

STATE OF NEVADA

MINUTES OF MEETING

OF THE

State Board of Assessors

WITH THE

STATE REVENUE BOARD

Carson City, January 13, 14 and 15, 1902



CARSON CITY, NEVADA

**STATE PRINTING OFFICE, : : : : ANDREW MAUTE, SUPERINTENDENT
1902**

STATE OF NEVADA

MINUTES OF MEETING

OF THE

State Board of Assessors

WITH THE



Custom City, January 12, 11 and 15, 1902



STATE OF NEVADA, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, DIVISION OF ASSESSMENT, CUSTOM CITY, NEVADA

MINUTES OF ASSESSORS' MEETING, 1902.

FIRST DAY.

CARSON CITY, NEVADA, January 13, 1902.

Meeting called to order by Reinhold Sadler, Governor, as Chairman of the Board, at 10:15 o'clock a. m., January 13, 1902.

There being a quorum present, the Secretary, W. R. Davis, was ordered to call the roll.

The following answered to their names:

Thomas Dolf.....	Churchill County
William McCormick.....	Douglas County
J. Eggers.....	Elko County
W. J. Hooper.....	Eureka County
J. W. Guthrie.....	Humboldt County
George Watt.....	Lander County
Charles Matthews.....	Lincoln County
William Kinney.....	Ormsby County
James Quirk.....	Storey County
Mr. Holcomb.....	Washoe County
J. B. Williamson.....	White Pine County

W. A. Ingalls of Esmeralda County, D. P. Randall of Lyon County, and Thomas W. Logan of Nye County, were absent at roll-call, but appeared immediately thereafter.

Of the State officers acting with the Assessors' Board under the law there were present Reinhold Sadler, acting as Chairman, Controller Sam P. Davis and Attorney-General Woodburn, its legal advisor.

Clerk Davis opened the proceedings by reading Section 1 and a portion of Section 2 of the law under which the Board was authorized to act, as follows:

CHAP. L.—*An Act to provide for a more uniform valuation and assessment of property in this State.*

[Approved March 16, 1901.]

The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. The County Assessors of the several counties of this State

shall meet for a period not exceeding ten days, in the office of the Governor, at Carson City, Nevada, on the first Monday of April in the year A. D. 1901, and on the second Monday in January of each and every succeeding year, and shall, at such meetings, establish throughout the State a uniform valuation of all classes of property which, by their character, will admit of such uniform valuation; *provided*, that in fixing such valuation the location and situation of such property shall be considered; *and provided further*, that nothing herein shall be so construed as to impair the right of the Board of Equalization of any county to equalize taxes on all property, the valuation of which has not been fixed at the annual meeting of County Assessors as provided in this section; *provided*, any taxpayer under the provisions of this Act shall not be deprived of any remedy or redress in a court of law relating to the payment of taxes.

Sec. 2. At such meetings the Governor shall be the Chairman, and the Governor's Secretary shall be the Clerk of said meeting; but neither the Governor nor his Secretary shall have a vote in the proceedings of said Board.

After the reading of the law, Mr. Guthrie of Humboldt County stated that the Assessors had had no time for consultation, and moved that they adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow. Carried.

Adjourned.

SECOND DAY.

CARSON CITY, NEVADA, January 14, 1902.

Board called to order by the Chairman at 10 o'clock.

All present.

The Chairman stated that he had given all the Assessors a copy of the law, and asked their pleasure.

Mr. Guthrie of Humboldt County asked if the Attorney-General could not be sent for.

The Secretary was ordered to request the presence of the Attorney-General.

While waiting for the Attorney-General, Mr. Holcomb of Washoe County moved that a committee of five be appointed to draw up an order of business.

Carried unanimously.

The Chairman appointed Randall of Lyon, Williamson of White Pine, Guthrie of Humboldt, Eggers of Elko, and Hooper of Eureka.

The Chairman stated that Washoe County was represented by the Chairman of its Board of County Commissioners, Mr. Holcomb.

