the working arrangements on California ranchos. There is a clear division between Latin American and California scholars; too often, scholars from each side ignore mutual topics of interest. This study attempts to close that gap by adopting designs and methodologies from Latin American hacienda studies and applying these to the study of California ranchos. Cross' study serves as a template for this study. Most California scholars accept the idea that California ranchos resemble Mexican haciendas, but refuse to apply findings from Latin American hacienda studies. As Cook suggested, "the hacienda-peon society was introduced without much modification from Mexico to

49. Magliari, "Free Soil, Unfree Labor," 368.

California and was impressed thoroughly upon the thought of the state.”⁵⁰ The juxtaposition of Mexican haciendas and California ranchos facilitates a much-needed review and re-examination of the California rancho workplace.

Mexican haciendas and California ranchos also differed, most notably in their size. Mexican haciendas, some of which were over a half-million acres in the 19th century, were much larger than California ranchos. Most hacienda owners leased large land holdings to people who ran smaller ranchos.⁵¹ As a comparison, the two ranchos included in this study, Rancho Santa Ana and Rancho Azusa, encompassed only 32,000 and 26,000 acres respectively; neither rancho actively engaged in sub-leasing their property like their Mexican neighbors.⁵² The number of workers varied greatly between Mexican haciendas and California ranchos. In 1834, Hacienda del Maguey reported a high mark of 417 workers; Rancho Azusa reported 73 workers in 1859.⁵³ The size of both land and workforce differed greatly, but the workplace and its dynamics were very similar.

The main similarity between workplaces in Mexico and California was the existence of the *tienda de raya*. This dissertation suggests that the structure of the employee-employer arrangement in both locations converged at the *tienda de raya*, due to shared liberal credit policies. As seen in chapter two and chapter three, Mexican haciendas and later on Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana and Rancho Asuza, the *tienda de raya*

50. Cook, *Conflict Between*, 304.

51. Brading, 21.

52. Wayne D. Gibson, *Tomas Yorba's Santa Ana Viejo: 1769-1847* (Santa Ana: Santa Ana College Foundation Press, 1976), 23.

53. Cross, 483.

represented a place and process for both employees and employers to benefit. For workers, the *tienda de raya* was a bank and a place to purchase staple items. For employers, the *tienda de raya* reduced the demand for large amounts of often scarce hard currency and created an opportunity to sell, manufacture, and trade goods. The *tienda de raya* provided employers with a way to borrow worker labor during challenging economic times.

CHAPTER TWO:

Mexican California and the Indian Worker

Steven Hackel suggested that scholars revisit Mexican California and the assumption that after the secularization of the missions in California, Indians flooded into the pueblos and remained unemployed. Hackel called for a reexamination of “the origins and magnitude of the pathological behaviors, such as drunkenness and homicide, that has long been attributed to Indians in Mexican California.” Scholars must examine census reports, court cases, account books, and letters regarding San Jose, Los Angeles, and Monterey to develop a more accurate image of Indian participation in Mexican California society.¹ Employing these sources and probate inventories, this chapter includes a case study of one of the largest ranchos in the Los Angeles area, Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana. This study identifies the working conditions and arrangements of the Indian workers on the Southern California rancho during this period. I examine and challenge many long-held characteristics of Indian workers at this location, especially those related to Indian labor demand and wage arrangements. This chapter consists of an examination of the Mexican California economy, labor records relating to Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana and legal records from the Mexican court and local authorities.

The Mexican California Economy

The central focus of this chapter is on Indian labor in Mexican California, but understanding the economic landscape is essential. The removal of the Spanish Crown from rule in New Spain in 1821 offered great hope to the Mexican California economy.

1. Steven Hackel, “Land Labor, and Production,” in *Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush*, eds. Ramón A. Gutiérrez and Richard J. Orsi (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 129-37.

The people became integrated participants in the national economy. Immediately after taking control, Mexican authorities commissioned the Junta de Formento de Californias to develop plans to defend and increase economic growth. The Junta's first recommendations included moving the San Blas shipworks to Monterey and building a monopolistic trading house to foster Mexican-Asian trade. They never implemented either plan, much to the disappointment of Governor Juan Bautista Alvarado (governor from 1837 to 1842). Independent Mexico did little to improve the military and never fully integrated California into its national economy. Due to the disinterest of the Central Mexican government, Californian colonists, Indians, and soldiers witnessed a slow deterioration of their standard of living. Soldiers went unpaid for long periods of time. In 1829, they staged a mutiny in Monterey (i.e., they refused to serve and abandoned the Monterey Presidio). Those who remained took control of the Presidio and protested the central government, but the only notable outcome was the deportation of the deputy commissioner.²

Despite a lack of support from the central government and provincial frustration, the Mexican period was an era of economic growth. The Spanish departure immediately opened California to international markets and free trade. Foreign countries rushed to gain access to the region's growing hide-and-tallow production. In Monterey, before the Spanish flag lowered in June of 1822, the English trading company of McCulloch, Hartnell, and Company acquired exclusive rights for the province's surplus hide and

2. Ibid., 129-30.

tallow.³ While British merchants monopolized the hide and tallow market until the mid-1820s, a Boston firm—Bryant and Sturges and Company—dominated the legal trade thereafter.⁴

Most exporting of hide and tallow in California during the Mexican period included some level of smuggling and larceny. During this period, California merchants and traders often developed successful strategies to avoid duties and tariffs (e.g., locating goods in remote places). One specific example of this type of smuggling is that of Abel Stearns, a notable and respected Los Angeles merchant, who faced accusations in 1835 of running illegal operations out of his San Pedro warehouse and Santa Catalina Island. The courts eventually dropped the charges, but indicted him again in October 1840. A strange vessel arrived late at night in San Pedro, and authorities searched Stearns' home. They found and confiscated a large quantity of silk and a large cache of liquor. Stearns strongly denied any improprieties. Three months later, officials returned to his San Pedro warehouse and found contraband hides.⁵

Bribery of local officials complemented smuggling as a method to reduce the cost of trading in this new global market economy. In his memoirs of life in California, W. H. Davis suggested that he was not aware of any local Mexican officials engaging in such activities.⁶ He stated that he “never knew an instance of bribery by an official by a

3. William J. Barger, “Furs, Hides, and a Little Larceny: Smuggling and Its Role in the Early California's Economy,” *The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly* 85 (2003): 395.

4. *Ibid.*, 396.

5. Barger, 402-3.

6. William H. Davis, *Sixty Years in California* (San Francisco: A. J. Leary, 1889).

merchant [but]...they must have had it their own minds an idea that the customs were evaded.”⁷ Davis’ testimony appears to have been sincere; his second point may, therefore, have had more merit. There is a plethora of evidence to confirm that authorities turned a blind eye to this type of activity. In April 1839, a Monterey customs official quipped that “he often had to shut his eyes to many frauds out of pity and unwillingness to ruin the merchants. The level of smuggling and tax evasion suggested a strong partnership between officials and merchants. The sources also pointed to gratuities bestowed on officials. Bancroft⁸ revealed that Governor José Darío Argüello “did not object to smuggling, saying: ‘I see why we should not prevent it, since our people are the gainers.’” Argüello may have also participated in this type of clandestine behavior. On August 9, 1834, he contacted a person living in Baja California and requested they send pearls as a gift for his daughter, with directions to send the cargo to the governor’s uncle to prevent any appearance of suspicion.⁹

Ship captains still engaged in surreptitious activities to avoid taxation. Merchant W. H. Davis explained that “a large amount of goods could easily be concealed in the lining of a vessel or a false lining be built, at no great expense, around the sides of ship behind which could be stowed away.” Ships had plenty of hiding places where the captain could hide valuable cargo, including silver. Davis suggested that when captains arrived at California ports, they expected and depended on cursory inspections. Mexican

7. Davis, 146.

8. Hubert H. Bancroft, *History of California* (San Francisco: The History Company, 1890), 91.

9. Barger, 403-4.

authorities “were so exceedingly well-mannered that they did not wish to appear impolite, and so they did not make any critical and offensive scrutiny of the arrangements and contents of the vessel.”¹⁰

Economist William Barger argued that, from a twenty-first-century American viewpoint, smuggling and tax evasion in Mexican California were “social aberrations.” Yet, they were integral parts of the economy. Across the entire social spectrum, priests, governors, soldiers, poor farmers, and merchants were willing participants. After Mexican Independence in 1821, California was a possession of Mexico, and Mexico’s attempt to enact control over trade failed. By 1830, California developed its own processes and expectations, ignoring those set by Mexico. California officials, merchants, and smugglers created a system that worked for them. It included the adaptation of modified regulations and transactions that skirted the excessive tariffs from the time of Mexican Independence. Governor Argüello explained: “Necessity makes licit that which is not licit under the law.”¹¹

In the early 1820s, merchants started to arrive in Los Angeles ready to cash in on the growing demand for hide and tallow. In the 1830s, secularization transformed the region’s landscape and economy by shifting the control of available farm and grazing lands away from the missions. Innovative pursuits (e.g., Abel Stearns building a warehouse at San Pedro) guaranteed that all Southern California’s hide and tallow flowed through this port. Hide and tallow brought good prices to sellers, and Californians

10. Ibid., 404-6.

11. Ibid., 407-9.

developed a new appetite for imported consumer goods. These new imported goods often served as a form of payment for rancho exported products and created a need for new accounting techniques.¹²

In 1827, John Temple and George Rice settled in Los Angeles Pueblo and immediately launched the region's first general merchandise store. Albert Robinson noted that, by 1829, Tirbucio Tapia had emerged as the town's foremost merchant.¹³ Excepting these facts, the lack of primary sources leaves scholars with only conjecture. These stores were small country stores competing with those located on the large ranchos.¹⁴ Ships arriving in San Pedro served as floating outlets to the townsmen and rancheros. In 1836, Richard Henry Dana chronicled that the arrival of visiting hide ships prompted many business transactions, as local hide and tallow producers traded for merchandise. It also created a festive atmosphere, with events and celebrations.¹⁵ In the end, local small retailers carved out a niche for providing goods to locals when no ships anchored in San Pedro.

In 1832, Abel Stearns arrived in the Los Angeles area and became the dominant merchant in Southern California. Stearns, a Massachusetts native, acquired a great amount of land and took full advantage of smuggling opportunities. He was a close business partner and friend of Tomás Yorba, the owner of Rancho Santiago de Santa

12. William J. Barger, "Merchants of Los Angeles: Economics and Commerce in Mexican California," *Southern California Quarterly* 85 (2000): 132-33.

13. Alfred Robinson, *Life in California* (New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1846).

14. *Ibid.*, 62.

15. Barger, "Merchants of Los Angeles," 128.

Ana. In 1850, the United States Census noted that Stearns was the wealthiest man in Los Angeles. Fortunately for researchers, he maintained meticulous records of his business transactions, like Yorba and Dalton. These deals ranged from small cash transactions to complex deals that engaged in hide-and-tallow futures. They also included debt collections, consignment, and auction fees. Like most merchants of this period, the diversity of income sources remained strong throughout the entire Mexican California hide-and-tallow boom period.¹⁶

During the early period of Mexican California, hide ships dealt primarily with the missions. The Padres were reliable customers who paid their bills in a timely manner and never defaulted on their debt. Trader Alfred Robinson was often responsible for \$200,000 to \$300,000 of mission hides.¹⁷ In 1834, the California missions became secular and their property and control shifted from the Padres to local secular authorities.¹⁸ This transition moved quickly, as the rancheros aggressively took over mission land and livestock. For example, in 1820, there were only twenty private land grants; by 1846, the count included 700, encompassing almost 800,000 acres.¹⁹ During the Mexican period, California rancheros were a major supplier to the global hide-and-tallow markets.²⁰

With the shift of control between the Padres and rancheros, transaction costs rose as risks to the traders increased. In the past, the Padres had represented reliable business

16. Ibid., 128.

17. Ibid., 131.

18. Ibid., 131.

19. Ibid., 131.

20. See Barger, "Merchants of Los Angeles."

partners, but that was not always the case with the rancheros. Davis explained that the first merchant to engage with a ranchero at a rodeo was more likely to satisfy the hide and tallow obligations, even if the late arriving merchants did not.²¹ Adele Ogden chronicled that adding this new participant worked well for both local farmers and the hide ships. The merchants created a new economic system; merchants bought and sold hide and tallow and purchased merchandise at wholesale prices from the ships, then sold these goods to rancheros. Hide and tallow held in warehouses was like a bank for debt obligations or future transactions.²²

An example of this new economic process, Stearns signed a promissory note on January 7, 1834, agreeing to pay A. B. Thompson \$1,695 in “merchantable hides at two dollars each.”²³ This transaction commenced on the beach of San Pedro, and the text of the note suggested that Thompson, a wholesale hide trader, served as a middleman between Stearns and the owner of a large trading vessel off of the coast of Santa Barbara. The actual transaction provided a large inventory of merchandise they would pay for later with hides. During this period, large wholesale transactions included advanced goods for future payments of hides and cash. Merchants charged interest, but it was implicit in the cost of the goods.²⁴ Lacking any formal financial lending institutions, the sources of working capital for these merchants included available funds and one’s good name.

21. Ibid., 131.

22. Ibid., 131.

23. Ibid., 131.

24. Ibid., 131.

Stearns facilitated the expansion of the hide-and-tallow boon in California during this period. San Pedro was the principal hide port in California; it was the only port within a reasonable distance that served hundreds of miles of plains in the Los Angeles area. In 1840, Sir James Douglas estimated that 40 percent of California hide production passed through the San Pedro port that year. Predicting this trend as early as 1834, Stearns developed a warehouse enterprise on the San Pedro port. In 1834, he purchased an existing warehouse in San Pedro, previously owned by the mission. In the following years, he expanded that facility into the central hub for the storing of hide, tallow, and merchandise.

Ships docking in San Pedro carried large quantities of specie, primarily silver coins. While hide was the primary method of payment, specie paid for custom duties (often bribe money) and for hides that exceeded the value of available merchandise carried on Boston ships.²⁵ With excess species, Stearns developed his own lending business. Stearns biographer John Gaffey noted that:

Slowly, Sterns' reputation spread throughout the Southern California area, and he extended his commercial activities into Riverside, San Bernardino, and Los Angeles counties. As his trading connections expanded among ranches and ship captains alike, anyone who needed cash was obligated to go to him for assistance.²⁶

Stearns' specie also ended up in the hands of Tomás Yorba's Indian workers.

Stearns' successful lending business highlights that maintaining an adequate cash flow in California during the Mexican period was often challenging. The consensus

25. Ibid., 133.

26. Ibid., 133.

among most scholars is that there was little available hard currency; there were no banks and credit was informal (name recognition and trust opened the door to lines of credit).²⁷ Most transactions between consumers and merchants relied on bills of exchange, which became payment for other commercial ventures. Local merchants accepted hard currency from other nations for many types of transactions. Yet, in California, cowhide was a common and acceptable form of payment. Hide demand and price strongly influenced the Mexican California economy, and hide's steady value provided a stable and acceptable replacement for hard currency. In 1822, the price of hide was only 50 cents; by 1823, it was \$1.50 in cash and \$2.00 for merchandise. In 1835, it increased to \$2.00 in cash and \$2.25 for merchandise, where it remained throughout the rest of the period.²⁸ Selling and buying in Southern California consisted of a combination of payments of specie, hide, or a personal promise to deliver hide later.

The reason for the stability of hide prices is clear in the hide market in Boston and California. In California, cows grazed the open fields and multiplied; when the weather cooperated, the hide exceeded the demand of the hide ships. Davis noted that without the demand of hide, the cows would have overrun Southern California.²⁹ Labor presented the only variable cost to the rancheros. Cowhide production included the roundup, slaughter, and hide and tallow production. There is little evidence that the demand for hide workers

27. Ibid., 136.

28. Receipt Dated 10 November 1823, Box 81, Papers of Abel Stearns, The Huntington Library, San Marino, California; Barger, "Merchants of Los Angeles," 136.

29. Barger, "Merchants of Los Angeles," 137.

resulted in any wage fluctuation, although some Indian vaqueros attempted to negotiate higher wages. Barger reflected:

In short, cattle production costs were stable at relevant production levels. A commodity with stable production costs, minimal product differentiations (i.e. one cowhide looks like another), and relatively large number of participants yields an elastic supply curve. A hide market with an elastic supply curve permitted a purchaser to buy all of the cowhide he wanted at the prevailing price. Suppliers had no incentives to lower prices because competition had driven out excess profits and purchasers had no incentives to raise prices.³⁰

In economic terms, the hide enterprise was a “constant cost” industry.

Demand in the California hide market derived from the New England shoe industry. Shoe makers depended on hide from California and Russia. Considering the distances from both sources, Boston hide merchants had to carefully estimate the price of shoes and guess what merchandise would sell in California and Russia in the future. At the time, the trip around Cape Horn could take a year or more. In addition to shipping costs, expenses included insurance, local taxes, and an uncertain amount for bribes. When a ship finally dropped anchor in California, there were additional costs from other ships from South America and Asia. Each of the foreign ships arrived with cargo based on the keenness and insight of its owner.³¹

The capital gains came from successfully finding buyers for merchandise and returning with a full ship of hides at an expected price. If successful, the merchant’s only concern was the future prices of hide in New England. Hide merchant capital investment required patience, which meant waiting two to three years for tangible return. If they

30. Ibid., 137.

31. Ibid., 138.

guessed wrong on California consumer demand, they would experience significant losses. Examining the account books of San Francisco merchant Jacob Leese showed that the prices of the goods sold in California were triple those in Boston. This minimized hide merchants' risks and allowed for adjusting prices downward on slow items. When the price of hide finally fell in the early 1840s, it was the end of the California-Boston hide trading market.³²

Like cotton in the American South during most of the nineteenth century, California hides were a major form of payment for goods and services. Tomás Yorba's letters also suggested that there was an ample supply of currency circulating in Mexican California for Yorba to pay Indian workers in silver coins.³³ Part of the arriving cargo included some form of specie, either Mexican or foreign. Dana observed in 1835 that "another thing that surprised me was the quantity of silver in circulation, I never, in my life, saw so much silver at one time, as during the week that we were at Monterey." Dana was a reliable world chronicler, but scholars ignored his insight that there was probably more available specie circulating in California at this time than scholars once believed. Specie currency was part of the hide trade. Rancheros sold hide and received payment in merchandise and foreign species. In this way, California was unlike the United States during the early nineteenth century; the U.S. population was growing and relied on

32. Ibid., 138.

33. Gibson, *Tomas Yorba's Santa Ana Viejo*, 184-293.

federal and state bank note circulation.³⁴ Dana's observation perhaps provides insight into why Yorba paid his Indian workers in specie rather than store credits.

A Case Study: Tomás Yorba and Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana

On January 19, 1942, the *Santa Ana Register* published an article titled "Old Account Book: Basis of Article on County History."³⁵ An Orange County merchant had an account book for over 100 years that belonged to Tomás Yorba; it included transactions of labor and store purchases on Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana during the Mexican California period. In 1941, Terry E. Stephenson³⁶ examined the operations, financial processes, and strategies Yorba used to maintain an adequate amount of credit and cash flow. With the support of the Yorba account book, letters, wills, and court testimony, the present case study will expand understandings of Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana with a new emphasis on the working arrangement between Yorba and his Indian workers.

Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana, the original name of the land granted to José Antonio Yorba and his nephew Juan Pablo Peralta by the Spanish governor in 1810, spread across 65,516 acres (i.e., most of what is now Northern Orange County). The rancho extended from what is now the Riverside Freeway to the Pacific Ocean in Newport Beach.

34. Barger, 139.

35. "Old Account Book: Basis of Article on County History," *Santa Ana Register* (Santa Ana, CA), Jan. 19, 1943, 1A, p. 9.

36. Terry E. Stephenson, "Tomás Yorba, his Wife Vicenta, and his Account Book," *Historical Society of Southern California* 23 (1941).




Figure 2.1. Map of Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana and other ranchos located in Orange County

The bowed-tract shape of the property followed the Santa Ana River and spread across the Orange County cities of Orange, Villa Park, Costa Mesa, Santa Ana, Newport Beach, and parts of Tustin. Both Yorba and Peralta married neophytes from Mission San Carlos.³⁷ Yorba immediately constructed his adobe headquarters, which, in 1810, became home for his wife and five sons: Francisco, José, Antonio, Tomás, Bernardo, and Teodocio.

Yorba and Peralta engaged in cattle production and maintained large vineyards with the help of local gentile Indians who resided on the outskirts of the rancho. In 1814,

37. Gibson, 23; neophytes mean Indians who were baptized on California Missions.

Fray José María de Zavidea complained that the rancheros' idleness was the result of exploitation of their Indian labor: "Both men and women who are pagans assist the work of the fields. Also, they are employed as cooks, water carriers and in domestic occupations. This is one of the most potent causes of why the people of the gente de razón are given so much idleness." The Fray's testimony implied that, as early as the Spanish California period, Indians felt satisfied with working conditions on Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana: "since the pagan Indians are paid by their labor by a half or third of the crops, they remain content in the service of their masters during the season of planting."³⁸ It is unknown whether early rancheros matched the description of being lazy by missionaries and foreign chroniclers, but the amount of ranch work and so few non-Indians clearly suggested that rancheros and Indians were quite industrious.

José Antonio Yorba died on January 16, 1825 and left to his wife and sons the rancho property, eight hundred mature cows, sixteen oxen, nineteen mules and their saddles, an adobe house, an orchard, and a thirty-acre vineyard.³⁹ After his death, his wife, sons, except Bernardo, and daughters continued to reside on Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana. In 1834, Bernardo received a large land grant from the Mexican Governor and moved to Rancho Cañón de Santa Ana, just north of the Santa Ana River.⁴⁰ Around that same time, Tomás and the residents of Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana were busy with cowhide and tallow production and the manufacturing of household goods. Tomás

38. Ibid., 48.

39. Ibid., 54.

40. Stephenson, 132.

managed enterprises: a large vineyard, cattle and sheep ranching, a store, and manufacturing leather goods and soap. He farmed much of his land with the help of irrigation from the bordering Santa Ana River and employed a hatter, silversmith, cigar maker, and silversmith.⁴¹ In court testimony regarding an irrigation dispute in 1883, former Yorba employee José Delores Sepúlveda remembered that Tomás was an extremely energetic man and that no one could replace him after his death; consequently, many workers, including Sepulveda, left Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana for other ranchos.⁴²

In court testimony, Sepúlveda revealed that Tomás employed thirty to forty servants who were paid annually; most were Indians who received three pesos per month.⁴³ Yorba committed to paying Indian workers in silver on the Catholic feast of Three Kings Day. In December 1841, he wrote to Abel Stearns' manager, Mariano Roldán: "My friend, I send you six pairs of reins by Delores so that you can sell them for me. I must pay my Indians by Three Kings' Day."⁴⁴ In a closer examination of Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana from the 1836 Los Angeles Padrón (census), Tomás reported three Mexicans and sixty-eight Indians living and working on the rancho, which is many more

41. Gibson, 78.

42. See court case testimony in *Anaheim Water Company v. Semi-Tropic Water Company*, Santa Ana River Report, MS-R155, Special Collections and Archives, UC Irvine Libraries, Irvine, CA, 185.

43. *Ibid.*, 184.

44. Gibson, 275.

than Sepúlveda claimed.⁴⁵ The rancho was a bustling workplace during the Mexican period. Tomás and Bernardo's detailed accounting records survived, and provide insight into the scope of business transactions at Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana and the working arrangements between Yorba and his workers. This is especially true when reviewing the debt level carried by Mexican and Indian workers.

Stephenson's investigation of the Yorba account book revealed that many workers, primarily non-Indians, relied on purchasing goods from the company store and engaged in a credit-labor agreement, like that of the Mexican haciendas. The ledger entries provided a valuable record of non-Indian wages (an average of eight pesos per month), which were much more than the three pesos per month scholars originally believed Indian workers received. At times, Yorba amassed large amounts of silver that he often lent to others. On one page alone, silver debts totaled almost eight hundred pesos, and the list of creditor names included well-known Californios such as Dominguez and Pico.⁴⁶ However, Stephenson overlooked the lack of Indian credit and wage entries in the account book. He briefly mentioned three Indian workers, the products they purchased, and the agreed credit arrangement. While he suggested that "there are perhaps scores of similar examples," after review of the account book, there are in fact only

45. 1836 Los Angeles Census, Register of the City of Los Angeles and its Jurisdiction, for the Year of 1836, Los Angeles City Archives, Records Management Division, City Clerk's Office, Piper Technical Center, Los Angeles, CA.

46. Stephenson, 139-48.

five.⁴⁷ Despite some omissions, Stephenson's study offered substantial information regarding the operation of Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana.

Beyond the Stephenson findings, the account book reveals Indian labor arrangements on the rancho. However, the best assessment of the account book comes from what is *not* in the account book; it only has limited entries regarding Indian worker debt. The five entries are quite useful and worth further attention. Considering that approximately ninety Indians worked on the rancho during the period covered by the account book, the smaller number of Indian entries suggests that few engaged in any credit activity at Yorba's store.⁴⁸ Of the five Indian entries, three owed less than three pesos; the others' debts were nine and ten pesos. Only one account mentioned the payment type as *labor* paid at a monthly rate of three pesos and the rest with silver. This suggests that if Indians purchased consumer goods from Yorba, he expected payment in pesos or they were not interested in any of the products sold. Exceptions included the case of Indian Nicasio who bought thirteen cuartillas of aguardiente (approximately fourteen gallons of hard liquor).⁴⁹ Nicasio may have been an enterprising distributor of Yorba brew to the local Indian population. Such activities were common at Mexican haciendas as loans secured by labor.

A review of the 1836 and 1844 Padróns (Mexican Census) showed that many workers at Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana remained over the span of eight years. Their

47. Tomás Yorba, Business Ledger of Don Tomás Yorba: 1841-1849, 1941, The Bowers Museum, Santa Ana, CA.

48. 1844 Los Angeles Census, Los Angeles City Archives; Business Ledger of Don Tomás Yorba: 1841-1849.

49. Yorba, 183-99.

decision to remain on the rancho suggests that they were content with working for Yorba, who provided them with three pesos a month and a consistent supply of food.⁵⁰

Other sources regarding Indian working arrangements at Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana suggest that Yorba did not exploit Indian rancho workers through debt peonage. Tomás Yorba died on January 30, 1845; his will and probate inventories provide the final picture of Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana. He left an estate worth close to 13,000 pesos. The list of assets reported in 1846 included a thirteen-room adobe, 1,514 cows, fifty-nine oxen, one hundred horses, two vineyards, and over 65,000 acres of land. In 1852, Bernardo's final probate statement mentioned that three workers who owed the estate a total of three hundred pesos had paid their debt in full by labor. These were non-Indians; Indian worker debt was missing from all of Yorba's probate inventories.⁵¹ Like the account book, the will and probate inventories reported no Indian worker debt on Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana.

The last significant sources for Tomás Yorba were written correspondence to and from his contemporaries. Gibson collected fifty-four letters that detail Yorba's lending and collecting from those who owed him. On January 22, 1836, he wrote to Captain José Noriega that he loaned three hundred pesos to the administrators of the San Luis Rey and San Diego missions. In July 1836, he mentioned to Noriega that he was struggling to collect on that debt. When Yorba's cash flow slowed, he could always depend on Abel Stearns. On July 25, 1841 and October 22, 1841, Yorba requested loans totaling one

50. 1836 Los Angeles Census, Los Angeles City Archives.

51. Tomás Yorba, Wills and papers related to the settlement of the estate 1844-1845, MSS HM 26653, Huntington Library, San Marino, CA; see also Los Angeles County Prefecture Records, vol. I, 538 and vol. II, 16, 27, 491, Huntington Library, San Marino, CA.

hundred pesos from Stearns, which he paid in full on June 30, 1843.⁵² Another letter revealed that Yorba paid the Indians, in pesos, annually on the Feast of Three Kings. Collectively, the letters provide strong supporting evidence that there was ample circulation of silver for Yorba to pay Indian workers in hard currency.

Los Angeles Court Records

Mexican court records regarding the Yorba estate provide useful will and probate inventories. They also explain claims of institutional exploitation of the California Indian workers during the Mexican period. Such claims represent reports of authorities capturing and returning Indians who left ranchos or pueblo employers before paying off their debt. Others include authorities capturing rogue Indians and enslaving them or assigning drunk and unruly Indians to private work details.⁵³ Surprisingly, of the fifty Indian cases found in over 1,650 pages of Southern California Mexican court cases in the Los Angeles County Prefecture records archive, the court ruled against the Indians fewer than five times. In most Indian cases, Mexican authorities ruled in favor of the Indians and often advocated for them in a compassionate and protective manner. Indians generally received fair and equal treatment under the Mexican Constitution of 1824.⁵⁴ Probate inventory records in Mexican court records included no Indian worker debt; in a few cases, estates owed wages to Indian workers.⁵⁵

52. Gibson, 184-293.

53. Philips, *Vineyards & Vaqueros*, 183-99

54. The Mexican Constitution of 1824 granted equal citizenship rights to all races, including California Indians.

55. Los Angeles County Prefecture Records, vols. ill I & II.

Few cases in Mexican Court records contested or adjudicated Indian worker flight or debt. In 1848, Enrique Dalton complained to the court that an Indian worker with debts, Oligario, fled with an Indian woman (the cook). The two Indians found new employment on a neighboring rancho. Dalton sought redress, but no records suggest that the judge acted on the request.⁵⁶ Earlier in 1842, Tomás Talamantes griped that four Indians assisting him with delivering lime to the city of Los Angeles quit unexpectedly and left him without resources to complete the jobs. The court responded by assigning a local resident and two Indians from the local jail to Talamantes to make good on his contract.⁵⁷ In 1841, John Davis of the Santa Barbara area pleaded with the court to capture and return an Indian, Mateo, to him. Davis testified that the Indian owed fourteen pesos and was living in the city of Los Angeles. The court refused to aid the ranchero.⁵⁸ The court was willing to hear cases regarding Indian worker flight, but lacked the will and resources to enforce the law. In cases of fleeing workers who moved to a new place of employment, the court was more reluctant to act.

Other types of Indian worker cases at the Mexican Court (e.g., domestic violence and family custody battles) demonstrated the court's role in protecting the rights of California Indians. In February 1842, Mission San Gabriel Padre Thomas Estenaga reported domestic abuse by Don Bonifacio Madariaga against his Indian bride-to-be. Madariaga allegedly held the Indian in seclusion against her will. The Padre and court

56. Los Angeles County Prefecture Records, vol. II, 748.

57. *Ibid.*, 133-36.

58. *Ibid.*, 427.

acted accordingly, and prohibited the wedding.⁵⁹ In October 1840, Marcos, an Indian from the San Juan Capistrano Mission, complained to the court that a foreigner named Samuel took his wife and two daughters, Susan and Lugarde, and petitioned the court for their return. A witness for the defendant argued that Marcos failed to present all the facts related to this case and had previously abandoned his family to live with another Indian woman. He only tried to reunite with his family after that relationship ended. The judge ruled in favor of Marcos and reunification:

Speaking of children in general, the law defines that ordinarily only legitimate children are considered, because that which defines the status of children is: to be born of a husband and wife united in public matrimony. It appears this section alone is sufficient to decide the case in this controversy. But although the intentions of the judge, is in this instance, were to protect the little children, without taking into consideration other disagreeable features resulting to this class of offsprings(sic) called legitimate by law, these cannot be made legitimate by marriage as sovereign order is provided by law for the neutral son's born of free men or women. In accord with this opinion, this court shall order the return of the children by the said married couple, because a grave injustice might result by upholding this class of petitions, thus condoning a crime abhorrent to divine and human laws.⁶⁰

This ruling, and other cases, confirmed that California Indians under Mexican court jurisdiction received protection under the law and that Indian children could expect the same level of protection by the court as Californios' children.

Court records showed collective resolve by Indian workers at Missions San Gabriel and San Luis Rey. In one case, the Indians refused to return to work until working conditions improved; the court advocated for the neophytes. In the summer of 1847, Indian workers stated: "Under the date of June 30th of June, we, Indians of the

59. Ibid., 422-23.

60. Los Angeles County Prefecture Records, vol. I, 61-66.

Mission of San Gabriel, delivered a petition to you. The contents of said petition, as we already said, and we respect them, are that it is our wish that Don Manuel Olivers should have absolutely nothing to do with us; and therefore we wish to know for our guidance, what is your decision.” Before the court could respond, Olivers was in jail, which rendered the problem moot.⁶¹ In a different scenario, disgruntled Indian workers at Mission San Luis Rey took flight and found employment elsewhere. In 1839, the mission authorities demanded the court to mandate exiled Mission Indians return. Once again, the court ruled in the favor of the Indians and their new employers. The court decreed: “In compliance with what you state to this Prefecture in your note of today, and the protest of the citizens who have Indians of the Mission of San Luis in their employ, it is well that the Alcaldes, who have come to claim them, limit themselves only take those who have no occupation.”⁶² In this case, the Indians gainfully employed on the surrounding ranchos and other workplaces could keep their jobs, but unemployed Indians were legally bound to go back. These two examples alone do not completely confirm or deny that the Mexican court favored the rights of Indian workers, but they do show that Indian labor was in demand, and that the court often ruled in favor of Indian workers.

The Mexican court, as reflected in the Los Angeles Prefecture records, generally treated Indians as deserving of some, though undoubtedly not all, the basic protections of citizens. Indians could petition and testify in all types of cases. Mexican courts often advocated for Indian workers. Indians did not fare as well when they fell under the

61. Los Angeles County Prefecture Records, vol. II, 528-59.

62. Los Angeles County Prefecture Records, vol. I, 551-54.

control of the local Los Angeles Pueblo Council or Ayuntamiento. Its laws and rulings were limiting to Indians, and often included forced labor. Ayuntamiento records supported the perception of harsh conditions for Indian workers in Mexican California historiography.⁶³ The Ayuntamiento was not a court; it was a city council that made city laws and enforced them as needed. These accounts reveal much more than instances in which Indians incarcerated for drunkenness were then forced to work as penance for their bad behavior. Many of the meeting minutes showed how much Indian labor remained in demand at the time. The pool of coerced Indian workers included the unemployed: men who received payment at the prevailing rate of one real and a half per day.

W. W. Roberson and George Philips examined Los Angeles Ayuntamiento meeting records and revealed details regarding Indians who occupied what is now the city of Los Angeles. They showed how Californios and foreigners treated the Indians and addressed the contributions made by the Indian laborers during the Mexican period. After re-examining their scholarship and the meeting minutes, issues regarding Indians appear to fall into three categories: drunkenness, labor, and Indian Village land. While the first and second categories are related, Indian land issues indicated that the Mexican Court often protected Indians' property rights as Mexican citizens.

In 1938, Robinson reviewed the entire collection of Los Angeles Ayuntamiento meeting records in the Los Angeles City Archives.⁶⁴ He focused on Indian issues from

63. Philips, *Vineyards & Vaqueros*; Silliman, *Lost Laborers*.

64. W. W. Robinson, *Land in California: The Story of Mission Lands, Ranchos, Squatters, Mining Claims, Railroad Grants, Land Scrip, and Homesteads* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1948).

1833 until the time when the American authorities took control in 1850.⁶⁵ He found that incarcerated and unemployed Indians often provided labor necessary to complete public works projects. In 1836, Rafael Guirado requested that the council consider improvement to the water system to increase water flow. This recommendation included rounding up the “drunken Indians” on the next Sunday and forcing them to work on this project. There are no records to confirm whether this happened, but other meeting records showed incarcerated Indians assigned to public work projects. An Indian arrested for drunkenness in the pueblo could serve eight to fifteen days of forced labor. As late as 1845, these sentences often presented hardship for local rancheros. In 1845, the Ayuntamiento made special arrangements for two Indians serving fifteen days of public works so that employers could determine the length of Indians’ sentences and could demand their early release at any time when their services were necessary on the rancho.⁶⁶

When public works projects were necessary, authorities gathered unemployed Indians in the Indian village to supply the labor. In 1839, the sexton of the San Gabriel mission complained of the deteriorating condition of the baptistery. The Ayuntamiento meeting minutes stated that: “The Ayuntamiento seeing the cost of repair would be nominal, ordered that on Sunday next the Alcalde for the Indians shall meet and bring together the Indians without a boss, so no one will be aggrieved, and placed to work thereon, using some posts and brea, now at the Guard House for the purpose.” The intention was to avoid taking Indians away from existing jobs, which would interrupt

65. Robinson, 159-66.

66. Ibid., 157-65.

both employers and employees.⁶⁷ Interestingly, Robinson's case study did not mention the so-called auction of Indian labor by the Ayuntamiento.

Following Robinson's interest in the Ayuntamiento, Philips (1980, 2010) engaged in a thorough re-examination of the same Ayuntamiento meeting minutes to understand Indians' social and economic roles in Mexican Los Angeles. Philips revealed a much clearer picture of the relationship between Californios, newly arriving foreigners, and Indians in the Los Angeles region during this period. Philips, like Robinson, noted that Indian drunkenness and unruly behavior challenged authorities' efforts to balance punishment with growing demands for Indian labor.⁶⁸

Philips noted that Indians often received protection under Mexican law, but remained at the bottom of the social ladder. Philips explained that Ayuntamiento policy segregated Californios and Indians during mass. A session in January 1845 included the following request, which indicated the prevailing sentiment toward the Indians at the time: "The syndic process that the Pres't destine (sic) for a place to hear mass apart from the whites, as these Indians are a dirty class and on mixing prevent the whites from hearing mass, and dirty their cloths."⁶⁹ Philips noted growing social unrest in the Indian village in 1844. The Ayuntamiento passed a resolution applying fines and incarceration to all unemployed Indians. Employers who fired a servant or laborer had to issue a document stating the circumstance of the release and whether the discharged employee

67. Ibid., 161.

68. Philips, 159-99.

69. Ibid., 194.

was free to find a new workplace. Those seeking employment applied for a certificate from the authorities.⁷⁰ Like many Ayuntamiento ordinances, there are no records of enforcement of these rules.

Analysis and Conclusion

This chapter's findings regarding Indian labor arrangements and conditions contest many prevailing assumptions in current California historiography and Mexican Haciendas studies. The Yorba account books and workers' personal testimonies confirm that Tomás Yorba paid Indian workers in food and silver. No evidence was found to suggest that he offered them any form of repressive credit at the ranch store. In reviewing the Yorba case study, legal records, and letters, the existence of debt peonage is highly questionable. In the case of Tomás Yorba, Indian workers received silver coins annually and on time. Further, there is evidence that his brother Bernardo did the same for Indian workers on Rancho Cañon de Santa Ana.⁷¹

The payment of wages in silver for Yorba Indian workers contests the assumption that a shortage of hard currency plagued the Mexican California economy as well as the Mexican haciendas and that hide and merchandise acted as its replacement. Barger, expanding on Dana's observations of a surplus of silver in California, offered a plausible explanation. The lack of formal banking and paper money may have required foreign merchants to arrive with boats stocked with goods and hard currency to pay for California hide and tallow. Given the lack of reliable shipping information reported to the Mexican

70. Ibid., 192-93.

71. Roberta S. Greenwood, "Historical and Archaeological Study of the Yorba-Slaughter Adobe, San Bernardino County," Los Angeles District, Corps of Engineering (1988), 17-18.

port authority, providing an accurate estimate of how much silver made it to the California shores is not possible. The fact that the Yorbas possessed an adequate supply of silver to cover the annual wages of ninety Indian workers in the amount of almost three hundred pesos suggests that hard currency played a much bigger role in the Mexican California economy than most scholars acknowledged.

Each of the scholars cited in this chapter argued that some form of debt peonage existed; however, evidence in the present study indicated that this was not the case. Weber confidently stated that nowhere was debt-peonage more prevalent than California; without the protection of missionaries, Indians were easy prey to debt schemes. Both Silliman and Philips suggested that Indian workers during the post secularization period had freedom at the workplace, but argued that a debt peonage system also prevailed to some extent. Hackel avoided committing to a single, definitive type of working arrangement, but ceded to the possibility that debt peonage existed.

Surprisingly, Indian workers on Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana received three pesos a month and an adequate supply of food. Tomás Yorba, at the time of his death, owed a handful of non-Indian laborers, but no Indians. In fact, Yorba's rancho account book showed, while non-Indian workers' wages consistently included store credits, the same was not the case for Yorba's ninety Indian workers.⁷² Indian account entries were few and appeared as one-time occurrences, unlike the non-Indian accounts whose purchase entries were ongoing and constituted a large portion of their monthly wages. There was no sign of debt peonage in oral testimony, account books, and letters from

72. Tomás Yorba, Business Ledgers.

Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana. The documentary evidence from Yorba and his acquaintances does not convincingly dispel the existence of debt peonage or some other form of coercive labor in Mexican California or the great Los Angeles area. Perhaps Yorba was an isolated exception. Yet, Indian workers assigned by the Ayuntamiento to repair the San Gabriel Mission baptistery received silver as well.

Socially, the Californios did not consider Indian workers and their families as equals. In general, they saw the Indians as dirty, uncivilized, and not worthy of the same economic and social benefits as non-Indian residents. Outside of the workplace, Indians lived in segregated housing, away from the rancho headquarters or in the Los Angeles Pueblo, housed only in the Indian Villages. In church, Indians prayed and attended mass far from other parishioners. Many Californios took Indian brides and adopted Indian children, sometimes rupturing social order in doing so.⁷³ The hide and tallow boom and the demand for Indian labor helped to improve the social divide to keep peace and order between the two groups, but did not eliminate it.

Past scholarship regarding the existence of debt peonage suggested that coercion prevailed. Monroy's *seigneurialism* thesis suggested that the working arrangements between rancheros and Indians were feudal and paternalistic. He compared the rancho with American cotton plantations.⁷⁴ Evidence from the Mexican courts and Ayuntamiento records suggests a much different picture. In the case of the cook who ran off another worker to work on another rancho, the court showed no interest in

73. Los Angeles County Prefecture Records, vol. A, I, II.

74. Monroy, 101-2

intervening. When the court and the Ayuntamiento became aware of New Mexicans attempting to sell captured young Indians as slaves, they arrested, convicted, and sentenced the sellers to an extended jail term. Hackel mentioned that rancheros occasionally captured rogue Indians from tribes outside of the regions and put them to work for the damages that they caused. There was no mention of this in the Mexican court or Ayuntamiento records. Rancheros likely found this was not a cost-effective labor approach.

The argument in favor of debt peonage or *seigneurialism* is that Indians lived under the control of Californios without any agency. However, sources revealed that Indians were not passive; they engaged in the legal system when they sought redress, petitioned the Mexican court and Ayuntamiento, and won most cases. When an Indian pleaded with the court to order the return of his wife and children from a non-Indian, the prefecture responded in the Indian's favor and ensured reunification. In the case of the protesting Indians at San Gabriel Mission who refused to work for a man who treated laborers harshly, the court ruled in favor of the Indians, removed the man from the worksite, and later sent him to jail. Foreigners and Californios often demanded Indian land; not until Americans arrived in the late 1840s did authorities agree to the requests. The same protective reaction arose when encroachers attempted to extend their properties onto Los Angeles Pueblo Indian land. Mexican prefectures approved all Indian applications for land they improved.⁷⁵

75. Los Angeles County Prefecture Records, vol. A, I, II.

If debt peonage or similar forms of compensation existed, as past scholars suggested, where is the evidence to support such claims? Cook suggested it years ago, and few scholars contested it. Legal records from this place and time only mention Indian workers owing their employers in the story of a fleeing cook and her partner and the five Yorba workers' brief participation in the credit market. Of the numerous probate inventories in Mexican Court records, no Indian worker owed any estate; in a few cases, the estate owed the Indian staff. Also missing from the legal records were complaints from Indians or their employers about working issues, which is significant because both groups were quite willing to petition the court over much lesser matters.

Finally, it is also important to note that the limited scope and sources in this case study make it difficult to claim that Indian worker conditions across California during this period modeled Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana. It is possible that other ranchos in the Los Angeles area engaged in oppressive Indian working arrangements. This study, however, strongly suggests that debt peonage arrangements did not exist on the Yorba rancho during this period. Indian workers received silver instead of store credit. Both Dana's observation of an excess supply of silver in Mexican California and Barger's rationale for the surplus call for scholars to re-examine the Mexican California economy. Indians who toiled on Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana did so as a lower class that never received the luxuries afforded to Yorba and his close friends and family; yet, they seemed content with their situation. If not, perhaps they could have left the rancho, moved to another rancho, or voiced their discontent to the Mexican California legal authorities.

CHAPTER THREE:

Early American California and the Indian Worker

For a very brief time, after California came under the control of the United States in 1848, the California ranchos continued to operate under the same political and economic conditions as they had under Mexican control. However, this was short lived. James Marshall's discovery of gold on Sutter's Mill—which shortly followed the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo—resulted in a steady flow of new emigrants, mostly Anglo-Americans. Soon after, in 1851, a number of new state and federal laws challenged the rancheros' land titles while stripping away the Indians' equal protection rights. Rancho owners were now called upon to prove in American courts that they were the legal owners of their lands while, at the same time, aggressive squatters attempted to wrestle the lands away. The Indians, who were once considered Mexican citizens, fared worse, losing their right to testify in a court of law. Yet, remarkably, both the rancheros and their Indian workers learned to navigate through many of these social and legal barriers for another twenty years. This chapter, like the previous one, focuses on Indian labor arrangements on the ranchos located in the Southern California region. It presents a case study of Henry Dalton's Rancho Azusa, from 1850 to 1870, in an effort to further reveal the working conditions on the Southern California ranchos.

