ANNUAL STATEMENT

Of The Pacific States Savings and Loan Company, of San Francisco, Cal.

For the year ending July 31st 1905

The amount of authorized capital	$25,000,000	00
The par value of each share	100	00
The number of share sold during the year	2,023	
The numbers of shares cancelled and withdrawn during the present year	4,839	
The number of shares now in force	31,062	

Receipts

Cash on hand last report	2,187	11
Mortgage loans repaid in regular way	320,757	86
Real Estate sold	86,226	95
Received for monthly dues installment shares	201,494	27
Received for paid-up stock	49,780	00
Received for Interest	139,692	70
Received for fines	3,085	05
Received for transfer fees	11	75
-Bills receivable	33,731	00
Bills payable	10,000	00
Rents	5,821	74
Profits on real estate sold	7,577	50
Ordinary deposits	52,440	81
Expense fund collections	2,293	78
Agents expense fund and Insurance commissions	534	62
Attorney fees and foreclosure expense	1,428	95
Personal and Temporary accounts	47,248	35
Insurance premiums	1,047	14
Incomplete loans	17,891	33
Total	983,850	01

Disbursements

Loans on Mortgages	148,875	00
Loans on association stock	30,684	00
Interest on borrowed money	280	30
Dues repaid on matured and surrendered shares	285,107	50
Profiits repaid on matured and surrendered shares	85,950	97
Withdrawals of paid-up stocks	44,510	00
Dividends on paid-up stocks	12,358	60
Interest on ordinary deposits	3,349	29
Cost of collections	2,552	98
Expenses including calaries and attorney fees	29,806	63
Incomplete loans	57,670	45
Paid bills payable	55,000	00
Real estate taken on foreclosure and deed	15,510	19
Real estate of members	45	00
Repairs and insurance premiums on real estate	281	20
Profit and loss (settlement of loans)	2,370	21
Ordinary deposits	46,696	29
Discount	431	50
Insurance premiums	1,549	99
Taxes	11,184	55
Personal and temporary accounts	45,735	65
Cash on hand	102,899	80
Total	983,850	01

Assets

Cash on hand	102,899	80
Loans on mortgage securities	1,219,469	92
Real estate	16,679	93
Real estate purchased for members	22,942	62
Advanced for taxes	488	57
Attorney fees (foreclosure expense)	386	55
Advanced for insurance premiums	1,019	30
Personal and temporary accounts	2,426	05
Furniture and fixtures	1,000	00
Bills receivable (loans on collateral)	15,120	00
Arrears	16,267	35
Total	1,398,699	84

Liabilities

Running stock and dividends	973,314	13
Paid-up stock and dividends	265,398	15
Ordinary deposits	71,973	97
Advance installments, classses A, C and D	7,414	90
Dues on installments loans	17,391	33
Mortgage taxes undisbursed	2,199	91
Contingent fund	36,934	75
Temporary accounts	2,435	20
Balance expense fund account	10,927	75
Undivided profits (arrears on interest)	10,709	75
Total	1,398,699	84

Pacific States Savings & Loan Co.
By Wm. S. PARDY, Asst. Secy.

OFFICIAL COUNT OF STATE FUNDS.

STATE OF NEVADA.
County of Ormsby. s. s.

W. G. Douglas, and James G. Sweeney, being duly sworn, say they are members of the Board of Examiners of the State of Nev., that on the 29th day of Jan. '05 they, (after having ascertained from the books of the State Controller the amount of money that should be in the Treasury) made an offcial examination and count of the money and vouchers for money in the State Treasury of Nevada and found the same correct as follows:

Cain	$288,280	54
Paid coin vouchers not returned to Controller	111,112	18
Total	399,392	92

State School Fund Securities.

Irredeemable Nevada State School bond	380,000	00
Mass. State 3 per cent bonds	537,000	00
Nevada State Bonds	253,700	00
Mass. State 3½ per cent bonds	313,000	00
United States Bonds	215,000	00
Total	2,098,092	92

W. G. Douglass
James G. Sweeney

Subscribed and sworn before me this 29th day of January, A. D. 1906.
J. Doane,
Notary Public, Ormsvy County, Nev.

Two quartz wagons, one wood and one low wheel wagon, also harness for six horses. House, barn and five lots Apply at Adam Bay, Silver City, Nev.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA.