Mr. Randall of Lyon County stated that it would take some time to arrange an order of business, and moved that a recess be taken until 1 o'clock.

Objections raised.

Mr. Kinney of Ormsby moved to take a recess for one-half hour.

Carried unanimously.

Recess until 10:45.

After Recess.

The Committee on the Order of Business stated that the time given was not sufficient for the amount of work to be done and asked for an extension of time.

After a slight discussion the Chair granted a recess until 1 o'clock.

Afternoon Session.

Board met at 1 p. m.

Mr. Randall of Lyon County, as Chairman of the Committee on the Order of Business, read the following report:

Mr. Chairman:

We, your Committee on the Order of Business, beg leave to submit the following report for your consideration:

1. Work Horses.
2. Saddle Horses.
3. Stock Horses.
4. Work Mules.
5. Stock Mules.
6. Beef Cattle.
7. Beef Cows.
8. Milch Cows.
9. Stock Cattle.
10. Thoroughbreds.
11. Sheep.
12. Buck Sheep.
13. Hogs.
14. Telephone Lines.
15. Telegraph Lines.
16. Railroads, to be classified as follows:
 1. Standard-gauge railroads whose terminals are outside the State.
 2. Standard-gauge railroads with only one terminal in this State.
 3. Standard-gauge railroads with both terminals in this State.
 4. Narrow-gauge railroads with one terminal in this State.
 5. Narrow-gauge railroads with both terminals in the same county of this State.
 6. Narrow-gauge railroads that are not in operation.

Respectfully submitted,

D. P. RANDALL,
Chairman.

After the reading of the report, Mr. Kinney of Ormsby moved that the report be accepted and the Committee be discharged.

Seconded by Mr. Logan and carried.

As some of the members came in late the report was read a second time.

Report adopted.

The Chairman then asked the Controller for the minutes of a meeting of the Revenue Board, held a few weeks ago.

The Controller then read the following report:

The State Revenue Board, consisting of the Governor, Attorney-General and State Controller, met at the Governor's office on December 27th to discuss the propriety of taking action in cases where County Boards of Equalization had lowered the assessments of the Virginia and Truckee Railroad and the Nevada, California and Oregon Railway in this State after the valuation had been previously fixed by the State Board of Assessors.

The Governor called the meeting to order, and after the question was stated there was a general discussion.

The question of how to proceed to recover the difference by a resort to the courts was discussed.

It was the unanimous opinion of the Board that the County Boards of Equalization in Ormsby, Washoe and Storey had acted without authority in changing the valuations fixed on the railroad properties by the State Board of Assessors.

It was the unanimous opinion of the Board that the assessment, as soon as made by the Assessor, became a lien upon the property, and the difference between the taxes made on the valuation fixed by the State Board of Assessors and the taxes accruing from the valuation fixed by the County Boards of Equalization could be recovered in the courts by the District Attorneys of the respective counties.

On motion of the Controller it was decided to lay the whole matter before the next meeting of the State Revenue Board convening in Carson on the 13th of January, that a course of action might be fixed upon with a full Board present.

Adjourned.

The Chairman asked for information in regard to the lowering of the rates in Esmeralda County.

Mr. Ingalls of Esmeralda County—I will state that the Carson and Colorado Railroad runs through Esmeralda County with 137 miles, and we set the valuation at \$2,500 per mile for the entire road running through Esmeralda County. I had placed it as the State Board had fixed it—at \$2,500 per mile. The report of the Company, appearing before the Board, showed cause, etc., so that the Board placed the valuation at \$2,000 per mile. We thought we had sufficient money to run the county, and agreed to leave the matter in that way. That is what they paid taxes on.

Mr. Kinney of Ormsby asked for the opinion of the Attorney-General on the report read by the Controller.

Clerk Davis was requested to bring the Attorney-General before the meeting.

Attorney-General Woodburn appeared, and was asked his opinion of the report read.