Early American California Economy

While the demand for hide and tallow gradually decreased at the end of the Mexican California period, this did not spell the end of the California ranchos' success, especially for those located in Southern California. As droves of new emigrant men

arrived in Northern California to try their luck panning gold, a new demand for rancho foodstuff saved the day for rancheros such as Stearns, Yorba, and Dalton. Beef, which had provided little commercial value during the hide-and-tallow boom in Mexican California, was now in great demand. Prior to this time, the average price for a California steer rarely exceeded four dollars. Yet, in 1849, a Southern California ranchero could earn up to twenty dollars a head.¹ Many of the ranchos thrived as a result of their success raising large herds of cattle, growing crops, and producing wine for the new arrivals in the north. However, politics, market forces, epidemics, and extreme weather all contributed to make this a very short-lived era. And, in 1857, a cattle glut and falling prices spelled the beginning of the end for most of the California ranchos.²

During this cattle boom, tens of thousands of cattle from the southern ranges were driven north, either through the San Joaquin Valley or a route that hugged the coast line. These herds averaged seven hundred to one thousand head, but at times the number reached as high as 2,500. Each herd was guided by a trail boss (mayordomo) and three or more cowboys (vaqueros). The cost to accomplish the journey varied between two and four dollars a head. Often, wholesale stampedes, Indian raids, severe storms, or cattle thieves took a toll on the herds, but in most circumstances these factors did not cause significant loss. Clearly, California too participated in the early era of the American cowboy; however, the workers were Indians which, as Robert Cleland pointed out,

1. See Hugo Reid testimony in Susanna B. Dakin, *A Scotch Paisano in Old Los Angeles: Hugo Reid's Life in California, 1832-1852 Derived from His Correspondence* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1839), 170; Robert G. Cleland, *The Cattle on a Thousand Hills: Southern California, 1850-1880* (San Marino: Huntington Library Press, 1841), 103.

2. Cleland, *Cattle on a Thousand Hills*, 110.

American historians have for the most part ignored: “In economic significance and picturesque detail, the traffic was comparable to the great cattle drives over the Bozeman Trail of Montana or the Abilene Trail of Kansas. But despite its historical importance and adventurous background, the subject has been in both the historical and romantic literature of the state, and material on it, whether statistical or descriptive, is disappointingly meager.”³ Regardless, the cattle drive and the growing demand for beef fostered a strong economic relationship between the Southern rancheros and newly arriving Anglo-American entrepreneurs in the north.

With this demand for beef also came a renewed demand for labor, especially for Indian vaqueros. During the cattle boom in the 1850s, California rancheros relied on both skilled and non-skilled Indian workers, who seemed well aware of their advantage in a shrinking labor market. And, for a very brief time, the California Indians were able to negotiate better wages and working conditions. Nowhere was this more evident than on Rancho Los Alamitos, where Charles Brinley, the manager, struggled to maintain an adequate supply of workers throughout the cattle boom period. In 1850, its 28,512 acres supported 10,000 cattle, 700 wild horses, 109 tamed horses, 1,100 sheep, and an assortment of other animals. Two years later, Abel Stearns, the Don of this rancho, employed seventeen Indians.⁴

Brinley’s responsibilities included supervising the cattle and other related tasks required to raise the herds and bring them to market. He often took his men to rodeos on

3. Ibid., 104.

4. John C. Hough, “John Henry Brinley: A Case Study in Rancho Supervision,” *The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly* 40 (June 1958): 174-79.

surrounding ranchos or sent his *mayordomo* and vaqueros to ensure that all the cattle were counted and branded. Other duties included ordering the slaughter, rendering the fat, processing the hide, and managing the cattle drive.⁵

As the hide-and-tallow export business declined in the late 1840s, so did the supply of silver that arrived from the Boston merchant ships. In response, worker compensation appeared to change. For example, on Rancho Los Alamitos—and demonstrated later in greater detail on Rancho Azusa—most wages came in the form of store credit and debit. Both Stearns and Dalton kept a firm hand on their cash boxes and seldom paid any workers in silver.⁶ Surprisingly, neither rancheros nor Indian workers seemed to take advantage of this credit arrangement. For example, when a worker quit on Brinley in 1852, Stearns settled up with the worker by paying him the twenty dollars minus his \$1.70 store debt.⁷

From Brinley's testimony, his greatest challenge appears to have been keeping a steady number of Indian workers. Indian workers came and went as they found improved opportunities. In 1852, as Brinley prepared to head out to round up cattle from Elsinore, one Indian worker, well-aware of the growing demand for vaqueros, refused to participate unless he received two dollars a day, or three if he needed to supply his own horse, while another worker demanded five dollars. In this case, both offers were rejected, and Brinley left five workers short of what he originally planned. But, in other

5. Ibid., 174-75.

6. Ibid., 176.

7. Ibid., 176.

cases, Brinley would gladly accept requests for higher wages, especially for high performing workers. He agreed to pay an Indian boy as much as one dollar a day, stating that “he’s a good boy, and if he would remain here, would prove serviceable.” Rancho Los Alamitos also welcomed disgruntled Indian workers in flight from abusive rancheros. One such refugee, Cerritos, fled the notorious John Temple, who claimed that the boy left with stolen rancho property. Brinley was more than happy to hire this young worker, praising him as “the only good servant that has been upon this rancho during my stay here, who has shown himself at all times prompt, and ready to do anything to the best of his availability.”⁸ Faced with a shrinking pool of labor and a rancho to run, Brinley had to attend to labor demands both carefully and frequently to keep up with rancho production requirements.

The auctioning of prisoner workers provided another valuable source of labor, which the local rancheros began to depend on as early as the Mexican period. Indians incarcerated for public drunkenness on the streets of Los Angeles became attractive recruits whenever rancheros found themselves in need of workers. Quite often, some of the most reliable and skilled Indian workers would find themselves rounded up and jailed during a weekend binge. While the usual sentence was fourteen days, agreeing to new employment served as a “get out of jail free pass.” On one occasion—when Brinley was desperately short of vaqueros, shepherds, and cooks—he pleaded with Stearns to “send someone to attend the auction that usually takes place on Mondays and buy me five or six

8. Ibid., 177.

Indians.”⁹ Yet, while rancheros could easily acquire the services of these imprisoned Indian workers in town, keeping them was a much greater challenge. Indians demanded higher wages and better treatment; if their current boss did not accommodate them, others would.

At times, Indian contract labor served to address the growing demands of the Indian workers or provide temporary help when rancheros required additional help beyond their in-house staff. In 1856, as Stearns prepared to drive his cattle to the northern markets, his vaqueros refused to participate unless they received four dollars a day. Finding the wages too high, Stearns contacted the leader of the Luiseños and brokered a deal to acquire the necessary help for a significantly lower cost.¹⁰ Like most Los Angeles rancheros who ran large vineyard enterprises, Dalton relied heavily on the temporary help from the migrant Cahuilla each fall, starting as early as 1846. Once the labor-intensive vineyard tasks at Rancho Azusa were completed, the Cahuilla would continue to move west and provide similar services to other rancheros. This relationship between the rancheros and the Indian migrants lasted until the 1870s.¹¹

While most Californian rancheros and their Indian workers benefitted from the cattle boom of the early American period, challenges from new economic institutions

9. Ibid., 177.

10. Abel Stearns to Cave Johnson Coutts 1856, Box 18, Abel Stearns Papers, Huntington Library.

11. Sheldon G. Jackson, *A British Ranchero in Old California: The Life and Times of Henry Dalton and the Rancho Azusa* (Glendale: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1987), 194.

gradually made this success more difficult to sustain.¹² Significantly, various federal and state laws placed both rancheros and Indians at a disadvantage to their newly arriving white-Anglo neighbors. During the Mexican period, both survived with little or no governmental interference and, more importantly, very little taxation. Yet, that all changed with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo and California coming under United States control. Five months before California acquired statehood in 1850, the Americans in control enacted the notorious “Act for the Government and Protection of Indians.” This act, created under the guise of Indian worker protection, made the practice of bound Indian labor legal.¹³

The former Mexican California rancheros also faced challenges with the transfer of power and authority. In 1851, President Millard Fillmore signed the “California Land Act of 1851,” originally known as “An Act to Ascertain and Settle the Private Land Claims in the State of California.” This law required each California ranchero to prove to federal authorities that they held legal claim to their property holdings. And, to make matters worse, in an effort to cover their legal expenses with loans, they faced the exorbitant interest rates now allowed by American law.¹⁴ Therefore, American colonization and the new laws did not favor either the Californios or Indians, but the struggle was much greater for the Indians.

12. Economic institutions are “devised as formal rules (sanctions, taboos, customs, traditions, codes of conducts) and formal rules (constitution, laws, property rights).” See Douglas C. North, “Institutions,” *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5 (Winter 1991): 97.

13. Michael F. Magliari, “Free State Slavery: Bound Indian Labor and Slave Trafficking in California’s Sacramento Valley,” *Pacific Historical Review* 81 (May 2012): 157.

14. Cleland, 33-50.

The Indian Act of 1850 legalized the practice of convict-leasing popular during the Mexican period, in which the local prisons offered the rancheros an additional source of Indian laborers. What differentiated the practice from that of the Mexican period was that, during the American period, Indian children could be removed from their families and bound to work as domestic servants under the custodial care of the private homes.

The related provision, as reported by the Californian Research Bureau, read:

Any person could go before a Justice of the Peace to obtain Indian children for Indenture. The Justice determined whether or not compulsory means were used to obtain the child. If the Justice was satisfied that no coercion occurred, the person obtained a certificate that authorized him to have the care, custody, control, and earnings of an Indian Minor until the age of majority (for males, eighteen years, and females fifteen years).

While this provision appeared to protect Indians from being taken against their will, another section of the law made it virtually impossible to contest the practice. The CBR further pointed out that “while Indians or white persons could make complaints before the Justice of the Peace, ‘in no case could a man be convicted of any offence[s] upon the testimony of an Indian or Indians.’”¹⁵ This clause made it almost impossible for Indians to seek any legal redress at the workplace.

As the California Indians lost their equal protection under California State law, the Californios also faced challenges with securing property titles. The Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo clearly stated that: “In the said territories, property of every kind, now belonging to Mexicans not established there, shall be inviolably respected. The present owners, the heirs of these, and all Mexicans who may hereafter acquire said

15. Kimberly Johnson-Dobbs, *CBR-02-014, Early California Laws and Policies Related to California Indians* (Sacramento: California State Library, 2002), 10-13; see also Alan F. Heizer and Alan F. Almquit, *The Other Californians: Prejudice, and Discrimination under Spain, Mexico, and The United States to 1920* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), 23-64.

property by contract, shall enjoy with respect to it guarantees equally ample as if the same belonged to citizens of the United States.” While, initially, the American authorities protected the rancheros’ rights to keep their property, Congress did not. In 1851, it passed a law that challenged the validity of every land title in California. The President assigned three commissioners to “ascertain and settle the Private Land Claims” related to all California titles held under Mexican or Spanish grants. All claims falling outside the set, two-year period would result in the outright forfeit of the property titles. Overwhelmed with over eight hundred claims, the commission’s three-year appointment was extended to five.¹⁶

Over twelve million acres of California land was adjudicated by the commission, which approved 520 claims and rejected 273. The rest of the claims were either withdrawn by the claimants or dismissed by the commissioners. Robert Cleland suggested that the commissioners appeared fair: “Despite occasional charges of bias, sometimes by large landholders, sometimes by settlers, the Commissioners apparently performed their difficult and involved tasks as impartially and expeditiously as circumstances could expect.” Claimants could appeal the commission’s decisions to the court and, in most cases, they did; however, over sixty percent of the time, the rulings were sustained.¹⁷

Even though most California rancheros succeeded in the process of holding their property titles, this came at a great cost. Time away from managing enterprises to attend

16. Cleland, 33-40.

17. Ibid., 38.

hearings and exorbitant attorney fees made keeping ranchos financially solvent a significant challenge for the rancheros. During a period when hard currency was in short supply, rancheros were left to sell or mortgage their primary asset: their land. Rancheros, who were accustomed to an open-handed credit system where debtors were seldom pressured for payments, were now required to pay under well-defined terms. In addition, the new American lenders imposed compounded interest on each loan, and often engaged in predatory lending practices that made repayment difficult if not impossible. For example, a short-term mortgage, often necessary to sustain market difficulties or to pay attorney fees for title claims in court, were frequently secured by property value that significantly exceeded the value of the loan.¹⁸

While under-valued property security was problematic, it did not compare to the interest levels charged during the post Gold Rush period. In 1850, Don Juan Bandini borrowed ten thousand dollars from a San Diego lender. The interest applied to the loan was a shocking four percent per month, which was comparatively low. In 1852, Dolores Valenzuela defaulted on two mortgages of \$2,200 and agreed to eight percent interest per month. With these high compound interest loans, it did not take long for the original debt to grow exponentially. In 1861, Júlio Verdugo mortgaged the portion of Rancho San Rafael inherited from his father for \$3,445.37. Eight years later, the principal had grown to \$58,750, leaving Verdugo landless.¹⁹ Further, a litany of such stories can be found in

18. Ibid., 111.

19. Ibid., 111-12.

the nineteenth-century new papers and literature, where once proud California Rancheros became landless and penniless, primarily due to these predatory lending practices.

In addition to these high lending costs, the U.S. government now assessed taxes on the rancheros' personal property. Prior to American annexation, the Californios funded their government costs primarily from import duties on the products arriving on foreign ships. Under the Constitution of 1849, the new property tax became the law of the land and the major source of revenue for the California government. In Southern California, where the rancheros owned large amounts of land, they were assessed between \$0.50 and \$0.25 an acre, and were now expected to pay taxes to both the state and the county. In 1862, Abel Stearns' personal property was assessed at \$90,930 and, based on the rate of \$0.25 per acre, his land was valued at \$96,743. To settle his 1862 tax bill in full, he paid a county tax of \$3,753.46 and a state tax of \$1,163.57. Combined, it cost an additional \$4,917.03 to live under the new American rule, with little or no value added in return. In fact, many of the Californios from the southern counties continued to voice their opposition to what they believed was an unfair method of taxation and, in 1859, introduced a law in the state assembly calling for the secession of the Spanish counties of Los Angeles, San Barbara, San Luis Obispo, and San Diego. While the legislation called for these counties to form a new "Territory of Colorado," the proposition failed.²⁰

In addition to these additional costs and operational challenges for the California rancheros in the early American period, extreme weather and ravaging epidemics served

20. Ibid., 117-24.

to deliver the final blow leading to the ranchos' decline. For decades, California, especially in the southern region where most of the large ranchos were located, experienced ideal weather for raising cattle and growing crops and grapes. Yet, from 1861 to 1865, extreme weather produced atypical floods and droughts not previously experienced in the rancheros' memories. Starting around Christmas 1861, and continuing for over a month, rain fell consistently and in tropical quantities. Thousands of cattle drowned, leading to a complete paralysis of business and resulting in the loss of over a quarter of the state's wealth. The flood of 1861-1862 was followed by two years of severe drought. Little to no rain fell, prompting one ranchero to complain to Stearns in February 1863, that "we have had no rain yet" and "there is no grass and the cattle are very poor; your Rancho men report a great many dying. Should we have no rain your cattle buyers will get nothing but hide and bones." The actual cost of the extreme weather was reflected in the decline of property value. In Los Angeles County, the number of cattle significantly decreased from seventy thousand in 1860 to twenty thousand in 1870. After the drought, Los Angeles property value also witnessed a sharp drop, as revealed in the change of assessed value. In 1862, grazing land was assessed at \$0.25 an acre, but plunged to \$0.12 an acre in 1863. In Los Angeles County, the total value—including land, improvements, and personal property—was assessed as \$1,018,476 in 1864, sinking to \$833,957 the following year. During the three years of extreme weather, the landowners of Los Angeles County were so pressed for available funds that over eighty percent of taxpayers were delinquent on their tax payments.²¹ Adding to the woes of the

21. Ibid., 126-37.

California rancheros during the early 1860s, cattle prices dropped as competition from eastern and southern herds began to flood the northern California market.²² These weather and economic factors presented major challenges to keeping the ranchos, especially those located in Southern California, afloat.

To make matters worse, in the fall 1862, southern California suffered an epidemic of Smallpox. The region had few physicians, and much-needed vaccines arrived too late to stem exposure to the disease. The Indians in Los Angeles, who lived in deplorable conditions, made no attempt to quarantine those stricken by the plague.²³ Their improvised treatment for the disease, which included “sweating followed by a plunge in cold water,” provided little relief. The epidemic finally ran its course by March, having killed over half of all Indians living in Los Angeles County and leaving the rancheros with significantly fewer Indian workers.²⁴ In 1868, Smallpox reappeared in the Los Angeles area, again infecting and killing Indians; this time, the number of casualties was much smaller since the population of Indians had already diminished to a fraction of what it had been in 1860.²⁵

Unfortunately, the rancheros who depended mostly on both skilled and unskilled Indians witnessed a steady decline in the Indian population throughout the early American period. In 1850, the Indians represented 3,693 of the Los Angeles County

22. Ibid., 108-11.

23. Ibid., 131-32.

24. John W. Robinson, *Los Angeles in Civil War Days: 1860-1865, LA in Civil War Days Epidemic* (Los Angeles: Dawson Book Shop, 1977), 113-19.

25. Phillips, *Vineyards & Vaqueros*, 292.

population of 7,223: over fifty-one percent.²⁶ In 1860, while the white population had grown to 11,246, the Indians only accounted for eighteen percent of the population of 2,014. In 1870, only 219 Indians were reported in the census, leaving the rancheros with very few available Indian workers.²⁷

Case Study of Henry Dalton and Rancho Azusa

In 1844, Henry Dalton settled permanently in the Los Angeles area after twenty years of operating as a trader in Peru and ten years as a merchant in Mexico. Upon his arrival in Mexican California, he set up a lucrative retail business trading his wares for hides, tallow, grain, wine, and, on a few rare occasions, silver coins. Yet, Dalton's ambitions did not stop with his successful merchant enterprise; he sought to become a wealthy ranchero. Dalton's timing and situation could not have been better in terms of his effort to acquire his own rancho. During the Mexican California period, selling and buying rancho property was strictly prohibited. Only the reigning Mexican governor could grant land, but, in an unusual circumstance, Dalton secured the opportunity to purchase Rancho Azusa from Alcalde Luis Arenas, who owed the national treasury a thousand dollars. At the time, Governor José Manuel Micheltorena was desperate for funds to raise a force to fend off the rebellion from revolutionaries in Northern California and gladly allowed Dalton to pay the money owed to the state by Arenas; in return, on December 24, 1844, Dalton claimed the property title of the Rancho.²⁸

26. For the population of California Indians, see Cook, *Conflict Between*, 55 and United States Census of 1850.

27. United States Census of 1860 and 1870; Philips, 292.

28. Jackson, 69-78.




Figure 3.1. Map of the exterior boundaries and official locations of Ranchos San Jose addition to San Jose and Azusa. *Source:* UCLA, Library Special Collections, Charles E. Young Research Library.





Figure 3.2. The Dalton winery. *Source:* Sheldon G. Jackson, *A British Ranchero in Old California*.

AZUSA RANCH BELL
The bell was purchased
by Henry Dalton in Mexico
in 1845. It was used at the
Rancho for twenty-five years.
Courtesy, Azusa Historical Museum



THE DALTON FAMILY AT AZUSA
The family stands midst the vineyard in this photo from the 1860s. In
the foreground, Valentin Dalton leans on the hoe next to sister Ellen;
young Henry Dalton is directly behind Ellen, and in front of sister
Soyla and friend sitting by the fence; father Henry is to their right,
and Winnall prepares to kill a bullock.
Courtesy, Azusa Historical Museum

Figure 3.3. The Azusa ranch bell and the Dalton family at Azusa. *Source:* Sheldon G. Jackson, *A British Ranchero in Old California*.




Figure 3.4. Rancho Azusa November 1856. *Source: Sheldon G. Jackson, A British Ranchero in Old California.*

In the Rancho Azusa deal, Dalton acquired 34,000 acres of prime growing and grazing land; for an additional three thousand dollars, he purchased for a bargain the ranchos' existing livestock and vineyards with seven thousand vines. The following year,

Dalton acquired the Rancho San Francisquito in the more transitional manner of a Mexican Land Grant from Governor Pio Pico. After purchasing Rancho San Anita from Hugo Reid in 1847, Dalton's Rancho enterprise covered 45,000 acres, spanning almost the entire San Gabriel Mountain foothills. The rancho encompassed present day Azusa, Arcadia, Monrovia, Irwindale, Baldwin Park, Sierra Madre, Pasadena, and San Marino.²⁹

All Rancho Azusa activities centered on Dalton Hill, located on the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains. The family's large and extravagant Mexican-style home served as the centerpiece of Dalton's rancho enterprise. Northeast of the ranch house stood the winery, which was the largest building on the property. Other structures of various sizes included a cotton gin, grain storage tanks, a blacksmith's shop, a carpenter's shop, corrals for sheep and horses, and a chicken coop. About a quarter of a mile northeast of the family homestead, fifteen ramshackle shacks served as housing for the Indian laborers and their families. Nearby was the busy mill, which often ran twenty-four hours a day, as well as the miller and his family's small adobe. A corral holding fifty to sixty hogs and hundreds of beehives was also located in this vicinity.³⁰

Dalton's original rancho plan included running a large cattle ranch, but, in December 1850, he embarked on his last attempt to take advantage. Complaining of a serious Indian labor shortage, he opted to herd his thirteen hundred cattle to the market in the north, rather than process the beef products in-house. Dalton's expectation was to walk away with a profit of twenty thousand dollars. Unfortunately, during the journey,

29. *Ibid.*, 77-78.

30. *Ibid.*, 163-66.

they were confronted by three hundred Tulare Indians at Four Creeks in the southern San Joaquin Valley. While Dalton survived, many of his party did not; to make matters worse, the confrontation resulted in the cattle scattering in all directions.³¹ In response to this costly disaster, Dalton abandoned the cattle business and set out to diversify and engage in a variety of new enterprises. Yet, even before Four Creeks, viticulture was a high priority and a major revenue source, along with the mill.³²

Dalton not only grew grapes, but also processed them into wine and brandy. In particular, Dalton boasted of his white wines and Muscatel. The mill was even busier, making use of the small grains produced on the rancho. At great expense and with hard labor, workers cleared very large fields for the purpose of growing wheat and barley. Additional wheat was shipped in from surrounding ranchos, keeping the mill running continuously. Dalton's mill supplied flour to both Los Angeles and San Francisco.³³ Dalton also delved into a number of smaller enterprises and often experimented with alternative crops. In 1845, Dalton took a chance at raising cotton and set up his own gin, which was modestly successful. The same was true for his effort to harvest tobacco and manufacture cigars. He raised a variety of vegetables including corn, potatoes, beans, pumpkins, watermelons, and others. In addition to vegetables, the rancho produced a wide range of fruits, such as olives, oranges, figs, peaches, apricots, pomegranates, quinces, limes, and oranges. To assist with taking care of these crops, Dalton acquired the

31. Ibid., 134-38.

32. Ibid., 168.

33. Ibid., 168-69.

latest farming equipment and machinery. In 1859, he purchased one of the earliest mechanical threshers to assist with the workload required to cultivate his large wheat and barley fields. And, when the thrasher was idle, he rented it out to neighboring rancheros.³⁴

Rancho Azusa was one of the largest and more successful California ranchos from its purchase in 1845 until the mid-1870s when Dalton could no longer pay the mortgages and debt he had accumulated, and found himself conceding to the newly arriving Anglo-American squatters.³⁵ The Dalton story, as presented by Sheldon Jackson, is one that, at a minimum, is equally important as those of the other Ranchero-Merchants, such as Abel Stearns and the Yorba family. Further, the rich sources left by the Dalton estates offer insight to the operation of a California rancho; more importantly, they include valuable detailed Indian worker records.

The Indian Workers of Rancho Azusa

Dalton kept meticulous rancho operational records and his descendants saw the value in safeguarding his diary and Indian account books. Using these sources—the daily diary of the rancho activity between the years of 1844 and 1864, and detailed Indian wage account books representing wage and store purchase transactions between the years of 1856 and 1863—this chapter develops the story of the Azusa Indian workers.

In an effort to make sense of the Indian wage book data, I have created a database representing each line entry. The database fields include worker names, date worked,

34. Ibid., 169.

35. Jackson, 201-17; United States Census of 1850.

days worked, wages earned, products purchased, purchased quantities, purchase costs, and cash received. The sample datasets found on page eighty-one provide an example of the database. Each product was assigned one of ninety-three material codes for the goods sold at the Dalton company store, which represent a wide variety of consumer goods. It is also noteworthy that there are some gaps in the database datasets, due to what appear to be gaps in the entries from February 1860 through December 1860, and for six months in 1861. Regardless, the reports created in this database offer valuable insights into the lives of Indian workers who labored on one of the largest California ranchos during the early America period.

During the period of 1856 to 1863, as recorded in the Indian wage books, 161 Indians worked for Dalton on Rancho Azusa. Jackson pointed out that, when Dalton arrived on the Azusa rancho, he stated that he expected “a day’s work for a day’s pay,” and those who were not actively employed were not welcome to live on the rancho.³⁶ As shown in Table 1, Dalton’s Indian workers earned between \$0.46 and \$0.59 a day, and those who were part of the workforce could also expect housing and food for both themselves and their families.

Figure 3.5. Sample page of the Dalton account books.

In addition, the Indians on Azusa were allowed to grow their own crops and gather acorns to supplement the monthly allocation of food.³⁷ While these arrangements

36. Jackson, 73.

37. Daily Occurrences at Azusa, 6 August 1845, DL1138-1144, Henry Dalton Collection, Huntington Library, San Marino, CA; Azusa Indian Account Books, vols. I-IV, DL1158, Henry Dalton Collection.

seem similar to Yorba's during the Mexican period, differences existed. The Azusa Indians no longer lived in their local huts, but rather in rancho wood shacks away from their own Indian communities. In addition, the Azusa Indians became much more dependent on the Dalton's store and merchandise.³⁸

Table 1. Sample of Indian account book datasets

First Name	Last Name	Date	Days Worked	Wages Earned	Material Amount	Material Cost	Material Code	Cash Distribution
Coyote		Jan-57	11	5.6				
Coyote		Jan-57			1	0.4	5	
Coyote		Jan-57			1	1.6	8	
Coyote		Jan-57			1	1.2	41	
Coyote		Jan-57			1	0.2	5	
Coyote		Jan-57			1	0.4	5	
Coyote		Jan-57			1	0.4	5	
Coyote		Jan-57						1
Coyote		Jan-57			1	0.6	5	
Coyote		Jul-57	7	3				
Coyote		Jul-57			1	0.4	5	
Coyote		Jul-57						1

38. Jackson, 166.

(Table 1 continued)

First Name	Last Name	Date	Days Worked	Wages Earned	Material Amount	Material Cost	Material Code	Cash Distribution
Coyote		Jul-57			1	0.4	5	
Coyote		Jul-57						1
Felix		Jul-58	6	2.2				
Felix		Jul-58			1	0.4	5	
Felix		Jul-58						1
Felix		Jul-58			1	0.4	5	
Ignacio		Oct-58	11	2.6				
Ignacio		Oct-58			1	2		
Ignacio		Oct-58			1	0.2		
Ignacio		Oct-58			1	0.2	43	
Ignacio		Oct-58			1	0.2	9	
Tamaris		Jun-58	15	6				
Tamaris		Jun-58			1	3	30	
Tamaris		Jun-58						1
Tamaris		Jun-58			1	0.6	5	
Tamaris		Jun-58			1	0.3	5	
Tamaris		Jun-58						2
Tamaris		Jun-58						1
Tamaris		Jun-58			1	0.3	6	
Tamaris		Jun-58			2	0.8	5	
Tamaris		Jun-58						4.2
Tamaris		Jun-58			1	2	16	
Tamaris		Jun-58						1
Tamaris		Jun-58			1	0.2	5	

Table 2. Rancho Azusa products and codes

Material Description	Material Code	Material Description	Material Code	Material Description	Material Code
india	1	honey	32	mercada	63
blankets	2	card game	33	flannel shirts	64
rope	3	knife	34	From Other	65
wine	4	dress	35	handkerchief	66
aguardente	5	rags	36	To Others	67
empty	6	tread	37	rice	68
empty	7	empty	38	wheat	69
shirt	8	corn flour	39	belt	70
empty	9	soap	40	biscuits	71
flask	10	empty	41	whiskey	72
mustard	11	cards	42	pills	73
bread	12	To others	43	salt	74
shoes	13	wood	44	sardines	75
cigar	14	crackers	45	cotton	76
game	15	patches	46	beef	77
pants	16	candles	47	matches	78
empty	17	muslin	48	comb	79
calico	18	flannel cloth	49	potatoes	80
empty	19	horse feed	50	molasses	81
baraja	20	medicine	51	shorts	82
empty	21	relic	53	overhauls	83
tobacco	22	sheep	54	hickory shirt	84
sugar	23	tie	55	powder	85
brandy	24	flour	56	coffee	86
gauze	25	café	57	beans	87
veil	26	grain	58	ham	88
wool	27	paper	59	corn meal	89
silverware	28	socks	60	chickens	90
hat	29	cards	61	nails	91
fresada	30	housing	62	tea	92
				butter	93




Figure 3.6. Sample of Dalton daily occurrences on Rancho Azusa.

Table 3. Indian daily wages on Rancho Azusa

Year	Workers	Average Day Wages
1856	9	0.59
1857	34	0.49
1858	34	0.49
1859	72	0.54
1860	9	0.46
1861	20	0.47
1862	59	0.54
1863	10	0.48

Rancho Azusa and its many enterprise activities kept the Indians working six days a week, with Sunday as their day of rest, evidenced by excerpts from the Dalton diary. On Monday January 27, 1862, Dalton noted that “eight Indians cleaned out ditches, two gathered cuttings in the vineyard, three framed a roof, and one trimmed sets.” The next day, “nine cleaned out ditches, two gathered cuttings in the vineyards, one trimmed sets, and three framed a roof.” On Thursday March 13, 1862, five Indians assisted with road repair near the ditches, while the rest spent the day hoeing the vineyards. A month later, the same Indians repaired a dam and, in the summer of the same year, a crew of Indians harvested the new wheat crop with the assistance of Dalton’s new thrashing machine. Other tasks included mill work, shelling corn, and occasionally rebuilding wagons.³⁹

39. Daily Occurrences at Azusa, January and March 1862.

Clearly, when a job needed to be done on Azusa, Dalton usually relied on his Indian workforce.

The Indians worked six days a week and often spent their day off engaging in heavy drinking. In most Sunday ranch diary entries, Dalton reported on the Indians' drinking and dispositions. On Sunday January 5, 1862, Dalton noted that "the Indians were comfortably drunk" and a week later that the "Indians are merry." Later in that month, he complained that "Indians all drunk broke into the store and stole two gal of whiskey." On occasion, the Indians took their drinking into town; however, no available records show the Dalton Indians running into any trouble or being detained and arrested. More importantly, no matter how drunk the Indians were on Sunday, they consistently reported to work on Monday and during the rest of the work week.⁴⁰ Interestingly, there was no record of Dalton charging those who stole the whiskey in either the account book or diary.⁴¹

Indian alcohol consumption and abuse is prevalent throughout California Indian scholarship, which paints a picture of hapless, drunken, and dependent Indians. While the Azusa Indians drank on Sunday, they also worked the rest of the week and seemed to limit this vice to once a week. Scholars, including Street, have also suggested that the Indian rancho workers spent most of their earnings on alcohol. However, the Table 4 figures on Indians' spending on alcohol present a very different picture.

40. Daily Occurrences at Azusa, January 1862.

41. Dalton Indian Account Books.

Table 4. Indian worker alcohol purchases on Rancho Azusa

Year	All Ind Workers	Alcohol Sales	Annual Wages	Annual Purchases	Percentage of Wages	Percentage of Alcohol Purchases	Average Alcohol Purchases
1856	9	15.6	123	91.52	13	17	1.73
1857	34	207.08	917	767.4	23	27	6.09
1858	34	131.66	562.77	472.04	23	28	3.87
1859	72	371.69	2075.02	1485.75	18	25	5.16
1860	9	33.22	121.3	96.22	27	35	3.69
1861	20	91.08	435.71	319.25	21	29	4.56
1862	59	237	1332.54	1059.14	18	22	4.02
1863	10	26.55	93.65	120.08	28	22	.38
Totals	247	1113.88	5660.99	4411.4	20	25	4.51

Throughout the period included in the Indian account books, the Indian workers only spent an average of twenty percent of their wages on alcohol. In 1857, 1858, 1859, and 1862, when Indian worker employment was at its highest, the Indians spent between eighteen percent and twenty-two percent of their wages on alcohol. During these years, the average worker spent between four and six dollars annually on alcohol, equating to roughly eight to twelve days of their yearly wages. It is also worth noting what type of alcohol the Indian workers consumed. Their selections included wine, whisky, brandy, and aguardente, all produced and sold by Dalton. The most popular choice was aguardente, which cost between \$0.40 and \$0.50 a gallon, and represented over fifty-eight percent of the alcohol purchases recorded. Brandy, the second most popular choice,

which cost between \$0.40 and \$0.60 a gallon, comprised sixteen percent of alcohol transactions. That was followed by whisky and wine, at fourteen percent and twelve percent, respectively. Both of these product prices appeared to vary greatly, which may have been due to shifts in demand and supply at the company store.⁴² While the Indian workers certainly, from time to time, appreciated drinking the finer brandies, wines, and whiskies produced on the rancho, most seemed to prefer aguardente, potentially influenced by its lower cost. In the examination of the database of Indian account data, the Indian wages and company store transactions show that a small amount of debt existed on Rancho Azusa. Interestingly, many of the same trends found in the Cross study of the Mexican Haciendas also existed on Azusa.

Table 5. Indian worker indebtedness on Rancho Azusa

Year	Workers	Average Day Wages	Workers In Debt	Percentage in Debt	Average Worker Debt	Workers Owed	Percentage Owed	Average Rancho Debt
1856	9	0.59	2	22.2	3.95	7	77.8	9.05
1857	34	0.49	15	44.1	11.4	19	55.9	10.22
1858	34	0.49	15	44.1	4.71	19	55.9	3.83
1859	72	0.54	31	43.1	6.34	41	56.9	15.08
1860	9	0.46	3	33.3	2.28	6	66.7	6.13
1861	20	0.47	5	25	6.04	15	75	4.34
1862	59	0.54	33	55.1	5.72	26	44.9	3.85
1863	10	0.48	7	70	1.86	3	30	2.03

42. Dalton Indian Account Books.

The eight years of recorded Indian account books in Table 1 suggest that, at the end of each year, the majority of Indian workers laboring on the rancho were not indebted to Dalton; instead, in most years, the ranchero owed the Indians. Even more striking is the extent of the debt of those workers who ended the year in the red. In this eight-year period, the average amount owed was \$5.29 a year, with an average debt of \$6.34 in the highest reporting year of 1859. In labor terms, that represented roughly a couple of weeks, not seemingly an insurmountable time to work off or to provoke feelings of enslavement. The total number of Indian workers who left without settling their debt was seventy-seven, averaging \$4.80 and costing Dalton \$341.89 over this eight-year period. Yet, that was significantly less than what Dalton gained from Indian workers who left or died without collecting what they were owed. Sixty-six Indians fell into this category, and the amount of uncollected wages averaged \$11.62, earning Dalton \$760.06.⁴³ These results indicate that Indians seemed to leave, regardless of their debt levels.

The worker indebtedness data strongly challenges the existence of debt-peonage on Rancho Azusa, which makes a great deal of sense given the time, place, and economic environment. Both Indian labor and hard currency were in great demand. On December 2, 1861, Dalton, who was desperately in need of more Indian workers, happily noted that the Indians had brought back from town two of their Indian friends recently released from the jail to work on the rancho.⁴⁴

43. Dalton Indian Account Books

44. Daily Occurrences at Azusa, December 1861.

In order to keep the rancho solvent, Dalton appears to have kept a close watch on his supply of silver and closely controlled its distribution. Table 6 shows that, during this eight-year period, Dalton paid barely fifteen percent of the Indian wages in cash. With the exception of the two busiest years, 1859 and 1861, he paid out less than \$150 in hard cash a year. As a result, the rancho store not only served as a place for the Indians to purchase food, clothing, and other consumer goods, but also acted as a bank. Available rancho store credit eliminated the need for hard currency, while at the same time offering it as a benefit to new prospective Indian workers.

Table 6. Indian store credit and cash distributions on Rancho Azusa

Year	Workers	Wages Total	Store Purchases	Cash Distributions
1856	9	123	91.52	25.8
1857	34	917	767.4	134.13
1858	34	562.77	472.04	146.22
1859	72	2075.02	1485.75	217.95
1860	9	121.3	96.22	9.575
1861	20	435.71	319.25	67.875
1862	59	1332.54	1059.14	238.33
1863	10	93.65	120.08	3.65
Totals	247	5660.99	4411.4	843.52

The Indian account books also reveal a temporary Indian workforce at Rancho Azusa. The average Indian worker stay was slightly over eighteen months. Only seven

Indian workers of the 161 recorded lived and worked on the rancho for more than four years. The two more “senior” workers lasted six years, followed by two workers who remained for five years and three who stayed for four years. Thirteen lasted for three years, while another thirty-six Indians worked two years. The daily entries from the rancho diary show that Dalton called upon the labor of fifteen to twenty Indian workers Monday through Saturday. During harvest time, or in the fall when wine production became labor-intensive, Dalton would hire more Indian workers.⁴⁵ Jackson noted that, when temporary Indian workers were needed, Dalton would often send gifts to the Coahuilla Chief Cabazon; in return, the chief would provide the rancho with a group of his strongest and finest workers.⁴⁶

While Dalton never showed any personal affinities with his Indian workers, they seemed to tolerate each other. After the Sunday evening when the Indians broke into the store and stole two gallons of whisky, any mention of retribution from Dalton or any redress or reconciliations is conspicuously missing from both the rancho diary and Indian account books. Each party went back to work the following Monday, clearing ditches and pruning vines. This is not to say that Dalton ignored Indian theft, however, and if Indian workers showed up late or left work early, he was quick to deduct from their pay. In reviewing Dalton’s interactions with the Indian workers, he appears to have been aloof and condescending. Throughout his rancho diary, Dalton consistently referred to “the Indian” or “the Indians.” No Indian worker was ever identified by their first or last name,

45. Dalton Indian Account Books.

46. Jackson, 194.

with the exception of the Indian account book entries.⁴⁷ Further, Dalton's personal testimony reveals a very strict employer-employee relationship which limited any social engagement between the boss and his worker.

Table 7. Indian clothing and cloth purchases on Rancho Azusa

Year	Workers	Clothing	Total Wages	Purchases	Percent of Annual Worker Wages	Clothing Purchases % of Total Purchases	Average Worker Clothing Purchases
1856	9	16.5	123	91.52	13	18	1.83
1857	34	173.67	917	767.4	19	23	5.11
1858	34	104.45	562.77	472.04	19	22	3.07
1859	72	407.22	2075.02	1485.75	20	27	5.66
1860	9	23.28	121.3	96.22	19	24	2.59
1861	20	73.34	435.71	319.25	17	23	3.67
1862	59	317.41	1332.54	1059.14	24	30	5.38
1863	10	32.5	93.65	120.08	35	27	.31
Totals	247	1148.37	5660.99	4411.4	20	26	4.65

While the Indian account books serve to piece together the Indian worker labor narrative on Rancho Azusa, they also uniquely reveal the spending patterns of the Indians who made the rancho home. As shown in Table 7, most of the Indians' disposable income went to the company store and the purchases fell into four major categories of products: alcohol, clothing and cloth, foodstuff, soap, and other products. As previously mentioned, alcohol—including aguardente, brandy, wine, and whisky—represented almost twenty percent of the workers' wages earned and almost twenty-five percent of

47. Daily Occurrences at Azusa, 1856 -1864.

their store purchases. Interestingly, the Indians spent more on clothing and cloth than alcohol, and, as shown in Table 7, these purchases amounted to slightly more than twenty percent of wages and twenty-six percent of their recorded store credit.

Table 8. Indian foodstuff purchases on Rancho Azusa

Year	Workers	Food	Wages	Purchases	Percentage of Wages	Percentage of Worker Store Purchases	Average Annual Food Purchases
1856	9	4.05	123	91.52	3	4	.45
1857	34	39.63	917	767.4	4	5	1.17
1858	34	10.77	562.77	472.04	2	2	.32
1859	72	54.15	2075.02	1485.75	3	4	.75
1860	9	23.28	121.3	96.22	2	24	2.59
1861	20	6.98	435.71	319.25	2	2	.35
1862	59	45.62	1332.54	1059.14	3	4	.77
1863	10	7.1	93.65	120.08	8	6	1.408
Totals	247	191.58	5660.99	4411.4	3	4	.78

The Indians also bought food to supplement their monthly beef allotments and the crops that they grew for their families. Table 8 shows that these purchases accounted for a very small part of their wages, with purchases at three and four percent, respectively. While not an expensive item, soap was also a popular choice and the Indians procured almost three hundred boxes of soap over the eight-year period of the account books.

Table 9. Indian soap purchases

Year	Workers	Soap	Wages	Purchases	Percentage of Total Wages	Percentage of Store Purchases	Annual Soap Worker Purchases
1856	9	0.25	123	91.52	0.2	0.3	.03
1857	34	7.05	917	767.4	0.8	0.9	.21
1858	34	8.28	562.77	472.04	1.4	1.7	.24
1859	72	19.51	2075.02	1485.75	.9	1.3	.27
1860	9	1.43	121.3	96.22	1.1	1.5	.16
1861	20	5.21	435.71	319.25	1.1	1.6	.26
1862	59	18.35	1332.54	1059.14	1.3	1.7	.31
1863	10	1.33	93.65	120.08	1.4	1.1	7.52
Totals	247	61.41	5660.99	4411.4	1	1.4	0.25

Tobacco, like soap, did not significantly drain the Indian workers' resources, but it did present another way to spend the money they had earned. Like his soap enterprise, Dalton grew tobacco and manufactured cigars, and, while most of his Indian workers did not spend a great amount of their earnings on this product, they were frequent cigar customers. Between 1856 and 1863, tobacco-related purchases represented only one percent of the Indians' annual store purchases. Finally, the last category and a little over thirty percent of the Indians' income went to such discretionary items such as horse feed, knives, silverware, cards, wood, pills (medicine), and nails.⁴⁸ It appears that Dalton's

48. Dalton Indian Account Books; Daily Occurrences at Azusa, 1856 -1863.

Indians did not need to venture into town for consumer goods, as the company store contained a readily available stock and no cash was required. This arrangement appeared to work for both sides.

A further examination of two categories, clothing and cloth and foodstuff, offers additional insight into the evolving culture of these Indian workers and their families. It seems from some of these buying patterns that the Azusa Indians dressed and ate very much like the Californios. Unlike Yorba's Indian workers, who, twenty-five years prior, were scantily dressed in Indian garb and lived in their original Indian huts, the Azusa Indians seemed to adapt a more modern dress code and diet. The Indian workers spent a large amount of money on hats, veils, ties, shoes, and flannel and hickory type shirts, dresses, handkerchiefs, overalls, and shorts. Perhaps looking fashionable and adopting a more non-Indian appearance reduced the racial profiling that was rampant during the time. The cloth purchases indicate a preference for fine, imported material such as calico, muslin, and flannel. They also bought wool and cloth patches, which suggests that the women spent a great deal of time sewing, supplementing the clothing from the company store.⁴⁹

Similarly, the Indians' eating habits also seemed to shift toward those of the Californios. While the Azusa Indians continued to cook and bake a number of meals from acorn flour, they now supplemented their rancho diets with baked goods from the company store. Biscuits, breads, and crackers were popular items, as were tea and coffee.

49. Dalton Indian Account Books; Daily Occurrences at Azusa, 1856 -1863.

In addition, they purchased cooking materials such as flour, sugar, honey, rice, salt, and corn meal in order to feed their families.⁵⁰ Indians were gradually moving away from their indigenous diets and adapting to more Euro-American eating habits. And, more importantly, they were becoming more dependent on other producers.

As the account books show, the rancho store was the center of the Rancho Azusa operation. Most of the goods sold there were raised, grown, or manufactured on the rancho. Dalton covered almost eighty percent of his Indian worker payroll with store credit. At times, the ranchero took advantage of the Indian labor credit by deferring cash payment with store credit, and the Indians obliged. Surprisingly, Indians often permanently left the rancho either owing and owed. It seemed that neither Dalton nor any Indian voiced protest with these unsettled accounts, which were generally small. The rancho store acted as the bank for both parties, a system which appears to have worked well.⁵¹

While Dalton was never endeared to his Indian workers, the relationship was quite symbiotic. He needed workers, and the Indians sought work. As noted in the Indian account books, the Indian workers came and went, and new Indian workers replaced the ones who left. It is also important to point out that that the Indian workers left on their terms and never found themselves in a debt stranglehold, as has been described by many scholars.⁵²

50. Dalton Indian Account Books.

51. Ibid.

52. Street, *Beasts of the Field*; Magliari; Monroy, *Thrown Among Strangers*.

Analysis and Conclusion

Monroy strongly argued that the relationship between the *ranchero* and Indian workers was best described as *seigneurial*, suggesting a very strong dependency of the Indian worker on the good graces of the *ranchero*. He further contended that the paternalistic nature of this arrangement resembled a parent-child structure. The rancho store and the credit system created an even greater reliance of the Indian worker on the *ranchero*. Yet, the case study of Rancho Azusa presented here does not contain these elements of the Monroy thesis. From the first day Dalton arrived at Azusa, his personal relationship with the Indian workers was quite limited. As previously mentioned, not once does he identify an Indian worker by name. To Dalton, they were all called “Indian.” Further, out of the 161 Azusa Indian workers recorded, only twenty took permanent residence for more than two years. The remaining 141 Indian workers seemed to represent a much more temporary labor force and, more importantly, were not around long enough to develop the kind of social or economic dependency Monroy has suggested.

