

What It Reveals

The decision of Attorney-General Gray Mashburn in the Boulder dam revenue case and the prompt action of State Controller Dan Franks in sending on Clark county's \$60,000, should convince the people of Nevada that their state government functions in accordance with the statutes, free and independent of any pressure group.

A very definite effort was evident to make up the minds of Mashburn and Franks for them, to put them in a spot where they dared not go contrary to the pressure, to make them feel there was an overwhelming sentiment against following the law.

They were told what the law was, told what their opinions should be, told what course to follow, with predictions of dire results if they failed to do what they were told.

Clark county was smeared, accused of threatening political reprisals and all sorts of things—all of which were manufactured out of whole cloth.

It was predicted here from the start that when the attorney-general's opinion was forthcoming it would be based on the law. It was also predicted that the state treasurer would follow that opinion. We expressed confidence in the integrity and judgment of both officials, and stated that Clark county would abide by their decision whatever it was, because the people in this area knew they'd do the right thing.

The attorney-general decried the "misinformation circulated" and the "suppression or lack of information with reference to the reason motivating congress for allocating to each of the states of Nevada and Arizona \$300,000 annually for the next fifty years to compensate them and their taxing political subdivisions" for taxes lost.

The attorney-general held that in view of the fact that this \$300,000 was "simply tax money" and that Clark county "should have a reasonable portion thereof for taxes lost to the county." He held also that the 1941 statute making that allocation to this county, is valid.

It took a great deal of moral courage for the attorney-general to take the stand he has for years, upholding Clark county's right in this field when political expediency SEEMED to point the other way. It took a great deal of moral courage to render the opinion he did in the face of the intense campaign carried on in the other direction.

But Gray Mashburn has that kind of courage, and has exemplified it on many occasions to the confusion of those who have mistaken him for an ordinary politician.

There can be no criticism of Franks for delaying the matter awaiting the ruling of his legal advisor. And it should be noted that the treasurer had no other inclination from the beginning, than to dispose of the money as directed by the 1941 statute. Had he made an unlawful distribution, he himself would have been responsible.

The fact that no one saw fit to challenge the attorney-general's opinion to the extent of taking the matter to court through an injunction stopping the treasurer from sending the \$60,000 to Clark county, indicates those who were making the most noise know they haven't a legal leg to stand on, and their inaction only serves to strengthen Mashburn's position many fold.

If they were sincere in their desire to protect the taxpayers—if they were sincere in the interpretation of the law in which they professed to believe—they would have carried the case to court.

The whole controversy has been extremely worthwhile, however, for it has disclosed, as nothing else could, the intellectual and moral integrity of the two state officials involved, and this is something every sincere citizen will remember, come election time.