The Attorney-General—The State Revenue Board met at the office of the Governor, December 27th, to discuss the propriety of taking action in reference to the cases where the County Boards of Equalization had lowered the valuation per mile of the Virginia and Truckee Railroad Company after the valuation had been previously fixed by this Board. I presume that if the law creating this Board is constitutional, and it is presumed to be so until a competent court decides otherwise, the Boards of Equalization should be governed by the present law. Take, for instance, the case in point: The County Assessors placed the valuation at figures which, according to their judgment, should be paid. This valuation was afterwards reduced by the County Boards of Equalization. If the Railway Company could show in a court that the reduced valuation was a fair one, and they held a receipt for their taxes, it would be difficult to find a jury that would decide against the Company. This law has never been tested as to its constitutionality. If it should be unconstitutional, the Assessors could act under the old law. Whenever an assessment has been levied, it becomes, from that time, a lien upon the property, and legally the full amount is due and can be collected from the bondsmen of officers who fail to carry out the law. This holds good on all property in the county. In the case of *The State v. The Central Pacific*, reported in the 10th Nevada, it was held that the cost of constructing the road was the main element to be considered. In the subsequent case of *The State v. The Virginia and Truckee Railroad* the Supreme Court held that the main element to be considered in estimating the valuation of a railroad for purposes of taxation was its net earnings capitalized at the current rate of interest. The Controller at the meeting last April made some suggestions to this Board relative to classification, making the classification on the lines of broad and narrow gauge. Judge Hawley, in his decision in the railroad case, mentions this, and states that the Board of Assessors did not follow these suggestions. Even this classification, the Court went on to say, fell short of the requirements of the law. It seems a generally accepted view of the courts that the assessment of a railway should be made on the basis of its net earnings. The revenue question is a very complex one in all its bearings. Some roads, which seem equal, in other respects differ widely when their net earnings are considered. The Eureka and Palisade, a narrow gauge, makes more money than the Battle Mountain and Austin road, also a narrow gauge, within the State. I believe, if I were a member of this Board, I would leave the new road in Lincoln county to the judgment of the Assessor, and, as a rule, I believe that each separate Assessor can more properly deter-

mine the valuation of a road entirely in his own county than this Board as a body.

Mr. Hooper of Eureka County—I would like to ask what this Board has to do with the State Revenue Board. What have we to do with settling a judgment on any Assessor? We are collected here by this law to fix rates on such property as can be classified.

Mr. Guthrie of Humboldt County—I do not think we have a thing to do with this matter.

The Controller stated that it had been referred more as a matter of courtesy than anything else.

Mr. Kinney of Ormsby—I would like to ask the Attorney-General if any of the Assessors put the valuation lower than we made it. I understand there were some who assessed the railroad for \$15,000 on the main line of the Southern Pacific.

Chairman—For the information of the Board, I will state that I have examined every assessment roll in the State, and I think that all the Assessors have done their duty. We have with us a gentleman who is here by authority of the law as Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners. I think in his county they reduced the taxes as they were levied by the Board of Assessors. Let us talk this all over and understand it while we are all here.

Mr. Holcomb, Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Washoe County—I presume you allude to me. I believe that the law gave the right to the Commissioners of Washoe County, as a Board of Equalization, to classify taxes according to their best judgment, and we did so.

Controller—I would like to ask you under what section the Board had that right.

Mr. Holcomb—Do not ask me for sections; I am not a lawyer.

Mr. Eggers of Elko County—It seems to me that this is a case like the other one. We are not here to judge on such cases.

Mr. Guthrie then moved to proceed with the business for which they had been called together.

The Chairman stated that the first order of business was to place a valuation on work horses.

No. 1—Work Horses. Left to the discretion of the Assessors.

No. 2—Saddle Horses. Same.

No. 3—Stock Horses. Same.

No. 4—Work Mules. Same.

Mr. Quirk of Storey County—We are going through the routine of business the same as we did last year, and putting the State to a great expense. Now, I would like to know if what we are doing here will stand in law. We are classifying these things, and I want to know if it is all right.