Street specifically argued that the Indian rancho workers of the Los Angeles area labored under a system in which they were bound by slavery, alcohol, and debt. Street suggested that the new Indian vagrancy laws provided a much-needed delivery system of cheap Indian labor to the *rancheros*. To ensure the Indians remained at the workplace, Street noted, the *rancheros* depended on the Indians to amass large amounts of debt on their alcohol purchases. This debt was so great that the Indians had no other option but to

stay put. Yet, the early American period Rancho Azusa sources employed in this study strongly challenge Street's assertions.

Unlike most scholars, Philips presented the California Indian worker as a major contributor to the greater early California narrative. In many ways, the case study of Rancho Azusa works to confirm and validate many of Philips' key assertions. However, Philips, like Street, also promoted the notion that Indian drunkenness and vagrancy contributed to the successful maintenance of an adequate labor supply to run the Los Angeles area ranchos. Most of these Indian workers were subject to a working period of no longer than fourteen days, while the average Azusa Indian worker tenure was sixty-seven days.⁵³ Philips also contended that, as the ranchos developed and grew in size, they formed social, economic, and political systems guided by a well-defined hierarchy and paternalism. And, under a system of economic and social reciprocity, most rancheros successfully recruited and maintained Indian labor. None of the Azusa sources reveal that Dalton either saw or treated the Indians as children. In fact, his writing suggests that he had great contempt for the Indians, and the relationship between Dalton and the Indians was limited to that of employer-employee. I would argue that the Indians who chose to work on Rancho Azusa did so because they were housed, fed, and paid regularly and Azusa provided some sense of security for the workers and their families.

Magliari correctly pointed out that the Californio rancheros were less likely to engage in the exploitation of Indian vagrancy laws to secure Indian labor. Even though Dalton was born in Great Britain, he was a Californio and showed little interest in

53. Dalton Indian Account Books.

procuring labor via the weekly auction of incarcerated Indians. It was the new American arrivals who seemed to favor this methodology, which the Azusa records confirm.

Interestingly, Magliari's study of Cave Couets' oppressive rancho practices in the San Diego region revealed that, annually, over twenty percent of the Indian workers ran away, owing the ranchero over \$316 per year. Dalton, on the other hand, let the Indian workers come and go as they wished and complained of no major exoduses in the eight years represented in the account books. In only one year, the Indians left Dalton in the red. While Couets spent most of his days keeping the Indian workers from flight and chasing the runaways, Dalton kept his focus on the daily operations of the rancho.

The Rancho Azusa case study strongly contests much of California historiography related to Indian working arrangements on the California rancho; yet, as expected, the results are quite similar to those of Harry E. Cross' study: "Debt Peonage Reconsidered: A Case Study in Nineteenth-Century Zacatecas, Mexico." The Azusa case study outcome, like Cross' with regard to Hacienda del Maguey, strongly refutes the existence of debt-peonage on the California rancho and shows that a complex, symbiotic relationship developed between the California ranchos and their Indian workers during this period. The indebtedness trends between Azusa and the Mexican Hacienda were very similar. The Cross study revealed that, in the twelve years of tracking worker debt on the hacienda, the average number of workers in debt was 22.7% and the average amount owed was 3.49 pesos, equaling less than a day's pay. In most years included in the Cross study, roughly seventy-five percent of the workers were owed, but never more than one day's pay.⁵⁴ On

54. Cross, "Debt Peonage Reconsidered," 482-86.

Rancho Azusa, Dalton also managed worker and rancho debt closely, and the Indian account books reflect the same trends as those of the Cross Hacienda. Both owners successfully kept the number of workers who owed more than they earned at a minimum, which perhaps played a key role in limiting the amount of debt lost when workers left prematurely. On the other hand, both owners realized a positive balance sheet by allowing the workers to accumulate store credit. This served two distinctive purposes: first, it provided the owners with additional capital and second, it limited cash distributions and maximized cash flows. When examining the operations of both enterprises in greater detail, it is clear that the employer reaped the financial advantage, but neither workplace seemed to exploit their indigenous workers.

The Rancho Azusa narrative presented in this chapter suggests that some California scholars either ignored or missed altogether the detailed functions the rancho store provided. When comparing the operation of Rancho Azusa with that of Cross' discussion of Hacienda del Maguey, it becomes apparent that the store was the center of both the hacienda and rancho universe. The store served every aspect of the hacienda and rancho enterprises. Its customers were often the producers of the items they purchased. One other complaint sometimes found in the historiography was that the workers on the California ranchos were coerced into paying inflated prices for the rancho products. Both Dalton sources employed in this study show that the Indian workers paid the same for the store items as Dalton's neighbors.⁵⁵

55. Daily Occurrences at Azusa, 1856 -1864.

In conclusion, the study of Rancho Azusa and its labor arrangement between 1856 and 1863 strongly contests the existence of debt peonage on the ranchos located in the Los Angeles region during the early American period. Yet, the study does not end with this single assertion, but offers a new and long overdue narrative related to the operations of the California rancho. The central theme of this new narrative includes the role of the rancho store and how it served to maintain the economic balance between employer and employee. On the rancho, the workers represented both producer and consumer, while Dalton assumed the management role. Both parties seem to have developed a co-dependency that lasted for almost twenty-five years until the Indians of Southern California had almost vanished, demand for California rancho products rancho slowly diminished, and the rancheros ran out of capital.

CHAPTER FOUR:

The Indians of Rancho Azusa

The study of California Indian labor, especially regarding the ranchos, has been quite limited. Nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarship often addresses the role the Indian worker played in supplying necessary labor; further, almost all existing literature suggests a strong presence of debt-peonage arrangements, which took a variety of forms. Yet, few scholars during this period have undertaken a deeper exploration of Indian workers' lives. One reason for this oversight is the lack of sources left by the Indians. Most, if not all, of the California Indians working on the ranchos were illiterate and left little written testimony. Not a single Indian living on Dalton's rancho in 1860 could read or write.¹ And, to make matters worse, nineteenth-century chroniclers who attempted to describe life in California in detail during the Spanish, Mexican, and early-American periods seemed to purposely ignore these Indian workers and made little effort to report on them, excepting occasional disparaging comments. However, as addressed in previous chapters, scholars including George Philips, Steven Hackel, William Bauer, Michael Magliari, and Stephen Silliman have taken up the challenge of revisiting the nineteenth-century California workplace. This chapter endeavors to extend the work of these scholars.

In this chapter, I shift the point of focus in order to take a more detailed look at the conditions Dalton's Indian workers experienced and endured during their tenure on Rancho Azusa. To this end, I explore several topics—tribal affiliations, rancho social and

1. United States Census of 1860.

economic standings, family life, education, and product consumption—which collectively reveal a vision of the past that has too long been absent from scholarship. While limited sources do create a serious challenge to showing the personal aspects of the Rancho Azusa Indians' experience, this chapter attempts to work with the available sources to tell the Indian rancho worker's story on an individual basis and expand the California rancho narrative in general. Considering sources such as census data, government reports, rancho account books, personal testimony, and secondary sources, this chapter attempts to reveal the Indian worker's personal experience on Rancho Azusa.

Rancho Azusa Indian Origins

The 1860 census identified each Indian who was living on Rancho Azusa at the time, but did not include their tribal affiliation. However, government reports, Dalton's account books and letters, and the personal testimony from someone who witnessed firsthand the rancho operation under Dalton's management suggest that the Indians who worked for Dalton were Cahuilla, from either the San Bernardino or Temecula area. While this evidence for the Cahuilla identification is somewhat circumstantial, there are several reasons that it is nonetheless convincing.

The first piece of evidence that supports the Cahuilla identity for the Indians working at Rancho Azusa is from an 1852 analysis by B. D. Wilson, who was both the mayor of Los Angeles and an Indian agent for the United States government. In the report, which he sent to President Benjamin Harris in 1852, Wilson suggests that Indian workers are domesticated and are an integral part of both the Southern California society and economy. He specifically notes that the "San Luiseño is the most sprightly, skillful,

and handy; the Cahuilla plodding, but strong, and very useful with instructions.”²

Wilson’s description of the Cahuilla aligns closely with what we know of Dalton’s Indian workers. On Azusa, the Indians’ work assignments were limited to hard, non-skilled tasks.³

When Dalton arrived at Azusa, he seemed to immediately develop an affinity to Cahuilla workers for both permanent and migratory labor needs. In an effort to quell a possible Cahuilla uprising in the spring 1852, Dalton (under the direction of Indian Agent B. D. Wilson) hired Cahuilla vaqueros and delivered 125 head of cattle to starving Cahuillas in Temecula.⁴ Sheldon Jackson’s account confirms the fact that Dalton’s friendly relationship with the Cahuilla Indians from San Bernardino and Temecula began in 1846, as soon as he arrived for the first time on Rancho Azusa; Jackson also suggests that this relationship continued until Dalton relented control of the rancho. Jackson points out that, starting as early as 1852, Dalton would send a messenger to Chief Cabazon requesting additional Cahuilla workers each October when wine making operations required additional temporary workers. These invitations would include gifts, such as stovepipe hats, pairs of trimmed red pants for the chief and his wife, and yards of colorful calico cloth. Dalton’s messenger would inform the chief that it was time to engage in the vintage processes, and that Dalton needed additional temporary help with picking the grapes and other wine production tasks. In response, Cabazon, along with twenty to thirty

2. B. D. Wilson, *The Indians of Southern California in 1852*, ed. John Walton Caughey (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1995), 22.

3. Daily Occurrences at Azusa, 6 August 1845, DL1138-1144, Henry Dalton Collection.

4. Azusa Indian Account Books, vols. I-IV, DL1158, Henry Dalton Collection.

migrant Indian workers, would return ready to work. Interestingly, while these Indians went to work in the vineyards, Cabazon received a royal welcome as a guest at Dalton's rancho home.⁵



Figure 4.1. Cahuilla chief Cabazon.

5. Sheldon G. Jackson, *A British Ranchero in Old California: The Life and Times of Henry Dalton and the Rancho Azusa*, (Glendale: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1987), 194; 195.



Figure 4.2. Cahuilla migrant workers photographed on Dalton's Rancho Azusa circa 1860s.

Stephen Slauson's 1932 oral testimony provides more confirmation concerning this close working relationship between Dalton and the Cahuilla Indian workers. The grandson of a neighboring ranchero, who would later take ownership of Dalton's Rancho

Azusa, Slauson stated convincingly that the Indian workforce for Dalton was “entirely made up of Cahuilla Indians.”⁶ Dalton maintained a lasting peace with his Indian neighbors and the Cahuilla provided a steady and reliable workforce. For Cabazon and his tribe, Dalton offered an opportunity for workers to earn wages and provide for their families; the Azusa rancho store records confirm the dispersal of these payments.⁷ Thus, this close relationship between Dalton and the Cahuilla seemed to serve both parties well.

Indian Society and Economy on Rancho Azusa

In this section, I closely examine topics including education, housing, religion, and wage equality. Unfortunately, there are no extant personal accounts or testimony of Rancho Azusa Indian life. As mentioned previously, even the nineteenth-century foreign chroniclers, who often wrote extensive scholarship on the early periods of California, seemed uninterested in the Indian rancho workers. But even considering this void of personal testimony, sources such as rancho accounts books, census, court records, probate inventories, and personal correspondence collectively reveal a much more cohesive narrative than has been published to date. Together, these sources show that the social and economic conditions for Indian workers on Rancho Azusa were somewhat different than has previously been proposed. These records clearly challenge the long-held notion of a debt-peonage working arrangement on the California rancho. Further, they offer insight concerning personal aspects of life for these Indian workers and their families, including their social and economic environments on the ranchos.

6. Keith Vosburg, *Azusa Old and New: Being a True Recital of the Founding & Development of a California Community* (Azusa, CA: Azusa Foot-hill Citrus Company, 1921).

7. *Azusa Indian Account Books*.




Figure 5.2. Dalton-Rancho Map. The Indian shacks were located above the mill in the upper right portion of the map.

In the summer of 1860, forty-one Cahuilla Indians lived amongst forty non-Indians on Rancho Azusa. The forty-one Indians included five women, twelve children, and twenty-three adult men. The non-Indian population (forty total) consisted of four Dalton children, two worker children, four women, and thirty adult men. The assignment of skilled versus non-skilled positions seems to have been determined by race. Rancho skilled positions, such as clerk, teamster, cooper, hunter, blacksmith, and miller, were all held by non-Indian residents. All male Indian workers were considered day laborers,

while adult Indian women worked as either servants or washers. The ages of Indian children ages ranged from two months to fourteen years, while the ages of non-Indian children ranged from one month to ten years.⁸

On Rancho Azusa, social and economic conditions for the Indian and non-Indian Azusa residents differed greatly. With regard to living conditions, the Indians lived on the outskirts of the property, out of sight of the Dalton homestead. Similar to most Indian workers' housing on the California ranchos, Dalton's Indians and their children lived in approximately fifteen small, dilapidated shacks.⁹ The non-Indian staff were assigned much better sleeping accommodations in one of the two adobe ranch houses close to the Dalton home.¹⁰

The Indian children resided with their parents, and interacted with the Dalton children and the other non-Indian workers'. While Dalton showed little interest in the Indian children, he expressed concern that the non-Indian children lacked formal educational opportunities. To correct this oversight, he hired a school teacher and remodeled an unoccupied ranch house to serve as a school house. Dalton's school offered a much-needed education center for the non-Indian Azusa children and those from the surrounding ranchos. His own children thrived in the education provided at this school, and three advanced to college.¹¹ However, these educational opportunities were not

8. 1860 United States Census.

9. Vosburg, 18; Jackson, 194-196.

10. Jackson, 195-196.

11. Ibid., 196.

offered to either the Indian adults or their children. The census records of 1860 confirm this fact, indicating that Dalton's Indians, along with all of the other Indians working on the surrounding ranchos, reported that they had not received any formal education in the past year and could not read or write.¹² Like education, Dalton also attended to his children's religious training; on most Sundays, his wife and children attended mass at Mission San Gabriel. Yet, it seemed that Azusa Indians were uninterested, and chose instead to spend most of their day off with family members outside of the rancho, or remained at Azusa engaged in some recreational drinking or card playing.¹³

In terms of the division of labor and income equality at the rancho, the Indians fared about the same as they did in rancho society at large. No Indian man held a highly-skilled position; all twenty-three were hired as laborers and earned roughly \$0.50 a day. Of the five female Indian workers, three were house servants and two served as washers, and all were paid only \$0.25 a day. The highly-skilled positions—clerk, teamster, cooper, porter, hunter, blacksmith, cook, miner, and miller—were restricted to non-Indian men, who earned \$2.00 a day. The sixteen non-Indian laborers were paid twice as much as their Indian counterparts, earning \$1.00 a day. Interestingly, the four non-Indian women who also worked as servants collected \$0.25 a day, exactly the same as the Indian women. With the exception of the non-Indian female servants, the Indians earned 50% less than the non-Indian workers, and were not offered any opportunities for

12. 1860 United States Census.

13. Daily Occurrences at Azusa, Azusa Indian Account Books, DL1138-114, Henry Dalton Collection.

advancement to any of the highly-skilled positions.¹⁴ The Azusa Indians did not have access to either social and economic mobility or opportunities to improve the quality of their lives.

Finally, the Dalton rancho was not a place where a long-term sense of community developed between the ranchero family and the workforce. Both Indian and non-Indian workers came and went frequently. Of the 161 Indian workers tracked in the Dalton account books, the average tenure was eighteen months; the tenure for the more highly-skilled, non-Indian workers was similar. The employment records for a number of Indian workers at the rancho include frequent leave and return gaps.¹⁵ Perhaps, the temporary nature of the rancho population may have been a reason why Dalton himself showed no signs of personal attachment to the Indian workers.

Indian Rancho Life as Told by Consumption Patterns

Unfortunately, the Azusa Indians left no written or oral testimony. However, the Indian account books offer an important alternative source through which to examine Rancho Azusa life for these workers. In particular, the purchasing and consumption activities of Indian workers, which Dalton recorded in great detail, provide a useful replacement to testimony and construct a more personal image of life for Indian workers. These consumption patterns help illustrate the workers' daily life, especially their social interactions and interdependencies. In addition, the frequency of the purchases and the quantity of commodities purchased show that wages not only went to the individual

14. Azusa Indian Account Books.

15. Ibid.

workers themselves, but also helped support their families and their local Cahuilla communities outside of the rancho.

Like many of the Rancho Azusa Indian workers, Mariano Viejo appears intermittently in the Dalton Indian account books. In December 1856, he worked eleven days and earned \$4.10. Most of his monthly earnings went toward purchasing twelve pieces of fine cloth and a sack of flour; the remainder of his pay covered the cost of a few cigars and bottles of aguardente. In September 1859, Viejo worked sixteen days and earned eight dollars. This time, \$7.20 went toward a combination of fine cloth and blankets. In the same month, Viejo also purchased a dress and a pair of shoes, perhaps for his spouse or another family member living outside of the rancho. In August 1857, Indian worker Andres spent most of his monthly wages on blankets. During the following two months, Andres' earnings went toward the purchase of soap, flour, dried pork, more blankets, and clothing, including a pair of pants, a shirt, and some shoes. In his three months tenure at the Dalton rancho, Andres also bought a bottle of aguardente, and left with ten dollars in his pocket.¹⁶

Juan Viejo worked at the Dalton rancho from November 1859 to January 1860; his choice of products purchased from the rancho store also included items that seem to have been intended for family members living outside of Azusa. The list included: sugar, fine cloth, blankets, thread, candles, a pair of pants, aguardente, and brandy. In 1862, Jose Ignacio worked at the Dalton rancho from May through July and purchased over fifty

16. Ibid.

pieces of fine cloth. In addition, he bought three cakes of soap, four sacks of sugar, a pair of pants, eight bottles of aguardente, cigars, and tobacco.¹⁷

The Indian women workers, who earned considerably less than the Indian men, also spent most of their earnings on household goods. Simon Viejo, who worked as a washer for two months in 1857, left Azusa with one dollar and a pile of blankets. Dionicia, who worked as a washer for a month in 1861, applied all of her earnings to buy a sack of sugar. Loli, another washer, worked for two months in 1861, and purchased a sack of sugar, a pair of pants, and a bottle of aguardente. Interestingly, Loli was the only female Indian worker who purchased alcohol. In general, the wages earned by the Indian women of Azusa went toward purchases of food, clothing, and cloth.¹⁸

This sample of purchases by both Indian men and women is fairly representative of most of the Indian workers' product choices; these purchases also suggest that the rancho store served as a supplier not only to the Indian workers, but also to their families or Cahuilla communities living outside of Azusa. Most workers bought candles, cloth, soap, clothing, and foodstuff, which included flour, sugar, wheat, crackers, and biscuits.¹⁹ Dalton fed and housed the workers, as well as providing them with clean work clothing.²⁰ These auxiliary purchases confirm that Indian workers came to the rancho with the

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid.

20. Jackson, 163-78; 191-200.

purpose of earning enough to provide for their families, and perhaps their Cahuilla Communities, as well.

While the quantity of Indian store purchases implies that the Indians worked to provide for their families and Cahuilla communities, the rancho sources, including the Dalton Indian account books and the rancho diaries, also offer hints at the activities workers engaged in during their time at Azusa. These rancho sources show that the Indians labored through a long six-day work week but recreated on Sundays.²¹ Many spent their Sunday drinking and enjoying recreational activities.²²

Dalton himself kept a watchful eye on the Indians' drinking activities, and each week he would describe any drunken behavior observed in his Sunday diary entries. On Sunday January 5, 1862, Dalton noted that "the Indians were comfortably drunk" and a week later he wrote, "Indians are merry." Later in that month, he complained that "Indians all drunk broke into the store and stole two gal of whiskey." Although, on a few occasions, the Indians took their drinking outside of the rancho grounds, there is no mention in Dalton's diary or any other available records to indicate the Dalton Indians running into any trouble or being detained or arrested.²³ This routine of weekly drinking amongst the workers was not only confirmed Dalton's testimony, but this behavior was also witnessed among the Cahuilla workers by other observers. In 1852, B. D. Wilson strongly recommended against allowing the Cahuilla a life of idleness: "The policy

21. Daily Occurrences at Azusa.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid.

referred to, by affording sufficient provisions to the Indians to live upon work has created a grand 'fiesta'; and the Indian servants have generally left their employers to the festival: and idleness and consequent crime and outrage will be the results."²⁴ Wilson continued, pointing out that the Cahuilla rancho workers, "when at work, they do without ardent spirits, but must have it on Saturday night and Sunday. Very little of the money goes for meat and bread—their chief want with it is for drinks."²⁵ While Wilson's latter observation is somewhat questionable, as I pointed out in Chapter 3, some Azusa Indians certainly drank heavily during their brief time off. Yet, the account books suggest that some did not; indeed, Wilson admitted that "I have met with some who do not drink and have the aspiration to decency. Some again are idle and vagabonds; but I have rarely found them unwilling to work, when well paid."²⁶

The account books also confirm that gambling occurred among the rancho Indian workers at Azusa. Anthropologists Lowell John Bean and Lisa Bourgeault claim that Cahuilla men loved games, especially when gambling was involved. Wagering was not limited to those playing; onlookers often make side bets among themselves.²⁷ Bean notes that many of the games the Cahuilla men engaged in were of a physical nature, such as shinny or kickball. Similar to hockey, shinny was a game that involved a wooden ball and sticks, while kickball resembled today's soccer. Both Cahuilla women and men played

24. Wilson, *Indians of Southern California*, 22.

25. Ibid.

26. Ibid., 22.

27. Lowell John Bean and Lisa Bourgeault, *The Cahuilla* (New York: Chelsea House Publisher, 1989), 25-26.

tag, tug-of-war, and guessing games. The women favored games that challenged their dexterity, including spinning, juggling, and balancing of objects. While each game served to provide some form of entertainment, it also enhanced the physical and mental adeptness of the participants.²⁸

Perhaps the Azusa Indian workers did engage in the games mentioned by Bean and Bourgeault, but there is no recorded testimony to suggest they did. The Cahuilla anthropologists do not mention cards, though it appears to have been a game Dalton's Indians played often. The Dalton account books include a record of money won and lost during these card games. Whether or not Dalton personally approved or sanctioned such gambling activities among his Indian workers is unknown, but he was willing to sell them decks of cards. Even more significantly, the Indian account books show that Dalton was happy to serve as the banker for these games, allowing the players to transfer wages earned between winners and losers.²⁹

On Christmas Day in 1858, Dalton's store sold a deck of cards and a bottle of brandy to Indian worker Ramon Muchacho for \$0.50; in the same transaction, he received a cash payout of \$0.50. Juan, a cook, purchased a deck of cards for \$0.25 on January 8, 1858. On July 30, 1859, Jesus was paid four dollars, and later stopped by the store and bought a deck of cards along with a few cigars at a cost of three dollars. On December 29, 1859, Antonio Donato purchased a sack of salt and a couple of decks of cards from the rancho store, which suggests that multiple card games were planned for

28. Ibid.

29. Azusa Indian Account Books.

the upcoming weekend. After this purchase, the account books do not contain entries specific to cards, but card playing and gambling continued amongst the Indian workers.³⁰

While it appears that most of the Indians' gambling winnings and losses were small, and easily covered by the small cash disbursements they received from Dalton, there were occasions when considerable amounts of money passed between the card players. It appears that Indian worker Jesus, who had purchased cards in July 1859, lost a week's pay to a co-worker with the surname Viejo and Dalton was willing to transfer the money from one Indian's account to another. Four other Indians engaged in similar gambling transactions, though these amounted to less than a couple days' pay. Yet, card playing and the gambling amongst the Azusa Indians seemed to end abruptly in October 1861, when the last ledger item related to this activity appears in the account books. Surprisingly, Dalton never acknowledged the Indian gambling in his diaries, nor did he complain about it.³¹ Perhaps he just stopped selling cards and the Indians' gambling transactions were handled outside of Dalton's rancho store and credit system.

Soap was one of the most popular items bought at the Rancho Azusa company store, purchased by Indian workers in large amounts. The Cahuilla Indian religion promoted personal hygiene. Bean notes that personal hygiene and health were part of the Cahuilla creation story. When their moon maiden, Menil, departed from the earth she ordered them to "bathe every day." She said: "in the evening you will see me in the west, you must say, ha! ha! ha! and run to the water and bathe." Given this attention to personal

30. Ibid.

31. Daily Occurrences at Azusa, 1164.

cleanliness, bathing and visits to the sweat house were part of Cahuilla daily routine. In addition to daily bathing, the Cahuilla religion also emphasized the disposal of human waste. Cahuillas were continually reminded that acquisition and improper disposal of fecal matter had resulted in the death of their beloved god, Muskat. Urination and defecation was a private matter for the Cahuilla, and waste was buried underground to prevent it from becoming a tool of “ill use for sympathetic, magical purposes.” The same attention to cleanliness applied to cooking utensils, blankets, and clothing.³²

The Dalton rancho store records indicate that the Azusa Indians remained committed to the Cahuilla tradition of cleanliness. In the eight years of purchases tracked, almost four hundred cakes of soap were sold. Eighty-three Indian workers at Azusa purchased a minimum of one box of soap, which cost \$0.10. On average, Indians bought 3.5 boxes during their tenure at the Dalton rancho. While some Indians limited their purchases to a single box while visiting the company store, many bought between four and six boxes, with one Indian picking up nine boxes in one visit. The amount of soap acquired by the Indians suggests that they remained committed to the long-held Cahuilla tradition of cleanliness.³³ However, the larger sales of soap to individual Indians further suggest that the Azusa Indians were also providing soap to their families and Cahuilla communities outside of the rancho.

The Azusa Indian workers’ clothing and fashion choices also offer insight into life on the rancho. As Bean argues, the Cahuilla Indians showed great concern for

32. Lowell J. Bean, *Mukats’ People: The Cahuilla Indians in Southern California* (Berkeley: California University Press, 1972), 81.

33. Azusa Indian Account Books.

cleanliness, which also extended to their clothing. Dalton fully staffed the rancho with clothing washers, a service the Indian workers seemed to employ. The records show that the Indian workers frequently bought new clothing, from head to toe. Of the 161 Indians who Dalton tracked in his Indian account books, 149 bought clothes from the rancho store. In the eight years of company sales records to the Azusa Indians, Dalton sold 161 pairs of shoes, 354 shirts, and 236 pairs of pants.³⁴ While the Indian workers appeared to keep themselves well-dressed, the clothing transactions, like other commodity sales, suggest that some products went to other family or Cahuilla community members.

The results of this close analysis of the Indian workers' purchases of clothing from the Azusa rancho store suggest that large purchases of these items were not intended solely for the workers themselves. Francisco Chino worked briefly at the Dalton rancho in December 1856; during that limited time, he purchased three shirts, a pair of pants, and three pairs of shoes. Luis Cocenero, during his three months tenure in 1856, bought six pairs of shoes, two pairs of pants, and six shirts. Jose Maria worked for fifteen months starting in January 1859, and purchased eleven pairs of shoes, twelve pairs of pants, twenty-one shirts, and a couple of handkerchiefs. Salyaco, who worked fourteen months starting in November 1862, acquired six pairs of shoes, thirteen shirts, and nine pairs of pants. In February 1957, both Bartolo and Brijido bought veils for women. Other clothing items sold included belts, dresses, socks, and hats, patterns which reflected the typical shopping choices found throughout the Indian account books.³⁵ More importantly, these

34. Azusa Indian Account Books.

35. Ibid.

transactions suggest that some of this clothing purchased went to those living outside of the rancho.

Further, the type of clothing purchased hints at a new taste for more Euro-American attire. In fact, the company's store transaction records suggest that the Indian workers had developed a strong demand for Euro-American type attire. In early 1859, Dalton's store began offering flannel shirts, which became a popular choice. The Indian workers' clothing options had expanded; now they could choose between the old white cotton shirts and the new flannel. These new shirts were offered beginning in 1859, and Indian workers Juan Pablo Jr., Santiago, Jose, Pinto, Cuerdo, and Fefon all chose the new style and more expensive apparel over the old. In the Fall of 1861, the store added hickory shirts to the list of available shirt options. These shirts cost more than half the price of the flannel shirts, and sold for \$0.85. In 1861 and 1862, Jose Nuevo bought three hickory shirts, while Jose Cahpo, Francisco Nuevo, Francisco Oiecho, Juan Oiecho, Ambrosia, Cuerty, Ignacio, and Salaco all purchased one. Pant fashion also changed over the course of the eight-year period reflected in the company store records. In 1861, about the same time of the arrival of cheaper hickory shirts, overall pants were stocked at the Azusa company store. A number of Indian workers made the shift from regular trousers to these new ones with straps. Of the Indians who chose to buy new overalls, many were also those who decided on the hickory shirts, including Antonio, Jesus, and a female Indian worker, Juanita. While, in general, the Indians continued to overwhelmingly prefer the regular shirts and trousers, the rancho store and the Indian workers often showed interest in the changing fashion market. Finally, the handkerchief increased in popularity.

Although it was not the most popular item on the company store shelf, almost thirty were sold to the Indian workers over the time recorded in the company store records.³⁶

Regardless, the Indian records of the company store show that the Indian workers and their families and friends often wore Euro-American style clothing, and some Indian workers showed a strong interest in this new fashion.

While the Indian workers purchased a large quantity of manufactured clothing, they also showed a great interest in making their own clothing. In the span of eight years, the Azusa company store recorded nearly 300 cloth transactions, which included over 1,400 lengths of fabric including india, flannel, wool, calico, and muslin, at a total cost of seven hundred dollars. In addition, they bought thirty-four spools of thread. The demand for cloth remained steady throughout each of the years, though some transactions were larger than others. In 1857, Jose Viejo purchased fifty lengths of india cloth. In the summer of 1859, Andrea, an Indian woman, acquired fifty lengths of india and some wool. In 1862, Jose Ignacio Sr. picked up sixty-four pounds of wool and three lengths of muslin. These Indian workers were the exception, and were not representative of cloth purchases in general, which averaged slightly more than five lengths of material.³⁷

While the cloth purchases, when compared to other commodities, appear quite significant (and quantity certainly contributes to the argument of the Indian workers as providers for others living outside of the rancho), one other question remains. What was the purpose or intent for all of the cloth material acquired? Jackson addresses the fact that

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid.

Dalton, in an effort to please and persuade Cahuilla Chief to send his much-needed Cahuilla migrant workforce to Azusa, presented large amounts fine cloth to the chief's wife. This suggests, perhaps, that the Cahuilla women favored the fine cloth that the Azusa rancho store offered. The cloth and thread purchased further implies that cloth purchases were intended for sewing activities outside of the rancho by the women from the workers' families or the Cahuilla communities. Whether the end product of this material was for ceremonial purposes or everyday clothing use, such as dresses, veils or women's shirts, is not quite clear. Bean shows that the Cahuilla women became adept at making flannel shirts. Finally, the quantity of cloth bought at the rancho store, like the other commodities previously mentioned, also strongly suggests that the Indian workers were providers for those outside of Rancho Azusa.

Dalton's Indian workers also bought large amounts of foodstuff, including sugar, flour, salt, beef, pork, lamb, rice, wheat, coffee, beans, corn meal, potatoes, molasses, chickens, tea, and butter. In the eight years tracked, the Indian workers shopped for food 450 times, spending almost two hundred dollars. In June and July 1856, Indian Jose Antonia bought seven sacks of sugar, dried pork, and a sack of flour. In February and March 1862, Indian Quaty picked up thirteen sacks of sugar, a sack of corn meal, and some chickens. In May and June 1862, Indian Cuervo purchased three sacks of sugar and two pieces of beef. While Dalton sold a wide variety of food items, the most popular item was clearly sugar. Sugar amounted to eighty-five percent of the foodstuff choices and fifty percent of the total foodstuff cost.³⁸ It is important to note that, as Jackson suggests,

38. Ibid.

Dalton fed his workers well, including the Indian workers.³⁹ Once again, the quantity of the food transactions suggests that, like the other commodity groups mentioned, some of the products were intended for families and communities living outside of the rancho.

While household goods—such as nails, wood, ropes, knives, matches, candles, and plates—represented a very small percentage of Dalton’s Indian purchases, they again suggest that these workers were providing for others outside of the ranchos. Two Indian women workers spent almost two weeks’ wages on wood in July 1862. However, the most popular choices in this category were candles and matches, which represented over ninety percent of these types of products. During his six-month tenure at Rancho Azusa between 1861 and 1862, Indian Jose Oiecho bought an average of two boxes of candles each month. Indian Pedro Hemero acquired three boxes of candles during his six-month tenure.⁴⁰ While some of the Indian workers’ demand for candles and matches could have had personal intent, the quantity and frequency suggests otherwise. The other items, such as nails, wood, ropes, and plates, were clearly intended for a destination outside of the rancho.

Analysis

In this chapter, I moved past the debt-peonage argument, and attempted (with limited available sources) to reveal details of life for an Indian worker on Dalton’s Rancho Azusa. The Indian workers’ identity presented the first challenge. In the 1860 census, Native Americans were all grouped as Indians and the data did not reflect their

39. Jackson, 163-78; 191-200.

40. Azusa Indian Account Books.

respective ethnic or tribal affiliation. An examination of available sources confirm that Dalton limited his hiring of Indians to the Cahuillas. Wilson strongly suggested that the Cahuilla men were strong and willing to work for a good daily wage. The close proximity of the Cahuilla territory in San Bernardino and Temecula also made this arrangement convenient for both Dalton and the Indian workers.

The Rancho Azusa society always left the Indians on the outside and positioned them as second-class citizens. When it came to housing, the Indian workers' dilapidated housing was out of sight of Dalton's home, and was substandard as compared with the non-Indian workers' adobes. The Indian workers and their children fared no better when it came to education. Reading and writing, for the rancho Indians, was not even a remote possibility. Finally, as mentioned in chapter 3, in Dalton's diary—except for an incident when an Indian worker was late for work and his pay was deducted—none of the Indians were mentioned by name.⁴¹

These same Indians also experienced a disadvantage when it came to employment opportunities and lower wages. The non-Indian workers held all of the more highly-skilled positions and the male non-Indian unskilled workers earned twice as much as the Indians performing the same jobs. Interestingly, this wide disparity in pay rates was limited to the male populations. Women, regardless of race or ethnicity, received \$0.25 a day. Finally, it is important to note that, as unfair as the treatment of the Indians by Dalton was, especially when it came to wages, the rancho store did not engage in any

41. Daily Occurrences at Azusa.

form of price discrimination. The Dalton general account books showed that the company store charged all Azusa residents the same prices for its goods.⁴²

Consumption habits can often reveal a great deal about the cultural habits of a group. In the case of the Azusa Indians, rancho store purchases reveal more than has typically been offered by scholars to date. Consumption habits show that the Azusa Indians worked hard during the week and enjoyed their day off. On Sundays, many drank and others drank and gambled. Indian workers' soap purchases seemed to confirm a strong commitment to good hygiene and a heightened level of cleanliness. Some Indian workers appeared to have an affinity for the latest fashion, and most adopted at least a sense of the newly accepted new Euro-American style in clothing. Finally, the most important human characteristic revealed from the analysis of the rancho store purchases was the Indian worker as a committed provider.

In conclusion, this deeper investigation of the Dalton sources strongly contests many Southern California Indian rancho workers' characteristics, as previously represented in the historiography. Many scholars stressed the Indians' love for alcohol, along with the notion that the Indian workers spent every penny they earned on liquor. And, as the result of their addictions, the Indians became unreliable workers at best. The Dalton Indian account books and diary show that the Indians spent a small percentage of their wages on alcohol and that they limited this kind of activity one day a week. The soap and clothing purchases suggest much cleaner and better-dressed Indians than were portrayed in the historiographies. The food and clothing the Indian workers bought hint at

42. Dalton Rancho Account Books; Azusa Indian Account Books.

a greater adoption of Euro-American life style. Further, most of consumer goods from the rancho store seemed to find their way into the local Cahuilla communities, along with some of the same Euro-American influences. This shift in consumer choice also suggests that some assimilation to Euro-American culture occurred more broadly. This study cannot determine the exact level; however, it does confirm that the Azusa Indians ate, dressed, and gambled just like their non-Indian neighbors. Finally, and quite importantly, the Indian rancho store transactions, including quantity and product choice, show that the Indians were consistent providers for their families and Cahuilla communities.

CONCLUSION:

Final Implications

The results of this dissertation address the existence of debt peonage arrangements on Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana and Ranch Azusa, but also have implications outside of the Los Angeles area. To address this issue with a greater degree of certainty, further studies of other ranchos with account books will be needed. But, even with the limitations of the two case studies provided here, I suggest that their results seemed to apply outside of the two ranchos studied. Letters and correspondence from and to rancheros confirm that the California Indians had options, which they exercised frequently. Stearns continually complained that he struggled to maintain an adequate supply of Indian workers and often relied on the Los Angeles jail to fill in the void. In the north, John Bidwell, facing a shortage of available Indian workers, chose to concede to the demands of Indian workers for higher wages rather than risk watching his wheat crops rot in the fields. The account book records of Rancho Azusa show that Indian workers often left without paying their outstanding debts. Other rancheros, such as Coutts, and Sterns, experienced the same circumstances, and only Coutts made a significant effort to hunt these workers down, with very limited success. I contend that the option for workers to leave on their own terms, which led to an increase in Indian worker mobility, has been grossly underestimated and that its implications are significant.

The central role of the rancho store, as evidenced on Rancho Azusa and to a lesser degree Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana, seems to hold true for the rest of the other larger California ranchos. These California ranchos represented self-sufficient enterprises which

included manufacturing, farming, ranching, and wine making. Store credit served as the currency in place of cash, especially during the post hide and tallow boom, while the rancho store acted as a much-needed financial institution for both employer and employee. And, equally as important, neither party at Rancho Azusa appeared to abuse the store credit system. Nor did this seem to be the case at the Stearns or Coutts ranchos during the early American period.

On the other hand, Yorba's Rancho Santiago policy of paying his Indians in silver makes it more difficult to apply this same process to the ranchos in the region, let alone to those to the north and south. The fact is that rancho accounting sources from the Mexican period have eluded scholars, and this absence has led to conjecture and speculation. Fortunately, Yorba's account book and records have survived, and they, at a minimum, strongly refute the existence of debt-peonage on Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana. Yet, they also show that the Indian workers' participation in a store credit economy was quite limited.

While the Mexican era projections must remain on hold, I can confidently conclude that the early American period California rancho operations seem to resemble each other both south and north of the Los Angeles. The use of the rancho store as the center of these rancho enterprises seems to have been quite common. Also, as the rancheros struggled to maintain an adequate supply of labor, workers demanded higher wages and moved from workplace to workplace with greater frequency, resulting in less oppressive working conditions.

Finally, the subject of California Indian labor outside of the missions seems to have suffered from a lack of interest, or, as my adviser once suggested to me, from a lack of sources. When I first proposed my idea of pursuing this Indian labor topic, a number of California scholars suggested that I might become frustrated and disappointed. I am fairly certain that the same sentiments were shared with scholars such as Philips, Magliari, and Silliman. In my case, early on, I found rancho account books from both Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana and Rancho Azusa. These confirmed that basic principles of economics were at work, even on the remote California frontier. In general, the results of this study have demonstrated that labor demand and supply forces generally worked as expected and slightly favored the Indian workers on the California rancho.

As in many studies, the finite time period and resources have facilitated other important and scholarly opportunities in the future. For example, Barger's explanations of the possibility of an excess supply of silver—the "Silver Thesis"—invited further consideration and research. While I have identified where these useful sources are archived, time and travel restrictions made it impossible for me to pursue the project further at this point in time. However, that is not to minimize the value of this information. If silver was in great supply during the Mexican period, this would surely better define the hide and tallow economy and explain why Yorba, and possibly other rancheros, paid their workers in silver.

I must reiterate once again that the intent of this dissertation was never to suggest that the California Indian workers or their families ever realized equal treatment or consideration by Spanish, Mexican, or American colonizers. Their indigenous stigma

remained with them in social, political, and economic spheres throughout California history, and sadly remains today. For a very brief time, they experienced a limited amount of protection under Mexican law, but even access to that was often a struggle. What the findings of this dissertation do indicate is that the available labor options to the California Indians increased as they moved from one period to another based on the labor supply and demand continuum. Still, my results never revealed any improving sentiments toward Indian workers or higher wages, which came in the form of some largesse from the rancheros.

This study has strongly challenged the existence of debt peonage arrangements on the California ranchos during both the Mexican and early American periods. While the rancho store served as the foundation for the widely-held debt-peonage thesis, this study, as with Latin American Hacienda scholarship, confirmed that the rancho store operated much differently than was previously acknowledged. Both the rancheros and the Indian workers benefited from the arrangement. In addition, rancho account book records revealed a workforce that was both in-demand and mobile. Worker mobility appears to have been much greater than scholars once assumed. This study also highlighted Indian consumer interest and demand for the latest available products and fashion. In addition, purchasing patterns suggest that a significant amount of supplies bought went to Indians' family and community members outside of the rancho.

I strongly suggest that more research is necessary in an effort to delve deeper into the life of these Indian workers. Finding more rancho account books is necessary and,

equally importantly, coding and compiling them with line-by-line detail will further expand the California Indian labor narrative.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

The Bowers Museum, Santa Ana, CA.

Business Ledger of Don Tomás Yorba: 1841-1849.

The Claremont Colleges Library Special Collection, Claremont, CA.

Vosburg, Keith. *Azusa Old and New: Being a True Recital of the Founding & Development of a California Community*. Azusa: Azusa Foot-hill Citrus Company, 1921.

The Huntington Library, San Marino, CA.

Abel Stearns Collection, Box II.

Dalton, Henry. Daily Occurrences at Azusa, Vols. 1-4, DL1158. Henry Dalton Collection.

Dalton, Henry. Indian Books-Wages for Indian Employees on Azusa Ranch, Vols. 1-4, DL1138-1144.

Los Angeles area court records, 1850-1899. Plaintiff Yorba, Tomas, deceased, Estate of Juan Maria Sepulveda, receiver.

Los Angeles County Prefecture Records, Vols. I-II.

Los Angeles City Archives, Records Management Division, City Clerk's Office, Piper Technical Center, Los Angeles, CA.

1836 Los Angeles Census, Register of the City of Los Angeles and its Jurisdiction, for the Year of 1836.

1844 Los Angeles Census, Register of the City of Los Angeles and its Jurisdiction, for the Year of 1844.

United States Census Bureau.

Population and Social Statistics, 1872, Octavo, pp. xlix, 80. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Preliminary Report on the Eighth Census, 1862, Octavo, pp. xvi. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Seventh Census of the United States, 1853, Quarto, pp. cxxxvi, 10. Washington: Robert Armstrong, Public Printer.

University of California Irvine Libraries, Special Collections and Archives, Irvine, CA.

Anaheim Water Company v. Semi-Tropic Water Company, Santa Ana River Report, MSR155.

Secondary Sources

Bancroft, Hubert H. *History of California*. San Francisco: The History Company, 1890.

———. *The Works*. A. L. Bancroft and Company, 1884.

Barger, William J. "Furs, Hides, and a Little Larceny: Smuggling and Its Role in the Early California's Economy." *The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly* 85 (2003): 395.

———. "Merchants of Los Angeles: Economics and Commerce in Mexican California." *Southern California Quarterly* 85 (2000): 132-33.

Bauer, Arnold J. "Rural Workers in Spanish America: Problems of Peonage and Oppression." *Hispanic America Historical Review* 59 (February 1979): 34-5.

Bean, Lowell J. *Mukats' People: The Cahuilla Indians in Southern California*. Berkley: California University Press, 1972.

Bean, Lowell J. and Bourgeault, Lisa. *The Cahuilla*. New York: Chelsea House Publisher, 1989.

Bolton, Herbert E. *The Spanish Borderland: A Chronicle of Old Florida and the Southwest*. Yale University Press, 1921.

Borah, Woodrow. *New Spain's Century of Depression*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1951.

Chevalier, Francois. *Land and Society in Colonial Mexico: The Great Hacienda*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1963.

Cleland, Robert G. *The Cattle on a Thousand Hills: Southern California, 1850-1880*. San Marino: Huntington Library Press, 1841.

