

May 9, 1922

Hon. Ray L. Riley,  
State Comptroller,  
Sacramento, California.

My dear Mr. Riley:

At the suggestion of Mr. Werner, and because I could not locate you personally, I wrote a letter pertaining to a compromised settlement of the Morse Construction Company note, which the Murray Estate owns, on which we have agreed to compromise on \$3,000, providing it is satisfactory to you. Has this matter ever come to your attention?

In reality the \$3,000 is not a fair settlement. If we had been paid the interest in our account, we would owe the Murray Estate nothing, but it is a compromised settlement in any event, and I want to see the obligation of the Morse Construction Company wiped out, altho I am only a half owner in same.

Can you let me know what your attitude will be in the matter at your convenience?

Also I would appreciate it if you would drop me a line when your department has made its final valuation of the James A. Murray estate holdings in San Diego County.

Whenever you are headed for San Diego, just wire me and I will be ready to play off that match with you, 18 holes - for money, marbles or chalk. Or, shall it be trout out of Cuyamaca Lake?

Very sincerely yours,

RF:KLM

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Inheritance Tax Department  
STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA  
May 16, 1922

Mr. Ed Fletcher,  
c/o Cuyamaca Water Company,  
916 Eighth Street,  
San Diego, California.

My dear Sir:-

Re: James A. Murray, deceased

We are in receipt of your inquiry of the 9th inst., relative to the above noted matter. The slight delay in reply has been due to the fact that the writer had expected a call from Mr. James L. Atteridge, late of this Department, who is personally looking after this estate. However, Mr. Atteridge's plans have been somewhat altered; therefore, we are taking this opportunity of addressing you. We are also at this time writing to Mr. Atteridge, that you may be supplied with information concerning the appraised value of the San Diego estate direct by him.

You may know that the Inheritance Tax Department is not interested in any compromise made between a debtor and an estate. The executor can adjust and compromise any claim against an estate, limited only by the Court. However, it is true that for the purpose of computing the amount due the State of California for Inheritance Tax, we are not bound to recognize a compromise. This point was settled as early as the

Estate of Rossi  
169 Cal. 148

The matter of Inheritance Tax, however, is not a pertinent issue between the estate and its creditors.

I will suggest to Mr. Atteridge that he submit this matter of suggested compromise to the Appraiser, in order that we may be advised as to whether this compromise would be accepted as an appraised value of the estate by our Inheritance Tax Appraiser.

Very truly yours,  
RAY L. RILEY, Controller  
By Ralph W. Smith

f  
Inheritance Tax  
Attorney

RWS:F

original to Werner



June 23, 1922

Mr. Ray L. Riley,  
State Comptroller,  
Sacramento, Calif.

Friend Riley:

I have had a conference Leroy Holt, Mayor Fawcett, Ray Edgar and four or five other business men and directors of the Imperial Irrigation District. Part of them came to Descanso the other day and I met them there for a conference.

They are going to line up the whole valley strong for Governor Stephens, but they are scared to death over the program of the Brawley people to form a district and build a road from Holtville to Brawley, with the result that they want a conference with Governor Stephens in Los Angeles, and I have arranged for it today - sometime between the 5th and 13th of July.

Ray Edgar spoke particularly of having you down on that day when we come to Los Angeles. I am bringing a San Diego delegation also. It is important that we line this situation up right. What day would it be convenient can you be in Los Angeles? Any day from the 5th of July to the 13th. On receipt of this kindly wire me.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

EF:KLM

OFFICE OF STATE CONTROLLER

PLACE: Sacramento  
DATE: Dec. 12, 1952

TO: Mr. Kuchel

FROM: Floyd Clouse

RE: Senator Fletcher's Inquiry

Senator Ed Fletcher has requested certain information as to the amount paid by California to the Federal Government for highway purposes during the last five years.

California's State Government does not pay directly any money to the Federal Government for highway expenditures. I am wondering, therefore, if the Senator means the collections in California by the Federal Government of the 1½-cent excise tax on gasoline? If so, the collections in California from this source for the last five years for which information is currently available are shown in the following schedule:

<u>Fiscal Year Ended June 30:</u>	<u>Total Receipts</u>
1947	\$ 47,233,674.57
1948	59,116,399.49
1949	56,949,038.16
1950	51,514,413.92
1951	54,680,417.56

(Source: Table 1 of Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, for fiscal years indicated.)

(Note: All above reports received by State Library in February or March following end of fiscal year reported.)

FC/mvs

9X



**Ed Fletcher Papers**

**1870-1955**

**MSS.81**

**Box: 4 Folder: 2**

**General Correspondence - California State. Controller**



**Copyright:** UC Regents

**Use:** This work is available from the UC San Diego Libraries. This digital copy of the work is intended to support research, teaching, and private study.

**Constraints:** This work is protected by the U.S. Copyright Law (Title 17, U.S.C.). Use of this work beyond that allowed by "fair use" requires written permission of the UC Regents. Permission may be obtained from the UC San Diego Libraries department having custody of the work (<http://libraries.ucsd.edu/collections/mscl/>). Responsibility for obtaining permissions and any use and distribution of this work rests exclusively with the user and not the UC San Diego Libraries.