The Attorney-General—It is my opinion that under the decision in

the Hawley case, and under the case cited in Humboldt County, in the brief of the Attorney-General, that this Board has the undoubted right to do what they propose. The Legislature of this State has a right to adopt any means or methods for collecting revenue, provided it is not conflicting with the provisions of the Constitution. They can assess every specie of property in a different way. This bill provides that any property not assessed by this Board may be assessed in the old way, by the local County Assessors.

Mr. Holcomb of Washoe then asked if there was any law compelling the Board to fix valuations.

The Attorney-General—The Act of the Legislature created this Board to classify and assess. In a Humboldt County decision, Judge Bonfield decided that the classification was unconstitutional, and that the Legislature had no power to make a classification. Judge Hawley decided in this case that the classification was absolutely necessary, that the Board of Assessors did not assess the Central Pacific, because they did not assess it by classifying it, but by name, and therefore the Board had transgressed their power.

Mr. Holcomb of Washoe—My idea would be that, if we can pass one thing, we can pass everything without fixing a valuation.

The Attorney-General—That is true under this bill.

The Chairman—We will proceed with the order of business.

No. 5—Stock Mules. Valuation left to the County Assessors.

No. 6—Beef Cattle.

Mr. Dolf, of Churchill County moved to leave the valuation of beef cattle to the judgment of the Assessors.

Objection raised. Question called, and motion passed by a vote of 9 to 5.

No. 6—Beef Cattle. Left to the County Assessors.

No. 7—Beef Cows.

Mr. Guthrie moved to pass beef cows.

Mr. Randall of Lyon County—I do not see what we are going to gain by passing everything. If we are going to set no valuations, we may as well go home and be done with it.

Mr. Quirk of Storey—I came here with the understanding that this Board was called here for the purpose of classifying these things so that they would be the same in all the counties. It seems to me they ought to be classified.

The Chairman—The question is whether to pass No. 7 on the order of business.

Roll called, and the motion carried by a vote of 10 to 4.

Motion to adjourn lost.

No. 8—Milch Cows.

Mr. Watt of Lander moved to place the valuation the same as last year.

After a short discussion an amendment was made to leave it to the Assessors.

Amendment lost by a vote of 8 to 6.

Original motion put—that milch cows be assessed the same as last year, \$25 per head.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas—Churchill, Douglas, Elko, Eureka, Lander, Lyon, Nye, and White Pine—8.

Nays—Esmeralda, Humboldt, Lincoln, Ormsby, Storey, and Washoe—6.

No. 9—Stock Cattle.

Mr. Holcomb moved that the valuation of stock cattle be left to the discretion of the County Assessors.

Lost by a vote of 11 to 3.

Mr. Randall moved that the valuation be placed at \$15 per head.

Mr. Holcomb moved to amend Mr. Randall's motion by placing the valuation at \$17 per head, with the exception of the Counties of Nye, White Pine, and Lincoln, and that they be placed at \$16 per head.

Mr. Ingalls moved as an amendment that Esmeralda be added.

Amendment accepted by Mr. Holcomb.

Mr. Logan of Nye County moved an amendment that the stock cattle in the four counties be assessed at \$15 per head, stating that the cattle in the western part of the State were worth more than the cattle on the deserts.

Amendment accepted.

Mr. Hooper of Eureka objected to having Lincoln County included in the list.

Motion put that stock cattle be assessed at \$16 per head in Lincoln, Nye, White Pine, and Esmeralda Counties.

Motion lost.

Mr. Randall moved that stock cattle be assessed at \$16 throughout the State with the exception of White Pine, Lincoln, and Nye.

Motion lost by a vote of 9 to 5.

Mr. Holcomb moved that stock cattle be assessed at \$17 per head in all the counties, excepting White Pine, Nye, Esmeralda, and Lincoln, and there at \$16 per head.

Motion carried.

No. 10—Thoroughbreds. Left to the Assessors.

No. 11—Sheep.

Mr. Kinney of Ormsby moved that the valuation of sheep be placed at \$2.50 per head throughout the State.