Cook, Sherburne F. *The Conflict Between the California Indian and White Civilization*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

- Cross, Henry E. "Debt Peonage Reconsidered: A Case Study in Nineteenth-Century Zacatecas, Mexico." *The Business History Review* 53 (1979).
- Dakin, Susanna B. *A Scotch Paisano in Old Los Angeles: Hugo Reid's Life in California, 1832-1852 Derived from His Correspondence*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1839.
- Davis, William H. *Sixty Years in California*. San Francisco: A. J. Leary, 1889.
- Gibson, Wayne D. *Tomas Yorba's Santa Ana Viejo: 1769-1847*. Santa Ana: Santa Ana College Foundation Press, 1976.
- Greenwood, Roberta S. "Historical and Archaeological Study of the Yorba-Slaughter Adobe, San Bernardino County." Los Angeles District, Corps of Engineering, 1988.
- Hackel, Steven W. "Land Labor, and Production." In *Contested Eden: California before the Gold Rush*, edited by Ramón A. Gutiérrez and Richard J. Orsi, 134-46. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Heizer, Alan F and Alan F. Almquit. *The Other Californians: Prejudice, and Discrimination under Spain, Mexico, and The United States to 1920*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.
- Hough, John C. "John Henry Brinley: A Case Study in Rancho Supervision." *The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly* 40 (June 1958): 174-79.
- Jackson, Sheldon. *A British Ranchero in Old California: The Life and Times of Henry Dalton and the Rancho Azusa*. Glendale: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1987.
- Johnson-Dobbs, Kimberly. *CBR-02-014, Early California Laws and Policies Related to California Indians*. Sacramento: California State Library, 2002.
- Knight, Alan. "What Was It and Why was IT." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 18 (1986): 41-48.
- Magliari, Michael F. "Free Soil, Unfree Labor." *Pacific Historical Review* 73 (2005): 351-68.
- . "Free State Slavery: Bound Indian Labor and Slave Trafficking in California's Sacramento Valley." *Pacific Historical Review* 81 (May 2012): 157.
- Monroy, Douglas. *Thrown Among Strangers: The Making of the Mexican Culture in Frontier California*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

- North, Douglas C. "Institutions." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5 (1991): 97.
- Pearse, Andrew. *The Latin American Peasant*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Philips, George H. *Vineyards & Vaqueros: Indian Labor and the Economic Expansion of Southern California, 1771-1877*. Norman: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 2010.
- Robinson, Alfred. *Life in California*, New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1846.
- Robinson, John W. *Los Angeles in Civil War Days: 1860-1865, LA in Civil War Days Epidemic*. Los Angeles: Dawson Book Shop, 1977.
- Robinson, W. W. *Land in California: The Story of Mission Lands, Ranchos, Squatters, Mining Claims, Railroad Grants, Land Scrip, and Homesteads*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1948.
- Semo, Enrique. *Historia del Capitalismo en Mexico*. Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 1973.
- Silliman, Stephen. W. *Lost Laborers in Colonial California: Native Americans and the Archaeology of Ranch Petaluma*. Tucson: University of Arizona, 2004.
- Simpson, Eyler N. *The Ejido, Mexico's Way Out*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1971.
- Stavenhagen, Rodolfo. *Social Classes in Agrarian Societies*. New York: Anchor Press, 1975.
- Street, Richard S. *Beasts of the Field: A Narrative of California Farmworkers, 1769-1913*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Stephenson, Terry E. "Tomás Yorba, his Wife Vicenta, and his Account Book." *Historical Society of Southern California* 23 (1941).
- Turner, John Kenneth. *Barbarous Mexico*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr Cooperative, 1910.
- Weber, David J. *The Mexican Frontier, 1821-1846: The American Southwest Under Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982.
- White, Richard. *The Middle Ground Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Wilson, B. D. *The Indians of Southern California in 1852*. Edited by John Walton Caughey. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1995.

Zavala, Silvio. "Origenes coloniales del peonaje." *Trimestre Económico* 10 (1943-1944): 711-48.

Appendix A

California Rancho Account Books

In the early and mid-nineteenth century, many Californian rancheros operated large and complex enterprises which required keeping detailed accounting and labor records. Tomás Yorba and Henry Dalton were no exceptions and many of their account books survived. Unfortunately, Yorba's Indian workers were not significantly represented in his, but that was not the case for Dalton's books. Dalton also segregated his Indian worker's labor and purchasing transactions into separate Indian account books. These account books spanned an eight-year period from 1856 to 1864

Rancho Azusa Indian Worker Database

The Rancho Azusa Indian workers database includes 5737 line-item transactions which consists of the Indian workers' first and last name, date of entry, the number of days worked, amount of wages earned, amount of product purchased, the total cost of product purchased, the type of product purchased, and cash payments. Dalton organized his books by employee and by date of each entry. In order to simplify the reporting, the specific dates of the entries were dropped and replaced by a month-year value. For each specific product, a code number was assigned.

There were some shortcomings in collecting the line-item data and compiling this database. There was a noticeable gap of missing recordings between February 1860 and January 1861. It is quite likely that one of the Dalton books might have been destroyed or lost. Also, Dalton was not consistent with accurately entering the product quantity. In many cases the product quantity value was assigned to one even when total costs amount would suggest otherwise. To a lesser degree of significance, identifying the nineteenth-century product names was quite challenging at times. A best effort was put together to successfully translate Spanish abbreviations and decipher some poor and illegible writing of the product entries. As a result, there were a few duplicate code entries, but the duplicates were combined as a one in the reporting.

Appendix B

Rancho Azusa Account Books Material Codes

Material Description	Material Code
india	1
manta	2
cordelette	3
wine	4
aguardente	5
frealan	6
jabon	7
comisas	8
Jabon	9
borrache	10
medias	11
pano	12
zapatos	13
cigar	14
juesadas	15
pantalones	16
calico	17
calico	18
freja	19
baraja	20
drason	21
tobacco	22
sugar	23
brandy	24
gasa	25
vail	26
wool	27
plata	28
somebero	29
fresada	30
debt	31
miel	32

falla	33
corte	34
vestido	35
reboso	36
hilo	37
botella	38
maicena	39
soap	40
zincuter	41
baraja	42
vecirio	43
reboso	44
crackers	45
delano	46
candles	47
muslin	48
bayeta	49
horse Feed	50
velís	51
vesibio	53
bela	54
corbata	55
flour	56
café	57
molienda	58
papel	59
socks	60
cards	61
boarding	62
mercada	63
flannel Shirts	64
From Other	65
handkerchief	66
To Others	67
rice	68
wheat	69
belt	70
galleta	71
whiskey	72
pills	73

salt	74
sardines	75
cotton	76
beef	77
matches	78
comb	79
potatoes	80
molasses	81
shorts	82
overalls	83
hickory shirt	84
powder	85
coffee	86
beans	87
ham	88
corn meal	89
chickens	90
nails	91
tea	92
butter	93

Appendix C

Rancho Azusa Account Books Datasets

First Name Payout	Last Name	Entry Date	Day Worked	Wages Earned	Item Numbers	Item Costs	Cash
Lieab	Viejo	Oct-59	18	9.6			
Lieab	Viejo	Oct-59			8	2	1
Lieab	Viejo	Oct-59			16	4	2
Lieab	Viejo	Oct-59			3	0.6	3
Lieab	Viejo	Oct-59			2	0.4	4
Lieab	Viejo	Oct-59			4	1.8	5
Juan	Duran	Oct-58	19	14.4			
Juan	Duran	Oct-58			64	6.4	5
Juan	Duran	Oct-58			2	5	6
Martin	Duarte	Dec-56	25	18			
Martin	Duarte	Dec-56			1	0.4	7
Martin	Duarte	Dec-56			3	1.2	5
Martin	Duarte	Jan-57	25	18	6	12	8
Martin	Duarte	Jan-57					
Martin	Duarte	Jan-57			4	0.6	9
Martin	Duarte	Jan-57			10	5	1
Martin	Duarte	Jan-57			10	1	5
Martin	Duarte	Jan-57			1	0.2	12
Martin	Duarte	Jan-57			11	0.3	11
Martin	Duarte	Feb-57	25	18			
Martin	Duarte	Feb-57			1	0.4	9
Martin	Duarte	Feb-57			1	1	5
Martin	Duarte	Feb-57			1	1.6	13
Martin	Duarte	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Martin	Duarte	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Martin	Duarte	Feb-57			1	0.6	5
Martin	Duarte	Mar-57	25	18			
Martin	Duarte	Mar-57			1	0.12	14
Martin	Duarte	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Martin	Duarte	Mar-57			1	3.2	8
Martin	Duarte	Mar-57			2	2.8	13

Martin	Duarte	Mar-57			26	5.2	1
Martin	Duarte	Mar-57			45	9	2
Martin	Duarte	Mar-57			1	1.4	9
Martin	Duarte	Mar-57			1	0.2	5
Martin	Duarte	May-57	25	18			
Martin	Duarte	May-57			1	2.2	13
Martin	Duarte	May-57			1	1	5
Martin	Duarte	May-57			1	0.4	5
Martin	Duarte	Jun-57	25	18			
Martin	Duarte	Jun-57			1	2.2	13
Martin	Duarte	Jul-57	25	18			
Martin	Duarte	Jul-57			2	6	15
Martin	Duarte	Jul-57			1	2.4	16
Martin	Duarte	Jul-57			2	2	8
Martin	Duarte	Jul-57			1	1	5
Martin	Duarte	Jul-57			1	4.4	4
Martin	Duarte	Jul-57					
Martin	Duarte	Jun-58	25	18			
Martin	Duarte	Jun-58			1	1	8
Martin	Duarte	Jun-58					
Martin	Duarte	Jul-58	25	18			
Martin	Duarte	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Martin	Duarte	Jul-58			1	8.4	16
Martin	Duarte	Jul-58			1	2.4	19
Martin	Duarte	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Martin	Duarte	Jul-58			1	0.15	9
Martin	Duarte	Jul-58			4	1.6	5
Martin	Duarte	Jul-58			2	0.9	5
Martin	Duarte	Aug-58	25	18			
Martin	Duarte	Aug-58					
Martin	Duarte	Aug-58			10	10	4
Martin	Duarte	Aug-58			1	0.4	5
Martin	Duarte	Aug-58			1	1	4
Martin	Duarte	Aug-58			2	0.8	5
Martin	Duarte	Aug-58			1	0.1	19
Martin	Duarte	Aug-58			1	0.1	19
Martin	Duarte	Aug-58			1	0.6	5
Martin	Duarte	Sep-58	25	18			
Martin	Duarte	Sep-58			1	6	4
Martin	Duarte	Sep-58			2	0.8	5

Martin	Duarte	Sep-58					
Pio	Serrano	Dec-56	25	28			
Pio	Serrano	Dec-56			1	0.4	5
Pio	Serrano	Jan-57	25	28			
Pio	Serrano	Jan-57			1	1	9
Pio	Serrano	Feb-57	25	28			
Pio	Serrano	Feb-57			1	1	8
Pio	Serrano	Feb-57			1	2.5	16
Pio	Serrano	Feb-57			3	0.45	2
Pio	Serrano	Feb-57					
Pio	Serrano	Feb-57			1	0.4	4
Pio	Serrano	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Pio	Serrano	Feb-57			1	3.4	23
Pio	Serrano	Feb-57			3	0.45	1
Pio	Serrano	Feb-57					
Pio	Serrano	Mar-57	25	28			
Pio	Serrano	Mar-57			1	1.1	5
Pio	Serrano	Mar-57			1	1.6	13
Pio	Serrano	Mar-57			1	0.2	20
Pio	Serrano	Mar-57					
Pio	Serrano	Apr-57	25	28			
Pio	Serrano	May-57	25	28			
Pio	Serrano	Jun-57	25	28			
Pio	Serrano	Jul-57	25	28			
Pio	Serrano	Jul-57					
Pio	Serrano	Aug-57	25	28			
Pio	Serrano	Aug-57			1	2	4
Pio	Serrano	Sep-57	25	28			
Pio	Serrano	Sep-57			1	2	4
Pio	Serrano	Oct-57	25	28			
Pio	Serrano	Nov-57	25	28			
Pio	Serrano	Dec-57	25	28			
Pio	Serrano	Dec-57			1	3	4
Pio	Serrano	Dec-57			15	15	4
Francisco	Ortega	Dec-56	25	16			
Francisco	Ortega	Dec-56			1	1.6	8
Francisco	Ortega	Dec-56			10	13	
Francisco	Ortega	Dec-56			2	0.6	5
Francisco	Ortega	Jan-57	21	11.5			
Francisco	Ortega	Jan-57			1	0.5	5

Francisco	Ortega	Jan-57			4	0.5	14
Francisco	Ortega	Jan-57					
Francisco	Ortega	Feb-57			1	1.4	21
Francisco	Ortega	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Francisco	Ortega	Feb-57			1	0.3	22
Cochero	Garilacio	Mar-57	47	6.1			
Cochero	Garilacio	Mar-57			5	1.6	2
Cochero	Garilacio	Mar-57			1	0.3	9
Cochero	Garilacio	Mar-57			1	1.6	8
Cochero	Garilacio	Mar-57			1	2.2	13
Cochero	Garilacio	Mar-57			1	0.2	14
Cochero	Garilacio	Jul-57	10	1.2			
Cochero	Garilacio	Jul-57			1	1.2	2
Crispin		Jul-59	13	6.4			
Crispin		Jul-59					
Crispin		Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Crispin		Jul-59			1	0.2	9
Crispin		Jul-59			1	0.2	23
Crispin		Jul-59			7	1.6	1
Crispin		Jul-59			1	0.2	1.6
Crispin		Jul-59					
Crispin		Jul-59			1	3	9
Crispin		Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Crispin		Aug-59	32	16.2			
Crispin		Aug-59			8	8	3
Crispin		Aug-59					
Crispin		Aug-59			1	0.6	24
Crispin		Aug-59					
Crispin		Aug-59			4	2	4
Crispin		Aug-59			1	0.4	24
Crispin		Aug-59					
Crispin		Aug-59			5	2	1
Crispin		Aug-59	7	3.4			
					1	1	2
Bartolo		Jan-57	25	12			
Bartolo		Jan-57			18	2.4	25
Bartolo		Jan-57			22	4.1	1
Bartolo		Jan-57			10	1.2	13
Bartolo		Jan-57			1	0.3	5
Bartolo		Jan-57			1	0.3	26

Bartolo		Feb-57	25	12			
Bartolo		Feb-57			1	10	27
Bartolo		Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Bartolo		Feb-57			1	0.4	23
Bartolo		Feb-57			1	0.4	9
Bartolo		Mar-57	16	8			
Bartolo		Mar-57			10	4.4	23
Bartolo		Mar-57			1	1	28
Ramoncito		Oct-58	4.5	2.2			
Ramoncito		Oct-58			1	0.2	5
Ramoncito		Oct-58			2	8	5
Ramoncito		Nov-58	6	3			
Ramoncito		Nov-58			3	10	5
Ramoncito		Nov-58			1	4.4	29
Ramoncito		Nov-58			1	3	30
Ramoncito		Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Martino		Dec-56	9	3.3			
Martino		Dec-56			1	4.7	31
Ignacio	Oajariero	Feb-57	23	4			
Ignacio	Oajariero	Feb-57			2	0.5	12
Ignacio	Oajariero	Feb-57			4	0.05	5
Ignacio	Oajariero	Feb-57			2.5	1.4	5
Ignacio	Oajariero	Feb-57			5	1.2	2
Ignacio	Oajariero	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Ignacio	Oajariero	Feb-57			5	1.2	4
Ignacio	Oajariero	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Ignacio	Oajariero	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Ignacio	Oajariero	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Ignacio	Oajariero	Mar-57	19	4.4			
Ignacio	Oajariero	Mar-57			6	1.1	8
Ignacio	Oajariero	Mar-57			4	0.6	5
Ignacio	Oajariero	Mar-57			2	0.2	14
Ignacio	Oajariero	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Ignacio	Oajariero	Mar-57			1	0.3	5
Francisco	Ortega	Jan-57	25	10			
Francisco	Ortega	Jan-57			1	0.2	32
Francisco	Ortega	Jan-57			1	3.4	16
Francisco	Ortega	Feb-57	25	10			
Francisco	Ortega	Feb-57			1	1	13
Francisco	Ortega	Feb-57			2	1	5

Francisco	Ortega	Feb-57			2.5	1	5
Francisco	Ortega	Mar-57					
Francisco	Ortega	Mar-57			1	2	13
Francisco	Ortega	Mar-57			6	2.6	8
Francisco	Ortega	Aug-58	25	12			
Francisco	Ortega	Aug-58					
Francisco	Ortega	Aug-58			15	14.4	5
Francisco	Ortega	Sep-58	22	10.6			
Francisco	Ortega	Sep-58			2	2	33
Francisco	Ortega	Sep-58			2	0.4	23
Francisco	Ortega	Sep-58			1	0.2	26
Francisco	Ortega	Sep-58			1	1.4	33
Francisco	Ortega	Sep-58			4.5	0.7	1
Francisco	Ortega	Oct-58	25	27.7			
Francisco	Ortega	Oct-58					5.4
Francisco	Ortega	Nov-58	24	18			
Francisco	Ortega	Nov-58					5.1
Francisco	Ortega	Nov-58			30	12	5
Brijido	Morrillo	Dec-56	12	4.4			
Brijido	Morrillo	Dec-56			1	9.7	31
Brijido	Morrillo	Dec-56			2	2	5
Brijido	Morrillo	Jan-57	11	6.6			
Brijido	Morrillo	Jan-57			2	0.5	12
Brijido	Morrillo	Jan-57			3	2.7	5
Brijido	Morrillo	Jan-57			2	2	13
Brijido	Morrillo	Jan-57			4	1.2	5
Brijido	Morrillo	Jan-57			1	0.1	14
Brijido	Morrillo	Jan-57			1	0.1	5
Brijido	Morrillo	Feb-57	26	9.4			
Brijido	Morrillo	Feb-57			1	0.5	5
Brijido	Morrillo	Feb-57			1	2	29
Brijido	Morrillo	Feb-57			18	4.4	2
Brijido	Morrillo	Feb-57			2	0.4	12
Brijido	Morrillo	Feb-57			3	1.2	12
Brijido	Morrillo	Feb-57			1	3.2	5
Brijido	Morrillo	Feb-57			1	0.2	5
Brijido	Morrillo	Feb-57			3	3.6	30
Brijido	Morrillo	Feb-57			1	1	8
Brijido	Morrillo	Feb-57			1	0.1	5
Brijido	Morrillo	Feb-57			1	0.2	11

Brijido	Morrillo	Feb-57			1	0.2	5
Brijido	Morrillo	Mar-57	23	8.8			
Brijido	Morrillo	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Brijido	Morrillo	Mar-57			1	0.2	5
Brijido	Morrillo	May-57	26	19.1			
Oye	Salvatore	Feb-57					
Oye	Salvatore	Feb-57			8	3	1
Oye	Salvatore	Feb-57			6	1.4	2
Oye	Salvatore	Feb-57			1	0.2	10
Oye	Salvatore	Feb-57			1	0.6	5
Oye	Salvatore	May-57	21	7.7			
Oye	Salvatore	May-57			1	0.4	5
Oye	Salvatore	May-57			1	0.8	24
Oye	Salvatore	May-57			6	1.4	2
Oye	Salvatore	May-57			2	0.8	5
Oye	Salvatore	May-57			1	0.4	29
Oye	Salvatore	May-57			1	0.2	7
Oye	Salvatore	May-57			1	0.2	23
Oye	Salvatore	May-57			1	0.5	2
Oye	Salvatore	May-57			1	0.3	23
Oye	Salvatore	Jun-57	16	5.6			
Oye	Salvatore	Jun-57			1	0.4	5
Oye	Salvatore	Jun-57			1	1	8
Oye	Salvatore	Jun-57					
Oye	Salvatore	Jun-57			1	0.5	5
Oye	Salvatore	Jun-57			1	0.2	5
Oye	Salvatore	Jun-57					
Oye	Salvatore	Jun-57			1	0.4	5
Oye	Salvatore	Jun-57			1	1.4	2
Oye	Salvatore	Jul-57	13	4.7			
Oye	Salvatore	Jul-57			1	0.4	5
Oye	Salvatore	Jul-57					
Oye	Salvatore	Jul-57			1	0.4	
Oye	Salvatore	Jul-57			1	0.3	5
Oye	Salvatore	Jul-57			1	0.2	4
Oye	Salvatore	Jul-57			8	2	1
Oye	Salvatore	Jul-57			1	0.4	5
Oye	Salvatore	Jul-57					
Oye	Salvatore	Aug-57	12	4.4			
Oye	Salvatore	Aug-57			1	2.6	16

Oye	Salvatore	Aug-57			1	2.2	1
Oye	Salvatore	Aug-57			1	0.4	5
Oye	Salvatore	Aug-57			1	0.2	12
Andrea	Larandera	Dec-56	5	4			
Andrea	Larandera	Dec-56			1	2.2	31
Andrea	Larandera	Dec-56			10	2.2	2
Andrea	Larandera	Dec-56			6	1	5
Andrea	Larandera	Jan-57	7	3.4			
Andrea	Larandera	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Andrea	Larandera	Feb-57	6	3			
Andrea	Larandera	Feb-57			1	3	19
Andrea	Larandera	Feb-57			22	5.4	1
Andrea	Larandera	Feb-57					
Andrea	Larandera	Mar-57	19	14.4			
Andrea	Larandera	May-57	3	1.4			
Ahuja	Jiliner	Nov-58	5	10.2			
Ahuja	Jiliner	Nov-58			1	4	16
Ahuja	Jiliner	Nov-58			1	3	30
Ahuja	Jiliner	Nov-58			1	1	8
Ahuja	Jiliner	Nov-58					
Santiago		Oct-58	4.5	2.2			
Santiago		Oct-58			3	1	5
Santiago		Nov-58	12	6			
Santiago		Nov-58			2	0.8	5
Santiago		Nov-58			1	4.4	29
Santiago		Nov-58			1	3	19
Santiago		Nov-58			1	0.5	5
Jose	Viejo	Dec-56	11	3.3			
Jose	Viejo	Dec-56			1	6.6	31
Jose	Viejo	Dec-56			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Jan-57	18	6.6			
Jose	Viejo	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Jan-57			4	3	30
Jose	Viejo	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Jan-57			1	2.7	34
Jose	Viejo	Jan-57			1	0.2	5
Jose	Viejo	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Feb-57	26	11.1			
Jose	Viejo	Feb-57			4	1.6	5

Jose	Viejo	Feb-57			40	8.8	1
Jose	Viejo	Feb-57			2	0.4	12
Jose	Viejo	Feb-57			4	0.6	5
Jose	Viejo	Feb-57			8	3	2
Jose	Viejo	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Mar-57	24	8.8			
Jose	Viejo	Mar-57			1	1	20
Jose	Viejo	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Apr-57	24	10.4			
Jose	Viejo	Apr-57			2	1	5
Jose	Viejo	Apr-57			5	1.8	2
Jose	Viejo	Apr-57			2	0.8	5
Jose	Viejo	Apr-57			2	1	5
Jose	Viejo	Apr-57			4	4	2
Jose	Viejo	Apr-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Apr-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	May-57	20	7.4			
Jose	Viejo	May-57			1	4.6	35
Jose	Viejo	May-57			6	1.6	2
Jose	Viejo	May-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	May-57			1	0.4	14
Jose	Viejo	Jun-57	23	5.9			
Jose	Viejo	Jun-57			10	2.4	1
Jose	Viejo	Jun-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Jun-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Jun-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Jun-57			1	0.2	5
Jose	Viejo	Nov-58	8	4			
Jose	Viejo	Nov-58			4	1	2
Jose	Viejo	Nov-58			1	0.6	5
Jose	Viejo	Nov-58			1	0.2	5
Jose	Viejo	Nov-58			4	0.6	5
Jose	Viejo	Nov-58			1	1	8
Jose	Viejo	Dec-58	13	6.4			
Jose	Viejo	Dec-58			1	1.5	5
Jose	Viejo	Dec-58			1	0.4	23
Jose	Viejo	Dec-58					
Jose	Viejo	Dec-58			1	1	2

Jose	Viejo	Dec-58		3	0.6	2
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Dec-56				
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Dec-56		1	35.7	31
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Dec-56		1	2.2	13
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Dec-56		3	0.5	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Dec-56		2	0.8	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Dec-56		1	0.2	14
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Dec-56		1	1	8
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Dec-56		4	1	14
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Dec-56		1	0.4	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Dec-56		1	0.1	14
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Dec-56		2	0.2	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jan-57		1	1	2
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jan-57		4	1	14
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jan-57		1	1.4	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jan-57				
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jan-57		1	0.4	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jan-57		1	0.2	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jan-57		2	0.2	12
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jan-57		2	0.2	14
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jan-57		1	0.3	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jan-57		1	0.3	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jan-57				
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jan-57		1	0.2	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57	75	50		
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		3	0.25	14
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		2	0.25	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		1	1.2	8
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		4	1	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		1	2	29
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		1	2	8
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		2	0.2	14
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		4	0.4	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		4	0.4	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		1	0.2	14
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		1	0.4	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		1	0.1	14
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		10	2.4	2
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		10	2.4	1
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57		4	2	13

Lose Luis	Cocenero	Feb-57			2	0.2	14
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Mar-57					
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Mar-57			3	3.4	16
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Mar-57			1	0.4	8
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Mar-57			2	1	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Mar-57			1	0.6	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Mar-57					
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Mar-57			1	1	8
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jun-57					
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jun-57					
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jun-57					
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jun-57			1	2.4	16
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jun-57			1	2.2	13
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jun-57			1	1.6	8
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jun-57			1	0.4	4
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jul-57					
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jul-57			1	5	29
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jul-57					
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jul-57			1	0.2	20
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jun-58	314	230.6			
Lose Luis	Cocenero	Jun-58			1	0.6	5
Mariano	Viejo	Dec-56	11	4.1			
Mariano	Viejo	Dec-56			12	3	1
Mariano	Viejo	Dec-56			2	0.4	5
Mariano	Viejo	Dec-56			2	0.2	14
Mariano	Viejo	Dec-56			1	3	19
Mariano	Viejo	Jan-57	18	6.6			
Mariano	Viejo	Jan-57			1	0.5	5
Mariano	Viejo	Jan-57			4	0.4	5
Mariano	Viejo	Jan-57			1	0.1	14
Mariano	Viejo	Jan-57			1	0.1	14
Mariano	Viejo	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57	28	11.3			
Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57			2	0.2	14
Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57			16	2.4	1
Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57			12	3	2
Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57			1	0.4	
Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57					

Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57			11	2.4	1
Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57			1	0.6	8
Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57			2	0.2	14
Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57			4	0.4	5
Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Mariano	Viejo	Feb-57			4	0.4	5
Mariano	Viejo	Mar-57	21	7.5			
Mariano	Viejo	Mar-57			1	0.1	12
Mariano	Viejo	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Viejo	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Viejo	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Viejo	Apr-57	27	7.9			
Mariano	Viejo	Apr-57			12	3	1
Mariano	Viejo	Apr-57			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Viejo	Apr-57			2	0.2	14
Mariano	Viejo	Apr-57			6	1.7	2
Mariano	Viejo	Apr-57			12	3	1
Mariano	Viejo	Apr-57			2	1	5
Mariano	Viejo	Apr-57			7	1.7	2
Mariano	Viejo	Apr-57			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Viejo	Apr-57			2	0.2	14
Mariano	Viejo	Jul-59					
Mariano	Viejo	Jul-59			1	0.1	5
Mariano	Viejo	Aug-59	23	11.5			
Mariano	Viejo	Aug-59			10	2.4	1
Mariano	Viejo	Aug-59			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Viejo	Aug-59			7	3.7	24
Mariano	Viejo	Aug-59			2	0.2	24
Mariano	Viejo	Aug-59					
Mariano	Viejo	Aug-59			12	3	2
Mariano	Viejo	Aug-59			2	0.6	5
Mariano	Viejo	Sep-59	16	8			
Mariano	Viejo	Sep-59			12	3	1
Mariano	Viejo	Sep-59			1	0.5	5
Mariano	Viejo	Sep-59			1	1	2
Mariano	Viejo	Sep-59			1	0.1	14
Mariano	Viejo	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Viejo	Sep-59			12	3.2	2

Mariano	Viejo	Sep-59			2	2	13
Mariano	Viejo	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Viejo	Sep-59			1	4	35
Mariano	Viejo	Oct-59	14	7			
Juan	Pablo	Dec-56	11	4.1			
Juan	Pablo	Dec-56			1	7.3	31
Juan	Pablo	Dec-56			12	3	1
Juan	Pablo	Dec-56			1	0.4	5
Juan	Pablo	Dec-56			4	1	2
Juan	Pablo	Dec-56			4	0.5	9
Juan	Pablo	Dec-56			2	0.2	14
Juan	Pablo	Jan-57	15	5.3			
Juan	Pablo	Jan-57			1	3	30
Juan	Pablo	Jan-57			8	2	2
Juan	Pablo	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Juan	Pablo	Jan-57			2	0.2	9
Juan	Pablo	Jan-57			1	0.2	32
Juan	Pablo	Feb-57	26	9.4			
Juan	Pablo	Feb-57			1	1	8
Juan	Pablo	Feb-57			2	0.2	12
Juan	Pablo	Feb-57			1	0.2	5
Juan	Pablo	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Juan	Pablo	Feb-57			2	1	9
Juan	Pablo	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Juan	Pablo	Feb-57			1	1.1	8
Juan	Pablo	Feb-57			6	0.6	14
Juan	Pablo	Feb-57			8	2	2
Juan	Pablo	Feb-57			1	0.6	8
Juan	Pablo	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Juan	Pablo	Mar-57	6	2.2			
Juan	Pablo	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Juan	Pablo	Mar-57			2	0.3	37
Juan	Pablo	Mar-57			3	0.7	2
Juan	Pablo	Jul-57	14	5.2			
Juan	Pablo	Jul-57			1	2	16
Juan	Pablo	Jul-57					
Juan	Pablo	Jul-58	12	4.4			
Juan	Pablo	Jul-58			1	0.7	8
Juan	Pablo	Jul-58			1	0.2	14
Juan	Pablo	Jul-58			2	2	12

Mariano	Briejo	Oct-57	11	7			
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57	27	13.2			
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57			23	3	1
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57			6	1.2	2
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57			1	0.2	5
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57					
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57			1	3	30
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57			1	2	13
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57			12	3.4	1
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57			1	0.6	8
Mariano	Briejo	Dec-57			1	1.4	16
Mariano	Briejo	Jan-58	6	3			
Mariano	Briejo	Jan-58			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Briejo	Jan-58			1	0.4	5
Francisco	Alcalde	Dec-56	9	4.4			
Francisco	Alcalde	Dec-56			1	15.2	31
Francisco	Alcalde	Jan-57	18	9			
Francisco	Alcalde	Jan-57			8	2	2
Francisco	Alcalde	Feb-57	22	10.8			
Francisco	Alcalde	Feb-57			6	0.6	5
Francisco	Alcalde	Feb-57			7	1.6	2
Francisco	Alcalde	Feb-57			4	0.4	5
Francisco	Alcalde	Feb-57			4	1	9
Francisco	Alcalde	Feb-57			2	0.2	4
Francisco	Alcalde	Feb-57			2	0.4	12
Francisco	Alcalde	Mar-57	6	3			
Francisco	Alcalde	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Francisco	Alcalde	May-57	15	7.4			
Francisco	Alcalde	May-57			5	1.2	2
Francisco	Alcalde	May-57			1	0.1	5
Francisco	Alcalde	May-57			10	3	2
Francisco	Alcalde	May-57			2	1	5
Francisco	Alcalde	May-57			2	0.2	14
Francisco	Alcalde	May-57			1	1	5
Francisco	Alcalde	May-57			10	2.7	2

Francisco	Alcalde	May-57			2	0.6	30
Francisco	Alcalde	Jun-57	24	12			
Francisco	Alcalde	Jun-57					
Francisco	Alcalde	Jun-57			1	0.7	19
Francisco	Alcalde	Jun-57			10	5	4
Francisco	Alcalde	Jun-57			1	1.2	37
Francisco	Alcalde	Jun-57					
Francisco	Alcalde	Jun-57			1	0.6	5
Francisco	Alcalde	Jul-57	20	9.4			
Francisco	Alcalde	Jul-57			8	2	1
Francisco	Alcalde	Jul-57					
Francisco	Alcalde	Jul-57					
Francisco	Alcalde	Jul-57			2	0.2	20
Francisco	Alcalde	Jul-57			2	0.2	22
Pedro	Quintano	Dec-56	11	4.4			
Pedro	Quintano	Dec-56			1	6.2	31
Pedro	Quintano	Dec-56			1	0.4	38
Pedro	Quintano	Jan-57	16	5.8			
Pedro	Quintano	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintano	Jan-57			10	2.4	2
Pedro	Quintano	Jan-57			1	2.7	1
Pedro	Quintano	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintano	Jan-57			2	0.4	12
Pedro	Quintano	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintano	Jan-57			6	1.4	1
Pedro	Quintano	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintano	Feb-57	32	11.4			
Pedro	Quintano	Feb-57			1	1	8
Pedro	Quintano	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintano	Feb-57			2	0.2	9
Pedro	Quintano	Feb-57			1	3.4	16
Pedro	Quintano	Feb-57			10	2.4	1
Pedro	Quintano	Feb-57			10	2	2
Pedro	Quintano	Feb-57			3	0.4	9
Pedro	Quintano	Feb-57			1	0.2	5
Pedro	Quintano	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Pedro	Quintano	Feb-57			5	1.2	2
Pedro	Quintano	Feb-57			1	0.6	5
Pedro	Quintano	Feb-57			1	0.2	5
Pedro	Quintano	Mar-57	23	8.3			

Pedro	Quintano	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintano	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintano	Mar-57			1	0.1	9
Andres		Aug-57	13	6.4			
Andres		Aug-57			12	3	2
Andres		Aug-57			10	2.4	2
Andres		Aug-57			2	0.4	2
Andres		Aug-57					
Andres		Sep-57	11	5.4			
Andres		Sep-57			8	2	2
Andres		Sep-57			1	3	30
Andres		Sep-57			3	0.6	1
Andres		Sep-57					
Andres		Oct-57	22	13.8			
Andres		Oct-57			10	3	2
Andres		Oct-57			1	4	36
Andres		Oct-57			8	2	19
Andres		Oct-57			1	2	16
Andres		Oct-57			1	0.3	9
Andres		Oct-57			1	0.1	14
Andres		Nov-57	22	10.8			
Andres		Nov-57			2	0.2	9
Andres		Nov-57			2	0.2	12
Andres		Dec-57	18	8.8			
Andres		Dec-57			6	0.4	5
Andres		Dec-57					
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56	11	4.1			
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			1	6.2	31
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			1	2.2	13
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			1	0.4	5
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			1	0.1	14
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			4	0.6	5
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			5	0.5	14
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			1	1	8
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			2	2.2	13
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			3	5	16
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			3	1.4	2
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			2	2	1
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			2	2	1
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			2	0.2	12

Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			1	0.4	5
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			2	0.2	14
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			1	1	8
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			1	0.4	5
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			2	0.2	14
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			1	1	8
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			1	0.4	5
Francisco	Chino	Dec-56			1	0.4	5
Miguel	Silvas	Jul-58	9.5	7.1			
Miguel	Silvas	Jul-58					
Miguel	Silvas	Jul-58					
Ignacio	Ochoa	Aug-58	5.2	3			
Ignacio	Ochoa	Aug-58					
Ignacio	Ochoa	Aug-58			4	3	5
Jose Ante	Larjo	Sep-57	2	1			
Jose Ante	Larjo	Sep-57			1	1.5	31
Jose Ante	Larjo	Sep-57			1	1.4	29
Jose Ante	Larjo	Sep-57			1	0.1	23
Jose Ante	Larjo	Sep-57			1	2	16
Jose Ante	Larjo	Sep-57			4	0.6	2
Jose Ante	Larjo	Sep-57			1	0.4	5
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57	37	18.4			
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			6	1	2
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			2	1	4
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			1	0.4	5
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			1	1	8
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			1	0.6	39
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			1	3	30
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			1	0.4	5
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			2	1	5
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			1	0.1	9
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			1	2	8
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			1	0.4	5
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			1	0.1	5
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			1	0.1	9
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			2	0.2	5
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			2	0.2	9
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			1	0.1	40
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			2	0.2	40
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			1	0.1	22

Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			1	0.4	24
Jose Ante	Larjo	Oct-57			3	0.6	22
Pedro	Carpintero	Dec-56	9	3.3			
Pedro	Carpintero	Dec-56			1	2.2	13
Pedro	Carpintero	Dec-56			4	0.4	5
Pedro	Carpintero	Dec-56			2	0.2	12
Pedro	Carpintero	Dec-56			2	0.2	9
Pedro	Carpintero	Dec-56			1	0.1	14
Pedro	Carpintero	Jan-57	15	5.3			
Pedro	Carpintero	Jan-57			4	0.4	5
Pedro	Carpintero	Jan-57			1	0.1	14
Pedro	Carpintero	Jan-57			4	0.4	5
Pedro	Carpintero	Jan-57			1	0.1	14
Pedro	Carpintero	Jan-57			1	3.4	16
Pedro	Carpintero	Jan-57			1	1	8
Pedro	Carpintero	Feb-57	15	5.5			
Pedro	Carpintero	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Carpintero	Feb-57			1	0.6	29
Pedro	Carpintero	Feb-57			1	1	8
Pedro	Carpintero	Feb-57			2	0.2	12
Pedro	Carpintero	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Pedro	Carpintero	Feb-57			1	2	16
Pedro	Carpintero	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Pedro	Carpintero	Feb-57			4	2	29
Pedro	Carpintero	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Carpintero	Jul-58					
Pedro	Carpintero	Jul-58			4	0.4	5
Pedro	Carpintero	Jul-58			2	1.2	34
Jesus	Dias	Jul-58	5	2.4			
Jesus	Dias	Jul-58			1	2	16
Jesus	Dias	Jul-58					
Jesus	Dias	Jul-58			1	0.7	8
Jesus	Dias	Jul-58			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Dias	Dec-56	9	3.3			
Jesus	Dias	Dec-56			2	1	5
Jesus	Dias	Dec-56			1	0.1	14
Jesus	Dias	Dec-56			4	2.2	2
Jesus	Dias	Jan-57	18	6.6			
Jesus	Dias	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Dias	Jan-57			1	3	30

Jesus	Dias	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Dias	Jan-57			1	0.1	14
Jesus	Dias	Jan-57			1	0.1	12
Jesus	Dias	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Dias	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Dias	Jan-57			8	2	1
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57	31	13.6			
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			1	0.1	12
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			1	3	30
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			1	0.6	29
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			1	1	5
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			12	3	2
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			2	0.2	12
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			2	1	5
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			1	1	8
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			1	2	16
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Jesus	Dias	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Dias	Mar-57	6	2.2			
Jesus	Dias	Mar-57			1	1	8
Jesus	Dias	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Dias	Mar-57			1	0.1	14
Jesus	Dias	Jun-57	23	7.1			
Jesus	Dias	Jun-57			1	0.1	14
Jesus	Dias	Jun-57			1	0.2	23
Jesus	Dias	Jun-57					
Jesus	Dias	Jun-57			1	0.4	2
Jesus	Dias	Jun-57					
Jesus	Dias	Jun-57			1	3	1
Jesus	Dias	Jun-57			1	4	30
Jesus	Dias	Jul-57	22	8			
Jesus	Dias	Jul-57			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Dias	Jul-57					
Jesus	Dias	Jul-57					

Jesus	Dias	Aug-57	6	2.2			
Jesus	Dias	Aug-57			1	2.4	16
Jesus	Dias	Aug-57			8	2	2
Tomas	Chapo	Dec-86	9	3.3			
Tomas	Chapo	Dec-86			1	0.4	5
Tomas	Chapo	Dec-86			2	0.2	12
Tomas	Chapo	Dec-86			1	0.1	12
Tomas	Chapo	Dec-86			1	2.4	31
Tomas	Chapo	Jan-57	6	2.2			
Tomas	Chapo	Jan-57			2	1	5
Tomas	Chapo	Jan-57			1	0.1	14
Tomas	Chapo	Jan-57			2	1	5
Bautisto		Feb-56	9	2			
Bautisto		Feb-56			1	0.9	16
Bautisto		Feb-56			1	0.2	14
Bautisto		Feb-56			1	0.4	5
Bautisto		Feb-56			10	2.4	2
Bautisto		Feb-56			1	0.4	5
Bautisto		Mar-56	16	3.8			
Bautisto		Mar-56			1	0.4	5
Bautisto		Mar-56			7	1.8	1
Bautisto		Mar-56			1	0.4	5
Jose	Manuel	Jan-56	12	4.4			
Jose	Manuel	Jan-56			1	0.5	5
Jose	Manuel	Jan-56			1	3	30
Jose	Manuel	Jan-56			2	0.2	12
Crispin		Sep-59	12	6			
Crispin		Sep-59			1	1.1	31
Crispin		Sep-59			8	2	2
Crispin		Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Crispin		Sep-59			1	1.4	29
Crispin		Sep-59			1	0.4	9
Crispin		Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Crispin		Oct-59	30	14.9			
Crispin		Oct-59			1	1	8
Crispin		Oct-59			1	2	13
Crispin		Oct-59			1	1.6	13
Crispin		Oct-59			3	0.3	12
Crispin		Oct-59			2	0.2	23
Crispin		Oct-59			2	0.2	40

Crispin		Oct-59			1	0.4	4
Crispin		Oct-59			8	2	2
Crispin		Oct-59			2	0.4	12
Crispin		Oct-59			1	0.2	22
Crispin		Oct-59			1	0.2	4
Crispin		Oct-59			1	3	30
Crispin		Oct-59			1	2	16
Crispin		Oct-59			1	1.8	8
Crispin		Oct-59			1	0.2	2
Crispin		Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	Posobero	Dec-56	1	1.4			
Julian	Posobero	Dec-56			1	3	31
Julian	Posobero	Dec-56			1	0.3	5
Julian	Posobero	Jan-57	18	4.4			
Julian	Posobero	Jan-57			1	3	30
Julian	Posobero	Jan-57			1	0.1	14
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57	30	8			
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57			8	2	2
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57			1	2.2	13
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57			2	0.2	12
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57			1	1	8
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57			1	1	8
Julian	Posobero	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Julian	Posobero	Mar-57	20	4.4			
Julian	Posobero	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Julian	Posobero	Mar-57			1	0.1	14
Julian	Posobero	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Julian	Posobero	May-57	21	5.2			
Julian	Posobero	May-57			1	4.4	35
Julian	Posobero	May-57			1	1	5
Julian	Posobero	May-57			1	0.1	14
Julian	Posobero	Jun-57	18	3.8			

Julian	Posobero	Jun-57			1	0.4	5
Julian	Posobero	Jun-57			1	0.1	22
Julian	Posobero	Jun-57			1	0.4	
Julian	Posobero	Jun-57					
Julian	Posobero	Jun-57			1	0.4	5
Julian	Posobero	Jun-57					
Julian	Posobero	Jun-57			1	0.1	23
Julian	Posobero	Jun-57			1	0.1	12
Julian	Posobero	Jul-57	18	4.4			
Julian	Posobero	Jul-57			1	0.4	5
Julian	Posobero	Jul-57					
Julian	Posobero	Jul-57			1	2.2	16
Julian	Posobero	Aug-57	12	3			
Julian	Posobero	Aug-57			1	3	30
Julian	Posobero	Aug-57			1	0.2	5
Julian	Posobero	Jun-58	15	3.6			
Julian	Posobero	Jun-58			1	0.6	5
Julian	Posobero	Jun-58			1	0.6	5
Julian	Posobero	Jun-58			1	0.4	5
Julian	Posobero	Jun-58			1	0.1	23
Julian	Posobero	Jun-58					
Julian	Posobero	Jun-58			1	0.6	5
Julian	Posobero	Jul-58	33	9			
Julian	Posobero	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Julian	Posobero	Jul-58					
Julian	Posobero	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Julian	Posobero	Jul-58			4	0.2	12
Julian	Posobero	Jul-58					
Julian	Posobero	Jul-58			1	0.2	5
Julian	Posobero	Jul-58					
Julian	Posobero	Jul-58			1	0.2	5
Julian	Posobero	Jul-58					
Julian	Posobero	Jul-58			1	0.2	5
Julian	Posobero	Jul-58					
Julian	Posobero	Aug-58	1	0.23			
Julian	Posobero	Aug-58					
Julian	Posobero	Aug-58			1	0.6	5
Julian	Posobero	Aug-58					
Anesdano		Dec-56	18	6.6			
Anesdano		Dec-56			4	1.6	5

Anesdano		Dec-56			2	2	8
Anesdano		Dec-56			4	2	5
Anesdano		Dec-56			2	0.2	14
Coyote		Jan-57	11	5.6			
Coyote		Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Coyote		Jan-57			1	1.6	8
Coyote		Jan-57			1	1.2	41
Coyote		Jan-57			1	0.2	5
Coyote		Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Coyote		Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Coyote		Jan-57					
Coyote		Jan-57			1	0.6	5
Coyote		Jul-57	7	3			
Coyote		Jul-57			1	0.4	5
Coyote		Jul-57					
Coyote		Jul-57			1	0.4	5
Coyote		Jul-57					
Felix		Jul-58	6	2.2			
Felix		Jul-58			1	0.4	5
Felix		Jul-58					
Felix		Jul-58			1	0.4	5
Julian	Poroleso	Sep-58	19	1.7			
Julian	Poroleso	Sep-58			1	0.2	5
Julian	Poroleso	Oct-58	30	11			
Julian	Poroleso	Oct-58			1	0.6	5
Julian	Poroleso	Oct-58			1	0.6	5
Julian	Poroleso	Oct-58			1	0.45	2
Julian	Poroleso	Oct-58			1	0.6	5
Julian	Poroleso	Oct-58			1	0.2	5
Julian	Poroleso	Oct-58			1	0.6	5
Julian	Poroleso	Oct-58			1	0.4	5
Julian	Poroleso	Oct-58			1	0.25	5
Julian	Poroleso	Oct-58			1	0.6	6
Julian	Poroleso	Oct-58			1	0.7	5
Julian	Poroleso	Oct-58			1	0.4	5
Julian	Poroleso	Oct-58			1	0.4	5
Julian	Poroleso	Nov-58	12	5.2			
Julian	Poroleso	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Julian	Poroleso	Nov-58			1	0.2	5
Julian	Poroleso	Nov-58			1	0.4	5