Ebenezer Twaddle and Ebenezer Twaddle as Special Admr., of the Estate of Alexander Twaddle, deceased,
Plaintiffs and Respondents
V.
Theodore Winters, A. C. Winters, L. W. Winters and Samuel Longabaugh,,
Defendants and Appellants

From 2d Judicial District Court, Washoe County.

Messrs. Cheney and Massey, attorneys for Plaintiffs.

Alfred Chartz, attorney for Defendants.

DECISION

The respondents have moved to dismiss the appeal from the judgment because it was not taken within one year, and to dismiss the appeal from the order of the district court denying appellants motion for a new trial, also to strike from the records the statement on motion for a new trial, upon the ground that the statement was not filed within the time prescribed by law. The appeal from the judgment is dismissed because not taken until March, 1905,, more than one year after its rendition on June 23, 1903. On that day Judge Curler of the Second Judicial District court who had tried the case at Reno and rendered the decree, made in open court and had entered in the minutes an order "that all business and all cases and proceedings that have not been completed or in the process of completion, and all new business that may be brought before the court during the absence of the presiding judge, be referred to Judge M. A. Murphy of the first judicial district court of the State of Nevada, and that he be requested to try, determine and dispose of all cases and business now before the court in the absence of the judge of this district."

Pursuant to this request Judge Murphy occupied the bench in Reno until July 31, 1903, when a recess was taken until a further order of the court. There was no other session until Judge Curler's return on August 17th. On July 17th, Judge Murphy, in open court in Reno, made an order allowing plaintiff until August 15th in which to file objection to findings, and prepare additional findings.. On August 3d Judge Murphy at Carson City, and within his own first judicial district, by an ex parte order made without affidavit of Judge Curler's absence or inability, granted the defendants until September 15, 1903, within which to prepare, file and serve their notice and statement on motion for a new trial. Later extensions were made by Judge Curler, but whether they are effectual depends upon this order, which respondents claim Judge Murphy was unauthorized to make under Section 197 of the Practice Act which provides in regard to notices and statements on motions for new trial that "the several periods of time limited may be enlarged by the written agreement of the parties, or upon good cause shown, by the court, or the judge before whom the case is tried," and under district court rule XLIII which directs that "no judge, except the judge having charge of the cause or proceeding shall grant further time to plead, move, or do any act or thing required to be done in any cause or proceeding, unless it be shown by affidavit that such judge is absent from the State, or from some other cause is unable to act."

Rule XLI provides: "When any district judge shall have entered upon the trial or hearing of any cause or proceeding, demurrer or motion, or made any ruling, order or decision therein, no other judge shall do any act or thing in or about said cause, proceeding, demurrer or motion, unless upon written request of the judge who shall have first entered upon the trial or hearing of said cause, proceeding demurrer or motion."

Section 2573 of the Compiled laws, passed after section 197 of the Practice Act as quoted, enacts: "The district judges of the State of Nevada shall possess equal coextensive and concurrent jurisdiction and power. They shall each have power to hold court in any county of the State. They shall each exercise and perform the powers, duties and functions of the court, and of Judges thereof, and of Judges at Chambers. Each judge shall have power to transact business which may be done in chambers at any point within the State. All of this section is subject to the provisions that each judge may direct and control the business in his own district, and shall see that it it properly performed."

We think under the minute order and circumstances related, the power inherent in Judge Curler to extend the time of filing the notice and statement became conferred upon Judge Murphy during the former's absence, and that Judge Murphy became the Judge in charge, endowed with the authority to grant the extension without the presentation of the affidavit showing the absence or inability of Judge Curler, as the rule requires before the order can be made by a Judge not having the business in charge.

Judge Curer's absence was presumed to continue until his return was shown and consequently Judge Murphy's authority based upon that absence would likewise continue. It is said that under the first statute mentioned, the language that "the court or judge before whom the case was tried" may extend the time invalidates the order, because Judge Murphy was not the judge before whom it was tried, and that he was not the court after he returned to Carson City, where he made the order. In a narrow technical sence this may be true, if we do not look beyond the strict letter of the statute. But not so if we consider the intent and purpose of the enactment, and construe it in the light of reason as applied to the ordinary rules of practice, and give due weight to the later section. Apparently the object of this legislation was to prevent the granting of extensions and the meddling of judges in cases which they had not tried or which were not properly under their control, and yet in the case of the absence or inability of the judge who tried the action, to grant relief, or allow extensions to be made to deserving litigants.