Mr. Holcomb stated that the price of sheep had diminished during the year and moved as an amendment that the valuation be placed at \$2.25 per head.

After a short discussion the question on the amendment was called—that sheep be assessed at \$2.25 per head.

Motion lost by a tie vote.

Original motion—that sheep be assessed at \$2.50 per head—carried.

No. 12—Buck Sheep. Unanimously voted to place the valuation at \$5 per head, the same as last year.

No. 13—Hogs. Left to the County Assessors.

No. 14—Telephone Lines. Left to the County Assessors.

No. 15—Telegraph Lines. Same.

No. 16—Railroads. Classified as follows:

Standard-gauge railroads whose terminals are outside this State.

Standard-gauge railroads with only one terminal in this State.

Standard-gauge railroads with both terminals in this State.

Narrow-gauge railroads with one terminal in this State.

Narrow-gauge railroads with both terminals in the same county.

Narrow-gauge railroads that are not in operation.

Mr. Ingalls asked to have a report of the different railroads read, showing the yearly earnings, etc.

The Chairman ordered the Clerk, Mr. Davis, to obtain the railroad reports that were filed with the Secretary of State.

A recess of fifteen minutes was declared.

After Recess.

The yearly financial reports of the Central Pacific, the Carson and Colorado, the Nevada, California and Oregon, the Virginia and Truckee, the Eureka and Palisade, and Nevada Central Railroads were read by the Secretary.

Mr. Hooper moved to have sidetracks added to each of the railroads in the order of business.

Motion carried.

Mr. Ingalls asked if the Controller could tell how the proceeds of last year compared with this, from the different counties.

Mr. Holcomb moved to proceed with the order of business.

Motion carried.

Mr. Ingalls asked the Controller the result of the taxes of this year.

The Controller replied that the assessment roll for 1901 was, in round numbers, \$28,000,000 as against \$24,000,000 for 1900. The actual increase in valuation in all kinds of property over the previous year was \$4,104,496 03, which showed that Nevada was going up hill instead of down.

Mr. Holcomb moved to take up railroads not having any terminals in this State.

Motion carried.

Mr. Holcomb moved that the valuation of such roads be placed at \$15,000 per mile.

Mr. Randall moved to amend by placing the valuation at \$18,000 per mile.

Motion lost by the following vote:

Yeas—Douglas, Esmeralda, Lincoln, Lyon, Nye, Ormsby, and Storey—7.

Nays—Churchill, Elko, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Washoe, and White Pine—7.

Motion to assess the railroad at \$15,000 per mile lost by the following vote:

Yeas—Churchill, Elko, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Washoe, and White Pine—7.

Nays—Douglas, Esmeralda, Lincoln, Lyon, Nye, Ormsby, and Storey—7.

Mr. Holcomb moved that the valuation be left to the Assessors of the different counties through which the road passes.

Mr. Quirk of Storey—There is a great deal to look into in regard to this matter. Last year, in our county, I assessed the railroads as we passed on them here, and the Board of Equalization saw fit to lower it. I would like to know if this thing is going to stand. I want to vote so it will stand. I don't want the Board at home to tell me that I did not do right. If the Board of Equalization has the power to change our valuations, there is no use in our doing anything.

Mr. Kinney—Last year, I understand, this road was assessed as low as \$9,000 per mile—from \$9,000 to \$11,000—while the Company was willing to be assessed \$15,000. The Company might not like it if they were assessed any lower than \$15,000.

Mr. Hooper of Eureka County moved that the railroads under Class 1, of No. 16 on the order of business, be assessed at \$16,000 per mile.

Seconded by Mr. Eggers.

Mr. Logan of Nye County—I think the majority of the Assessors are jumping at conclusions in placing the valuation of this road. I think it would be wise for us to adjourn for a while and make an estimate on the value of the road. We wish to do what is just to the railroad and what is just to the people. I move we take a recess.