Julian	Poroleso	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Julian	Poroleso	Nov-58			1	1	8
Julian	Poroleso	Nov-58			1	3	30
Jose	Fuerto	Dec-56	9	3.3			
Jose	Fuerto	Dec-56			2	1	5
Jose	Fuerto	Dec-56			1	0.1	14
Jose	Fuerto	Dec-56			9	2.2	2
Jose	Flores	Jan-57	10	3.4			
Jose	Flores	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Flores	Jan-57					
Jose	Flores	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Flores	Jan-57					
Jose	Flores	Jan-57			1	0.3	43
Ignacio		Oct-58	11	2.6			
Ignacio		Oct-58			1	2	
Ignacio		Oct-58			1	0.2	
Ignacio		Oct-58			1	0.2	43
Ignacio		Oct-58			1	0.2	9
Tamaris		Jun-58	15	6			
Tamaris		Jun-58			1	3	30
Tamaris		Jun-58					
Tamaris		Jun-58			1	0.6	5
Tamaris		Jun-58			1	0.3	5
Tamaris		Jun-58					
Tamaris		Jun-58					
Tamaris		Jun-58			1	0.3	6
Tamaris		Jun-58			2	0.8	5
Tamaris		Jun-58					
Tamaris		Jun-58			1	2	16
Tamaris		Jun-58					
Tamaris		Jun-58			1	0.2	5
Tamaris		Jun-58	11	4.1			
Tamaris		Jun-58					
Tamaris		Jun-58					
Tamaris		Jun-58					
Jose	Ignacio	Jan-57	29	10.7			
Jose	Ignacio	Jan-57			1	0.2	5
Jose	Ignacio	Jan-57			3	3	30
Jose	Ignacio	Jan-57			2	0.2	9
Jose	Ignacio	Jan-57			4	0.4	12

Jose	Ignacio	Jan-57			4	0.6	5
Jose	Ignacio	Jan-57			9	2.2	2
Jose	Ignacio	Jan-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Ignacio	Feb-57			11	2.7	2
Bruno	Cojo	Jun-57	11	3.9			
Bruno	Cojo	Jun-57			1	1	2
Bruno	Cojo	Jun-57					
Bruno	Cojo	Jun-57			1	0.2	4
Bruno	Cojo	Jun-57			1	0.4	5
Bruno	Cojo	Jun-57			2	0.2	12
Bruno	Cojo	Jun-57			4	1.1	2
Bruno	Cojo	Jul-57	20	7.7			
Bruno	Cojo	Jul-57			1	0.4	5
Bruno	Cojo	Jul-57					
Bruno	Cojo	Jul-57			1	1	2
Bruno	Cojo	Jul-57			1	2.2	16
Bruno	Cojo	Jul-57			1	0.4	5
Bruno	Cojo	Aug-57	15	8.1			
Bruno	Cojo	Aug-57			1	3	30
Bruno	Cojo	Aug-57			1	0.6	5
Bruno	Cojo	Aug-57			1	0.1	14
Bruno	Cojo	Aug-57			1	0.2	4
Bruno	Cojo	Aug-57			1	0.6	5
Bruno	Cojo	Aug-57			1	0.6	9
Bruno	Cojo	Aug-57			1	0.6	5
Jose	Ignacio	Jan-58	9	3.1			
Jose	Ignacio	Jan-58			8	1.7	2
Jose	Ignacio	Jan-58			1	0.4	5
Jose	Ignacio	Jan-58					
Ramon	Huertes	Jan-57	12	4.4			
Ramon	Huertes	Jan-57			1	20.4	31
Ramon	Huertes	Jan-57			1	0.2	5
Ramon	Huertes	Feb-57	31	12.1			
Ramon	Huertes	Feb-57			1	0.1	12
Ramon	Huertes	Feb-57			1	0.3	5
Ramon	Huertes	Feb-57			1	0.1	12
Ramon	Huertes	Feb-57			1	0.3	5
Ramon	Huertes	Feb-57			1	2	30
Ramon	Huertes	Feb-57			4	3.4	1
Ramon	Huertes	Feb-57			1	0.2	5

Ramon	Huerteso	Feb-57			1	1.4	29
Ramon	Huerteso	Feb-57			1	2	13
Ramon	Huerteso	Mar-57	23	8.5			
Ramon	Huerteso	Mar-57			1	1	8
Ramon	Huerteso	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Ramon	Huerteso	Mar-57			6	1.6	2
Ramon	Huerteso	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Ramon	Huerteso	Mar-57			1	1	8
Ramon	Huerteso	Jun-57	12.5	4.7			
Ramon	Huerteso	Jun-57			1	1.4	43
Ramon	Huerteso	Jun-57			9	2.2	1
Ramon	Huerteso	Jun-57			1	0.4	5
Ramon	Huerteso	Jun-57					
Ramon	Huerteso	Jun-57			3	0.2	5
Ramon	Huerteso	Jun-57			1	0.4	5
Ramon	Huerteso	Jun-57					
Ramon	Huerteso	Jun-57			1	4.4	44
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-57	20	7.4			
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-57			1	0.4	5
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-57					
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-57					
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-57			1	0.4	5
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-57			1	0.4	5
Ramon	Huerteso	Aug-57	11	4.1			
Ramon	Huerteso	Aug-57			9	2.2	1
Ramon	Huerteso	Aug-57					
Ramon	Huerteso	Jun-58	5	2.4			
Ramon	Huerteso	Jun-58			1	1	0.4
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-58	34.5	23.2			
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-58			3	0.6	2
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-58			1	0.1	9
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-58					
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-58			1	0.3	5
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-58			1	0.5	5
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-58					
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-58			1	1	8
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-58					
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-58			1	2	16

Ramon	Huerteso	Jul-58			1	0.6	38
Ramon	Huerteso	Aug-58	11	5.4			
Ramon	Huerteso	Aug-58					
Ramon	Huerteso	Aug-58			1	0.4	5
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jan-57			1	5.6	31
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jan-57	12	4.4			
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jan-57			1	0.2	5
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57	32	11.4			
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			4	1.6	5
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			1	2.4	16
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			2	2.3	29
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			1	0.1	12
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			1	3.4	16
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			1	2.2	13
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			2	4.9	16
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			1	0.1	9
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			1	0.4	29
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			1	0.2	14
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			1	1	8
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Feb-57			1	0.1	14
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Mar-57	24	11			
Jose	Flores	Mar-57			1	0.1	14

Antonio							
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Mar-57			1	1	8
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Mar-57			2	2	13
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Mar-57			4	1.2	5
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Mar-57			2	1.4	29
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Mar-57			1	3	16
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Mar-57			1	1.6	13
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Apr-57	22	11.8			
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Apr-57			2	1	5
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Apr-57			1	2.2	13
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Apr-57			1	1	8
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Apr-57			1	2.2	13
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Apr-57			1	2.2	16
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	May-57	25	9.3			
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	May-57			1	3	43
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	May-57			1	0.4	5
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	May-57			1	0.4	5
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jul-57	23	8.3			
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jul-57			1	0.4	5
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jul-57					
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jul-57			1	1	5
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jul-57			1	2.2	16
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jul-57			1	1	8
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jul-57					
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jul-57			1	3	30

Antonio							
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Aug-57	13	4.7			
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Aug-57			1	2.4	16
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Aug-57			1	1	8
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Aug-57			1	0.2	14
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Aug-57			1	0.4	5
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Sep-58	12	4.4			
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Oct-58	25	9.9			
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Oct-58					
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Oct-58			1	0.4	5
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jul-58	21	13.2			
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jul-58					
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jul-58			1	0.1	14
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Jul-58					
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Aug-58	5	2.4			
Jose							
Antonio	Flores	Aug-58			1	0.2	9
Garrocha		Feb-57	31	11.1			
Garrocha		Feb-57			10	2.4	1
Garrocha		Feb-57			10	2.4	2
Garrocha		Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Garrocha		Feb-57			1	0.2	9
Garrocha		Feb-57			1	0.5	2
Garrocha		Feb-57			8	1.7	2
Garrocha		Feb-57			1	3	30
Garrocha		Feb-57			9	2.4	1
Garrocha		Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Garrocha		Feb-57			1	0.2	37
Garrocha		Mar-57	30	10.2			
Garrocha		Mar-57			9	2.2	1
Garrocha		Mar-57			1	0.4	5

Garrocha		Mar-57			8	2	1
Garrocha		Mar-57			1	0.1	9
Garrocha		Mar-57			9	2.2	2
Garrocha		Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Garrocha		Mar-57			1	0.2	40
Garrocha		Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Garrocha		Mar-57			1	0.2	24
Garrocha		Mar-57			1	0.1	14
Garrocha		Nov-57					
Garrocha		Nov-57			1	0.4	5
Garrocha		Nov-57			6	0.6	23
Garrocha		Nov-57			3	1.3	2
Garrocha		Dec-57	6	3			
Garrocha		Dec-57			2	0.2	12
Garrocha		Dec-57			2	0.2	23
Garrocha		Dec-57			1	0.4	5
Garrocha		Dec-57					
Mariano		Jun-58	5	1.7			
Mariano		Jun-58			12	2.2	1
Mariano		Jun-58			6	1.4	5
Mariano		Jun-58					
Mariano		Jun-58					
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59	16	8			
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59					
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			1	0.5	14
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			1	0.4	5
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			1	0.4	5
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			6	0.2	2
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			2	0.2	9
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			1	0.1	14
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			4	0.4	24
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			1	0.1	23
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			3	0.3	40
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			1	0.4	24
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			2	0.2	23
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			1	0.2	24
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			1	0.1	45
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59					
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			1	1	46
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			1	0.1	47

Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			2	0.2	24
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			1	0.1	23
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59					
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			4	0.4	5
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59			1	0.1	14
Joneato	Flores	Aug-59					
Joneato	Flores	Sep-59	12	6			
Joneato	Flores	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Joneato	Flores	Sep-59			8	2	1
Joneato	Flores	Sep-59			8	2	48
Joneato	Flores	Sep-59			1	2	13
Joneato	Flores	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Rosa	Planchiadora	Feb-57	1	0.4			
Rosa	Planchiadora	Feb-57			9	2.2	9
Rosa	Planchiadora	Mar-57	12	6.6			
Rosa	Planchiadora	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Rosa	Planchiadora	Mar-57			9	2.2	1
Rosa	Planchiadora	Mar-57			1	0.1	14
Rosa	Planchiadora	Mar-57			1	0.1	14
Rosa	Planchiadora	Mar-57			1	0.4	5
Rosa	Planchiadora	Mar-57			18	1.9	1
Rosa	Planchiadora	Mar-57			1	0.1	12
Rosa	Planchiadora	Jun-57	8	4			
Rosa	Planchiadora	Jul-57					
Rosa	Planchiadora	Jul-57					
Rosa	Planchiadora	Aug-57	10	5			
Antonio		Jun-58	9	3.1			
Antonio		Jun-58			1	0.4	5
Antonio		Jun-58			1	0.1	23
Antonio		Jul-58	23	6.3			
Antonio		Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Antonio		Jul-58			3	1.2	5
Antonio		Jul-58					
Antonio		Jul-58					
Antonio		Jul-58	5	1.7			
Antonio		Jul-58			1	0.7	5
Luis	Ybarra	Feb-57	10	3.6			
Luis	Ybarra	Feb-57			10	2.4	1
Luis	Ybarra	Feb-57			5	1.2	2
Luis	Ybarra	Feb-57			1	3	30

Luis	Ybarra	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Luis	Ybarra	Mar-57	15	5.5			
Luis	Ybarra	Mar-57			7	2	1
Luis	Ybarra	Mar-57			1	0.1	9
Marcelina		Jun-58	4	2			
Marcelina		Jun-58			10	2.4	1
Marcelina		Jul-58	2	1			
Marcelina		Jul-58			8	2	1
Marcelina		Jul-58			4	1	2
Pedro	Aberrero	Feb-57					
Pedro	Aberrero	Feb-57			1	0.4	29
Pedro	Aberrero	Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Feb-57			4	1	2
Pedro	Aberrero	Feb-57			1	2	13
Pedro	Aberrero	Mar-57	11	6.7			
Pedro	Aberrero	Mar-57			2	2	8
Pedro	Aberrero	Jun-58					
Pedro	Aberrero	Jun-58			1	0.6	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Jun-58			1	3	16
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58	72	45			
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			12	3	2
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			1	2.4	16
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			1	2	13
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			1	2	8
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			1	3	30
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			4	1.4	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			3	0.3	14
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			2	0.9	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			1	0.1	14
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			1	0.4	6
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			6	0.6	14
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			12	3	1
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			12	3	1
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			9	2.8	2
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			6	3.4	49
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			6	0.6	9
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			3	1.6	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			20	11.2	5

Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			1	1	8
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Jul-58			1	2.2	16
Pedro	Aberrero	Aug-58	23	14.3			
Pedro	Aberrero	Aug-58					
Pedro	Aberrero	Aug-58			1	5	50
Pedro	Aberrero	Aug-58			1	0.6	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Aug-58			1	0.6	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Aug-58			1	0.6	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Aug-58			2	0.2	9
Pedro	Aberrero	Sep-58					
Pedro	Aberrero	Sep-58			1	0.6	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Sep-58			2	0.4	12
Pedro	Aberrero	Sep-58			1	0.6	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Sep-58					
Pedro	Aberrero	Oct-58	53	33.1			
Pedro	Aberrero	Oct-58			1	0.6	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Oct-58			2	0.6	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Oct-58					
Pedro	Aberrero	Oct-58					
Pedro	Aberrero	Oct-58			1	0.1	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Oct-58			1	2.4	8
Pedro	Aberrero	Nov-58	23	10.5			
Pedro	Aberrero	Nov-58			2	3	30
Pedro	Aberrero	Nov-58			1	1	8
Pedro	Aberrero	Nov-58			12	4.4	29
Pedro	Aberrero	Nov-58			1	4	16
Pedro	Aberrero	Nov-58			1	0.2	9
Pedro	Aberrero	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Nov-58			10	2.4	1
Pedro	Aberrero	Nov-58			1	0.2	4
Pedro	Aberrero	Nov-58			3	0.6	1
Pedro	Aberrero	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Dec-58					
Pedro	Aberrero	Dec-58			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Aberrero	Dec-58			1	0.4	8
Pedro	Aberrero	Dec-58					
Chanate		Feb-57	13	3			

Chanate		Feb-57			1	2	16
Chanate		Feb-57			1	0.6	5
Chanate		Feb-57			1	3	30
Chanate		Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Chanate		Mar-58	14	3.4			
Chanate		Mar-58			1	0.4	5
Chanate		Mar-58			2	0.2	12
Chanate		Mar-58			1	0.4	5
Manuel	Janolero	Jul-58					
Manuel	Janolero	Jul-58			2	1.2	4
Manuel	Janolero	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Manuel	Janolero	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Manuel	Janolero	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Manuel	Janolero	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Manuel	Janolero	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Manuel	Janolero	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Manuel	Janolero	Jul-58			1	0.6	5
Manuel	Janolero	Jul-58			1	0.7	5
Manuel	Janolero	Jul-58			1	0.7	5
Manuel	Janolero	Jul-58			1	0.1	5
Manuel	Janolero	Jul-58			1	0.1	5
Manuel	Janolero	Aug-58	47	123.4			
Manuel	Janolero	Aug-58			4	7.4	30
Manuel	Janolero	Aug-58			1	0.4	22
Manuel	Janolero	Aug-58					
Juquin		Feb-57	20	7			
Juquin		Feb-57			6	1.4	2
Juquin		Feb-57			1	3	30
Juquin		Feb-57			8	2.2	1
Juquin		Feb-57			2	0.2	9
Juquin		Feb-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Alvarier	Sep-58	18	14.2			
Jose	Alvarier	Sep-58			2	0.2	22
Jose	Alvarier	Sep-58			2	0.2	9
Jose	Alvarier	Sep-58			1	0.2	12
Jose	Alvarier	Sep-58			1	0.6	5
Jose	Alvarier	Sep-58					
Jose	Alvarier	Sep-58					
Jose	Alvarier	Sep-58					
Jose	Alvarier	Sep-58			4	0.6	38
Jose	Alvarier	Sep-58			1	0.2	5

Jose	Alvarier	Sep-58			1	0.2	5
Jose	Alvarier	Sep-58					
Jose	Alvarier	Nov-58					
Jose	Alvarier	Nov-58					
Jose	Alvarier	Nov-58			1	1	8
Jose	Alvarier	Nov-58			11	2.05	2
Jose	Alvarier	Nov-58			10	1.2	4
Jose	Alvarier	Nov-58			1	1.2	16
Jose	Alvarier	Nov-58			2	2.4	16
Jose	Alvarier	Nov-58					
Jose	Alvarier	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Jose	Alvarier	Nov-58			1	3.4	16
Fernando	Pajanero	Sep-58	11	2			
Fernando	Pajanero	Sep-58			1	0.2	23
Fernando	Pajanero	Sep-58			1	0.8	5
Fernando	Pajanero	Nov-58	9	9			
Fernando	Pajanero	Nov-58			1	0.1	9
Fernando	Pajanero	Nov-58			2	2	8
Fernando	Pajanero	Nov-58			1	1.6	16
Fernando	Pajanero	Nov-58			1	0.4	19
Fernando	Pajanero	Nov-58			1	0.2	52
Fernando	Pajanero	Nov-58			4	0.4	9
Fernando	Pajanero	Nov-58			1	0.6	5
Simon	Viejo	Feb-57	5	1.7			
Simon	Viejo	Feb-57			7	1.7	2
Simon	Viejo	Mar-57	6	2.2			
Simon	Viejo	Mar-57			9	2.2	2
Bruno	Lojo	Oct-58	22	40.1			
Bruno	Lojo	Oct-58			1	5	31
Bruno	Lojo	Oct-58			1	0.2	9
Cayetano	Duarte	Jul-58	19.5	14.5			
Cayetano	Duarte	Jul-58					
Cayetano	Duarte	Jul-58			1	4.4	16
Cayetano	Duarte	Jul-58			1	2	13
Cayetano	Duarte	Jul-58					
Cayetano	Duarte	Jul-58					
Jose	Lugo	Jul-58	9	7.1			
Jose	Lugo	Jul-58					
Jose	Lugo	Jul-58			1	3.5	56
Lorenzo	Elias	Jul-58	13	6.4			

Lorenzo	Elias	Jul-58			1	1	8
Rosa		Oct-58	2	0.6			
Rosa		Oct-58			8	1	25
Rosa		Nov-58	8	2			
Rosa		Nov-58			1	0.1	23
Romon	Ortega	Jul-58					
Romon	Ortega	Jul-58			12	15	8
Romon	Ortega	Aug-58	30	25			
Romon	Ortega	Aug-58					
Romon	Ortega	Aug-58			4	0.6	22
Romon	Ortega	Aug-58			6	0.4	9
Romon	Ortega	Aug-58			11	5.5	5
Romon	Ortega	Aug-58			12	1.2	23
Romon	Ortega	Aug-58			6	4.5	57
Romon	Ortega	Aug-58			1	0.1	47
Romon	Ortega	Aug-58			2	0.2	28
Romon	Ortega	Aug-58			2	0.2	40
Romon	Ortega	Aug-58			2	0.2	9
Romon	Ortega	Sep-58					
Romon	Ortega	Sep-58			1	0.4	22
Romon	Ortega	Sep-58					
Romon	Ortega	Sep-58			1	0.4	23
Romon	Ortega	Sep-58			5	5	52
Romon	Ortega	Sep-58					
Romon	Ortega	Oct-58					
Romon	Ortega	Oct-58			1	2	13
Romon	Ortega	Oct-58					
Romon	Ortega	Nov-58	101	84.1			
Romon	Ortega	Nov-58					
Romon	Ortega	Nov-58			13	4.3	58
Jose	Flores	Sep-57	6	3			
Jose	Flores	Sep-57			1	1.4	31
Jose	Flores	Sep-57			3	0.6	2
Jose	Flores	Sep-57			1	1.4	16
Jose	Flores	Sep-57			1	0.1	14
Jose	Flores	Sep-57			2	0.2	5
Jose	Flores	Sep-57			1	0.2	5
Jose	Flores	Sep-57			1	0.2	23
Jose	Flores	Sep-57			1	0.6	8
Jose	Flores	Sep-57			1	2.6	16

Jose	Flores	Sep-57			1	2	13
Jose	Flores	Sep-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Flores	Oct-57	36.5	18.2			
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			1	0.2	40
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			1	0.3	4
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			1	0.4	4
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			8	2	1
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			8	2	2
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			1	0.2	5
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			1	2	13
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			1	1.4	29
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			1	2	16
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			1	0.2	5
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			1	0.2	5
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			1	0.1	40
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			1	2	16
Jose	Flores	Oct-57			6	0.6	5
Jose	Flores	Nov-57	25.5	12.6			
Jose	Flores	Nov-57			1	0.2	24
Jose	Flores	Nov-57			1	0.9	8
Jose	Flores	Nov-57			1	0.1	23
Jose	Flores	Nov-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Flores	Nov-57			1	0.2	12
Jose	Flores	Nov-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Flores	Nov-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Flores	Nov-57			2	1.6	57
Jose	Flores	Nov-57			4	1.6	5
Jose	Flores	Dec-57	29	15.4			
Jose	Flores	Dec-57			2	1.6	57
Jose	Flores	Dec-57			4	0.8	5
Jose	Flores	Dec-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Flores	Dec-57			16	4	1
Jose	Flores	Dec-57			8	1.6	2
Jose	Flores	Dec-57			1	1.4	16
Jose	Flores	Dec-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Flores	Dec-57			2	2	8
Jose	Flores	Dec-57			1	3.4	16
Jose	Flores	Dec-57			1	0.4	5
Jose	Flores	Dec-57			1	0.4	5

Jose	Flores	Dec-57			1	2	13
Jose	De Marne	Jun-58					
Jose	De Marne	Jun-58			1	1	22
Jose	De Marne	Jun-58			1	0.15	9
Jose	De Marne	Jun-58			1	0.5	22
Jose	De Marne	Aug-58	63	105			
Jose	De Marne	Aug-58			1	0.15	9
Gavino	Ortega	Aug-58					
Gavino	Ortega	Aug-58					
Gavino	Ortega	Sep-58	36	4			
Gavino	Ortega	Sep-58			1	0.4	22
Gavino	Ortega	Sep-58			2	0.2	4
Gavino	Ortega	Sep-58			5	0.5	59
Gavino	Ortega	Sep-58			2	2	4
Gavino	Ortega	Sep-58			1	0.3	51
Gavino	Ortega	Sep-58			2	0.4	23
Gavino	Ortega	Sep-58			1	0.1	51
Gavino	Ortega	Sep-58					
Gavino	Ortega	Sep-58					
Julian	Molino	Nov-58					
Julian	Molino	Nov-58			1	0.4	22
Julian	Molino	Nov-58					
Julian	Molino	Mar-59	10	5			
Julian	Molino	Mar-59			1	0.8	8
Julian	Molino	Mar-59			1	0.2	23
Julian	Molino	Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Julian	Molino	Mar-59			1	3	2
Julian	Molino	Mar-59			1	2.2	16
Julian	Molino	Mar-59			4	0.4	24
Julian	Molino	Mar-59			4	0.4	24
Julian	Molino	Mar-59			4	0.4	24
Julian	Molino	Apr-59	24	12			
Julian	Molino	Apr-59			7	0.7	17
Julian	Molino	Apr-59			4	2.6	8
Julian	Molino	Apr-59			10	1.2	24
Julian	Molino	Apr-59			1	0.1	23
Julian	Molino	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Julian	Molino	Apr-59			10	2.4	17
Julian	Molino	Apr-59			1	2	13
Julian	Molino	Apr-59			1	0.4	24

Julian	Molino	Apr-59			6	0.6	24
Julian	Molino	Apr-59			1	0.1	22
Julian	Molino	May-59	6	3			
Julian	Molino	May-59			1	0.1	23
Juan	Viejo	Nov-58	18	8.8			
Juan	Viejo	Nov-58			9	2.2	1
Juan	Viejo	Nov-58			1	0.2	9
Juan	Viejo	Nov-58			1	1	8
Juan	Viejo	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Nov-58			1	0.1	5
Juan	Viejo	Nov-58			1	0.1	2
Juan	Viejo	Nov-58			1	0.6	30
Juan	Viejo	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Dec-58	10	6			
Juan	Viejo	Dec-58					
Juan	Viejo	Dec-58			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Dec-58			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Dec-58					
Juan	Viejo	Aug-59	10	5			
Juan	Viejo	Aug-59			7	0.7	24
Juan	Viejo	Aug-59			8	1	24
Juan	Viejo	Aug-59			1	1	8
Juan	Viejo	Aug-59			1	0.3	24
Juan	Viejo	Aug-59			4	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Sep-59	16	7.4			
Juan	Viejo	Sep-59			9	2.2	2
Juan	Viejo	Sep-59			2	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Sep-59			1	1	5
Francisco	Cahuilla	Nov-58	11	5.4			
Francisco	Cahuilla	Nov-58			8	2	1
Francisco	Cahuilla	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Francisco	Cahuilla	Nov-58			2	0.2	9
Francisco	Cahuilla	Nov-58			1	1	5
Francisco	Cahuilla	Nov-58			1	0.2	23
Francisco	Cahuilla	Dec-58	10	2.4			
Francisco	Cahuilla	Dec-58					
Francisco	Cahuilla	Dec-58					
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57	29	15.6			
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			1	0.2	12

Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			1	1	8
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			1	0.4	4
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			1	0.2	37
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			12	3	1
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			1	0.2	5
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			2	0.1	30
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			1	0.3	5
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			4	1	2
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			4	1	24
Juan	Viejo	Sep-57			3	1.4	5
Juan	Joven	Nov-58	3	1.4			
Juan	Joven	Nov-58			1	0.1	22
Juan	Joven	Nov-58			1	0.1	9
Juan	Joven	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Juan	Joven	Nov-58			2	0.2	23
Juan	Joven	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Juan	Joven	Dec-58	14	6.8			
Juan	Joven	Dec-58			2	0.2	23
Juan	Joven	Dec-58			1	0.6	5
Juan	Joven	Dec-58			1	0.2	9
Juan	Joven	Dec-58					
Juan	Joven	Dec-58					
Jose	Antonio	Nov-58	3	1.4			
Jose	Antonio	Nov-58			1	1	8
Jose	Antonio	Nov-58			1	0.4	23
Jose	Antonio	Dec-58	14	6.8			
Jose	Antonio	Dec-58			1	0.6	8
Jose	Antonio	Dec-58			1	0.4	23
Jose	Antonio	Dec-58			1	0.4	5
Jose	Antonio	Dec-58			1	0.6	23
Jose	Antonio	Dec-58					
Jose	Antonio	Dec-58			1	0.5	23
Jose	Antonio	Dec-58			1	0.5	23
Jose	Antonio	Dec-58			1	1	24
Jose	Antonio	Dec-58					
Jose	Antonio	Dec-58			1	0.5	23

Jose	Antonio	Jan-59	6	3			
Jose	Antonio	Jan-59					
Jose	Antonio	Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Jose	Maria	Nov-58	16	7.8			
Jose	Maria	Nov-58			1	1	8
Jose	Maria	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Nov-58			1	0.1	22
Jose	Maria	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Nov-58			1	1.3	5
Jose	Maria	Nov-58			1	0.2	
Jose	Maria	Nov-58					
Jose	Maria	Dec-58	5	2.4			
Jose	Maria	Dec-58			1	3	30
Ramon	Muchacho	Nov-58	8	2.8			
Ramon	Muchacho	Nov-58			1	3	30
Ramon	Muchacho	Dec-58	4	1			
Ramon	Muchacho	Dec-58			1	0.25	61
Ramon	Muchacho	Dec-58			1	0.25	24
Ramon	Muchacho	Dec-58			1	0.75	8
Ramon	Muchacho	Jan-59	16	4			
Ramon	Muchacho	Jan-59					
Ramon	Muchacho	Jan-59					
Ramon	Muchacho	Jan-59					
Ramon	Muchacho	Jan-59			1	2	16
Ramon	Muchacho	Jan-59			1	0.4	5
Jose		Nov-58	3	1.4			
Jose		Nov-58			1	1	2
Jose		Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Jose		Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Jose		Nov-58			1	0.4	5
Andres	Chico	Dec-58	14	10.4			
Andres	Chico	Dec-58					20
Andres	Chico	Dec-58			1	0.1	59
Andres	Chico	Dec-58			1	0.4	24
Andres	Chico	Jan-59	15	11.25			
Andres	Chico	Jan-59					
Andres	Chico	Jan-59			1	2.2	8
Andres	Chico	Jan-59			1	0.2	22

Andres	Chico	Jan-59			1	0.2	22
Andres	Chico	Feb-59					
Andres	Chico	Feb-59			2	1	8
Juan	Cook	Dec-58	4	2			
Juan	Cook	Dec-58			1	3.4	16
Juan	Cook	Dec-58			1	1.4	29
Juan	Cook	Dec-58			1	0.75	24
Juan	Cook	Dec-58			1	0.25	40
Juan	Cook	Jan-59	9	7.87			
Juan	Cook	Jan-59			1	1.5	29
Juan	Cook	Jan-59			1	0.25	61
Juan	Cook	Jan-59			1	0.5	
Juan	Cook	Jan-59					
Juan	Cook	Jan-59			1	0.12	24
Jose	Maria	Dec-58	5	2.5			
Jose	Maria	Dec-58			4	0.87	5
Jose	Maria	Dec-58			1	2.5	24
Jose	Maria	Dec-58					
Jose	Maria	Dec-58			1	1.25	24
Jose	Maria	Dec-58			1	1.5	29
Jose	Maria	Jan-59	12	6			
Jose	Maria	Jan-59					
Jose	Maria	Jan-59			1	2.5	13
Jose	Maria	Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Jose	Maria	Jan-59					
Jose	Maria	Jan-59			1	0.25	23
Jose	Maria	Jan-59			1	0.25	24
Jose	Maria	Jan-59			1	0.25	24
Jose	Maria	Jan-59			1	0.25	24
Jose	Maria	Jan-59			4	0.5	23
Jose	Maria	Jan-59			1	1	24
Jose	Maria	Jan-59			1	2.4	16
Jose	Maria	Jan-59			1	1	8
Jose	Maria	Jan-59			4	0.5	2
Jose	Maria	Jan-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Maria	Feb-59	14	7			
Jose	Maria	Feb-59			1	0.1	22
Jose	Maria	Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Maria	Feb-59			1	1	8
Jose	Maria	Feb-59			1	0.4	24

Jose	Maria	Feb-59					
Jose	Maria	Feb-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Maria	Feb-59			1	1.2	24
Jose	Maria	Feb-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Maria	Feb-59			1	0.9	8
Jose	Maria	Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Maria	Mar-59	6	3			
Jose	Napata	Dec-58	10	5			
Jose	Napata	Dec-58					
Jose	Napata	Jan-59	5	2.5			
Jose	Napata	Jan-59			1	2	56
Jose	Napata	Jan-59					
Jose	Napata	Jan-59			1	0.13	47
Jose	Napata	Jan-59			1	0.25	57
Jose	Napata	Jan-59			1	4	56
Jose	Napata	Jan-59			1	2	13
Jose	Napata	Jan-59			1	2.5	16
Jose	Napata	Feb-59					
Jose	Napata	Feb-59			1	0.3	8
Jose	Napata	Feb-59			1	0.3	60
Jose	Napata	Feb-59			1	1.2	8
Jose	Napata	Feb-59			1	6	2
Jose	Napata	Feb-59			4	0.5	23
Jose	Napata	Feb-59			4	0.5	40
Jose	Napata	Feb-59			2	0.2	57
Jose	Napata	Feb-59			2	0.2	12
Jose	Napata	Feb-59			1	0.3	23
Jose	Napata	Feb-59					
Jose	Napata	Feb-59			1	1.5	56
Jose	Napata	Feb-59			2	0.4	23
Jose	Napata	Feb-59			1	4	62
Jose	Napata	Mar-59	39	23.5			
Jose	Napata	Mar-59			2	0.25	57
Jose	Napata	Mar-59			4	1	24
Jose	Napata	Mar-59			1	0.75	56
Jose	Napata	Mar-59					
Jose	Napata	Mar-59			1	2	13
Jose	Napata	Mar-59					
J.M.	Alvares	Dec-58					
J.M.	Alvares	Dec-58			1	3.4	56

J.M.	Alvares	Dec-58			1	0.3	9
J.M.	Alvares	Dec-58			1	0.2	23
J.M.	Alvares	Dec-58			5	1.9	24
J.M.	Alvares	Jan-59	46				
J.M.	Alvares	Jan-59					
J.M.	Alvares	Jan-59			1	0.1	5
J.M.	Alvares	Jan-59			1	6.35	4
Guillermo		Dec-58	9	4.5			
Guillermo		Dec-58			1	0.25	23
Guillermo		Dec-58			1	0.25	23
Guillermo		Dec-58					
Guillermo		Dec-58			2	0.5	23
Guillermo		Dec-58			1	1	24
Jose	Viejo	Jan-59	3	1.12			
Jose	Viejo	Jan-59					
Jose	Viejo	Jan-59			1	0.12	24
Jose	Viejo	Jul-59	12	6			
Jose	Viejo	Jul-59			10	2.4	2
Jose	Viejo	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Jul-59			1	0.1	14
Jose	Viejo	Jul-59			2	0.2	23
Jose	Viejo	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Jul-59			1	0.1	14
Jose	Viejo	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Aug-59	22	10.9			
Jose	Viejo	Aug-59			1	3	30
Jose	Viejo	Aug-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Aug-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Aug-59			1	0.1	40
Jose	Viejo	Aug-59			4	2	17
Jose	Viejo	Aug-59			2	1	24
Jose	Viejo	Aug-59			2	1	24
Jose	Viejo	Aug-59					
Jose	Viejo	Aug-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Viejo	Aug-59			1	0.3	23
Jose	Viejo	Aug-59			10	2.4	1
Jose	Viejo	Aug-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Aug-59			1	0.4	5

Jose	Viejo	Aug-59			1	0.1	9
Jose	Viejo	Sep-59	17	8.4			
Jose	Viejo	Sep-59			1	1.4	16
Jose	Viejo	Sep-59			1	1	63
Jose	Viejo	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Sep-59			1	3	63
Jose	Viejo	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Sep-59			1	3	30
Jose	Viejo	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Sep-59			1	0.2	5
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59	8	2.4			
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			10	2.4	2
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			3	1.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			2	1.4	8
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			1	3	30
Jose	Viejo	Dec-58	4	2			
Jose	Viejo	Dec-58					
Jose	Viejo	Dec-58			1	3	2
Jose	Viejo	Dec-58			1	0.4	24
Jose	Viejo	Dec-58			1	0.5	24
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58	20	10			
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			4	2	1
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			2	1	2
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			4	1.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			1	0.1	23
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			1	0.13	5
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			1	1	8
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			2	1.2	5
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			1	1.6	16
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			4	0.6	5
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			1	0.1	14
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			1	0.3	5
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			1	0.1	14
Jose	Viejo	Jun-58			1	0.1	14
Jose	Viejo	Jul-58					
Jose	Viejo	Jul-58			1	0.3	5

Jose	Viejo	Jul-58			3.5	1.4	2
Juan	Viego	Dec-58	4.5	2.25			
Juan	Viego	Dec-58			4	0.9	5
Juan	Viego	Dec-58			1	0.1	23
Juan	Viego	Dec-58			1	0.5	5
Juan	Viego	Dec-58			1	0.25	24
Juan	Viego	Dec-58					
Juan	Viego	Dec-58			1	0.5	24
Juan	Viego	Dec-58			1	1.5	29
Juan	Viego	Jan-59	21	12			
Juan	Viego	Jan-59					
Juan	Viego	Jan-59					
Juan	Viego	Jan-59			1	0.25	17
Juan	Viego	Jan-59			1	0.37	24
Juan	Viego	Jan-59					
Juan	Viego	Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Juan	Viego	Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Juan	Viego	Jan-59			1	0.25	5
Juan	Viego	Jan-59			1	0.5	5
Juan	Viego	Jan-59			1	0.5	23
Juan	Viego	Jan-59					
Juan	Viego	Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Juan	Viego	Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Juan	Viego	Jan-59			18	4.5	18
Juan	Viego	Feb-59	8	4			
Juan	Viego	Feb-59			1	1	24
Juan	Viego	Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Francisco		Dec-58	4	2			
Francisco		Dec-58					
Francisco		Dec-58			1	1	24
Francisco		Jan-59	25	11.24			
Francisco		Jan-59					
Francisco		Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Francisco		Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Francisco		Jan-59			1	1	24
Francisco		Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Francisco		Jan-59			1	1	24
Francisco		Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Francisco		Jan-59			1	1.5	29
Francisco		Jan-59			1	1	24

Francisco		Jan-59			1	1	24
Francisco		Jan-59			1	0.25	23
Francisco		Jan-59			20	5	2
Francisco		Jan-59			1	2.25	16
Francisco		Jan-59			1	0.25	24
Francisco		Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Francisco		Feb-59	13	6.5			
Francisco		Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Francisco		Feb-59			20	5	18
Francisco		Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Francisco		Feb-59			1	0.4	23
Pedro	Hemero	Dec-58	15	9.3			
Pedro	Hemero	Dec-58			1	3.4	16
Pedro	Hemero	Dec-58					
Pedro	Hemero	Dec-58			1	0.1	40
Pedro	Hemero	Dec-58			1	0.3	5
Pedro	Hemero	Dec-58			1	0.2	17
Pedro	Hemero	Dec-58					
Pedro	Hemero	Dec-58			1	0.2	24
Pedro	Hemero	Jan-59					
Pedro	Hemero	Jan-59			1	0.1	59
Pedro	Hemero	Jan-59			1	2	16
Pedro	Hemero	Jan-59			3	0.3	47
Pedro	Hemero	Jan-59			1	0.4	24
Pedro	Hemero	Jan-59					
Pedro	Hemero	Jan-59			1	0.4	24
Pedro	Hemero	Jan-59			1	0.4	24
Pedro	Hemero	Jan-59			1	0.4	24
Pedro	Hemero	Feb-59	30	25.45			
Pedro	Hemero	Feb-59			1	1	8
Pedro	Hemero	Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Pedro	Hemero	Feb-59			1	0.5	24
Pedro	Hemero	Feb-59			1	1.6	16
Pedro	Hemero	Feb-59			1	1.4	29
Pedro	Hemero	Feb-59			1	0.2	40
Pedro	Hemero	Feb-59			1	0.7	8
Pedro	Hemero	Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Pedro	Hemero	Feb-59			2	1	24
Pedro	Hemero	Feb-59			1	0.2	12
Pedro	Hemero	Feb-59			1	0.1	24

Pedro	Hemero	Mar-59	6	3.75			
Pedro	Hemero	Mar-59			4	2.6	1
Pedro	Hemero	Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Pedro	Hemero	Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Pablo	Dec-58	3	1.5			
Juan	Pablo	Dec-58					
Juan	Pablo	Dec-58			1	0.5	24
Juan	Pablo	Dec-58			2	0.75	2
Juan	Pablo	Jan-59	15	6.87			
Juan	Pablo	Jan-59					
Juan	Pablo	Jan-59			1	0.75	8
Juan	Pablo	Jan-59					
Juan	Pablo	Jan-59			1	0.25	40
Juan	Pablo	Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Juan	Pablo	Jan-59			1	2.25	16
Juan	Pablo	Jan-59			1	0.25	24
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59	26	12.9			
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			1	1	8
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			1	1	4
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			2	0.4	12
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			2	1.6	8
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			5	0.6	2
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			1	2	16
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			6	1.4	2
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			1	0.1	40
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			1	0.2	23
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			1	0.2	9
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Pablo	Feb-59			6	0.9	2
Jose	Gordo	Dec-58	5	2.5			
Jose	Gordo	Dec-58			1	1.5	2
Jose	Gordo	Dec-58	3	1.12			
Jose	Gordo	Dec-58					
Jose	Gordo	Dec-58			1	0.12	24
Juan	Pablo.Jr	Oct-59	11	5.4			
Juan	Pablo.Jr	Oct-59			1	1	8

Juan	Pablo.Jr	Oct-59			8	2	2
Juan	Pablo.Jr	Oct-59			1	2	64
Juan	Pablo.Jr	Oct-59			1	0.2	40
Juan	Pablo.Jr	Oct-59			1	0.2	22
Juan	Pablo.Jr	Nov-59	5	2.4			
Juan	Pablo.Jr	Nov-59			3	0.6	1
Juan	Pablo.Jr	Nov-59			6	0.8	2
Juan	Pablo.Jr	Nov-59			1	0.1	37
Juan	Pablo.Jr	Nov-59			1	0.2	23
Juan	Pablo.Jr	Nov-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Pablo.Jr	Nov-59			1	0.1	37
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59	23	10.12			
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59					
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59			1	0.75	8
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59					
Jose					1	0.5	24
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59			1	0.75	2
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59			1	0.12	37
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59			1	0.63	65
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59					
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59			1	0.12	23
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59			1	0.25	23
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59			1	1	8
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59			1	2	13
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59			1	0.75	24
Jose	Largo	Jan-59			1	0.25	23

Antonio							
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Jan-59			1	1.5	18
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Feb-59	10	5			
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Feb-59			1		
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Feb-59			1	0.2	40
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Feb-59			1	2.2	16
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Feb-59			1	1.4	29
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Feb-59			1	2	13
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Feb-59			1	0.2	12
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Feb-59			1	1	8
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Feb-59			1	0.1	40
Santiago		Jan-59	22	9.75			
Santiago		Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Santiago		Jan-59					
Santiago		Jan-59			1	0.25	47
Santiago		Jan-59			1	0.25	17
Santiago		Jan-59					
Santiago		Jan-59			1	0.25	24
Santiago		Jan-59					
Santiago		Jan-59			1	0.5	2
Santiago		Jan-59			1	0.37	24
Santiago		Jan-59			1	0.23	23
Santiago		Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Santiago		Jan-59			1	2	13
Santiago		Jan-59			1	1	8
Santiago		Jan-59					
Santiago		Jan-59			1	0.25	13
Santiago		Jan-59			1	0.24	24
Santiago		Jan-59			1	0.25	22
Santiago		Feb-59	12	5.5			

Santiago		Feb-59			1	1	8
Santiago		Feb-59			1	2	13
Santiago		Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Santiago		Feb-59			1	0.7	8
Santiago		Feb-59			2	0.4	40
Santiago		Feb-59			1	1.4	29
Santiago		Feb-59			1	0.5	2
Santiago		Feb-59			1	0.2	23
Santiago		Feb-59			1	2	16
Santiago		Feb-59			1	0.2	12
Santiago		Feb-59			1	0.2	22
Santiago		Feb-59			1	0.2	23
Santiago		Feb-59			1	0.7	8
Leonardo	Higuera	Jan-59	28	44.9			
Leonardo	Higuera	Jan-59			1	1.5	13
Leonardo	Higuera	Jan-59					
Leonardo	Higuera	Jan-59			2	2	5
Leonardo	Higuera	Jan-59			1	0.6	60
Leonardo	Higuera	Jan-59					
Leonardo	Higuera	Jan-59			1	4	56
Leonardo	Higuera	Jan-59			1	0.1	40
Leonardo	Higuera	Jan-59			1	0.4	24
Leonardo	Higuera	Jan-59			1	0.1	40
Jose	Antonia	May-59	17	8.5			
Jose	Antonia	May-59			10.5	2.4	18
Jose	Antonia	May-59					
Jose	Antonia	May-59			1	0.16	16
Jose	Antonia	May-59					
Jose	Antonia	May-59			1	0.6	8
Jose	Antonia	May-59			8	2	1
Jose	Antonia	May-59			1	0.5	29
Jose	Antonia	Jun-59	16	10.2			
Jose	Antonia	Jun-59					
Jose	Antonia	Jun-59			2	0.4	12
Jose	Antonia	Jun-59			1	0.1	23
Jose	Antonia	Jun-59			1	1	8
Jose	Antonia	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Antonia	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Antonia	Jun-59			1	0.1	23
Jose	Antonia	Jun-59			1	1.6	16

Jose	Antonia	Jun-59			1	2	13
Jose	Antonia	Jun-59			1	1	8
Jose	Antonia	Jun-59			2	0.4	23
Jose	Antonia	Jun-59			1	0.5	23
Jose	Antonia	Jun-59			1	0.1	45
Jose	Antonia	Jul-59	17	7.61			
Jose	Antonia	Jul-59			1	1.4	16
Jose	Antonia	Jul-59			1	1	8
Jose	Antonia	Jul-59					
Jose	Antonia	Jul-59			4	0.6	5
Jose	Antonia	Jul-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Antonia	Jul-59			1	1.4	29
Jose	Antonia	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Antonia	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Antonia	Jul-59			3	3	19
Jose	Antonia	Jul-59			1	0.1	12
Jose	Antonia	Jul-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Antonia	Jul-59			1	0.1	23
Jose	Antonia	Jul-59					
Pedro		Jan-59	3	1.12			
Pedro		Jan-59			1	0.1	23
Pedro		Jan-59					
Jehorn		Jan-59	11	5.5			
Jehorn		Jan-59			1	3.4	16
Jehorn		Jan-59			1	2	13
Louis		Jan-59	5	2.5			
Louis		Jan-59			1	0.1	23
Louis		Jan-59			1	0.3	24
Louis		Jan-59			1	2.25	16
Louis		Jan-59			1	0.25	22
Louis		Jan-59			1	0.75	8
Louis		Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Louis		Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Louis		Jan-59			1	0.25	22
Louis		Feb-59	17	8.5			
Louis		Feb-59			1	1	8
Louis		Feb-59			1	0.1	23
Louis		Feb-59			1	1.4	29
Louis		Feb-59			2	0.4	24
Louis		Feb-59			1	0.2	23