The argument advanced concedes that if Judge Murphy had gone to Reno and entered the order in open court it would have been good, but under this contention if he had stepped through the door into the chambers and made it, it would have been void. Orders extending the time for filings are business usually, or properly transacted in chambers and under Section 2573 can and ought to be made as effectually in any part of the State by the judge having the case in charge, as if made by him in chambers or in open court. Judge Murphy was merely acting for Judge Curler during his vacation, but by analogy the construction claimed, if adopted, would, in every case where a district judge dies, resigns or is succeeded, invalidate the orders extending time under section 197 made out of court by his sucessor in office, although they are of that character ordinarily granted in chambers. This would mean a distinction and two rules for filing orders of the same kind, and that the judge who had tried the cause as Judge Curler had done in this instance, could make the order in chambers, while his successor could so make it only in the cases tried by him, and would have to be in court to make these simple orders extending time in actions which had been previously tried by another judge.

Appellants desired and were entitled to the time granted for the purpose of enabling them to secure from the court reporter who had left the State, a transcript of the testimony given on the trial, which would enable them to properly prepare the statement.

Under Section 2573 Judge Curler could have made an order granting them the extension at any place in the State, and as during his absence Judge Murphy was requested by the Court minutes to attend to all business for him, we conclude that he was empowered to make the order at Carson City as he did, and as Judge Curler could have done, and that it was not necessary for him to make the trip to Reno and undergo the formality of opening court to enter ex parte orders simply extending time, such as are usually made out of court.

The motion to dismiss the appeal from the order overruling the motion for a new trial and to strike out the statement is denied.

ON THE MERITS

This action was brought by Alexander Twaddle in his life time and by Ebenezer Twaddle, as co-owners, for 450 miners inches running under a six inch pressure of the waters of Ophir Creek, alleged to have been appropriated by their grantors in the year 1856 "by means of dams, ditches and a flume" for the irrigation of their ranch containing 203.92 acres in Washoe county. The answer denies the allegation of the complaint sets up the ownership by the defendant, Winters, of a tract of land obut one mile wide and two miles long, and alleges appropriations by them or their grantors aggregating 600 inches flowing under a four inch pressure, by the year 1867, which are stated to be prior to any diversion of the water by the plaintiffs, and asserts a claim for defendant, Longabaugh, to 180 inches for fluming wood, lumber and ice from large tracts of timber lands owned by him, and for domestic use and irrigating garden on forty acres at Ophir.

Witnesses appeared to sustain, and others to dispute plaintiffs' right as initiated a half century ago, and the same is true regarding the claims of these defendants. The record affords a glimpse of pioneer history at a period previous to the admission of this State into the Union, and portrays the building and decay of saw and quartz mills and the rise and decline of towns by the banks of the stream, the waters of which are here in litigation. One witness testified that the Hawkins ditch, now known as the upper Twaddle ditch, was completed in 1857, and that he turned the water into it that year. Others stated that water was running in the ditch and flume about that time, and that these were aparently in the same place and of about the same capacity as at present.

On behalf of the defendant other witnesses testified that they were over the ground and saw no ditch and that none existed there during those earlier years. It is unnecessary for us to detail the conflicting portions of the evidence. These were carefully considered by the district court, and for the reasons stated in its decision, enforced by statements in deeds made many years before any controversy arose, the finding that this ditch was constructed and a prior appropriation of water made through it in 1857 finds ample support. At first on the Twaddle ranch land was plowed for only a garden and a small piece of grain and but little hay was cut. A reasonable time was allowed in which to extend and complete the use of the water that would flow through he ditch and the quantity of land irrigated was increased. The lower Twaddle ditch was constructed from Ophir Creek at some time prior to 1869 and runs to and irrigates the eastern portion of the plaintiffs' ranch It is shown that since that year at least their lands have been in practically the same state of cultivation and irrigation that they were in at the time of the commencement of this action, and that during that period plaintiffs' used all the water they needed from Ophir Creek without interruption except in 1887, 1898 and at the time this suit was begun. It appears that the plaintiffs' had not materially increased their opprop iation in [illegible] ear, [illegible] Theodore winters admitted upon the stand that during the last ten or fifteen years he had been using twice as much water from Ophir Creek in addition to that from other streams, as he used during the first ten years that he cultivated his lands. As he claims and uses more than the plaintiffs, we conclude that this large increase in his diversion of the waters of the streams since the completion of their oppropriation which has remained stationary may account for the shortage and dispute.