Mr. Ryan, representing the Central Pacific Railroad—I would like you to give me three or four minutes of your time. Last year our road was placed at \$20,000 per mile. We believed it was an imposition from the fact that all other property was raised from 20 to 30 per cent and we were increased over 80 per cent. We did not consider that fair, and we did not consider it an equalized assessment according to the law. The gentleman here is under a misapprehension, when he says our road was assessed from \$9,000 to \$11,000. The lowest we were assessed was

\$10,000 up to \$13,000 and \$14,000 in Eureka County. I want every gentleman here to understand that I am here in good faith, and with the best of feeling. Last year the Controller suggested this as a classification: Broad-gauge railroads with both terminal points outside of the State of Nevada, and then assesses the Central Pacific under this head. The classification suggested fell far short of the requirements of this Act. I will say here that I do not think the new classification has improved the old one. They had no jurisdiction to fix a valuation, only on classified property. [The following was quoted from a decision by Judge Beatty in the 10th Nevada Report:] "To determine the value of a railroad, then, the first inquiry is to its actual cost. If it appears that the actual cost was in excess of the necessary cost, the necessary cost is the proper standard. If the net earnings of the road do not amount to current rates of interest, and it is not likely to do so, or if the business of the road is likely to be destroyed or impaired by competition or other cause, or, in short, if the utility of the road is not equal to its cost, then its value is less than its cost. If the road does not pay current expenses, then it is worth no more than the value of the road. But if, on the contrary, its business is such as to yield a net income for an indefinite period, equal to interest at current rates on the necessary cost, then its cash value is equal to its necessary cost, less the damages to the material." Every decision rendered since that time has agreed with that decision. The cost will not exceed \$12,000 a mile, ballasted with heavy iron ties. Here is a gentleman who has been connected with the Central Pacific for years, who places it at a fraction less than that. We will say it cost \$12,000 or \$13,000 per mile. Thank you.

The Controller—The total valuation of property in Nevada for the year 1900 was \$24,286,757 22; for 1901, \$28,000,000. Taxes for 1900 paid into the State, \$238,260 94; for 1901, \$257,613 59; increase of \$19,352 65.

The Chairman—I wish to state that the revenue derived from the \$28,000,000 to the State at 80 cents fell 16,000 odd dollars short of what it had been before. In placing the raise on the valuation of the property, we have lowered the rate to such an extent that the State will be short on the valuation of the property \$16,000. That is in lowering the rate from \$1 to 80 cents. I do not know the difference in the several counties; I am merely speaking from the assessed valuation of property.

Mr. Ryan of the Central Pacific Company—You say the difference is \$19,000 in favor of 1901, increase to the State. We paid between ten and eleven thousand dollars of that increase on the Central Pacific line.

The Chairman—In increasing the assessed valuation of the property, as far as the State is concerned, if all the taxes on \$28,000,000 should be paid in, at the rate of 80 cents the State would gain nothing. I will

state that the County of Nye has paid a bullion tax on 200,000 odd dollars. Storey County has paid a bullion tax on \$50,000. Eureka, Lincoln, and Lyon Counties have also paid bullion taxes. Since the rate has been reduced from \$1 to 80 cents, the raise in the valuation does not make much of a raise to the State.

Mr. Ryan—I think you will concede that my statement is correct; that we paid between \$10,000 and \$11,000 in taxes out of the \$19,000 increase.

The Chairman—I will state that the Central Pacific Railroad is paying taxes on \$15,000 a mile all through the State. In one county they pay on \$20,000, and in that county where they pay on \$20,000 they pay less money than they did a year ago. In Washoe County they were assessed at \$13,500. I have taken those figures, and I know that on the \$15,000 raise to the railroad they have paid less on account of lowering the rate. I think it will be shown on the minutes of the Board of Revenue to be that way.

Motion to adjourn for thirty minutes.

Amendment to adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Motion and amendment both lost.

Motion by Mr. Hooper to place the valuation of the standard-gauge railroad with both terminals outside this State at \$16,000 per mile.

Mr. Holcomb moved to take a recess for five minutes.

Carried.

After Recess.