Louis		Feb-59			1	0.2	12
Louis		Feb-59			1	2	6
Louis		Feb-59			1	0.2	66
Louis		Feb-59			1	0.2	24
Louis		Feb-59			1	0.7	8
Louis		Feb-59			1	1.4	29
Louis		Feb-59			1	0.2	23
Louis		Mar-59	11.5	6.8			
Louis		Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Louis		Mar-59			4	1	2
Louis		Mar-59					
Louis		Mar-59			1	0.2	24
Louis		Mar-59			1	0.2	12
Louis		Mar-59			1	0.2	24
Louis		Mar-59			1	0.1	47
Louis		Mar-59			1	0.1	22
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59	10	5			
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.5	24
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.1	23
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	2	13
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59	11	8			
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			2	1	24
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	1.8	16
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			2	1	24
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.2	12
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.2	22
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59					
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.6	8
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59					
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.2	12
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.1	47
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.1	22
Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.4	24

Jose	Alidon	Jan-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Alidon	May-59	16	8			
Jose	Alidon	May-59					
Jose	Alidon	May-59			1	0.2	12
Jose	Alidon	May-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Alidon	May-59			1	0.1	21
Jose	Alidon	May-59			1	0.1	47
Jose	Alidon	May-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Alidon	May-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Alidon	May-59			1	0.5	29
Jose	Alidon	May-59					
Jose	Alidon	May-59			2	0.2	23
Jose	Alidon	May-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Alidon	May-59			1	0.1	23
Jose	Alidon	May-59			1	1.6	16
Jose	Alidon	May-59			1	0.6	8
Jose	Alidon	May-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Alidon	May-59			1	0.1	23
Jose	Alidon	May-59			1	0.1	23
Jose	Chafo	Jan-59	11	5.5			
Jose	Chafo	Jan-59			6	1.4	2
Jose	Chafo	Jan-59			1	1	24
Jose	Chafo	Jan-59			8	1	2
Jose	Chafo	Jan-59			1	1	24
Jose	Chafo	Jan-59			1	0.2	22
Jose	Chafo	Jan-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Chafo	Jan-59			1	0.1	37
Jose	Chafo	Jan-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Chafo	Feb-59	21	10.5			
Jose	Chafo	Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Chafo	Feb-59			1	0.1	40
Jose	Chafo	Feb-59			2	1	24
Jose	Chafo	Feb-59			1	1	40
Jose	Chafo	Feb-59			1	2	16
Jose	Chafo	Feb-59			1	0.2	66
Jose	Chafo	Feb-59			1	0.2	22
Jose	Chafo	Feb-59			2	1	24
Jose	Chafo	Feb-59			1	3	2
Jose	Chafo	Feb-59			1	2	13
Jose	Chafo	Feb-59			1	0.3	60

Jose	Chafó	Feb-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Chafó	Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Chafó	Feb-59			1	0.2	22
Jose	Chafó	Feb-59			1	2	13
Jose	Chafó	Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Chafó	Apr-59	12	6			
Jose	Chafó	Apr-59			1	0.1	22
Jose	Chafó	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Chafó	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Chafó	Apr-59			2	1	24
Jose	Marie	Mar-59	14	7.5			
Jose	Marie	Mar-59			1	12.87	31
Jose	Marie	Mar-59			1	1.6	8
Jose	Marie	Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Marie	Mar-59			1	2	13
Jose	Marie	Mar-59			1	1.6	16
Jose	Marie	Mar-59			1	0.7	8
Jose	Marie	Mar-59			2	1	24
Jose	Marie	Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Marie	Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Marie	Mar-59			1	1	2
Jose	Marie	Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Marie	Mar-59			1	2.2	16
Jose	Marie	Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Marie	Apr-59	24	15			
Jose	Marie	Apr-59			1	1.4	8
Jose	Marie	Apr-59			1	2	13
Jose	Marie	Apr-59			2	1	24
Jose	Marie	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Marie	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Marie	Apr-59			1	1.6	16
Jose	Marie	Apr-59			1	2	13
Jose	Marie	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Marie	Apr-59			1	2	13
Jose	Marie	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Marie	Apr-59			5	0.5	23
Andres							
Chico	Duarte	Feb-59	16	12			
Andres							
Chico	Duarte	Feb-59			1	20	67
Andres	Duarte	Feb-59			6	0.6	68

Chico							
Andres							
Chico	Duarte	Feb-59			1	0.2	22
Andres							
Chico	Duarte	Feb-59			1	0.2	22
Andres							
Chico	Duarte	Feb-59			1	0.4	23
Andres							
Chico	Duarte	Feb-59			1	0.2	57
Andres							
Chico	Duarte	Feb-59			1	1	68
Andres							
Chico	Duarte	Feb-59			1	0.2	23
Andres							
Chico	Duarte	Mar-59	26	20.15			
Andres							
Chico	Duarte	Mar-59			1	3	18
Andres							
Chico	Duarte	Mar-59			1	0.3	60
Andres							
Chico	Duarte	Mar-59			1	0.3	56
Andres							
Chico	Duarte	Mar-59			1	1.25	23
Andres							
Chico	Duarte	Mar-59			1	1.5	22
Jose	La Cruziz	Feb-59	4	2			
Jose	La Cruziz	Feb-59			1	2	16
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Feb-59	10	5			
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Feb-59			10	2.4	2
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Feb-59			1	3	2
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Mar-59	19	9.5			
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Mar-59			1	2	2
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Mar-59			12	3	2
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Mar-59			2	1	24
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Mar-59			1	2	2
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Mar-59			1	0.4	24

Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Mar-59			1	1	2
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Apr-59	26	13			
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Apr-59			1	1.4	2
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Apr-59			1	1.8	16
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Apr-59			13	5.4	2
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Apr-59			1	0.2	24
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Apr-59			10	2.5	18
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Apr-59			10	3	2
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Apr-59			1	0.2	23
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	May-59	6	3			
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	May-59					
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	May-59			1	0.1	22
Juan	Riaho	Feb-59	5	2.5			
Juan	Riaho	Feb-59			15	3.6	18
Juan	Riaho	Feb-59			30	3.6	2
Juan	Riaho	Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Riaho	Mar-59	21	10.5			
Juan	Riaho	Mar-59			2	0.6	24
Juan	Riaho	Mar-59			2	1	24
Juan	Riaho	Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Riaho	Mar-59			1	2.5	2
Juan	Riaho	Mar-59			1	2.1	16
Juan	Riaho	Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Riaho	Mar-59			1	0.2	40
Juan	Riaho	Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59	29	14.5			
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			2	0.6	24
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59					
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			1	0.4	23

Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			1	0.2	40
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			1	4	18
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			1	1	24
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			6	4.6	18
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			1	0.4	12
Juan	Riaho	Apr-59			1	0.6	24
Francisco		Feb-59	5	2.5			
Francisco		Feb-59			1	0.4	24
Francisco		Mar-59	19	9.5			
Francisco		Mar-59			2	1	24
Francisco		Mar-59			1	0.2	12
Francisco		Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Francisco		Mar-59			3	1.4	24
Francisco		Mar-59			1	1	2
Francisco		Mar-59			1	1	24
Francisco		Mar-59			2	1	24
Francisco		Mar-59			2	0.2	23
Francisco		Apr-59	22	11			
Francisco		Apr-59			4	3.6	2
Francisco		Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Francisco		Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Francisco		Apr-59			2	1	24
Francisco		Apr-59			10	3	2
Francisco		Apr-59			2	1	24
Francisco		Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Francisco		Apr-59			1	0.2	40
Francisco		Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Francisco		Apr-59			1	3	18
Francisco		Apr-59			4	2	2
Francisco		Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Francisco		Apr-59			1	0.2	23
Francisco	Porole	Feb-59	11	10.4			
Francisco	Porole	Feb-59			2	0.4	22
Francisco	Porole	Feb-59			3	4.6	60

Francisco	Porole	Feb-59				
Francisco	Porole	Feb-59			6	1.4
Francisco	Porole	Feb-59			1	0.4
Francisco	Porole	Feb-59			5	3
Francisco	Porole	Feb-59			2	0.2
Francisco	Porole	Feb-59			1	2.2
Francisco	Porole	Feb-59			1	0.4
Francisco	Porole	Feb-59				
Santiago		Dec-59	16	7.8		
Santiago		Dec-59			1	1.4
Santiago		Dec-59			1	0.6
Santiago		Dec-59			1	0.4
Santiago		Dec-59			1	2
Santiago		Dec-59			1	0.6
Santiago		Mar-59	24	15		
Santiago		Mar-59			1	0.2
Santiago		Mar-59			1	1
Santiago		Mar-59			1	0.7
Santiago		Mar-59			2	0.4
Santiago		Mar-59				
Santiago		Mar-59			1	1.2
Santiago		Mar-59			5	1.2
Santiago		Mar-59			1	2
Santiago		Mar-59			1	0.6
Santiago		Mar-59			1	0.4
Santiago		Mar-59			1	0.2
Santiago		Apr-59	6	3		
Santiago		Apr-59			1	1.4
Santiago		Apr-59			1	0.4
Santiago		Apr-59			1	1
Santiago		Apr-59			1	0.4
Santiago		Apr-59			1	1.6
Santiago		Apr-59			1	1.6
Santiago		Nov-59	14	6.9		
Santiago		Nov-59			1	0.1
Santiago		Nov-59			1	0.1
Santiago		Nov-59				
Santiago		Nov-59			1	0.4
Santiago		Nov-59			1	0.1
Santiago		Dec-59	4	2		

Santiago		Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Santiago		Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Santiago		Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Santiago		Dec-59			1	0.2	22
Santiago		Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Santiago		Dec-59			1	2	13
Juan	Rollini	Oct-59	5	2.5			
Juan	Rollini	Oct-59			1	0.2	22
Juan	Rollini	Oct-59			1	1.4	16
Juan	Rollini	Oct-59			1	0.6	8
Juan	Rollini	Oct-59			1	0.2	24
Juan	Rollini	Oct-59			2	0.2	40
Juan	Rollini	Oct-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Rollini	Nov-59	15	7.4			
Juan	Rollini	Nov-59			1	0.6	8
Juan	Rollini	Nov-59			1	0.6	24
Juan	Rollini	Nov-59			1	0.6	24
Juan	Rollini	Nov-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Rollini	Nov-59			1	0.2	22
Juan	Rollini	Nov-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Rollini	Nov-59			1	0.6	8
Juan	Rollini	Nov-59			1	0.2	12
Juan	Rollini	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Rollini	Nov-59			1	0.32	23
Juan	Rollini	Nov-59			1	0.2	23
Juan	Rollini	Nov-59			1	0.2	22
Juan	Rollini	Dec-59	3	1.4			
Juan	Rollini	Dec-59			4	1.2	2
Juan	Rollini	Dec-59			1	0.2	22
Jilian	Williams	Sep-59	6	3			
Jilian	Williams	Sep-59			1	0.4	31
Jilian	Williams	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Jilian	Williams	Sep-59			1	3	30
Jilian	Williams	Sep-59			1	1	8
Jilian	Williams	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Jilian	Williams	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Jilian	Williams	Sep-59			1	2	13
Jilian	Williams	Oct-59	12	6			
Jilian	Williams	Oct-59			4	2	2
Jilian	Williams	Oct-59			1	0.2	22

Juan	Rollini	Dec-59	22	5.2			
Juan	Rollini	Dec-59			1	2	13
Juan	Rollini	Dec-59			1	1.4	16
Juan	Rollini	Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Juan	Rollini	Dec-59			1	1.4	29
Juan	Rollini	Dec-59			1	0.2	22
Juan	Rollini	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Rollini	Dec-59			1	0.1	22
Juan	Rollini	Dec-59			1	0.2	22
Juan	Rollini	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Rollini	Jan-60	12	2.8			
Juan	Rollini	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Juan	Rollini	Jan-60			1	0.6	8
Juan	Rollini	Jan-60			2	0.6	5
Juan	Rollini	Jan-60			1	1.4	16
Jilian	Fraude	Jul-59	4	2			
Jilian	Fraude	Jul-59			1	1	8
Jilian	Fraude	Jul-59					
Coyote		Mar-59	7	3.5			
Coyote		Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Coyote		Mar-59			1	3	2
Coyote		Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Coyote		Mar-59			1	1	24
Coyote		Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Coyote		Mar-59			1	0.4	24
Coyote		Apr-59	19	9.5			
Coyote		Apr-59			1	1	47
Coyote		Apr-59			1	0.2	12
Coyote		Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Coyote		Apr-59					
Coyote		Apr-59			3	3	2
Coyote		Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Coyote		Apr-59			4	2.6	2
Coyote		Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Coyote		May-59	16	8			
Coyote		May-59			1	0.6	24
Coyote		May-59					
Coyote		May-59			1	0.4	24
Coyote		May-59			1	0.2	23
Coyote		May-59			4	1.9	8

Coyote		May-59			3	1	2
Coyote		May-59			6	3	8
Coyote		May-59			1	0.4	24
Coyote		May-59			1	1.6	29
Coyote		May-59			4	0.4	40
Pedro	Qynten	Mar-59	8	5			
Pedro	Qynten	Mar-59			1	0.7	8
Pedro	Qynten	Mar-59			1	0.3	47
Pedro	Qynten	Mar-59			2	0.6	24
Pedro	Qynten	Mar-59			4	0.4	23
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59	24	12			
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59			5	2	2
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59			5	2	2
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59			4	0.4	40
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59			1	0.6	24
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59			2	1	24
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59			2	1	24
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59			4	0.4	2
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59			4	4	13
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59			2	0.8	24
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59			1	0.2	23
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59			2	2	18
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59			2	3.4	2
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59			1	0.6	18
Pedro	Qynten	Apr-59			1	0.2	23
Pedro	Qynten	May-59	19	9.5			
Pedro	Qynten	May-59			1	0.2	23
Pedro	Qynten	May-59			1	0.4	24
Pedro	Qynten	May-59			6	2	2
Pedro	Qynten	May-59			4	2	18
Pedro	Qynten	May-59			1	0.2	24
Pedro	Qynten	May-59			1	0.1	40
Pedro	Qynten	May-59			1	0.3	24
Pedro	Qynten	Jun-59	5	2.4			
Pedro	Qynten	Jun-59					
Pedro	Qynten	Jun-59			8	2	1
Pedro	Qynten	Jun-59			1	0.1	22
Pedro	Qynten	Jun-59			1	0.1	5
Martin	Duarte	Mar-59					
Martin	Duarte	Mar-59			2	0.6	24

Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59	24	12			
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59			1	1.4	31
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59			1	4	36
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59			1	0.2	20
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59			1	0.2	51
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59			1	0.1	22
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59			1	0.1	9
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59			1	2.5	67
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59					
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59			1	0.2	5
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59					
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59			1	0.2	61
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59			1	0.1	14
Jesus	Deporte	Jul-59			1	0.3	61
Jesus	Deporte	Oct-59	17	8.5			
Jesus	Deporte	Oct-59			1	3	2
Jesus	Deporte	Oct-59			8	2	
Jesus	Deporte	Oct-59			8	2	1
Jesus	Deporte	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Deporte	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Jesus	Deporte	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Millerboy	Mar-58					
Jose	Millerboy	Mar-58			10	1.7	1
Jose	Millerboy	Apr-58	4	2			
Jose	Millerboy	Apr-58			1	1.8	16
Jose	Millerboy	Apr-58			2	0.2	23
Jose	Millerboy	Apr-58			1	0.4	24
Jose	Millerboy	Apr-58			10	4	18
Jose	Millerboy	Apr-58			1	0.4	2
Jose	Millerboy	May-58	21	8.5			
Jose	Millerboy	May-58			1	0.2	23
Jose	Millerboy	May-58			1	0.2	40
Jose	Millerboy	May-58			2	1	24
Jose	Millerboy	May-58			4	3	2
Jose	Millerboy	May-58			2	2.2	18
Jose	Millerboy	May-58			1	0.6	8
Jose	Millerboy	May-58			1	0.1	23
Jose	Millerboy	May-58			1	0.2	69

Jose	Millerboy	May-58					
Jose	Millerboy	May-58			2	4	18
Jose	Millerboy	May-58			8	2	2
Jose	Millerboy	Jun-58	23	11.4			
Jose	Millerboy	Jun-58					
Jose	Millerboy	Jun-58			10	2.5	22
Jose	Millerboy	Jun-58			1	1	5
Jose	Millerboy	Jun-58			1	0.1	23
Jose	Millerboy	Jun-58			8	2	1
Jose	Millerboy	Jun-58			8	2	2
Jose	Millerboy	Jun-58			1	0.1	22
Jose	Millerboy	Jun-58			1	0.2	23
Jose	Millerboy	Jun-58					
Jose	Millerboy	Jun-58			8	2	2
Jose	Millerboy	Jun-58			1	3	30
Jose	Millerboy	Jul-58	6	3			
Jose	Nefete	Mar-59	25	15.3			
Jose	Nefete	Mar-59			2	2.2	56
Jose	Nefete	Mar-59			1	1	64
Jose	Nefete	Mar-59			1	0.4	40
Jose	Nefete	Mar-59					
Jose	Nefete	Mar-59			2	1.4	56
Jose	Nefete	Mar-59			2	0.6	40
Jose	Nefete	Mar-59			1	0.2	40
Jose	Nefete	Mar-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Nefete	Mar-59			4	0.5	23
Jose	Nefete	Mar-59			4	0.5	40
Julian	Secono	Apr-59	23	11			
Julian	Secono	Apr-59			1	0.8	8
Julian	Secono	Apr-59			1	2.4	16
Julian	Secono	Apr-59			2	1	24
Julian	Secono	Apr-59			1	0.8	29
Julian	Secono	Apr-59			1	2.4	16
Julian	Secono	Apr-59			1	0.2	23
Julian	Secono	Apr-59			1	0.2	23
Julian	Secono	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Julian	Secono	Apr-59			1	1.8	16
Julian	Secono	Apr-59			1	0.2	23
Julian	Secono	Apr-59			2	1	24
Julian	Secono	May-59	9	4.5			

Julian	Secono	May-59			1	2	13
Julian	Secono	May-59			1	0.2	23
Julian	Secono	May-59			1	0.4	24
Julian	Secono	May-59			8	2	2
Julian	Secono	May-59			1	0.4	24
Julian	Secono	May-59			1	0.2	23
Julian	Secono	May-59			1	1	8
Julian	Secono	May-59			1	0.2	23
Julian	Secono	Jun-59	22	10.8			
Julian	Secono	Jun-59			1	0.1	23
Julian	Secono	Jun-59			10	2.4	2
Julian	Secono	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	Secono	Jun-59			8	2	1
Julian	Secono	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	Secono	Jun-59					
Julian	Secono	Jun-59					
Julian	Secono	Jun-59			1	1.6	16
Julian	Secono	Jun-59			1	0.1	14
Pinto		Apr-59	18	9			
Pinto		Apr-59			1	3	2
Pinto		Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Pinto		Apr-59			3	3	2
Pinto		Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Pinto		Apr-59			4	2.6	18
Pinto		Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Pinto		Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Pinto		Apr-59			2	0.4	23
Pinto		Apr-59			2	0.4	12
Pinto		Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Pinto		May-59	20	10			
Pinto		May-59					
Pinto		May-59			4	0.6	2
Pinto		May-59			2	0.8	24
Pinto		May-59			2	0.2	40
Pinto		May-59			1	0.1	23
Pinto		May-59			1	0.2	24
Pinto		May-59			10	2.6	2
Pinto		May-59			1	0.4	24
Pinto		May-59					
Pinto		May-59			1	0.4	24

Pinto		May-59			1	0.3	40
Pinto		May-59			2	1	24
Pinto		Jun-59	3	1.4			
Pinto		Jun-59					
Pinto		Jun-59			6	1.4	2
Pinto		Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Pinto		Sep-59	6	3			
Pinto		Sep-59			8	2	2
Pinto		Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Pinto		Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Pinto		Sep-59			1	0.4	8
Pinto		Sep-59	4	2.4			
Jose	Chapo	Apr-59	15	7.5			
Jose	Chapo	Apr-59			5	1.2	18
Jose	Chapo	Apr-59			20	1.2	2
Jose	Chapo	Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Chapo	Apr-59			1	0.2	22
Jose	Chapo	Apr-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Chapo	Apr-59			2	1	24
Jose	Chapo	Apr-59			2	0.2	23
Jose	Chapo	Apr-59			2	0.8	24
Jose	Chapo	May-59	16	8			
Jose	Chapo	May-59			1	2	29
Jose	Chapo	May-59			2	1	24
Jose	Chapo	May-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Chapo	May-59			12	3	2
Jose	Chapo	May-59			1	1.6	16
Jose	Chapo	May-59			1	0.6	24
Maria		Oct-59	5	2.2			
Maria		Oct-59			1	0.2	23
Maria		Oct-59			1	0.1	12
Maria		Oct-59			1	2	13
Maria		Dec-59	8	3.8			
Maria		Dec-59			7	1.4	2
Maria		Dec-59			6	1.4	1
Maria		Dec-59			2	0.4	1
Maria		Dec-59			1	0.2	37
Maria		Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Maria		Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Maria		Jan-60	6	3			

Maria		Jan-60			1	1.4	16
Maria		Jan-60			1	0.6	8
Juan	Diego	May-59	23	11.5			
Juan	Diego	May-59			1	0.4	40
Juan	Diego	May-59			1	0.6	24
Juan	Diego	May-59			2	1	24
Juan	Diego	May-59					
Juan	Diego	May-59			5	2	2
Juan	Diego	May-59			1	0.6	8
Juan	Diego	May-59			2	0.6	24
Juan	Diego	May-59			2	1	24
Juan	Diego	Jun-59	23	11.4			
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			1	3	30
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			4	2	2
Juan	Diego	Jun-59					
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			1	0.2	23
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			1	3	30
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			2	0.4	23
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			10	2.4	2
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			8	2	2
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			1	0.6	9
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			1	0.2	37
Juan	Diego	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Diego	Jul-59	19	9.4			
Juan	Diego	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Diego	Jul-59			1	0.2	12
Juan	Diego	Jul-59					
Yarrochia		Apr-59	2	1			
Yarrochia		Apr-59			2	0.4	23
Yarrochia		Apr-59			1	0.6	2
Yarrochia		May-59	22	11			
Yarrochia		May-59			2	1.5	18
Yarrochia		May-59			18	4.4	5
Yarrochia		May-59			2	0.4	24
Yarrochia		May-59			1	0.1	23

Yarrochia		May-59					
Yarrochia		May-59			16	4	2
Yarrochia		May-59			1	0.1	23
Yarrochia		May-59			1	0.4	24
Yarrochia		Jun-59	18	9			
Yarrochia		Jun-59					
Yarrochia		Jun-59			1	3	30
Yarrochia		Jun-59			2	0.4	9
Yarrochia		Jun-59			8	2.4	2
Juan	Viejo	Jun-59					
Juan	Viejo	Jun-59					
Juan	Viejo	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Jun-59			12	3	5
Juan	Viejo	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Jul-59	6	3			
Juan	Viejo	Jul-59			1	3	19
Juan	Viejo	Jul-59			8	2.2	1
Juan	Viejo	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Jul-59			1	0.1	23
Manuel		Apr-59	24	12			
Manuel		Apr-59			1	0.6	8
Manuel		Apr-59					
Manuel		Apr-59			8	2	18
Manuel		Apr-59			2	0.4	23
Manuel		Apr-59			1	3	2
Manuel		Apr-59			1	0.4	24
Manuel		Apr-59			1	0.2	24
Manuel		Apr-59			1	0.2	23
Manuel		Apr-59			4	2	18
Manuel		Jun-59	6				
Manuel		Jun-59			3	5.6	30
Manuel		Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Manuel		Jun-59			1	13.6	1
Pinto		Oct-59	10	5			
Pinto		Oct-59			4	1.1	2
Jose	Maria	May-59	19	9.5			
Jose	Maria	May-59			2	0.8	24
Jose	Maria	May-59			2	0.2	23
Jose	Maria	May-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Maria	May-59			2	0.2	23

Jose	Maria	May-59			1	1.6	16
Jose	Maria	May-59			1	0.8	8
Jose	Maria	May-59			2	0.6	24
Jose	Maria	May-59			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	May-59			2	0.2	23
Jose	Maria	May-59			1	1.6	16
Jose	Maria	May-59			1	2	13
Jose	Maria	May-59			1	0.2	12
Jose	Maria	May-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Maria	May-59			1	0.4	70
Jose	Maria	Jun-59	23	11.4			
Jose	Maria	Jun-59					
Jose	Maria	Jun-59			1	1.6	16
Jose	Maria	Jun-59			3	0.4	2
Jose	Maria	Jun-59			1	0.2	5
Jose	Maria	Jun-59			1	0.2	5
Jose	Maria	Jun-59			1	1	8
Jose	Maria	Jun-59			1	2	13
Jose	Maria	Jun-59			1	0.1	5
Jose	Maria	Jun-59					
Jose	Maria	Jun-59			1	1	8
Jose	Maria	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Jun-59					
Jose	Maria	Jul-59	5	2.4			
Jose	Maria	Jul-59					
Cuerbo		May-59	24	12			
Cuerbo		May-59			1	0.6	8
Cuerbo		May-59			1	0.1	23
Cuerbo		May-59			1	0.1	23
Cuerbo		May-59			1	0.4	24
Cuerbo		May-59			1	0.1	22
Cuerbo		May-59			2	0.2	23
Cuerbo		May-59			1	0.4	24
Cuerbo		May-59			2	0.2	23
Cuerbo		May-59			1	0.4	24
Cuerbo		May-59			1	1.4	29
Cuerbo		May-59					
Cuerbo		May-59			1	0.1	23
Cuerbo		May-59			1	0.1	40
Cuerbo		May-59			1	1.4	16

Cuerbo		May-59				
Cuerbo		May-59			4	1 2
Cuerbo		May-59			1	2 13
Cuerbo		May-59			1	0.2 66
Cuerbo		May-59			2	1 24
Cuerbo		Jun-59	22	11		
Cuerbo		Jun-59				
Cuerbo		Jun-59			2	0.2 23
Cuerbo		Jun-59				
Cuerbo		Jun-59			1	0.2 12
Cuerbo		Jun-59			1	0.2 23
Cuerbo		Jun-59			1	0.2 9
Cuerbo		Jun-59			1	1.4 29
Cuerbo		Jun-59			1	2 16
Cuerbo		Jun-59			1	0.4 5
Cuerbo		Jun-59				
Cuerbo		Jun-59			1	1.6 16
Cuerbo		Jun-59			1	0.4 5
Cuerbo		Jun-59			1	1.4 29
Cuerbo		Jun-59			1	0.1 14
Cuerbo		Jun-59			1	0.4 5
Cuerbo		Jun-59			1	0.4 5
Cuerbo		Jul-59	12	6		
Cuerbo		Jul-59				
Cuerbo		Jul-59			1	1.6 16
Cuerbo		Jul-59			1	0.4 5
Cuerbo		Jul-59			1	0.4 5
Cuerbo		Jul-59			1	0.1 12
Julian	McMillian	May-59	15	7.5		
Julian	McMillian	May-59			1	1 24
Julian	McMillian	May-59			3	0.3 23
Julian	McMillian	May-59				
Julian	McMillian	May-59			1	0.4 24
Julian	McMillian	May-59			1	0.1 22
Julian	McMillian	May-59			2	0.2 23
Julian	McMillian	May-59			1	0.2 24
Julian	McMillian	May-59			2	0.2 23
Julian	McMillian	May-59			1	1.5 29
Julian	McMillian	May-59			1	1.5 16
Julian	McMillian	May-59			2	0.2 23

Julian	McMillian	May-59			2	2	8
Julian	McMillian	May-59			1	0.4	24
Julian	McMillian	May-59			1	0.6	24
Julian	McMillian	May-59			2	0.6	5
Julian	McMillian	May-59			1	0.4	24
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59	19	9.4			
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59					
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59			1	0.8	5
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59			1	0.1	23
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59			1	1	8
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59					
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59			1	0.6	5
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59			1	0.2	5
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59			1	0.2	23
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59			1	0.2	23
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	McMillian	Jun-59			1	2	13
Julian	McMillian	Jul-59					
Julian	McMillian	Jul-59	5	2.4			
Julian	McMillian	Jul-59					
Julian	McMillian	Jul-59			1	1.4	16
Jose	Ignacio	May-59	15	7.5			
Jose	Ignacio	May-59			8	2	18
Jose	Ignacio	May-59			1	1.4	16
Jose	Ignacio	May-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Ignacio	May-59					
Jose	Ignacio	May-59			11	2.6	18
Jose	Ignacio	May-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59	23	11.4			
Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59					
Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59			1	0.2	12
Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59			1	0.1	5
Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59			1	0.1	22
Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59			9	2.2	1
Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59			1	0.4	5

Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59			1	0.1	5
Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59			1	0.1	23
Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59			10	2.4	2
Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59					
Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59			10	2.4	2
Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59			1	0.2	40
Jose	Ignacio	Jun-59			1	0.2	12
Francisco		May-59	22	12			
Francisco		May-59			1	0.6	24
Francisco		May-59			1	0.4	12
Francisco		May-59			1	0.4	24
Francisco		May-59			1	0.6	40
Francisco		May-59			1	0.2	22
Francisco		May-59			2	1	24
Francisco		May-59			1	1.2	29
Francisco		May-59			1	0.2	23
Francisco		May-59			4	2	24
Francisco		Jun-59	4	2			
Francisco		Jun-59			1	0.6	5
Francisco		Jun-59					
Jose	Crispin	May-59	10	5			
Jose	Crispin	May-59			2	1	24
Jose	Crispin	May-59			1	0.2	40
Jose	Crispin	May-59			1	0.2	40
Jose	Crispin	May-59			1	0.5	29
Jose	Crispin	May-59			1	0.2	22
Jose	Crispin	May-59			4	2.2	18
Jose	Crispin	May-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Crispin	May-59			8	2.1	18
Jose	Crispin	May-59					
Jose	Crispin	May-59			1	0.1	23
Jose	Crispin	May-59			2	0.6	24
Jose	Crispin	May-59			3	3	2
Jose	Crispin	Jun-59	27	13.2			
Jose	Crispin	Jun-59					
Jose	Crispin	Jun-59			1	0.2	5
Jose	Crispin	Jun-59			8	2	2
Jose	Crispin	Jun-59			8	2	18
Jose	Crispin	Jun-59			1	0.1	5
Jose	Crispin	Jun-59					

Jose	Crispin	Jun-59			1	0.2	12
Jose	Crispin	Jun-59			1	0.5	29
Jose	Crispin	Jun-59			1	0.2	9
Jose	Crispin	Jun-59			1	0.1	14
Jose	Crispin	Jun-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Crispin	Jun-59			8	2	1
Jose	Crispin	Jun-59			1	0.4	23
Jose	Crispin	Jun-59			1	0.6	5
Jose	Crispin	Jul-59	12	6			
Jose	Crispin	Jul-59			5	2	1
Jose	Crispin	Jul-59					
Jose	Crispin	Jul-59			1	3	5
Jose	Crispin	Jul-59			1	1.4	16
Jose	Crispin	Jul-59			8	2	2
Jose	Crispin	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Crispin	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Crispin	Jul-59			1	3	1
Jose	Crispin	Jul-59					
Jose	Second	May-59	7	3.5			
Jose	Second	May-59			1	1.4	16
Jose	Second	May-59			1	1.4	16
Jose	Second	May-59					
Jose	Maria	Jul-59	24	12			
Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	1.4	16
Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	0.1	23
Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	1	8
Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Jul-59					
Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	0.2	12
Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	0.1	40
Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	1.4	16
Jose	Maria	Jul-59					
Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	1.4	16
Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Jul-59					
Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	1.2	2
Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	1	8
Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	0.6	5

Jose	Maria	Jul-59			1	0.6	29
Jose	Maria	Aug-59	6	3			
Jose	Maria	Aug-59			1	1.2	2
Jose	Maria	Aug-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Aug-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Aug-59			1	1	8
Jose	Maria	Aug-59			1	0.17	14
Juan		May-59	17	10.9			
Juan		May-59			1	0.6	8
Juan		May-59			1	1.4	16
Juan		May-59			1	2	13
Juan		May-59			1	0.4	5
Juan		May-59			1	0.4	5
Juan		May-59			8	2.4	2
Juan		May-59			1	0.4	5
Juan		May-59			8	2	1
Juan		May-59			1	0.5	9
Juan		May-59			1	0.5	5
Pinto		Oct-59	17	8.4			
Pinto		Oct-59			10	2.4	2
Pinto		Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Pinto		Oct-59			6	1.4	2
Pinto		Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Pinto		Oct-59			1	0.2	22
Pinto		Oct-59			2	1	5
Pinto		Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Pinto		Oct-59			1	0.2	5
Pinto		Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Pinto		Oct-59			1	2	64
Pinto		Oct-59			1	0.6	24
Pinto		Oct-59			1	2	64
Pinto		Oct-59			1	0.1	45
Pinto		Oct-59			2	1	5
Pinto		Nov-59	17	8.3			
Pinto		Nov-59			1	0.4	24
Pinto		Nov-59			1	0.4	24
Pinto		Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Pinto		Nov-59			1	0.7	2
Pinto		Nov-59			1	0.6	1
Pinto		Nov-59			1	0.1	23

Pinto		Nov-59			1	0.2	5
Pinto		Nov-59			1	0.2	5
Pinto		Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Pinto		Nov-59			1	0.3	12
Feliz	Pajanero	May-59	8	1.35			
Feliz	Pajanero	May-59			1	0.7	29
Feliz	Pajanero	May-59			1	0.2	12
Feliz	Pajanero	May-59			1	0.1	23
Feliz	Pajanero	May-59	12	2			
Feliz	Pajanero	May-59			1	2	13
Feliz	Pajanero	May-59			1	0.1	37
Feliz	Pajanero	May-59			1	0.1	23
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59	22	10.8			
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	0.2	5
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			2	6	30
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	1.2	63
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	0.2	5
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	1	8
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	0.5	5
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59					
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	0.1	23
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	2	64
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	2	64
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	0.3	5
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	0.1	40
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	0.2	5
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	0.1	40
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59					
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	1.4	16
Julian	McWilliams	Jul-59			1	0.1	5
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59	26	12.9			
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59					
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59			1	3	30
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59			1	0.1	14
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59			1	1.4	66
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59			1	0.6	5
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59			1	0.4	24

Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59				
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59			10	2.6
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59			1	0.4
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59				24
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59				
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59			1	2
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59			10	2.4
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59			1	0.4
Julian	McWilliams	Aug-59			1	0.2
Julian	McWilliams	Sep-59	10	5		5
Julian	McWilliams				1	3
Andrea	Larandera	Jun-59				30
Andrea	Larandera	Jun-59			10	2.4
Andrea	Larandera	Jun-59			1	0.4
Andrea	Larandera	Jun-59			1	0.4
Andrea	Larandera	Jun-59			6	1.4
Andrea	Larandera	Jun-59			1	0.3
Andrea	Larandera	Jul-59	7	5.3		5
Andrea	Larandera	Jul-59			10	2.4
Andrea	Larandera	Jul-59			10	2.4
Andrea	Larandera	Jul-59			1	0.2
Andrea	Larandera	Jul-59			1	3.4
Andrea	Larandera	Jul-59			1	0.4
Andrea	Larandera	Jul-59			1	0.2
Andrea	Larandera	Jul-59			1	0.1
Andrea	Larandera	Aug-59	8	4.19		23
Andrea	Larandera	Aug-59			1	0.1
Andrea	Larandera	Aug-59			30	7.4
Andrea	Larandera	Sep-59	12	6.9		18
Andrea	Larandera	Sep-59			1	3
Andrea	Larandera	Sep-59			1	0.2
Andrea	Larandera	Oct-59	7	4.3		5
Andrea	Larandera	Oct-59			2	6
Andrea	Larandera	Oct-59			1	0.4
Andrea	Larandera	Oct-59			1	2
Andrea	Larandera	Oct-59			2	1.4
Andrea	Larandera	Oct-59			2	1.4
Jesusito		Jun-59	4	1		63
Jesusito		Jun-59			1	0.5
Jesusito		Jun-59			1	0.1
Jesusito		Jun-59				23

Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59	21	10.4			
Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59			1	1.4	16
Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59			2	0.2	23
Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59			1	3	19
Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59					
Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59					
Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59			1	1.2	63
Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59			1	0.2	23
Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59					
Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59			1	0.6	5
Julian	McWilliams	Jun-59			1	0.2	23
Luis		Jun-59	15	7.4			
Luis		Jun-59			1	1.6	16
Luis		Jun-59			1	0.6	8
Luis		Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Luis		Jun-59			1	1.6	16
Luis		Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Luis		Jun-59			1	0.5	29
Luis		Jun-59			8	2	1
Cuerbo		Jul-59	18	9			
Cuerbo		Jul-59			1	0.1	23
Cuerbo		Jul-59					
Cuerbo		Jul-59			1	1.4	16
Cuerbo		Jul-59			2	1	5
Cuerbo		Jul-59					
Cuerbo		Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo		Jul-59			1	3	19
Cuerbo		Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo		Jul-59			1	1.6	16
Cuerbo		Jul-59					
Cuerbo		Jul-59			1	1	8
Cuerbo		Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo		Aug-59	11	6			
Cuerbo		Aug-59			1	1	8
Cuerbo		Aug-59			1	1.4	66
Cuerbo		Aug-59			1	1.5	5

Pedro	Quintana	Jun-59	12	5.4			
Pedro	Quintana	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintana	Jun-59			1	0.1	5
Pedro	Quintana	Jun-59			1	0.1	5
Pedro	Quintana	Jun-59			8	2	2
Pedro	Quintana	Jun-59			8	2	2
Pedro	Quintana	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintana	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintana	Jun-59			1	0.1	23
Pedro	Quintana	Jun-59			1	0.2	5
Pedro	Quintana	Jun-59			1	0.1	5
Pedro	Quintana	Jun-59			8	2	1
Pedro	Quintana	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintana	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59	24	12			
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59					
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59			1	0.2	9
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59			1	0.2	71
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59			1	0.2	5
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59			1	0.2	5
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59			1	0.2	23
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59			1	0.2	22
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59					
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59			4	1	1
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59			16	4	1
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59			1	0.6	9
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59			1	0.4	23
Pedro	Quintana	Jul-59			1	0.2	9
Rosario	Corturena	Jun-59					
Rosario	Corturena	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Rosario	Corturena	Jun-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Aug-59	15	7.4			
Jose	Maria	Aug-59			1	1.6	16
Jose	Maria	Aug-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Aug-59			3	1	24
Jose	Maria	Aug-59					
Jose	Maria	Aug-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Maria	Aug-59					

Jose	Maria	Aug-59			1	1	8
Jose	Maria	Aug-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Sep-59	15	7.4			
Jose	Maria	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Sep-59			1	0.2	14
Jose	Maria	Sep-59			8	2	1
Jose	Maria	Sep-59			8	2	2
Jose	Maria	Sep-59			2	0.2	23
Jose	Maria	Sep-59			1	1	8
Jose	Maria	Sep-59			12	3	2
Jose	Maria	Sep-59			1	0.6	63
Jose	Maria	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Oct-59	11	5.4			
Jose	Maria	Oct-59			1	4	44
Jose	Maria	Oct-59			1	2	13
Pedro	Quintano	Jul-59	5	2.4			
Pedro	Quintano	Jul-59					
Pedro	Quintano	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintano	Jul-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintano	Jul-59			1	0.1	22
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59	20	9.8			
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59					
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59			1	3	30
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59			1	0.2	5
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59			1	0.1	9
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59			1	0.1	71
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59			1	0.1	23
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59			1	0.1	23
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59			1	0.4	24
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59					
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59			1	0.1	22
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59					
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59			8	2	2
Pedro	Quintano	Aug-59			1	1.2	14
Pedro	Quintano	Sep-59	16	7.8			
Pedro	Quintano	Sep-59			8	2	2
Pedro	Quintano	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintano	Sep-59			10	2.4	2
Pedro	Quintano	Sep-59			1	4	44

Pedro	Quintano	Sep-59			1	0.2	5
Pedro	Quintano	Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Quintano	Sep-59			1	0.2	22
Pedro	Quintano	Sep-59			10	2.6	2
Pedro	Quintano	Oct-59	13	6.4			
Pedro	Quintano	Oct-59			1	0.2	40
Pedro	Quintano	Oct-59			1	0.4	4
Jose	Maria	Oct-59	17	8.2			
Jose	Maria	Oct-59			1	2	16
Jose	Maria	Oct-59			1	3	30
Jose	Maria	Oct-59			1	0.1	22
Jose	Maria	Oct-59			1		
Jose	Maria	Oct-59			1	0.2	5
Jose	Maria	Oct-59			1	0.6	8
Jose	Maria	Oct-59			3	3	2
Jose	Maria	Oct-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Maria	Oct-59			1	0.1	23
Jose	Maria	Oct-59			1	0.4	72
Jose	Maria	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Nov-59	16	7.9			
Jose	Maria	Nov-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Maria	Nov-59			1	1	24
Jose	Maria	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Nov-59			1	0.6	66
Jose	Maria	Nov-59			1	0.4	8
Jose	Maria	Nov-59			1	0.2	12
Jose	Maria	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Nov-59			1	0.1	22
Jose	Maria	Dec-59					
Jose	Maria	Dec-59			1	-2	2
Jose	Maria	Dec-59			1	-1.7	2
Jose	Maria	Dec-59			1	2.4	5
Jose	Maria	Dec-59			1	0.2	12
Jose	Maria	Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Jose	Maria	Dec-59			1	0.2	12
Manuel	Madeora	Jul-59					
Manuel	Madeora	Jul-59			1	1.6	5
Manuel	Madeora	Jul-59			1	0.2	22
Manuel	Madeora	Aug-59	11	27.4			

Manuel	Madeora	Aug-59			1	0.4	4
Manuel	Madeora	Aug-59			1	0.3	5
Manuel	Madeora	Aug-59			1	0.6	5
Manuel	Madeora	Aug-59			1	0.2	73
Manuel	Madeora	Aug-59			1	1	22
Manuel	Madeora	Aug-59			1	0.1	24
Manuel	Madeora	Aug-59			1	1	4
Manuel	Madeora	Aug-59			1	1	4
Manuel	Madeora	Aug-59			0.5	0.4	4
Manuel	Madeora	Aug-59			1	0.1	14
Manuel	Madeora	Aug-59					
Manuel	Madeora	Sep-59					
Manuel	Madeora	Sep-59			1	0.4	22
Manuel	Madeora	Sep-59			1	0.4	4
Manuel	Madeora	Sep-59					
Cuerbo		Aug-59	11	5.5			
Cuerbo		Aug-59			1	1.6	16
Cuerbo		Aug-59					
Cuerbo		Aug-59			1	0.2	24
Cuerbo		Aug-59			1	1	8
Cuerbo		Aug-59					
Cuerbo		Aug-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo		Aug-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo		Sep-59	17	8.4			
Cuerbo		Sep-59			1	1	63
Cuerbo		Sep-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo		Sep-59			1	0.1	14
Cuerbo		Sep-59			6	1.4	2
Cuerbo		Sep-59			2	0.9	5
Cuerbo		Sep-59			1	0.1	14
Cuerbo		Sep-59			1	2	5
Cuerbo		Sep-59			1	1.4	29
Cuerbo		Sep-59			1	2	13
Cuerbo		Sep-59			1	2.6	30
Cuerbo		Oct-59	36	18.6			
Cuerbo		Oct-59			1	0.4	40
Cuerbo		Oct-59			1	0.2	23
Cuerbo		Oct-59			1	1	8
Cuerbo		Oct-59			1	0.1	14
Cuerbo		Oct-59			1	0.3	4

Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	1	66
Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	2	8
Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	1	63
Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	2	16
Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	1.4	2
Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	0.5	22
Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	2	64
Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	0.8	66
Cuerbo	Oct-59			1	0.4	45
Cuerbo	Nov-59	17.5	9.02			
Cuerbo	Nov-59			1	0.2	12
Cuerbo	Nov-59			1	0.4	24
Cuerbo	Nov-59			1	0.4	24
Cuerbo	Nov-59			1	0.6	8
Cuerbo	Nov-59			1	0.4	24
Cuerbo	Nov-59			1	0.2	12
Cuerbo	Nov-59			1	0.6	5
Cuerbo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo	Nov-59			1	0.1	23
Cuerbo	Nov-59			1	0.3	5
Cuerbo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo	Dec-59	23	11.4			
Cuerbo	Dec-59			1	2	13
Cuerbo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo	Dec-59			1	0.1	9
Cuerbo	Dec-59			1	3.4	30
Cuerbo	Dec-59			1	1	8
Cuerbo	Dec-59			1	0.2	5
Cuerbo	Dec-59			1	2	8
Cuerbo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Cuerbo	Dec-59			1	1.6	16
Cuerbo	Dec-59			1	2	29