By consent of the parties in open ccurt the district judge, accompanied by a civil engineer who had testified as a witness for the defendants, viewed the premises and made measurements. At the point of least carrying capacity of the upper Twaddle ditch, which is the old square flume near the Bowers' Mansion and grave, he measured the flow at 184 inches and the water lacked more than two inches of reaching the top. A surveyor had testified for the plaintiffs that its capacity was 182 inches at this point, and that the capacity of 100 feet of old flume remaining up nearer the head of the ditch which had been impaired by age and abandoned, and supplanted by a new V flume built above the old one by the plaintiffs in 1900, was 150 inches. At this point the judge found that 184 inches of water which he had measured below about filled the new V flume, and he estimated that the old flume would carry from 200 to 200 inches. From his examination of the premises and the character of the soil the court was of the opinion that the plaintiffs required, and were entitled to, at least the amount of water they had flowing in the flume at the time he made the examination, and he decreed them a prior right to 184 miners inches running under a four inch pressure or 3 34-50 cubic feet per second from April 15th to Nov. 15th of each year, and 20 inches or 2-5 of one cubic foot per second for domestic use and watering stock at other times. It is claimed the amount allowed is not warranted by the evidence because more than the capacity of the upper Twaddle ditch as shown by the testimony mentioned fixing it at 182 inches at the point above the mansion, and at 150 inches along the 100 feet of old flume, through which the water flowed prior to 1900.

It is not necessary to determine whether the court on its own examination and measurement may allow a quantity beyond the range of the evidence, nor whether the surveyor could actually estimate the capacity of the 100 feet of old flume without knowing the volume and velocity of the water that entered it, nor whether the variation of one part in ninety-one or the difference between 182 inches in his measurement and that of 184 by the judge should be disregarded as too trifling to be material and as a slight discrepancy to be expected, for the judgment for the 34 inches which defendants' claim should be deducted because in excess of the capacity of the upper ditch and flume before the construction of the V flume in 1900 is supported by the finding of the court that the plaintiffs and their grantors had for more than thirty-one years before the commencement of this suit used a portion of the water through the lower Twaddle ditch. It is urged that 184 inches is more than required for the irrigation of plaintiffs' ranch and that this is especially so because a few of their 170.45 acres of cultivated land lies above the upper ditch from Ophir Creek and a small portion is naturally swampy. The quantity of water allowed by the decree seems very liberal, both for irrigation and for domestic use and watering stock. Engineers and others testified that one half and three fifths of an inch of water per acre was sufficient, while for the plaintiffs, farmers from the vicinity varied in their estimates of the amount necessary from one and one half to three and one half inches per acre.

The evidence indicated that the plaintiffs had used as much water as that awarded to them and more, and had uniformly produced good crops Much of their land is sandy with considerable slope. After examining the soil and viewing the quantity of water as it ran on the premises, the court agreed with the testimony of the plaintiffs that that amount was necessary and adopted a mean between the highest and lowest estimates. The quantity of water requisite varies greatly with the soil, seasons, crops, and conditions, and we cannot say that the allowance is excessive.

Alexander Twaddle testified that there were times during the summer, evidently short periods after the land had been irrigated, when it was not necessary to use as much as the upper ditch full of water. On such occasions and whenever it is not needed by the plaintiffs it should be turned to the defendants, if they have any beneficial use for it, and not permitted to waste. It may be implied by the law, but it is better to have decrees specify, and especially so in this case, in view of the testimony stated and of the perpetual injunction, that the award of water is limited to a beneficial use at such times as it is needed, Gotelli v. Cardelli. The point and purpose of diversion may be changed if such change does not interefere with the prior rights.