The Chairman—I want to state for the information of the Board that the rate at 80 cents will pay the running expenses of the State, but the State cannot be run for any less money, as we are running as close as we can. In Washoe and Lyon Counties they have reduced the rate of taxation. It is \$1.65 in Washoe County. Ormsby did not reduce its rate. I think Douglas did not reduce. I think there is plenty of money now to run the government for another year.

Mr. Kinney—I move that the question of the taxes of the Central Pacific Railroad be settled at \$16,000 per mile.

Mr. Holcomb moved to amend by making it \$15,000 per mile.

Seconded by Mr. Guthrie.

Amendment lost by the following vote:

Yeas—Churchill, Elko, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Washoe, and White Pine—7.

Nays—Douglas, Esmeralda, Lincoln, Lyon, Nye, Ormsby, and Storey—7.

Mr. Ingalls—It seems to me that we ought to be able to settle this matter. It is only a difference of a thousand dollars. Since the rate has been lowered I think it will not be impossible to place it at \$16,000 per mile.

The Chairman—I hope we can settle it without a lawsuit. Mr. Ryan says we are going to have a lawsuit.

Mr. Ryan—It is not I who have control of the lawsuits. It is I who know the facts and report them. Now, the head of the law department would often litigate where I would not, and that is all I have to say.

Mr. Quirk moved to adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Motion carried.

Adjourned.

THIRD DAY.

CARSON CITY, NEVADA, January 15, 1902.

Board called to order at 10 a. m.

The Chairman—There was considerable discussion yesterday about the valuation and the receipts of the railroad. We have now the report of the Controller and can give you the figures for this year and compare them with the revenue for last year, if you desire to hear it. If any of the Assessors will take their reports, they can see for themselves. We can give you all the information you want in the matter of State taxes and county revenue.

By request, the Chairman and the State Controller then compared the figures for the two years, showing that the amount of revenue had been increased in some of the counties, while others had lost under the raised valuation and the lowered rate. The figures for each separate county were read, with the county taxes, State taxes, and the total for the two years.

The Chairman then announced the order of business: The valuation of standard-gauge railroads with both terminals outside this State.

A motion was made by Mr. Kinney of Ormsby yesterday that the valuation be placed at \$16,000 per mile.

Mr. Holcomb moved an amendment, that it be placed at \$15,000.

Amendment lost by a tie vote.

Vote upon the original motion of \$16,000 per mile. Lost by the following vote:

Yeas — Douglas, Esmeralda, Lincoln, Lyon, Nye, Ormsby, and Storey—7.

Nays—Churchill, Elko, Esmeralda, Humboldt, Lander, Washoe, and White Pine—7.

Upon motion of Mr. Ingalls, a recess of twenty minutes was taken.

After Recess.

Board called to order.

Mr. Randall—We do not seem to agree very well on this proposition,

and I now move to rescind all action taken yesterday and leave everything to the discretion of the Assessors throughout the State.

Seconded by Kinney, Dolf and Quirk.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas—Churchill, Esmeralda, Humboldt, Lander, Lincoln, Lyon, Nye, Ormsby, and Storey—9.

Nays—Douglas, Elko, Eureka, Washoe, and White Pine—5.

Mr. Quirk of Storey—We have been here for three days and have done nothing, so I move we adjourn and go home.

Mr. Holcomb—I move to amend, and come back and take up everything over again.

Mr. Randall—I think we cannot make an amendment to a motion to adjourn.

The Chairman—A motion to adjourn is not debatable.

Motion put, and carried by the following vote:

Yeas—Churchill, Esmeralda, Humboldt, Lander, Lincoln, Lyon, Nye, Ormsby, and Storey—9.

Nays—Douglas, Elko, Eureka, Washoe, and White Pine—5.

Mr. Hooper—When are we to meet again? I would like to come back to-morrow morning and begin over.

The Chairman—We will meet again next January, under this law.

Adjourned.

REINHOLD SADLER,

Governor of Nevada and Chairman of the State Board of Assessors.

CARSON CITY, January 15, 1902.