Cuerbo		Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Antonio	Donato	Sep-59	8	6.4			
Antonio	Donato	Sep-59			1	4.6	2
Antonio	Donato	Sep-59			1	0.2	22
Antonio	Donato	Sep-59			1	0.3	4
Antonio	Donato	Sep-59			1	0.4	63
Antonio	Donato	Sep-59			1	0.3	73
Antonio	Donato	Sep-59			1	0.5	8
Antonio	Donato	Sep-59			1	0.2	22
Antonio	Donato	Sep-59			1	0.1	74
Antonio	Donato	Sep-59			1	0.2	61
Antonio	Donato	Oct-59	45	22.5			
Antonio	Donato	Oct-59			1	1	22
Antonio	Donato	Oct-59			1	0.3	4
Antonio	Donato	Oct-59			1	2	73
Antonio	Donato	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Antonio	Donato	Oct-59			1	1.6	64
Antonio	Donato	Oct-59			1	0.6	24
Antonio	Donato	Oct-59			1	1	22
Antonio	Donato	Oct-59			2	1	75
Antonio	Donato	Oct-59			1	10.12	67
Antonio	Donato	Oct-59			1	1	67
Antonio	Donato	Oct-59					
Antonio	Donato	Oct-59			1	0.9	67
Domingo		Dec-59	12	6			
Domingo		Dec-59			1	1.6	16
Domingo		Dec-59			1	2	8
Domingo		Dec-59			1	0.2	23
Brijoto	Morillo	Sep-59					
Brijoto	Morillo	Sep-59			1	3	2
Brijoto	Morillo	Sep-59			1	0.2	22
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59	27	13.5			
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	2.2	1
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	1	4
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	0.6	63
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	0.3	5
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	0.2	40
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	2	22
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	0.2	5

Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			4	1	2
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	0.4	8
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	0.1	40
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	0.6	8
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	0.2	23
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	0.4	24
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Brijoto	Morillo	Oct-59			1	0.2	23
Brijoto	Morillo	Nov-59	19	8.3			
Brijoto	Morillo	Nov-59			1	1.4	29
Brijoto	Morillo	Nov-59			1	0.1	67
Brijoto	Morillo	Nov-59			1	0.6	8
Brijoto	Morillo	Nov-59			1	0.4	24
Brijoto	Morillo	Nov-59			1	1.4	5
Brijoto	Morillo	Nov-59			1	0.3	23
Brijoto	Morillo	Nov-59			1	0.4	72
Brijoto	Morillo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Brijoto	Morillo	Nov-59			1	1	5
Brijoto	Morillo	Nov-59			1	1.4	2
Brijoto	Morillo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Largo	Oct-59	10	5			
Juan	Largo	Oct-59			12	3	2
Juan	Largo	Oct-59			1	0.2	22
Juan	Largo	Oct-59			1	1	2
Jose	Delores	Oct-59	23	10.2			
Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	2	8
Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	0.2	22
Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	0.2	23
Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	0.2	5
Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	2	13
Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	0.2	22
Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	3	30
Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	0.8	8
Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	0.2	24

Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	0.2	22
Jose	Delores	Oct-59			1	0.3	45
Jose	Delores	Nov-59	23	5.55			
Jose	Delores	Nov-59			1	0.5	23
Jose	Delores	Nov-59			1	0.5	5
Jose	Delores	Nov-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Delores	Nov-59			1	0.4	72
Jose	Delores	Nov-59			1	0.6	8
Jose	Delores	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Mariano	Chapo	Oct-59	6	3			
Mariano	Chapo	Oct-59			1	3	30
Jesus		Oct-59	17	8.4			
Jesus		Oct-59			1	2.6	31
Jesus		Oct-59			16	4	2
Jesus		Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Jesus		Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Jesus		Oct-59			1	0.2	5
Jesus		Oct-59			1	0.4	8
Jesus		Oct-59			1	1	2
Jesus		Oct-59			1	0.4	24
Jesus		Nov-59	19	11.8			
Jesus		Nov-59			1	0.2	23
Jesus		Nov-59			1	0.6	8
Jesus		Dec-59	26	12.2			
Jesus		Dec-59			1	1.6	8
Jesus		Dec-59			1	1.4	16
Jesus		Dec-59			10	2	2
Jesus		Dec-59			10	2.4	1
Jesus		Dec-59			1	2	13
Jesus		Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jesus		Dec-59			1	2	29
Jesus		Dec-59			1	0.2	22
Jesus		Dec-59			1	1.6	16
Jesus		Dec-59			8	2	2
Jesus		Dec-59			8	2	2
Jesus		Dec-59					
Jesus		Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jesus		Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Pinto		Oct-59	6	3			

Pinto		Oct-59			6	1.4	2
Pinto		Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Rosa		Dec-59					
Rosa		Dec-59			1	0.3	23
Rosa		Dec-59			1	3	4
Jesus		Jan-60	14	7			
Jesus		Jan-60			1	3	1
Jesus		Jan-60			8	2	1
Jesus		Jan-60			1	1	2
Jesus		Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Jesus		Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Jesus		Jan-60			1	0.2	23
Jesus		Jan-60			8	2	1
Jesus		Jan-60			1	0.2	12
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59	11	5.4			
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			1	2	16
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			1	2	28
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			1	0.4	8
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			1	0.1	40
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			1	0.5	24
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			1	0.5	5
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			1	0.2	24
Jose	Viejo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Nov-59	22	10.9			
Jose	Viejo	Nov-59			1	0.3	24
Jose	Viejo	Nov-59			1	0.4	24
Jose	Viejo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Dec-59	16	7.8			
Jose	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.1	23
Jose	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Dec-59			1	3.6	30

Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Nov-59	19	9.3			
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Nov-59			1	0.8	66
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Nov-59			1	0.4	24
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Nov-59			1	1	24
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Nov-59			1	1	5
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Nov-59			1	1	5
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Nov-59			1	0.2	2
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Nov-59			1	0.1	37
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Nov-59			1	0.1	9
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Dec-59	19	9.2			
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Dec-59			2	1	5
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Dec-59			2	4	13
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Dec-59			1	1.4	16
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Dec-59			2	1	5
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.2	24
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Dec-59			1	1.6	16
Jose							
Antonio	Largo	Dec-59			1	3	30

Jose Antonio	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose Antonio	Largo	Dec-59			1	2	65
Juan	Pablo	Oct-59					
Juan	Pablo	Oct-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Pablo	Oct-59			1	0.8	8
Juan	Pablo	Oct-59			1	0.2	45
Juan	Pablo	Nov-59	5	2.4			
Juan	Pablo	Nov-59			1	1.2	8
Juan	Pablo	Nov-59			1	0.2	12
Juan	Pablo	Nov-59			2	1	5
Chico		Dec-59	12	3.9			
Chico		Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Chico		Dec-59			1	1.4	16
Chico		Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Chico		Dec-59			1	1.6	16
Juan	Viejo	Nov-59	22	10.8			
Juan	Viejo	Nov-59			1	0.4	24
Juan	Viejo	Nov-59			2	1	24
Juan	Viejo	Nov-59			8	2	2
Juan	Viejo	Nov-59			1	0.3	5
Juan	Viejo	Nov-59			1	0.1	37
Juan	Viejo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Nov-59			2	1	5
Juan	Viejo	Nov-59			2	0.4	47
Juan	Viejo	Nov-59			1	0.6	8
Juan	Viejo	Nov-59			1	0.3	5
Juan	Viejo	Nov-59			1	0.1	23
Juan	Viejo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Dec-59	23	11.4			
Juan	Viejo	Dec-59					
Juan	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Juan	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Dec-59			2	3.6	1
Juan	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.4	2
Juan	Viejo	Dec-59			1	1.6	16
Juan	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5

Juan	Viejo	Jan-60	6	3			
Juan	Viejo	Jan-60			1	2	8
Juan	Viejo	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Juan	Viejo	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Largo	Nov-59	8	3.8			
Pedro	Largo	Nov-59			1	1.4	2
Pedro	Largo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Largo	Nov-59			1	0.1	22
Pedro	Largo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Largo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Largo	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Largo	Nov-59			1	0.1	22
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59	20	10			
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.1	9
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			4	0.6	1
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.2	5
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	1.4	16
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.1	22
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.3	5
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	2	29
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.2	12
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.1	9
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.1	22
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Pedro	Largo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Largo	Jan-60	12	6			
Pedro	Largo	Jan-60			2	1	5
Pedro	Largo	Jan-60			1	3	30
Pedro	Largo	Jan-60			1	2	13
Pedro	Largo	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Pedro	Largo	Jan-60			1	0.2	23
Pedro	Largo	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Jose Maria	Briejo	Nov-59	3	1.4			
Jose Maria	Briejo	Nov-59			1	1.4	2

Juan	Abrila	Dec-59	10	4.8			
Juan	Abrila	Dec-59			1	1.4	8
Juan	Abrila	Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Juan	Abrila	Dec-59			1	1.4	16
Juan	Abrila	Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Juan	Abrila	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Nov-59					
Jose	Delores	Nov-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Dec-59	22	10.2			
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	0.2	22
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	2	13
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	0.2	22
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	2	13
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			2	1	5
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	0.2	22
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	0.2	12
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	0.2	22
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	0.2	22
Jose	Delores	Dec-59			1	0.2	5
Jose	Delores	Jan-60	11	5.4			
Jose	Delores	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Jan-60			1	0.2	71
Jose	Delores	Jan-60			1	0.1	71
Jose	Delores	Jan-60			1	2	13
Jose	Delores	Jan-60			6	1.2	2
Jose	Delores	Jan-60			1	1.8	16
Jose	Delores	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Jose	Delores	Jan-60			1	0.2	22
Jose	Delores	Jan-60			1	0.6	5
Brijido		Nov-59					
Brijido		Nov-59			12	3	1
Brijido		Nov-59			1	0.2	71
Brijido		Dec-59	18	9			

Brijido		Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Brijido		Dec-59			1	2.6	1
Brijido		Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Brijido		Dec-59			1	0.1	71
Brijido		Dec-59			1	3	30
Brijido		Dec-59			1	1.6	16
Brijido		Jan-60	12	6			
Brijido		Jan-60			2	1	5
Brijido		Jan-60			6	1	2
Brijido		Jan-60			1	0.2	23
Brijido		Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Brijido		Jan-60			1	0.6	8
Brijido		Jan-60			1	1.4	16
Brijido		Jan-60			1	0.6	8
Brijido		Jan-60			1	2	76
Brijido		Jan-60			1	2	13
Brijido		Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Brijido		Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Brijido		Jan-60			1	0.2	23
Fefon		Dec-59	18	8.6			
Fefon		Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Fefon		Dec-59			1	2	13
Fefon		Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Fefon		Dec-59			1	1.4	16
Fefon		Dec-59			1	1.6	16
Fefon		Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Fefon		Dec-59			1	2	64
Fefon		Dec-59			1	0.2	12
Jose	Loy	Dec-59	20	9.8			
Jose	Loy	Dec-59					
Jose	Loy	Dec-59			4	1	2
Jose	Loy	Dec-59			1	0.2	40
Jose	Loy	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Loy	Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Jose	Loy	Dec-59			1	1.6	16
Jose	Loy	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Loy	Dec-59			1	3	30
Jose	Loy	Dec-59			1	2	30
Jose	Loy	Dec-59			1	0.2	12
Jose	Viejo	Dec-59	11	5.4			

Jose	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Jose	Viejo	Dec-59			8	1.6	2
Jose	Viejo	Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Jose	Viejo	Dec-59			1	1.8	16
Jose	Viejo	Dec-59			1	1.4	29
Jose	Viejo	Dec-59			2	1	5
Jose	Viejo	Jan-60	12	6			
Jose	Viejo	Jan-60			1	2.4	1
Jose	Viejo	Jan-60			2	0.4	12
Jose	Viejo	Jan-60			1	1	5
Jose	Viejo	Jan-60			1	0.6	8
Jose	Viejo	Jan-60			3	0.6	12
Jose	Viejo	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Juan	Quinaro	Dec-59	11	5.4			
Juan	Quinaro	Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Juan	Quinaro	Dec-59			1	1.4	16
Juan	Quinaro	Dec-59			1	0.2	71
Juan	Quinaro	Dec-59			1	2	30
Juan	Quinaro	Dec-59			1	0.2	12
Juan	Quinaro	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Juan	Quinaro	Dec-59			1	0.2	5
Juan	Quinaro	Jan-60	12	6			
Juan	Quinaro	Jan-60			1	1.4	16
Juan	Quinaro	Jan-60			1	0.6	8
Juan	Quinaro	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Juan	Quinaro	Jan-60			3	1.4	5
Juan	Quinaro	Jan-60			1	0.1	23
Juan	Quinaro	Jan-60			1	0.1	22
Juan	Quinaro	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Juan	Quinaro	Jan-60			1	0.8	8
Juan	Quinaro	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Helluto	Chapo	Dec-59	11	5.4			
Helluto	Chapo	Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Helluto	Chapo	Dec-59			1	1.4	16
Helluto	Chapo	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Helluto	Chapo	Dec-59			1	3	30
Helluto	Chapo	Dec-59			1	0.6	8
Helluto	Chapo	Dec-59			1	0.2	5
Ambrosio		Dec-59	11	5.4			

Ambrosio	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Ambrosio	Dec-59			1	0.2	23
Ambrosio	Dec-59			1	0.4	5
Ambrosio	Dec-59			2	1	5
Ambrosio	Jan-60	6	3			
Ambrosio	Jan-60					
Ambrosio	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Ambrosio	Jan-60			1	0.2	23
Ambrosio	Jan-60			1	0.6	8
Ambrosio	Jan-60			1	1.6	16
Ambrosio	Jan-60			1	3	30
Ambrosio	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Ambrosio	Jan-60			1	0.2	12
Ambrosio	Jan-60			2	1	5
Garrocha	Dec-59	4	2			
Garrocha	Dec-59			1	1.4	29
Garrocha	Dec-59			10	2.4	1
Garrocha	Dec-59			1	0.1	71
Garrocha	Dec-59			1	0.1	23
Garrocha	Dec-59			2	1	5
Garrocha	Dec-59			1	3	30
Garrocha	Jan-60	11	5.4			
Garrocha	Jan-60			1	0.2	23
Garrocha	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Garrocha	Jan-60			1	2	13
Garrocha	Jan-60					
Garrocha	Jan-60			1	0.1	23
Benito	Dec-59	5	2.4			
Benito	Dec-59			10	2.4	1
Rogue	Dec-59	5	2.4			
Rogue	Dec-59			1	0.1	71
Rogue	Dec-59			10	2	2
Rogue	Dec-59			1	1.4	13
Ramon	Jan-60	6	3			
Ramon	Jan-60			1	1.4	8
Ramon	Jan-60			6	1.4	2
Francisco	Dec-59	5	2.4			
Francisco	Dec-59			2	1.4	8
Francisco	Dec-59			1	2	13
Cuerbo	Dec-59	4	2			

Cuerbo		Dec-59			1	1.6	16
Cuerbo		Dec-59			1	1.4	29
Cuerbo		Dec-59			1	1	5
Cuerbo		Jan-60	11	5.4			
Cuerbo		Jan-60			1	0.2	5
Cuerbo		Jan-60			1	2	13
Cuerbo		Jan-60			1	2.4	76
Cuerbo		Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Amores		Dec-59	5	2.4			
Amores		Dec-59	11	5.4			
J.A	Flores	Dec-59	6	3			
J.A	Flores	Jan-60	12	6			
J.A	Flores	Jan-60			1	1.6	16
J.A	Flores	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
J.A	Flores	Jan-60			1	0.6	8
J.A	Flores	Jan-60			4	0.7	5
J.A	Flores	Jan-60			1	3.4	36
J.A	Flores	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
J.A	Flores	Jan-60			1	0.2	12
J.A	Flores	Jan-60			18	4.4	5
J.A	Flores	Jan-60			8	2	5
J.A	Flores	Jan-60			1	0.2	9
J.A	Flores	Jan-60			1	0.2	5
Francisco		Jan-60	6	3.2			
Francisco		Jan-60			6	1.4	2
Francisco		Jan-60			1	0.2	12
Francisco		Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Francisco		Jan-60			1	0.6	5
Francisco		Jan-60			1	0.2	23
Francisco		Jan-60			1	0.2	12
Francisco		Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Jose	Maria	Jan-60	10	4.8			
Jose	Maria	Jan-60			8	1.6	1
Jose	Maria	Jan-60					
Jose	Maria	Jan-60			1	1.4	16
Jose	Maria	Jan-60					
Jose	Angel	Jan-60	11	5.4			
Jose	Angel	Jan-60			1	1.6	16
Jose	Angel	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Jose	Angel	Jan-60					

Jose	Angel	Jan-60			8	2.6	1
Jose	Angel	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Jose	Angel	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Jose	Angel	Jan-60			1	0.4	5
Aquardiente		Jan-60	6	3			
Aquardiente		Jan-60			1	2	13
Aquardiente		Jan-60			5	1	2
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62	22	11			
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			10	2	18
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.135	14
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.5	23
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	25	77
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.135	14
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.25	77
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.5	23
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.25	22
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.875	8
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.185	22
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.185	22
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			20	2	18
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.25	77
Jose	Ignacio Sr	May-62			1	0.25	22
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62	20.5	10.25			
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	0.2	40
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	0.34	22
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	2	16
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	0.125	23
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			10	2	18
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	1	4

Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	2	16
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	1	4
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	1.25	4
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62	12	6			
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			20	2.25	18
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	1	4
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	1	4
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	1	4
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.125	22
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.125	78
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	1	4
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.875	8
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62	22	10.5			
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	2.5	18
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	1.25	48
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.5	40
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	2	48
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.25	4
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	2.5	18
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	1.25	48
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62	19.5	9.75			
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	0.25	72
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	0.25	72
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	1.75	16
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	1.25	29
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	0.25	4
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	1	4
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	2.5	18
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	0.875	8
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	0.25	4

Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	1.5	4
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jun-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62	12	6			
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	2.5	18
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.5	22
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	1.5	4
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.5	40
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.875	8
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.5	4
Jose	Ignacio Sr	Jul-62			1	0.25	23
Salyico		May-62	21	10.5			
Salyico		May-62			1	0.125	14
Salyico		May-62			1	0.5	5
Salyico		May-62			2	1	5
Salyico		May-62			1	0.25	23
Salyico		May-62			1	2	16
Salyico		May-62			1	0.25	72
Salyico		May-62			1	0.375	12
Salyico		May-62			1	0.875	8
Salyico		May-62			1	2	18
Salyico		May-62			1	0.25	66
Salyico		May-62			1	0.5	5
Salyico		May-62			1	0.375	79
Salyico		Jun-62	20.5	10.25			
Salyico		Jun-62			1	0.5	5
Salyico		Jun-62			1	2.25	18
Salyico		Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Salyico		Jun-62			1	0.5	40
Salyico		Jun-62			1	2	16
Salyico		Jun-62			1	2.25	18
Salyico		Jun-62			1	0.875	8
Salyico		Jun-62			2	0.75	4
Salyico		Jun-62			1	0.25	23
Salyico		Jun-62			1	0.25	22
Salyico		Jun-62			1	2	18
Salyico		Jun-62			1	2	13
Salyico		Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Salyico		Jun-62			1	0.25	40
Salyico		Jun-62			1	0.875	8

Salyico		Jul-62	5	3			
Salyico		Sep-62	1.5	0.75			
Salyico		Oct-62	16.5	7.565			
Salyico		Oct-62			1	0.25	4
Salyico		Oct-62			1	2	16
Salyico		Oct-62			1	0.25	40
Salyico		Nov-62	7	2.625			
Salyico		Nov-62					
Jose	Oiecho	May-62	17	8.5			
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	0.125	14
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	0.125	47
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	0.25	77
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	0.185	22
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	0.25	72
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	0.375	12
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	3	18
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	May-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Jun-62	21	10.5			
Jose	Oiecho	Jun-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Jun-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Jun-62			4	7.5	18
Jose	Oiecho	Jun-62			1	0.185	22
Jose	Oiecho	Jun-62			1	0.25	4
Jose	Oiecho	Jun-62			1	0.25	4
Jose	Oiecho	Jun-62			1	0.625	40
Jose	Oiecho	Jun-62			1	1	4
Jose	Oiecho	Jun-62			1	0.875	8
Jose	Oiecho	Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Jose	Oiecho	Jun-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Oiecho	Jun-62			1	0.874	8
Jose	Oiecho	Jul-62	22	11			
Jose	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	3	18
Jose	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	1	4

Jose	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	0.5	4
Jose	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	0.5	4
Jose	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	0.875	8
Jose	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	0.5	23
Jose	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	0.5	4
Jose	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	0.5	4
Jose	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	0.5	23
Jose	Oiecho	Aug-62	6	3			
Jose	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	2.25	29
Jose	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	1.75	16
Jesus		May-62	23	11.5			
Jesus		May-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		May-62			1	0.125	14
Jesus		May-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		May-62			1	0.25	23
Jesus		May-62			1	2	48
Jesus		May-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		May-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		May-62			1	0.25	23
Jesus		May-62			1	0.25	77
Jesus		May-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		May-62			1	0.5	23
Jesus		May-62			1	0.25	72
Jesus		May-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		May-62			1	0.25	72
Jesus		May-62			1	0.5	23
Jesus		Jun-62	21	10.5			
Jesus		Jun-62			1	1	4
Jesus		Jun-62			1	1	4
Jesus		Jun-62			1	1	4
Jesus		Jun-62			1	1	4
Jesus		Jun-62			1	0.25	22
Jesus		Jun-62			1	2	18
Jesus		Jun-62			1	2	16
Jesus		Jun-62			1	1	4
Jesus		Jun-62			1	2.25	16
Jesus		Jul-62	18	9			
Jesus		Jul-62			1	2	18
Jesus		Jul-62			1	1	4
Jesus		Jul-62			1	0.25	4

Jesus	Jul-62			1	0.25	23
Jesus	Jul-62			1	0.06	78
Jesus	Jul-62			1	0.25	4
Jesus	Jul-62			1	1	4
Jesus	Jul-62			1	0.5	4
Jesus	Jul-62			1	0.25	23
Jesus	Jul-62			1	0.125	22
Jesus	Aug-62	6	3			
Jesus	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Cuervo	May-62	22	11			
Cuervo	May-62			1	2	18
Cuervo	May-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo	May-62			1	0.125	22
Cuervo	May-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo	May-62			1	0.25	77
Cuervo	May-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo	May-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo	May-62			1	0.25	77
Cuervo	May-62			1	0.25	23
Cuervo	May-62			1	2	16
Cuervo	May-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo	May-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo	May-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo	Jun-62	19	9.5			
Cuervo	Jun-62			1	0.125	22
Cuervo	Jun-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo	Jun-62			1	0.25	40
Cuervo	Jun-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo	Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Cuervo	Jun-62			3	0.75	4
Cuervo	Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Cuervo	Jun-62			1	0.25	23
Cuervo	Jun-62			1	3	18
Cuervo	Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Cuervo	Jun-62			1	0.25	4
Cuervo	Jun-62			1	2.25	18
Cuervo	Jun-62			1	2.25	16
Cuervo	Jun-62			1	1	4
Cuervo	Jun-62			1	0.25	23
Cuervo	Jul-62	18	8.5			

Cuervo	Jul-62			1	0.875	8
Cuervo	Jul-62			1	1	4
Cuervo	Jul-62			1	0.5	4
Cuervo	Jul-62			1	0.5	4
Cuervo	Jul-62			1	0.5	4
Cuaty	May-62	27	13.5			
Cuaty	May-62			1	2	48
Cuaty	May-62			1	2.5	18
Cuaty	May-62			1	0.5	5
Cuaty	May-62			1	0.375	14
Cuaty	May-62			1	0.5	23
Cuaty	May-62			1	0.25	40
Cuaty	May-62			1	0.125	14
Cuaty	May-62			1	0.25	23
Cuaty	May-62			1	0.185	22
Cuaty	May-62			1	0.25	8
Cuaty	May-62			1	0.5	72
Cuaty	May-62			1	1.25	18
Cuaty	May-62			1	0.5	5
Cuaty	Jun-62	14	7			
Cuaty	Jun-62			1	1	65
Cuaty	Jun-62			1	0.315	23
Cuaty	Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Cuaty	Jun-62			1	0.5	5
Cuaty	Jun-62			1	0.25	4
Cuaty	Jun-62			1	0.25	4
Cuaty	Jun-62			1	0.25	4
Cuaty	Jun-62			1	0.5	60
Cuaty	Jun-62			1	1.875	18
Cuaty	Jun-62			1	0.25	40
Cuaty	Jun-62			1	0.25	40
Cuaty	Jun-62			1	2.25	16
Cuaty	Jul-62	15.5	7.75			
Cuaty	Jul-62			1	0.25	4
Cuaty	Jul-62			1	0.25	4
Cuaty	Jul-62			1	2	13
Cuaty	Jul-62			1	0.25	23
Cuaty	Jul-62			1	0.185	22
Cuaty	Jul-62			1	0.185	22
Cuaty	Jul-62			1	1.5	48

Cuaty		Jul-62			1	2.25	16
Cuaty		Jul-62			1	0.875	8
Cuaty		Jul-62			1	0.25	4
Cuaty		Jul-62			1	2	13
Cuaty		Jul-62			1	1.5	48
Cuaty		Jul-62			1	0.75	48
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62	21	10.5			
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62			1	2	48
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62			1	2	18
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62			1	0.5	5
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62			1	0.25	23
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62			1	0.25	23
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62			1	0.5	5
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62			1	0.25	72
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62			1	0.5	79
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62			1	2.25	16
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62			1	0.875	8
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62			1	3	48
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62			1	2	18
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62			1	0.5	5
Marriana	Ociecho	May-62			1	0.25	23
Marriana	Ociecho	Jun-62	16	8			
Marriana	Ociecho	Jun-62			1	0.5	5
Marriana	Ociecho	Jun-62			1	0.5	23
Marriana	Ociecho	Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Marriana	Ociecho	Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Marriana	Ociecho	Jun-62			1	0.25	23
Marriana	Ociecho	Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Marriana	Ociecho	Jul-62	15	7.5			
Marriana	Ociecho	Jul-62			1	0.5	4
Marriana	Ociecho	Jul-62			1	2.25	18
Marriana	Ociecho	Jul-62			1	0.25	40
Marriana	Ociecho	Jul-62			1	0.25	0.5
Marriana	Ociecho	Jul-62			1	2.5	48
Marriana	Ociecho	Jul-62			1	1.75	16
Marriana	Ociecho	Jul-62			1	0.25	23
Marriana	Ociecho	Aug-62	10	5			
Marriana	Ociecho	Aug-62			1	2.25	29
Marriana	Ociecho	Aug-62			1	3.25	48
Marriana	Ociecho	Aug-62			1	0.75	4

Palma	May-62	18	9			
Palma	May-62			1	0.5	5
Palma	May-62			1	2	48
Palma	May-62			1	0.5	5
Palma	May-62			1	0.5	5
Palma	May-62			1	0.25	77
Palma	May-62			1	2.25	16
Palma	May-62			1	0.25	40
Palma	May-62			1	0.25	23
Palma	May-62			1	0.5	5
Palma	May-62			1	0.25	23
Palma	May-62			1	0.5	5
Palma	May-62			1	0.5	5
Palma	May-62			1	0.3	5
Palma	May-62			1	0.2	23
Palma	May-62			1	0.375	79
Palma	Jun-62	21	10.5			
Palma	Jun-62			2	1	5
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.375	23
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.25	40
Palma	Jun-62			1	1.75	16
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.25	4
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.25	22
Palma	Jun-62			1	2	16
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.875	8
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.25	23
Palma	Jun-62			1	2.25	18
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.25	4
Palma	Jun-62			1	1.25	4
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.25	4
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.25	22
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.25	40
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.5	4
Palma	Jun-62			1	0.25	23
Palma	Jul-62	19.5	9.5			
Palma	Jul-62			1	3	18
Palma	Jul-62			1	1	4

Palma		Jul-62			1	0.75	4
Palma		Jul-62			1	0.375	22
Palma		Jul-62			1	0.5	23
Palma		Jul-62			1	1	4
Palma		Jul-62			1	0.875	8
Palma		Jul-62			1	0.245	40
Palma		Jul-62			1	2.25	4
Palma		Jul-62			1	2	13
Cisco		Jul-62	5	0.625			
Cisco		Jul-62			1	0.375	22
Cisco		Jul-62			1	0.25	22
Cisco		Jul-62			1	0.375	78
Cisco		Jul-62			1	0.25	4
Cisco		Jul-62			1	0.25	48
Cisco		Jul-62			1	0.375	79
Cisco		Jul-62			1	0.75	4
Cisco		Jul-62			1	0.5	4
Cisco		Jul-62			1	0.25	66
Cisco		Jul-62			1	1.5	29
Jose	Ignacio	Jul-62	4	2			
Jose	Ignacio	Jul-62			1	1	4
Jose	Ignacio	Jul-62			1	0.25	4
Jose	Ignacio	Jul-62			1	0.125	40
Jose	Ignacio	Jul-62			1	0.5	4
Juan	Oiecho	Jul-62	10	5			
Juan	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	0.5	4
Juan	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	0.25	23
Juan	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	2.625	18
Juan	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	1.5	48
Juan	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	1.75	16
Juan	Oiecho	Jul-62			1	1	4
Juan	Oiecho	Aug-62	16	8			
Juan	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	2	48
Juan	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Juan	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Juan	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	0.875	8
Juan	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Juan	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	0.125	40
Juan	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	0.25	23
Juan	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	0.125	40

Juan	Oiecho	Sep-62	18	9			
Juan	Oiecho	Sep-62			1	2.5	18
Juan	Oiecho	Sep-62			1	1.5	2
Juan	Oiecho	Sep-62			1	0.25	37
Juan	Oiecho	Sep-62			1	0.375	40
Juan	Oiecho	Sep-62			1	0.25	66
Juan	Oiecho	Sep-62			1	0.5	48
Juan	Oiecho	Sep-62			1	0.25	40
Juan	Oiecho	Sep-62			1	0.1875	40
Juan	Oiecho	Sep-62			1	0.25	40
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-62	17	7.875			
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-62			1	0.25	4
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-62			1	0.24	72
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-62					
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-62			1	0.25	23
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-62			1	0.125	22
Juan	Oiecho	Jan-63	5	1.875			
Juan	Oiecho	Jan-63					
Juan	Oiecho	Jan-63			1	0.25	23
Juan	Oiecho	Jan-63			1	0.125	40
Palma		Jul-62	7	3.5			
Palma		Jul-62			1	2	4
Palma		Jul-62			1	0.25	23
Palma		Jul-62			1	0.875	8
Palma		Aug-62	22	11			
Palma		Aug-62			1	0.25	4
Palma		Aug-62			1	2.25	29
Palma		Aug-62			1	0.3125	40
Palma		Aug-62			1	0.875	8
Palma		Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Palma		Aug-62			1	0.25	79
Palma		Aug-62			3	3.25	18
Palma		Aug-62			1	2.5	48
Palma		Aug-62			1	0.375	40
Palma		Aug-62			1	0.25	4
Palma		Sep-62	11	6.25			
Palma		Sep-62			1	2	16
Palma		Sep-62			1	0.25	37
Palma		Sep-62			1	2	29
Palma		Oct-62	12	5.25			

Palma	Oct-62			1	1	4
Palma	Oct-62			1	0.25	40
Palma	Oct-62					
Palma	Nov-62	21	9.25			
Palma	Nov-62					
Palma	Nov-62			1	0.5	16
Palma	Nov-62			1	0.5	29
Palma	Nov-62			1	2	16
Palma	Nov-62			1	0.5	66
Palma	Nov-62			1	1	8
Palma	Nov-62			1	0.25	40
Palma	Nov-62			1	2	13
Palma	Nov-62					
Palma	Nov-62			1	0.25	4
Palma	Nov-62			1	0.255	4
Palma	Nov-62			1	0.5	4
Palma	Nov-62			1	0.5	4
Cuervo	Jul-62	6	3			
Cuervo	Jul-62			1	2	13
Cuervo	Jul-62			1	2.25	2.25
Cuervo	Jul-62			1	0.25	40
Cuervo	Jul-62			1	8	4
Cuervo	Jul-62			1	0.25	23
Cuervo	Aug-62	17	8.5			
Cuervo	Aug-62			1	0.25	4
Cuervo	Aug-62			1	2.25	29
Cuervo	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Cuervo	Aug-62			1	0.875	4
Cuervo	Aug-62			1	0.125	22
Cuervo	Aug-62			1	1	4
Abooha	Jul-62	4	2			
Abooha	Jul-62			1	2.25	16
Abooha	Jul-62			1	0.125	22
Abooha	Jul-62			1	0.875	8
Abooha	Aug-62	20	10			
Abooha	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Abooha	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Abooha	Aug-62			1	0.125	4
Abooha	Aug-62			1	1	4
Abooha	Aug-62			1	0.25	23

Abooha	Aug-62			1	0.5	48
Abooha	Aug-62			1	0.185	22
Abooha	Aug-62			1	1	4
Abooha	Aug-62			1	0.15	47
Abooha	Aug-62			1	0.1	78
Abooha	Aug-62			1	0.25	22
Abooha	Aug-62			1	1.5	4
Abooha	Aug-62			1	2	13
Abooha	Aug-62			1	0.125	22
Abooha	Aug-62			1	1	4
Abooha	Nov-62	10	4.5			
Abooha	Nov-62					
Abooha	Nov-62			1	3	48
Abooha	Jan-63	13.5	5.065			
Abooha	Jan-63					
Abooha	Jan-63			1	2	8
Abooha	Jan-63			1	0.25	72
Abooha	Jan-63					
Abooha	Jan-63	8.5	3.19			
Ordia	Jul-62	4	2			
Ordia	Jul-62			1	2.25	16
Ordia	Jul-62			1	0.24	4
Ordia	Jul-62			1	0.875	8
Ordia	Aug-62	21	10.5			
Ordia	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Ordia	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Ordia	Aug-62			1	0.125	4
Ordia	Aug-62			1	1	4
Ordia	Aug-62			1	0.125	22
Ordia	Aug-62			1	0.25	23
Ordia	Aug-62			1	1	4
Ordia	Aug-62			1	0.187	22
Ordia	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Ordia	Aug-62			1	0.25	4
Ordia	Aug-62			1	0.875	8
Ordia	Aug-62			1	0.75	4
Ordia	Aug-62			1	0.25	23
Ordia	Aug-62			1	2	13
Ordia	Aug-62			1	0.75	4
Ordia	Aug-62			1	1.75	4

Ordia		Aug-62			1	0.875	8
Ordia		Sep-62	11	5.5			
Ordia		Sep-62			1	2	2
Ordia		Sep-62			1	2	29
Ordia		Sep-62			1	0.25	23
Ordia		Sep-62			1	2.8	18
Chico		Jul-62					
Chico		Jul-62			1	0.875	8
Chico		Aug-62	21	10.5			
Chico		Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Chico		Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Chico		Aug-62			1	1.25	4
Chico		Aug-62			1	2	13
Chico		Aug-62			1	2.25	29
Chico		Aug-62			1	0.25	4
Chico		Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Chico		Aug-62			1	2	13
Chico		Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Chico		Aug-62			1	0.125	22
Chico		Aug-62			1	2	13
Chico		Aug-62			1	1	4
Chico		Aug-62			1	0.25	22
Juan	Antonia	Aug-62	5	2.5			
Juan	Antonia	Aug-62			1	0.188	22
Juan	Antonia	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Juan	Antonia	Aug-62			1	1.25	4
Juan	Antonia	Aug-62			1	2.25	28
Juan	Antonia	Aug-62			1	2	48
Juanito		Aug-62	15	7.5			
Juanito		Aug-62			1	2	48
Juanito		Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Juanito		Aug-62			1	0.25	23
Juanito		Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Juanito		Aug-62			1	1	4
Juanito		Aug-62			1	2	13
Juanito		Aug-62			1	0.312	40
Juanito		Aug-62			1	1.5	4
Juanito		Dec-62	9	3.375			
Juanito		Dec-62					
Juanito		Jan-63	12	4.5			

Juanito	Jan-63					
Juanito	Jan-63					
Juanito	Jan-63					
Juanito	Jan-63			1	0.125	4
Jesus	Aug-62	24	12			
Jesus	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Jesus	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Jesus	Aug-62			1	1	4
Jesus	Aug-62			1	2	13
Jesus	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Jesus	Aug-62			1	1.5	16
Jesus	Aug-62			1	0.25	12
Jesus	Aug-62			1	2	29
Jesus	Aug-62			1	0.25	23
Jesus	Aug-62			1	0.175	
Jesus	Sep-62	1	0.5			
Jesus	Oct-62	12	5			
Jesus	Oct-62			1	2	13
Jesus	Oct-62					
Jesus	Nov-62	10	3.75			
Jesus	Nov-62					
Jesus	Nov-62			1	0.25	4
Jesus	Nov-62			1	0.125	22
Jesus	Dec-62	15.5	5.105			
Jesus	Dec-62					
Jesus	Dec-62			1	5	2
Jesus	Jan-63	21	7.875			
Jesus	Jan-63			1	0.5	4
Jesus	Jan-63			1	0.5	23
Jesus	Jan-63			1	0.5	72
Jesus	Jan-63					
Jesus	Jan-63					
Cuaty	Aug-62	19	9.5			
Cuaty	Aug-62			1	1	4
Cuaty	Aug-62			1	1.25	2
Cuaty	Aug-62			1	0.875	8
Cuaty	Aug-62			1	2.25	13
Cuaty	Aug-62			1	0.75	4
Cuaty	Aug-62			1	0.875	8
Cuaty	Aug-62			1	0.25	40

Cuaty		Aug-62			1	3	18
Cuaty		Aug-62			1	0.375	4
Cuaty		Aug-62			1	0.5	81
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62	17.5	8.75			
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62			1	1	18
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62			1	0.125	40
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62			1	0.75	48
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62			1	0.125	22
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62			1	2	13
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62			1	0.875	8
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62			1	0.125	22
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62			1	0.185	4
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62			1	0.317	40
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62			1	0.25	79
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62			1	1.6	18
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62			1	0.17	37
Juan	Prieta	Aug-62			1	0.75	4
Jose	Pedro	Aug-62	6	3			
Jose	Pedro	Aug-62			1	0.5	40
Jose	Pedro	Aug-62			1	0.25	22
Jose	Pedro	Aug-62			1	2	13
Jose	Pedro	Aug-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Oiecho	Aug-62	6	3			
Jose	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	0.24	4
Jose	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	1	4
Jose	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	1	4
Jose	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	0.25	4
Jose	Oiecho	Sep-62	4	2			
Jose	Oiecho	Sep-62			1	0.5	4
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-63	19	9.5			
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-63			1	0.25	4
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-63	17	7.5			
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-63			1	0.25	4
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-63			1	1	72
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-63			1	0.25	23
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-63			1	0.125	78
Andres		Aug-62	6	3			
Andres		Aug-62			1	0.5	40
Andres		Aug-62			1	2.25	48

Andres		Aug-62			1	0.25	23
Antonio		Aug-62	19	9.5			
Antonio		Aug-62			1	2	48
Antonio		Aug-62			1	0.75	4
Antonio		Aug-62			1	2	18
Antonio		Aug-62			1	0.125	78
Antonio		Aug-62			1	0.75	4
Antonio		Aug-62			1	2	13
Antonio		Aug-62			1	2	2
Antonio		Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Mariana	Oiecho	Aug-62	5	2.5			
Mariana	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	0.25	22
Mariana	Oiecho	Aug-62			1	0.25	4
Mariana	Oiecho	Nov-62	6	3			
Mariana	Oiecho	Nov-62			1	1.25	48
Mariana	Oiecho	Jan-63	13.5	6.31			
Mariana	Oiecho	Jan-63			1	0.25	22
Mariana	Oiecho	Jan-63			1	0.75	72
Mariana	Oiecho	Jan-63			1	0.25	23
Mariana	Oiecho	Jan-63					
Santiago		Aug-62	5	2.5			
Santiago		Aug-62			1	2	13
Santiago		Aug-62			1	0.5	4
Santiago		Aug-62			1	2	29
Santiago		Aug-62			1	0.25	23
Santiago		Aug-62			1	0.125	23
Santiago		Sep-62	19	9.5			
Santiago		Sep-62			1	2	16
Santiago		Sep-62			1	2	48
Santiago		Sep-62			1	0.125	40
Santiago		Sep-62			1	0.5	4
Santiago		Sep-62			1	0.25	23
Santiago		Sep-62			1	2	18
Santiago		Sep-62			1	2	16
Santiago		Sep-62			1	0.25	4
Santiago		Sep-62			1	0.25	4
Santiago		Sep-62			1	0.5	4
Santiago		Sep-62			1	0.25	4
Santiago		Sep-62			1	0.125	40
Santiago		Sep-62			1	0.5	4

Santiago		Oct-62	13	5.25			
Santiago		Oct-62			1	0.5	4
Santiago		Oct-62			1	0.25	4
Santiago		Oct-62			1	2	16
Santiago		Oct-62			1	0.25	4
Francisco	Chapo	Sep-62	1	0.5			
Francisco	Chapo	Sep-62			1	0.5	4
Salzadar		Sep-62	6	2.25			
Salzadar		Sep-62					
Salzadar		Sep-62	11	4.125			
Salzadar		Sep-62					
Salzadar		Sep-62			1	2	16
Salzadar		Sep-62					
J.A.	Flaco	Sep-62	1	0.5	1	0.25	22
J.A.	Flaco	Sep-62			1	0.25	4
J.A.	Flaco	Sep-62			1	0.25	12
Jose	Chapo	Sep-62	6	2.5			
Jose	Chapo	Sep-62					
Jose	Chapo	Sep-62			1	1.5	29
Jose	Chapo	Oct-62	11	4.125			
Jose	Chapo	Oct-62					
Antonio	Chico	Sep-62	6	2.25			
Antonio	Chico	Sep-62					
Antonio	Chico	Sep-62			1	0.185	40
Antonio	Chico	Oct-62	10	3.75			
Antonio	Chico	Oct-62					
Antonio	Chico	Oct-62					
Antonio	Chico	Nov-62	14	6			
Antonio	Chico	Nov-62					
Antonio	Chico	Nov-62					
Antonio	Chico	Nov-62					
Louis		Oct-62	13	4.875			
Louis		Oct-62			1	0.25	4
Louis		Oct-62					
Louis		Oct-62			1	2	16
Louis		Oct-62					
Louis		Oct-62			1	0.25	72
Louis		Oct-62					
Louis		Nov-62	15	6.125			
Louis		Nov-62					

Louis		Nov-62					
Louis		Nov-62			1	2	16
Louis		Nov-62					
Louis		Nov-62	9.5	3.75			
Louis		Nov-62			1	0.25	72
Louis		Nov-62					
Louis		Nov-62			1	0.125	22
Louis		Nov-62					
Juan	Largo	Oct-62	8	3			
Juan	Largo	Oct-62					
Juan	Largo	Oct-62					
Juan	Largo	Oct-62					
Juan	Batista	Oct-62	10	3.75			
Juan	Batista	Oct-62					
Juan	Batista	Oct-62					
Juan	Batista	Nov-62	10	3.75			
Juan	Batista	Nov-62					
Juan	Batista	Nov-62					
Mariana	Largo	Oct-62	11	4.125			
Mariana	Largo	Oct-62					
Mariana	Largo	Oct-62					
Mariana	Largo	Nov-62	8.5	3.18			
Mariana	Largo	Nov-62					
Mariana	Largo	Nov-62					
Mariana	Colorada	Oct-62	11	4.125			
Mariana	Colorada	Oct-62					
Mariana	Colorada	Oct-62					
Mariana	Colorada	Nov-62	18.5	6.937			
Mariana	Colorada	Nov-62					
Mariana	Colorada	Nov-62					
Mariana	Colorada	Nov-62					
Mariana	Colorada	Nov-62					
Quaty	Chapo	Oct-62	5	1.875			
Quaty	Chapo	Oct-62			1	2	16
Quaty	Chapo	Nov-62	5	2.5			
Quaty	Chapo	Nov-62					
Quaty	Chapo	Nov-62			1	2	16
Laevo		Nov-62	15.5	5.75			
Laevo		Nov-62					
Laevo		Nov-62					

Laevo		Nov-62				
Salyaco		Nov-62	28	12.25		
Salyaco		Nov-62				
Salyaco		Nov-62			1	3.5 48
Salyaco		Nov-62			1	2 16
Salyaco		Nov-62				
Salyaco		Nov-62			1	2 13
Salyaco		Nov-62				
Salyaco		Nov-62				
Salyaco		Dec-62	15.5	5.995		
Salyaco		Dec-62			1	1.5 16
Salyaco		Dec-62			1	0.5 8
Salyaco		Dec-62			1	2 18
Salyaco		Dec-62			1	1 8
Salyaco		Jan-63	29.5	11.06		
Salyaco		Jan-63			1	0.5 4
Salyaco		Jan-63			1	0.25 23
Salyaco		Jan-63			1	0.25 23
Salyaco		Jan-63			1	1.125 72
Salyaco		Jan-63				
Salyaco		Jan-63			1	0.11 72
Salyaco		Jan-63			1	2 13
Salyaco		Jan-63				
Salyaco		Jan-63			1	0.25 4
Salyaco		Jan-63			1	0.25 23
Salyaco		Jan-63			1	0.375 4
Salyaco		Feb-63	13	4.875		
Salyaco		Feb-63			1	1.5 8
Salyaco		Feb-63			1	1 4
Salyaco		Feb-63				
Salyaco		Feb-63			1	0.25 4
Salyaco		Feb-63			1	0.125 23
Maria	Stafieta	Nov-62	8	3.75		
Maria	Stafieta	Nov-62				
Maria	Stafieta	Nov-62			1	3 18
Savela		Nov-62	9	4.125		
Savela		Nov-62				
Savela		Nov-62			1	3 18
Josepha		Nov-62	9	4.125		
Josepha		Nov-62				