Under the testimony of Alexander Twaddle that the irrigating season closes about the first of October, and that sometimes he used water a little later, we think probably the decree should limit plaintiffs' right for irrigating purposes to October 15th. This may allow defendant Longabaugh to flume wood a month earlier at this season when the water is low, and allow Winters more for watering stock without material injury to the plaintiffs. Although his flume was erected many years ago Longabaugh did not show any prior appropriation and the decree properly enjoins him from interfereing with that part of the water of Ophir Creek awarded to the plaintiff, because he ran their water in his flume past their ditch and into one owned by Winters, and joined with the other defendants in answering and resisting the rights of plaintiffs. The decree does not prevent him from taking any water in the creek in excess of the amount awarded to plaintiffs. Nor does it in any way interefere with the water belonging to him coming from other sources. This he may turn into Ophir Creek and take out lower down provided he does not diminish the flow to which plaintiffs are entitled.

On May 30, 1877, John Twaddle, the father and predecessor in interest of the plaintiffs, conveyed to M. C. Lake "one-third of that certain water ditch and flume known as the Twaddle ditch, leading from what is now known as the Ophir Creek to the land of said Twaddle, southerly from said creek through the lands of C. F. Wooten and M. C. Lake, with the privilege of running water through said flume and ditch to what is known as the Bowers Mansion or grounds, the expense of maintaining said ditch and flume to be paid by each in proportion to their interests in same." It will be noted that this langauge does not purport to grant any water, but rather the right to convey water and that it amounts to a sale of a third interest in the ditch with at least the privilege to that extent of running in it water which Lake had, or might appropriate. Later, the defendant Theodore Winters, acquired the Bowers Mansion and grounds through conveyances which did not mention any interest in this ditch. It does not appear that Lake or his grantors ever made any use of the ditch or ever contributed towards its repair.

Alexander Twaddle stated on the stand that he did not claim all this ditch and that the plaintiffs owned two thirds of it. Whether under this deed the one-third interest in the ditch became appurtenant to the Bowers land when it was never used for its irrigation, and later passed with the land without being mentioned, and whether after the lapse of twenty-five years without any use or contribution towards its repair the grantee of Lake has a third interest as a co-owner in the ditch and that part of the flume which has not been superceeded by the new one built by plaintiffs, are questions which we need not determine, for they, and that part of the judgment of the court which gives the plaintiffs the "exclusive use of the upper Twaddle Ditch and Flume," are not within the allegations of the pleadings which contain no reference to the exclusive use of, or a third or any interest in the ditch.

Under the assertion in the complaint of the apropriation of water "by means of certain dams, ditches and a flume" the court properly decreed to plaintiffs the right to use the water through either or both the ditches running to their lands. They would have that right in the upper ditch if their interest in it is only an undivided two-thirds, as the court has given them jointly with the defendants in the lower ditch, but whether the grantee of Lake owns and can assert a right to an undivided one-third interest, is a question as foreign as the ownership of the mansion, and one which ought not to be determined by the judgment in the absence of any issue or allegation concerning it. The defendants specifically excepted to finding number twelve in this regard.

Patents for defendants' lands lying along the banks of Ophir Creek were issued to their grantors before the passage of the Act of Congress of July 26, 1866 and it is asserted that for this reason a vested Common Law riparian right to the flow of the waters of Opnir Creek accrued of which they could not be deprived by that Act If this were true defendants might as well be considered under the circumstances shown to have lost that right by acquiescence in the continued diversion of the water by plaintiffs for a period many times longer than that provided by the statute of limitations, but in this contention counsel is in error. We do not wish to consider seriously or at length an argument by which it is sought to have us over-rule well reasoned decisions of long standing in this and other arid states, and in the Supreme Court of the United States, such as Jones v. Adams, Reno Sampling Works v. Stevenson and Broder v. Water Co., declaring that this statute was rather the voluntary recognition of a pre-existing right to water constituting a valid claim to its continued use, than the establishment of a new one. As time passes it becomes more and more apparent that the law of ownersnip of water by prior appropriation for a beneficial purpose is essential under our climatic conditions to the general welfare, and that the Common Law regarding the flow of streams which may be unobjectionable in such localities as the British Isles and the coast of Oregon, Washington and northern California where rains are frequent and fogs and winds laden with mist from the ocean prevail and moisten the soil, is unsuitable under our sunny skies where the lands are so arid that irrigation is required for the production of the crops necessary for the support and prosperity of the people. Irrigation is the life of our important and increasing agricultural interests which would be strangled by the enforcement of the riparian principle.