Maria	Josepha	Nov-62	9	4.125			
Maria	Josepha	Nov-62					
Maria	Josepha	Nov-62			1	3	48
Savela	Naz	Nov-62	9	4.125			
Savela	Naz	Nov-62			1	3	48
Maria	Jesus	Nov-62	6	2.25			
Maria	Jesus	Nov-62					
Maria	Jesus	Nov-62					
Petra		Nov-62	6	3			
Petra		Nov-62					
Francisquiato		Nov-62	6	3			
Francisquiato		Nov-62			1	1	8
Francisquiato		Nov-62			1	2	16
Brijilo		Nov-62	5	2.5			
Brijilo		Nov-62					
Brijilo		Nov-62			1	1	8
Brijilo		Nov-62			1	0.5	29
Brijilo		Nov-62			1	0.5	66
Crispi		Nov-62	16	6.75			
Crispi		Nov-62			1	1.5	48
Crispi		Nov-62			1	1	8
Crispi		Nov-62					
Crispi		Nov-62					
Crispi		Nov-62			1	1	13
Crispi		Nov-62			-1	-1	13
Crispi		Nov-62					
Jesus	Gaurjales	Nov-62	5	1.875			
Jesus	Gaurjales	Nov-62					
Jesus	Gaurjales	Nov-62	2	0.25			
Jesus	Gaurjales	Nov-62					
Larivia		Nov-62	6	2.25			
Larivia		Nov-62					
Larivia		Dec-62	2	0.25			
Larivia		Dec-62					
Palma		Dec-62	22.5	8.065			
Palma		Dec-62			1	0.25	23
Palma		Dec-62					
Palma		Dec-62					
Palma		Jan-63	21	7.875			
Palma		Jan-63					

Palma		Jan-63			1	0.375	23
Palma		Jan-63					
Palma		Feb-63	4	1.5			
Palma		Feb-63			1	2	13
Palma		Mar-63	27	10.125			
Palma		Mar-63			1	2	13
Palma		Mar-63					
Palma		Mar-63			1	0.125	72
Palma		Mar-63			1	0.5	5
Palma		Mar-63			1	2	48
Palma		Mar-63					
Palma		Mar-63			1	0.125	72
Palma		Mar-63			1	0.5	72
Palma		Mar-63					
Palma		Mar-63			1	0.5	5
Palma		Apr-63	26.5	9.94			
Palma		Apr-63			1	0.75	72
Palma		Apr-63			1	0.25	40
Palma		Apr-63					
Palma		Apr-63			1	0.375	72
Palma		Apr-63			1	0.185	72
Palma		Apr-63			1	0.5	5
Palma		Apr-63					
Palma		Apr-63			1	0.5	5
Palma		Apr-63			1	0.5	5
Jose	Emanuel	Dec-62	1	1.125			
Jose	Emanuel	Dec-62					
Brigido		Dec-62	8	3			
Brigido		Dec-62			1	0.25	23
Brigido		Dec-62					
Brigido		Jan-63	2.5	0.935			
Brigido		Jan-63			1	0.315	82
Brigido		Jan-63					
Juan	Pablo	Dec-62	3	1.125			
Juan	Pablo	Dec-62					
Juan	Pablo	Jan-63	21	8.065			
Juan	Pablo	Jan-63					
Juan	Pablo	Jan-63			1	0.125	40
Juan	Pablo	Jan-63			1	2.5	72
Juan	Pablo	Jan-63			1	1	8

Juan	Pablo	Jan-63					
Juan	Pablo	Jan-63					
Juan	Pablo	Jan-63			1	0.5	4
Juan	Pablo	Jan-63			1	1.5	8
Juan	Pablo	Jan-63			1	1.125	4
Juan	Pablo	Feb-63	5.5	2.065			
Juan	Pablo	Feb-63					
Juan	Pablo	Feb-63			1	0.685	4
Juan	Pablo	Mar-63	10.5	4.185			
Juan	Pablo	Mar-63					
Juan	Pablo	Mar-63			1	0.187	22
Juan	Pablo	Mar-63			1	0.5	72
Juan	Pablo	Mar-63			1	0.5	72
Juan	Pablo	Mar-63					
Juan	Orechola	Jan-63	22	8.75			
Juan	Orechola	Jan-63			1	0.75	72
Juan	Orechola	Jan-63			1	1	8
Juan	Orechola	Jan-63					
Juan	Orechola	Jan-63					
Juan	Orechola	Jan-63			1	0.125	40
Juan	Orechola	Jan-63			1	0.125	23
Juan	Orechola	Feb-63	8.5	3.19			
Juan	Orechola	Feb-63					
Juan	Orechola	Feb-63			1	0.565	4
Juan	Orechola	Feb-63			1	0.625	72
Juan	Orechola	Feb-63					
Jose	Largo	Jan-63	20	10			
Jose	Largo	Jan-63			1	2.5	72
Jose	Largo	Jan-63					
Jose	Largo	Jan-63					
Jose	Largo	Jan-63			1	0.25	4
Jose	Largo	Jan-63			1	0.25	23
Jose	Largo	Jan-63			1	0.25	40
Jose	Largo	Feb-63	12	6			
Jose	Largo	Feb-63			1	4.75	4
Jose	Largo	Feb-63					
Jose	Largo	Feb-63			1	1	5
Jose	Largo	Feb-63			1	2	13
Mariana	Women	Jan-63	2				
Mariana	Women	Jan-63			1	0.5	72

Mariana	Women	Jan-63			1	0.375	23
Mariana	Women	Jan-63			1	0.375	23
Mariana	Women	Jan-63			1	0.75	72
Ramon		Jan-63	16	8			
Ramon		Jan-63					
Ramon		Jan-63					
Ramon		Feb-63	12	6			
Ramon		Feb-63			1	1.5	8
Ramon		Feb-63			1	1.75	4
Ramon		Feb-63			1	0.25	23
Ramon		Feb-63					
Ramon		Feb-63			1	1	4
Ramon		Feb-63			1	0.25	23
Ramon		Feb-63			1	3	72
Ramon		Feb-63			1	0.25	23
Shomash		Jan-63	7	2.625			
Shomash		Jan-63					
Shomash		Jan-63			1	0.25	4
Shomash		Jan-63					
Louis		Jan-63	6	2.25			
Louis		Jan-63			1	0.25	23
Louis		Jan-63			1	2	13
Jesus		Jan-63	6	2.25			
Jesus		Feb-63	7	2.625			
Jesus		Feb-63			1	0.5	4
Jesus		Feb-63					
Jesus		Feb-63					
Jesus		Feb-63					
Jesus		Mar-63	5	1.875			
Jesus		Mar-63					
Jesus		Mar-63			1	0.25	72
Jesus		Apr-63	22.5	8.44			
Jesus		Apr-63					
Jesus		Apr-63			1	2.5	18
Jesus		Apr-63			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Apr-63					
Jesus		Apr-63			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Apr-63			1	0.665	72
Jesus		Apr-63					
Salyaco		Feb-63	10	3.75			

Salyaco		Feb-63			1	2	13
Salyaco		Feb-63			1	0.5	23
Salyaco		Feb-63			1	0.25	23
Salyaco		Feb-63					
Salyaco		Mar-63	15.5	5.81			
Salyaco		Mar-63					
Salyaco		Mar-63			1	0.185	72
Salyaco		Mar-63			1	3	18
Salyaco		Mar-63			1	0.25	72
Salyaco		Mar-63			1	0.5	5
Salyaco		Mar-63			1	0.5	5
Salyaco		Mar-63			1	0.125	72
Salyaco		Apr-63	16.5	6.19			
Salyaco		Apr-63			1	0.065	72
Salyaco		Apr-63			1	0.315	72
Salyaco		Apr-63			1	0.5	5
Salyaco		Apr-63			1	0.375	72
Salyaco		Apr-63			1	0.5	5
Cuervo		Sep-61	6.5	3.25			
Cuervo		Sep-61			1	2	8
Cuervo		Sep-61			1	0.5	5
Cuervo		Sep-61			1	0.5	5
Cuervo		Oct-61	6	3			
Cuervo		Oct-61			1	1.5	29
Cuervo		Oct-61			1	0.75	83
Cuervo		Oct-61			1	0.25	23
Cuervo		Oct-61			1	0.25	66
Cuervo		Jan-62	8.5	4.25			
Cuervo		Jan-62			1	0.25	72
Cuervo		Jan-62			1	0.875	16
Cuervo		Jan-62			1	2	2
Cuervo		Jan-62			1	0.5	29
Cuervo		Jan-62			1	0.125	22
Cuervo		Jan-62			1	0.25	23
Cuervo		Mar-62	5	2.5			
Cuervo		Mar-62			1	0.25	5
Cuervo		Mar-62			1	0.75	72
Cuervo		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Oiecho	Sep-61	5	2.5			

Jose	Oiecho	Sep-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Sep-61			1	1	5
Jose	Oiecho	Sep-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Sep-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Oct-61	5	2.5			
Jose	Oiecho	Oct-61			13	3	2
Jose	Oiecho	Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Oct-61			1	0.25	72
Jose	Oiecho	Oct-61			1	0.125	22
Jose	Oiecho	Nov-61	11	5.5			
Jose	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	2.38	18
Jose	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.25	47
Jose	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.125	22
Jose	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.875	83
Jose	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.18	47
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61	5	2.5			
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			2	1	5
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.125	47
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.125	78
Juan	Oiecho	Sep-61	5	2.5			
Juan	Oiecho	Sep-61			3	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Sep-61			1	0.75	84
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-61	9	4.5			
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-61			1	0.75	83
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-61			1	0.125	67
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-61			1	1.5	16
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-61			1	0.75	84
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61	6	3			
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	2	18
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.25	40
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.125	23
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.125	37
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	2.5	2

Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Sep-61	5	2.5			
Jose	Chapo	Sep-61			3	1.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Sep-61			1	0.5	23
Jose	Chapo	Sep-61			1	0.12	78
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61	16	8			
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	0.75	83
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	0.125	22
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	0.25	72
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	13	22
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	0.13	78
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	1	8
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	2	13
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	0.12	22
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	0.5	72
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	1.5	8
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Oct-61			1	1.5	16
Cuerty		Sep-61	5	2.5			
Cuerty		Sep-61			3	1.5	5
Cuerty		Sep-61			1	0.25	23
Cuerty		Sep-61			1	0.125	22
Cuerty		Sep-61			1	0.125	72
Cuerty		Sep-61			1	0.75	84
Cuerty		Oct-61	6	3			
Cuerty		Oct-61			1	1.5	29
Cuerty		Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Cuerty		Oct-61			1	0.13	22
Cuerty		Oct-61			1	0.25	47
Cuerty		Oct-61			1	0.125	23
Cuerty		Oct-61			1	0.125	22
Cuerty		Oct-61			1	0.25	74
Cuerty		Nov-61	10	5			
Cuerty		Nov-61			1	2	2
Cuerty		Nov-61			1	2	16
Cuerty		Nov-61			1	0.5	5

Cuerty		Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Cuerty		Nov-61			1	1	18
Cuerty		Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Cuerty		Nov-61			1	2.625	18
Cuerty		Nov-61			1	0.25	23
Cuerty		Nov-61			1	0.125	40
Mariana		Sep-61	5	2.5			
Mariana		Sep-61			1	0.5	5
Mariana		Oct-61	5	2.5			
Mariana		Oct-61			1	2	18
Mariana		Oct-61			8	2	2
Mariana		Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Francisco		Sep-61	5	0.63			
Francisco		Sep-61			1	0.5	5
Francisco		Sep-61			1	0.25	72
Francisco		Oct-61	5	0.625			
Jose	Antonia	Sep-61	5	2.5			
Jose	Antonia	Sep-61			8	2	18
Jose	Antonia	Sep-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Antonia	Sep-61			1	0.13	22
Jose	Antonia	Sep-61			1	0.25	23
Jose	Antonia	Sep-61			1	0.25	5
Jose	Antonia	Sep-61			1	0.25	72
Jose	Antonia	Sep-61			1	0.25	72
Jose	Antonia	Nov-61	9.5	4.75			
Jose	Antonia	Nov-61			1	0.25	40
Jose	Antonia	Nov-61			1	1.25	2
Jose	Antonia	Nov-61			1	1.25	2
Jose	Antonia	Nov-61			1	0.25	23
Jose	Antonia	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Antonia	Nov-61			1	2.375	18
Jose	Antonia	Nov-61			1	0.13	40
Jose	Antonia	Dec-61	10	5			
Jose	Antonia	Dec-61			1	0.5	56
Jose	Antonia	Dec-61			1	0.25	72
Jose	Antonia	Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Antonia	Dec-61			1	2	2
Jose	Antonia	Dec-61			1	0.25	23
Loli		Sep-61	5	0.63			
Loli		Sep-61			1	0.5	5

Loli	Sep-61			1	0.13	23
Loli	Oct-61	5	0.625			
Loli	Oct-61			1	0.625	16
Andre	Nov-61	1	3.125			
Brigdio	Sep-61	5	2.5			
Brigdio	Sep-61			2	1	5
Brigdio	Oct-61	5	2			
Brigdio	Oct-61			6	1.5	2
Brigdio	Oct-61			1	1.5	16
Brigdio	Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Thomaso	Sep-61	2	1			
Thomaso	Sep-61			6	1	40
Thomaso	Oct-61	4.5	2.25			
Thomaso	Oct-61			1	0.19	60
Thomaso	Oct-61			1	0.44	18
Maria	Sep-61	2	1			
Maria	Sep-61			1	0.5	5
Maria	Sep-61			1	0.5	5
Maria	Sep-61			2	0.25	40
Pahio	Oct-61	4.5	2.25			
Pahio	Oct-61			4	0.5	40
Pahio	Oct-61			6	1.5	2
Pahio	Oct-61			2	0.19	60
Pahio	Oct-61			2	0.44	48
Jesus	Oct-61	6	3			
Jesus	Oct-61			1	2	13
Jesus	Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Jesus	Nov-61	13	6.5			
Jesus	Nov-61			1	0.875	83
Jesus	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jesus	Nov-61			1	0.25	40
Jesus	Nov-61			1	0.125	14
Jesus	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jesus	Nov-61			1	0.25	23
Jesus	Nov-61			1	1.5	13
Jesus	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jesus	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jesus	Nov-61			1	2	18
Jesus	Nov-61			1	0.125	78
Jesus	Nov-61			1.5	0.75	5

Jesus	Nov-61			1	2	16
Jesus	Nov-61			1.5	0.75	5
Jesus	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Antonia	Oct-61	13	6.5			
Antonia	Oct-61			1	1.5	29
Antonia	Oct-61			1	2	13
Antonia	Oct-61			1	0.13	22
Antonia	Oct-61			1	1	8
Antonia	Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Antonia	Oct-61			1	0.5	2
Antonia	Oct-61			1	0.5	5
Antonia	Oct-61			1	2.5	2
Antonia	Oct-61			1	0.875	83
Antonia	Nov-61	6	3			
Antonia	Nov-61			1	2	2
Antonia	Nov-61			1	0.125	22
Antonia	Nov-61			1	0.25	66
Antonia	Nov-61			1	0.5	70
Antonia	Nov-61			1	0.125	37
Joaquin	Oct-61	10	5			
Joaquin	Oct-61			1	2	2
Joaquin	Oct-61			1	2	18
Joaquin	Oct-61			1	1	2
Joaquin	Jan-62	6	2.75			
Joaquin	Jan-62			1	0.5	23
Joaquin	Jan-62			1	2.25	18
Ignacio	Oct-61	4	2			
Ignacio	Oct-61			1	2	18
Ignacio	Nov-61	21.5	10.75			
Ignacio	Nov-61			1	2	2
Ignacio	Nov-61			1	0.875	84
Ignacio	Nov-61			1	0.125	40
Ignacio	Nov-61			1	0.125	23
Ignacio	Nov-61			1	2	18
Ignacio	Nov-61			1	2	13
Ignacio	Nov-61			1	0.875	84
Ignacio	Nov-61			1	0.125	40
Ignacio	Nov-61			1	0.25	66
Ignacio	Nov-61			1	0.125	23
Ignacio	Nov-61			1	2	13

Ignacio		Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Ignacio		Jun-61	5	2.5			
Ignacio		Jun-61			1	2	2
Ignacio		Jun-61			1	0.125	23
Ignacio		Jun-61			1	0.125	40
Ignacio		Dec-61	5	2.5			
Ignacio		Dec-61			1	2	29
Ignacio		Dec-61			1	0.5	56
Pedro		Oct-61	4	2			
Pedro		Oct-61			1	2	48
Pedro		Nov-61	12	6			
Pedro		Nov-61			1	2.5	2
Pedro		Nov-61			1	0.25	40
Pedro		Nov-61			1	0.25	23
Pedro		Nov-61			1	2.5	2
Pedro		Nov-61			1	0.25	66
Pedro		Nov-61			1	0.25	37
Juanita		Oct-61	3	1.5			
Juanita		Oct-61			1	0.13	40
Juanita		Nov-61	21	10.75			
Juanita		Nov-61			1	0.875	83
Juanita		Nov-61					
Juanita		Nov-61			1	0.75	2
Juanita		Nov-61			1	1	8
Juanita		Nov-61			1	0.25	66
Juanita		Nov-61			1	2	13
Juanita		Nov-61			1	0.125	40
Juanita		Nov-61			1	0.125	22
Juanita		Nov-61			1	0.25	66
Juanita		Nov-61			1	0.125	78
Juanita		Nov-61			1	0.125	40
Juanita		Nov-61			1	0.25	72
Juanita		Nov-61			1	2	16
Juanita		Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Juanita		Nov-61					
Juanita		Nov-61			1	1	2
Juanita		Nov-61			2	1.12	0.5
Juanita		Nov-61			1	0.13	47
Francisco	Nuevo	Oct-61	3	1.5			
Francisco	Nuevo	Oct-61			1	1.5	16

Francisco	Nuevo	Nov-61	12	6			
Francisco	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	3	29
Francisco	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	1.5	56
Francisco	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	2	13
Francisco	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	0.25	23
Francisco	Nuevo	Feb-62	15.5	7.75			
Francisco	Nuevo	Feb-62			1	2.5	2
Francisco	Nuevo	Feb-62			1	0.25	4
Francisco	Nuevo	Feb-62			1	0.125	23
Francisco	Nuevo	Feb-62			1	0.125	23
Francisco	Nuevo	Feb-62			1	0.125	23
Francisco	Nuevo	Feb-62			1	0.125	14
Francisco	Nuevo	Feb-62			1	0.875	84
Francisco	Nuevo	Feb-62			1	0.25	72
Francisco	Nuevo	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Francisco	Nuevo	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Francisco	Nuevo	Feb-62			1	0.125	22
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61	26.5	12.75			
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.125	22
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.125	78
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	2.5	2
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.25	72
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	2	13
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	2	16
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.125	22
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	2	29
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.125	78
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			2	1	5
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.87	84
Jose	Chapo	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Ambrosia		Nov-61	4	2			
Ambrosia		Nov-61			1	0.5	5

Ambrosia		Nov-61			1	0.125	14
Ambrosia		Nov-61			1	0.875	83
Ambrosia		Nov-61			1	0.875	84
Ambrosia		Nov-61			1	1.81	18
Ambrosia		Nov-61			1	0.125	40
Salyaco		Nov-61	10	5			
Salyaco		Nov-61			1	2	29
Salyaco		Nov-61			1	0.25	66
Salyaco		Nov-61			1	2	13
Salyaco		Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Salyaco		Jan-62	9.5	4.75			
Salyaco		Jan-62			1	0.25	72
Salyaco		Jan-62			1	0.25	23
Salyaco		Jan-62			1	0.875	84
Salyaco		Jan-62			1	0.875	83
Salyaco		Jan-62			1	0.125	14
Salyaco		Jan-62			1	0.375	72
Salyaco		Jan-62			1	0.25	2
Salyaco		Jan-62			1	0.125	23
Salyaco		Jan-62			1	0.125	47
Salyaco		Jan-62			1	0.5	23
Salyaco		Feb-62	5	2.5			
Salyaco		Feb-62			1	2.5	2
Salyaco		Feb-62			1	0.25	23
Salyaco		Feb-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61	12	6			
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	2.5	2
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	0.25	22
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	0.125	78
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	0.125	40
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	2	13
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	0.875	84
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	0.125	23
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61	10	5			
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	1	8
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	0.875	16
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	1	85
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			2	1	86
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	0.25	40
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	0.875	84

Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	0.125	23
Jose	Nuevo	Nov-61			1	0.125	22
Jose	Nuevo	Jan-62	9.5	4.75			
Jose	Nuevo	Jan-62			1	0.875	84
Jose	Nuevo	Jan-62			12	0.375	56
Jose	Nuevo	Jan-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Nuevo	Jan-62			1	2	13
Jose	Nuevo	Jan-62			1	0.375	60
Jose	Nuevo	Feb-62	5	2.5			
Jose	Nuevo	Feb-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Nuevo	Feb-62			1	0.125	74
Jose	Nuevo	Feb-62			1	0.21	23
Pedro	Oiecho	Nov-61	21.5	10.75			
Pedro	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	2	13
Pedro	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.375	40
Pedro	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.125	37
Pedro	Oiecho	Nov-61			2.5	0.5	23
Pedro	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.25	23
Pedro	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	3	2
Pedro	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	2	16
Pedro	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.25	23
Pedro	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.875	84
Pedro	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	1.255	18
Pedro	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.125	23
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61	20	12.75			
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.125	22
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.125	59
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	2.5	18
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61					
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.25	23
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.25	23
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.875	84
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.25	23
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.25	56
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	3	18
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.125	40

Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61	20.5	10.25			
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	2	2
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.87	8
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.125	22
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			7	1.68	18
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	2	16
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	1.25	29
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	2	2
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.25	74
Juan	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.5	72
Jesus		Nov-61	9.5	4.75			
Jesus		Nov-61			1	1.75	18
Jesus		Nov-61			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Nov-61			1	0.125	22
Jesus		Nov-61			1	2	2
Jesus		Nov-61			1	2	18
Jesus		Nov-61			1	0.875	8
Jesus		Nov-61			2	1	5
Jesus		Dec-61	11	5.5			
Jesus		Dec-61			1	0.87	8
Jesus		Dec-61			1	0.13	22
Jesus		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Dec-61			1	0.875	16
Jesus		Dec-61			1	0.125	22
Jesus		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61	7	3.5			
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	3	18
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.25	40
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	0.25	23
Francisco	Oiecho	Nov-61			1	1	29

Francisco	Oiecho	Dec-61	14	7			
Francisco	Oiecho	Dec-61					
Francisco	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Francisco	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	1.25	18
Francisco	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.25	40
Francisco	Oiecho	Jan-62	9	4.5			
Francisco	Oiecho	Jan-62			2	5	2
Francisco	Oiecho	Jan-62			1	0.875	83
Francisco	Oiecho	Feb-62	13.5	6.75			
Francisco	Oiecho	Feb-62			2	5	2
Francisco	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.875	83
Francisco	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Francisco	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	2	13
Francisco	Oiecho	Feb-62			2	1	5
Francisco	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	2	29
Francisco	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.12	23
Chapo		Dec-61	13	11.5			
Chapo		Dec-61			1	0.25	72
Chapo		Dec-61			1	0.125	22
Chapo		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Chapo		Dec-61			2	1	5
Chapo		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Chapo		Dec-61			1	0.25	72
Chapo		Dec-61			1	1	8
Chapo		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Chapo		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Chapo		Dec-61			1	0.875	8
Chapo		Dec-61			1	0.125	14
Chapo		Jan-62	5	2.5			
Chapo		Jan-62			1	0.25	72
Chapo		Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Chapo		Jan-62			1	0.25	14
Juan	Oiecho	Dec-61	20	9.5			
Juan	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	2	2
Juan	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.25	72
Juan	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.38	5
Juan	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	3	18
Juan	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	2.5	2

Juan	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.28	72
Juan	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Jan-62	7.5	3.75			
Juan	Oiecho	Jan-62			1	2	18
Juan	Oiecho	Jan-62			1	0.25	40
Juan	Oiecho	Jan-62			1	0.25	72
Juan	Oiecho	Jan-62			24	0.5	87
Quarty		Dec-61	20.5	10.25			
Quarty		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Quarty		Dec-61			1	0.125	40
Quarty		Dec-61			1	0.25	40
Quarty		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Quarty		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Quarty		Dec-61			1	0.125	22
Quarty		Dec-61			1	0.125	72
Quarty		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Quarty		Dec-61			1	0.25	74
Quarty		Dec-61			1	2	29
Quarty		Dec-61			1	0.25	23
Quarty		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Quarty		Dec-61			1	2	13
Quarty		Dec-61			1	0.125	14
Quarty		Dec-61			1	0.87	8
Quarty		Dec-61			1	0.125	40
Quarty		Dec-61			1	2.5	2
Quarty		Dec-61			1	2	18
Ignacio		Dec-61	5	2.5			
Ignacio		Dec-61			1	2	2
Ignacio		Dec-61			1	0.125	23
Ignacio		Dec-61			1	0.25	40
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61	13	7			
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.25	40
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.5	23
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			2	1	5
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			2	1	5
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.25	74
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	2.5	2
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.25	72
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.5	5

Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.125	47
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.125	22
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.87	8
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	2.75	18
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Dec-61			1	0.25	23
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-62	3	1.87			
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-62			2	1	5
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-62			1	0.25	47
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-62			1	0.25	23
Jesus		Dec-61	9	4.5			
Jesus		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Jan-62	10.5	5.25			
Jesus		Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Jan-62			1	0.125	14
Jesus		Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Feb-62	5	2.5			
Jesus		Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Feb-62			1	2	16
Jose	Antonio	Dec-61	10	5			
Jose	Antonio	Dec-61			1	0.25	23
Jose	Antonio	Dec-61			1	0.87	8
Jose	Antonio	Dec-61			2	1	5
Jose	Antonio	Dec-61			1	0.25	18
Jose	Antonio	Dec-61			1	2	18
Jose	Antonio	Dec-61			1	0.25	23
Jose	Antonio	Dec-61			1	0.25	40
Jose	Antonio	Dec-61			1	0.87	83
Jose	Antonio	Dec-61			1	0.38	72

Jose	Antonio	Dec-61			1	0.5	5
Jose	Antonio	Dec-61			1	0.25	72
Jose	Antonio	Jan-62	4	2			
Jose	Antonio	Jan-62			1	0.125	37
Jose	Antonio	Jan-62			1	0.125	14
Jose	Antonio	Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Dionicia		Dec-61	1	0.25			
Dionicia		Dec-61			1	0.25	23
Jose	Maria	Jan-62	10	5			
Jose	Maria	Jan-62			1	0.25	72
Jose	Maria	Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	Jan-62			1	0.25	72
Jose	Maria	Jan-62			1	0.12	14
Jose	Maria	Jan-62			1	2	29
Jose	Maria	Jan-62			1	0.875	8
Jose	Maria	Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	Jan-62			1	0.125	14
Jose	Maria	Jan-62			1	0.5	72
Jose	Maria	Jan-62			1	0.375	5
Jose	Maria	Jan-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Maria	Jan-62			1	0.125	14
Jose	Maria	Feb-61	5	2.5			
Jose	Maria	Feb-61			1	2.5	2
Jose	Maria	Feb-61			1	0.25	4
Jose	Maria	Feb-61			1	0.5	4
Jose	Maria	Feb-61			1	0.5	4
Jose	Maria	Feb-61			1	0.125	14
Jose	Maria	Feb-61			1	0.25	23
Jose	Maria	Feb-61			1	0.125	14
Quaty		Jan-62	27.5	13.5			
Quaty		Jan-62			1	1	8
Quaty		Jan-62			1	0.125	14
Quaty		Jan-62			1	0.125	14
Quaty		Jan-62			1	0.125	14
Quaty		Jan-62			1	0.525	56
Quaty		Jan-62			1	0.375	72
Quaty		Jan-62			1	0.375	72
Quaty		Jan-62			14	3.25	18
Quaty		Jan-62			1	0.87	8
Quaty		Jan-62			3	0.75	18

Quaty		Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Quaty		Jan-62			1	0.5	23
Quaty		Jan-62			1	0.125	14
Quaty		Jan-62			1	0.125	78
Quaty		Feb-62	7	3.5			
Quaty		Feb-62			1	0.25	4
Quaty		Feb-62			1	0.125	14
Quaty		Feb-62			1	0.25	4
Quaty		Feb-62			1	0.25	23
Crispin		Jan-62	9.5	4.75			
Crispin		Jan-62			1	0.25	40
Crispin		Jan-62			1	0.25	72
Crispin		Jan-62			1	2	18
Crispin		Jan-62			1	0.25	37
Crispin		Jan-62			1	0.25	72
Crispin		Jan-62			1	1	2
Crispin		Jan-62			1	0.25	72
Crispin		Jan-62			1	0.5	23
Crispin		Feb-62	7.5	3.75			
Crispin		Feb-62			1	0.875	8
Crispin		Feb-62			1	0.25	40
Crispin		Feb-62			1	0.125	78
Crispin		Feb-62			1	0.125	14
Crispin		Feb-62			1	0.375	23
Crispin		Feb-62			1	0.25	4
Crispin		Feb-62			1	0.5	4
Crispin		Feb-62			1	0.25	23
Crispin		Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-62	9.5	6.125			
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-62			1	3	48
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-62			1	0.125	22
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-62			1	0.25	47
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-62			1	0.375	72
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Jan-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-62	5	3.25			
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.125	47
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	1	4
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.25	4

Jose	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.25	74
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.5	40
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.125	14
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.87	8
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.875	83
Jose	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.625	14
Francisco	Neuisa	Jan-62	4	2			
Francisco	Neuisa	Jan-62			1	1.75	2
Francisco	Neuisa	Jan-62			1	0.25	22
Juan	Oiecho	Jan-62	4	2			
Juan	Oiecho	Feb-62	14.5	7.25			
Juan	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.25	4
Juan	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.25	23
Juan	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.25	40
Juan	Oiecho	Feb-62			1	0.25	72
Juan	Oiecho	Mar-62	3	1.5			
Juan	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	2	18
Juan	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	0.14	37
Juan	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	0.14	40
Juan	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	2	16
Juan	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Juan	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Juan	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	0.75	23
Juan	Oiecho	Apr-62	4	2			
Chapa		Jan-62	4	2			
Chapa		Jan-62			1	0.25	72
Chapa		Jan-62			1	0.125	22
Chapa		Feb-62	9.5	4.75			
Chapa		Feb-62			1	2.5	2
Chapa		Feb-62			1	0.25	4
Chapa		Feb-62			1	0.125	78
Chapa		Feb-62			1	0.5	4
Chapa		Feb-62			1	0.875	83
Chapa		Feb-62			1	0.5	4
Chapa		Feb-62			1	0.125	23
Chapa		Feb-62			1	0.25	23

Chapa	Feb-62			1	1	8
Chapa	Feb-62			1	0.125	14
Chapa	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Chapa	Feb-62			2	1	5
Chapa	Feb-62			1	0.25	72
Chapa	Feb-62			1	0.125	40
Chapa	Feb-62			1	0.125	14
Chapa	Feb-62			1	0.125	78
Chapa	Feb-62			1	0.125	88
Chapa	Feb-62			1	0.125	66
Quaty	Feb-62	21	10.5			
Quaty	Feb-62			1	0.25	40
Quaty	Feb-62			2	1	5
Quaty	Feb-62			1	0.125	14
Quaty	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Quaty	Feb-62			1	0.375	72
Quaty	Feb-62			1	0.25	72
Quaty	Feb-62			1	0.25	23
Quaty	Feb-62			1	0.25	14
Quaty	Feb-62			1	0.5	89
Quaty	Feb-62			1	0.125	37
Quaty	Feb-62			1	0.25	72
Quaty	Feb-62			1	2	13
Quaty	Feb-62			1	0.125	14
Quaty	Feb-62			1	0.25	72
Quaty	Feb-62			1	0.25	40
Quaty	Feb-62			1	0.24	72
Quaty	Mar-62	28	14			
Quaty	Mar-62			30	6.625	18
Quaty	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Quaty	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Quaty	Mar-62			1	0.125	14
Quaty	Mar-62			1	0.25	72
Quaty	Mar-62			1	0.25	72
Quaty	Mar-62			1	0.5	82
Quaty	Mar-62			1	2.5	90
Quaty	Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Quaty	Mar-62			1	0.875	8
Quaty	Mar-62			1	2.75	2
Quaty	Mar-62			1	2	16

Quaty		Mar-62			1	2.25	18
Quaty		Mar-62			1	0.125	14
Quaty		Mar-62			1	0.25	72
Quaty		Mar-62			8	0.75	23
Quaty		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Quaty		Mar-62			1	0.125	91
Quaty		Mar-62			1	2	13
Quaty		Mar-62			1	0.25	22
Quaty		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Quaty		Mar-62			1	0.875	8
Jose	Maria	Feb-62	9	4.5			
Jose	Maria	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	Feb-62			1	0.125	14
Jose	Maria	Feb-62			1	1.24	2
Jose	Maria	Feb-62			2	1	5
Jose	Maria	Feb-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Maria	Feb-62			1	0.25	72
Jose	Maria	Feb-62			1	0.375	5
Jose	Maria	Feb-62			1	2	13
Jose	Maria	Feb-62			1	2	13
Jose	Maria	Feb-62			1	0.875	8
Jose	Maria	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	Feb-62			1	0.125	14
Jose	Maria	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	Mar-62	5	2.5			
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.125	14
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.125	78
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.25	66
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Emanuel	Feb-62	13.5	6.75			
Jose	Emanuel	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Emanuel	Feb-62			1	0.5	23
Jose	Emanuel	Feb-62			1	2	29
Jose	Emanuel	Feb-62			1	3	18
Jose	Emanuel	Feb-62			3	0.75	66
Jose	Emanuel	Feb-62			1	0.125	23
Jose	Emanuel	Feb-62			1	0.125	23
Jose	Emanuel	Feb-62			1	0.25	40

Jose	Emanuel	Mar-62	15	7.5			
Jose	Emanuel	Mar-62			1	4	18
Jose	Emanuel	Mar-62			2	1.75	8
Jose	Emanuel	Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Emanuel	Mar-62			1	0.25	5
Jose	Emanuel	Mar-62			1	0.5	23
Jose	Emanuel	Mar-62			1	0.25	92
Jose	Emanuel	Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Emanuel	Mar-62			1	2.5	18
Jose	Emanuel	Mar-62			1	0.25	37
Jose	Emanuel	Mar-62			1	0.5	40
Jose	Emanuel	Apr-62	4	2			
Jose	Emanuel	Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Emanuel	Apr-62			1	0.25	40
Jose	Emanuel	Apr-62			2	4	13
Salyaco		Feb-62	15.5	7.75			
Salyaco		Feb-62			1	0.875	8
Salyaco		Feb-62			1	0.875	83
Salyaco		Feb-62			1	0.125	23
Salyaco		Feb-62			1	2	16
Salyaco		Feb-62			1	1	29
Salyaco		Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Salyaco		Feb-62			1	2	13
Salyaco		Feb-62			2	1.75	8
Salyaco		Feb-62			1	0.875	8
Salyaco		Feb-62			1	0.375	60
Salyaco		Mar-62	24	12			
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.25	66
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.8756	8
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	2	18
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	2	16
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.375	72
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.5	5

Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.25	12
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.25	4
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.25	4
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Salyaco		Mar-62			1	0.875	8
Salyaco		Apr-62	4	2			
Salyaco		Apr-62			1	0.5	4
Salyaco		Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Salyaco		Apr-62			1	0.125	72
Salyaco		Apr-62			1	2	29
Chapo		Feb-62	9	4.5			
Chapo		Feb-62			1	1	4
Chapo		Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Chapo		Feb-62			1	0.125	14
Chapo		Feb-62			1	0.875	83
Chapo		Feb-62			1	0.875	8
Chapo		Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Chapo		Feb-62			1	0.125	22
Chapo		Feb-62			1	0.125	78
Chapo		Feb-62			1	0.25	72
Chapo		Mar-62	5	2.5			
Chapo		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Chapo		Mar-62			1	0.25	22
Chapo		Mar-62			1	0.75	72
Chapo		Mar-62			1	0.125	78
Chapo		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Ociecho	Feb-62	10	6.25			
Jose	Ociecho	Feb-62			1	0.125	47
Jose	Ociecho	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ociecho	Feb-62			5	1.125	18
Jose	Ociecho	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ociecho	Feb-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Ociecho	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ociecho	Feb-62			1	0.25	72
Jose	Ociecho	Feb-62			1	0.125	14
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62	24	12.5			
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			2	1.75	8
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.5	5

Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.25	40
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	2.25	18
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	2	2
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.25	72
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.5	23
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.5	72
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			2	4	16
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	2	16
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.875	8
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.25	77
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.75	72
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.5	23
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.25	66
Jose	Ociecho	Mar-62			1	0.25	93
Jose	Ociecho	Apr-62	4	2			
Jose	Ociecho	Apr-62			1	2	2
Jose	Ociecho	Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ociecho	Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Feb-62	5	2.5			
Jesus		Feb-62			1	0.25	23
Jesus		Feb-62			1	0.375	40
Jesus		Feb-62			1	2.5	2
Jesus		Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Feb-62			1	0.25	87
Jesus		Mar-62	21	10.5			
Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.25	77
Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.125	14
Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.125	40
Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.25	14
Jesus		Mar-62			1	2	2
Jesus		Mar-62			1	2	16

Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Mar-62			2	1	5
Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Mar-62			1	2	13
Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.5	82
Jesus		Mar-62			1	2	18
Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Jesus		Apr-62	9	4.5			
Jesus		Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Apr-62			1	1.625	48
Jesus		Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Apr-62			1	0.125	23
Jesus		Apr-62			1	0.125	14
Jesus		Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Jesus		Apr-62			1	0.25	23
Francisco	Oiecho	Mar-62	11	5.5			
Francisco	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	2	18
Francisco	Oiecho	Mar-62			4	2	5
Francisco	Neuave	Feb-62	5	2.5			
Francisco	Neuave	Feb-62			1	0.875	8
Francisco	Neuave	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Francisco	Neuave	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Francisco	Neuave	Mar-62	10	5			
Francisco	Neuave	Mar-62			1	3	18
Francisco	Neuave	Mar-62			1	2	13
Francisco	Neuave	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Francisco	Neuave	Mar-62			1	0.25	22
Francisco	Neuave	Mar-62			1	0.75	72
Francisco	Neuave	Mar-62			1	0.16	23
Francisco	Neuave	Mar-62			1	0.16	40
Francisco	Neuave	Mar-62			1	0.18	22
Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62	5	2.5			
Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62	15	8.12			

Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62			1	0.125	22
Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62			1	2	16
Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62			1	0.25	23
Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62			1	0.25	72
Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62			1	2	13
Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62			1	2	29
Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62			1	0.875	8
Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62			1	0.25	14
Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62			1	0.125	78
Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62			1	2	16
Juanito	Neuavo	Feb-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	Mar-62	21	10.5			
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			5	2.5	90
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.25	77
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	2	16
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.25	72
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.75	18
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	2	16
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.12	14
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.125	40
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.5	23
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	3	18
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	Mar-62	14	7			
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.75	48
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	2	18
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	2.5	29
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.875	8
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.125	14
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.125	14
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.5	40
Jose	Maria	Mar-62			1	0.5	5

Juan	Jose	Mar-62	2	4			
Juan	Jose	Mar-62			1	0.875	8
Juan	Jose	Mar-62			1	1.125	18
Slyzeria		Mar-62	15	9			
Slyzeria		Mar-62			1	1	18
Slyzeria		Mar-62			1	2	2
Slyzeria		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Slyzeria		Mar-62			1	0.25	82
Slyzeria		Mar-62			1	0.375	23
Slyzeria		Mar-62			1	0.25	66
Slyzeria		Mar-62			1	2.25	18
Slyzeria		Mar-62			1	0.25	40
Slyzeria		Mar-62			1	0.25	72
Slyzeria		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Slyzeria		Mar-62			1	0.5	40
Slyzeria		Mar-62			1	2.25	18
Slyzeria		Mar-62			2	0.25	37
Slyzeria		Mar-62			1	0.5	23
Slyzeria		Mar-62			1	0.125	778
Slyzeria		Apr-62	4	2.5			
Slyzeria		Apr-62			1	3	48
Slyzeria		Apr-62			1	2	16
Slyzeria		Apr-62			1	0.12	23
Slyzeria		Apr-62			1	1.5	18
Slyzeria		Apr-62			1	0.25	14
Slyzeria		Apr-62			2	1	5
Jara		Mar-62	15	7.5			
Jara		Mar-62			1	1.5	18
Jara		Mar-62			1	3	18
Jara		Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Jara		Mar-62			1	2.25	48
Jara		Mar-62			1	0.125	37
Jara		Mar-62			1	0.25	72
Jara		Mar-62			1	0.25	12
Mariano	Oiecho	Mar-62	16	8			
Mariano	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Mariano	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	0.625	72
Mariano	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	3	18
Mariano	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	1	4
Mariano	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	0.125	37

Mariano	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Mariano	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	0.25	5
Mariano	Oiecho	Mar-62			1	0.25	12
Mariano	Oiecho	Apr-62	14	7			
Mariano	Oiecho	Apr-62			1	2.625	18
Mariano	Oiecho	Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Mariano	Oiecho	Apr-62			1	0.25	72
Mariano	Oiecho	Apr-62			1	1.875	18
Mariano	Oiecho	Apr-62			1	0.875	8
Mariano	Oiecho	Apr-62			1	2	16
Mariano	Oiecho	Apr-62			1	0.25	40
Mariano	Oiecho	Apr-62			2	1.5	5
Mariano	Oiecho	Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Mariano	Oiecho	Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Mariano	Oiecho	Apr-62			1	2	16
Jose	Ignacio	Mar-62	6	3			
Jose	Ignacio	Mar-62			1	2.25	18
Jose	Ignacio	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio	Mar-62			1	0.25	37
Jose	Ignacio	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio	Mar-62			1	0.25	12
Jose	Ignacio	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio	Mar-62			1	0.875	8
Jose	Ignacio	Mar-62			1	2	13
Jose	Ignacio	Apr-62	14	7			
Jose	Ignacio	Apr-62			1	2	48
Jose	Ignacio	Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio	Apr-62			1	0.25	72
Jose	Ignacio	Apr-62			1	0.125	74
Jose	Ignacio	Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio	Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Jose	Ignacio	Apr-62			1	0.25	14
Jose	Ignacio	Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Andres		Mar-62	6	3			
Andres		Mar-62			1	2	48
Andres		Mar-62			1	0.25	37
Andres		Mar-62			1	0.375	22
Andres		Apr-62	14	7			
Andres		Apr-62			1	2	48
Andres		Apr-62			1	2	18

Andres	Apr-62			1	0.125	14
Andres	Apr-62			1	1.875	48
Andres	Apr-62			1	2.25	48
Andres	Apr-62			1	0.875	8
Andres	Apr-62					
Philifa	Mar-62	6	3			
Philifa	Mar-62			1	1.5	48
Philifa	Mar-62			1	0.25	40
Philifa	Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Philifa	Mar-62			1	0.5	23
Philifa	Mar-62			1	0.125	72
Cuaty	Mar-62	7	3.5			
Cuaty	Mar-62			1	2	16
Cuaty	Mar-62			1	0.25	23
Cuaty	Mar-62			1	0.25	87
Cuaty	Apr-62	26	13			
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	2.5	2
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	1.5	2
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	0.2	29
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	3	18
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	2	16
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	0.125	14
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	0.25	14
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	0.25	40
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	0.125	14
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	0.125	14
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	2	13
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	0.25	93
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	0.25	72
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	0.125	78
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	0.125	14
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	0.25	72
Cuaty	Apr-62			1	1.125	18
Cuaty	May-62	7	3.5			
Cuaty	May-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo	Mar-62	5	2.5			
Cuervo	Mar-62			1	0.875	8
Cuervo	Mar-62			1	2	13
Cuervo	Mar-62			1	0.125	23

Cuervo		Mar-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo		Apr-62	19	9.5			
Cuervo		Apr-62			1	2	29
Cuervo		Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo		Apr-62			1	2	48
Cuervo		Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo		Apr-62			1	2	13
Cuervo		Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo		Apr-62			1	0.875	8
Cuervo		Apr-62			1	0.125	14
Cuervo		Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo		Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo		Apr-62			1	1	5
Cuervo		Apr-62			1	0.5	23
Cuervo		Apr-62			1	0.125	14
Cuervo		May-62	5	2.5			
Cuervo		May-62			1	2	16
Cuervo		May-62			1	0.5	5
Cuervo		May-62			1	0.125	14
Cuervo		May-62			1	0.5	5
Mariano	Colorado	Apr-62	14.5	7.25			
Mariano	Colorado	Apr-62			1	2	48
Mariano	Colorado	Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Mariano	Colorado	Apr-62			1	2.5	48
Mariano	Colorado	Apr-62			1	0.875	8
Mariano	Colorado	Apr-62			1	0.5	5
Mariano	Colorado	Apr-62			1	0.375	40
Mariano	Colorado	Apr-62			2	1	5
Sylverio		Apr-62	18	11.25			
Sylverio		Apr-62			1	1.5	48
Sylverio		Apr-62			1	0.25	14
Sylverio		Apr-62			1	0.32	14
Sylverio		Apr-62			1	0.375	72
Sylverio		Apr-62			1	0.125	78
Sylverio		Apr-62			1	0.375	72
Sylverio		Apr-62			1	0.25	66
Sylverio		Apr-62			1	2	13
Sylverio		Apr-62			1	0.25	72
Sylverio		Apr-62			1	0.125	14
Sylverio		Apr-62			1	0.25	4

Sylverio	Apr-62			1	0.25	23
Sylverio	May-62	4	2			
Sylverio	May-62			1	2.25	48
Sylverio	May-62			1	2.25	18
Sylverio	May-62			1	0.5	5
Sylverio	May-62			1	0.125	47
Sylverio	May-62			1	1	16
Sylverio	May-62			1	0.125	14
Sylverio	May-62			1	0.5	5