Congress is apropriating millions for storage and distribution and our Legislature have recognized the advantages of conserving the water above for use in irrigation instead of having it flow by lands of riparian owners to finally waste by sinking and evaporating in the desert. The California decisions cited for appellants may no longer be considered good law even in the state in which they were rendered.

In the recent case of Kansas v. Colorado before the Supreme Court of the United States, Congressman Needham testified that irrigation had doubled and trebled the value of property in Fresno and King counties, California,, that they had to depart from the doctrine of riparian rights and under that doctrine it would be difficult to make any future development; that there has been a departure from the principles laid down in Lux v. Haggin, because at that time the value of water was not realized, that the decisoin has been practically reversed by the same court on subsequent occasions, and that the doctrine of prior appropriation and the application of water to a beneficial use is in effect in force now in that State.

We must decline to award the defendants the waters of the stream as riparian proprietors and patentees of the land along its banks prior to 1866.

The case will be remanded for a new trial unless there is filed on the part of the plaintiffs within thirty days from the filing hereof, a written consent that the judgment be modified by limiting the use of the 184 inches, or 3 34-50 cubic feet per second of water awarded to the plaintiffs, to such times as may be necessary for the irrigation of their crops or lands or for other beneficial purposes, between April 15 and October 15 of each year, and by allowing plaintiffs for the remainder of the time the 20 inches awarded to them, when necessary for their household, domestic and stock purposes, and by striking from the decree the words:

"It is further ordered, adjudged and decreed that said plaintiffs have the exclusive right to use and the exclusive use of said Upper Twaddle Ditch and Flume at all seasons of the year."

If such consent is so filed the district court will modify the judgment accordingly and as so modined the judgment and decree will stand affirmed.

Talbot, J.

We concur:
Fitzgerald, C. J.
Norcr[illegible]

Quarterly Report.

Ormsby County, Nevada.

Receipts.

Filed Feb. 1, 1906.

Balane in County Treasury at end of last quarter	$40023	36¾
County licenses	701	05
Gaming licenses	1057	50
Liquor licenses	310	20
Fee of Co. officers	531	46
Rent of county bldg	250	00
Poll taxes	620	40
1st. Instalment taxes	14924	21
Special school tax	1710	90
Slot machine license	282	00
Cigarette license	42	30
Semi-Annual Set. State Treas	531	78
Delinquent taxes	23	80½
Sale of horse	10	00
Sale of pump	13	00
Keep of W. Bowen	45	00
Total	61,077	36¾

Disbursements.

State fund	6692	82½
General fund	2732	32
Salary fund	2390	00
Agl Assn. Bond Fund, Series A, $100.00	250	00
Agl. Assn. Bond Fund, Series B $100.00	400	00
Co. School Fund. Dist. 1	388	95
Co. School fund, Dist. 2	151	20
Co. School fund Dist. 3	30	70
Co School Fund Dist. 4	24	00
State School fund, Dist. 1	2605	00
State school fund, Dist 2	160	00
State School fund, dist.3	120	00
State School fund, Dist 4	165	00
Special building	5850	00
School library, No. 2	86	00
Total	21,968	59½

Re pitulation.

Cash in Treasury October 1905	40023	36¾
Receipts from Oct. 1st to Dec 30, 1905	21054	00⅓
Disbursements from Oct. 1st to Dec 30, 1905	21968	59½
Balonce cash in County Treas. January 1, 1906	$9108	77⅓

H. DIETERICH,
County Auditor.

Recapitulation

State fund	103	86
General fund	6017	03½
Salary fund	2725	78
Co. School fund	3248	71
Co. School Dist. 1, fund	7638	22½
Co. School Dist. 2, fund	139	64
Co. School Dist. 3, fund	190	26½
Co. School Dist. 3, fund	425	55
State School Dist. 1, fund	1608	00
State School Dist. 2, fund	77	51
State School Dist. 3, fund	371	39
State School Dist. 3, fund	371	39
State School Dist 4, fund	19	29
Agl. Assn. Fund A	680	82½
Agl. Assn Fund, B	86	86½
Agl. Assn Fund Special	1918	94
Co. School Dist. fund - special	13735	90½
Co. School Dist. fund 1, library	108	40
Co School Dist. fund 3, library	6	50
Co. School Dist fund 4, library	6	10
Total	$9108	77⅓

H. B. VAN ETTEN
County Treasurer