

From *W. H. Hill*Date *12-18-25*

## IT'S "JIM FERGUSON" NOW.

Jim Ferguson is reported to be trying to divest himself of the title of "Governor" by which he has been popularly referred to ever since he first held that office. He is reported to be particular on this point now, even a bit touchy; and in phone conversations from the executive offices it is now "Jim Ferguson speaking," where before it was "Governor Ferguson."

In other words, Mr. Ferguson is trying to make it plain now that his wife is the governor of Texas in fact as well as in name and that he is merely "the wood and water carrier" he promised to be in the hot July and August days when he was campaigning the state for her election. Drawing this fine distinction is an effort to counteract the charges that have been made that he, and not his wife, is the real governor.

We can see little importance to the statement. If his wife has been governor only in name and he has performed all of the duties for her as has been charged, it is nothing more than was to have been expected. Mrs. Ferguson made it plain in her campaign that she knew nothing of the duties of governor; that she was not versed in statecraft and that in such matters she naturally would rely upon and be guided by her husband's advice. Former United States Senator Bailey, an enthusiastic supporter of Mrs. Ferguson, was even more frank than the lady candidate herself. Challenged as to why he, an ardent opponent of woman suffrage, was supporting a woman candidate, Senator Bailey replied that he was not. He stated then that if he thought Mrs. Ferguson would be governor in fact, he would not be campaigning for her. Jim Ferguson, he said, would be the real governor and everybody ought to know it. And in our opinion, most everythinking person in Texas did know it. Only those outside the state harbored the delusion that Mrs. Ferguson would be governor in fact.

But the question of whether Mrs. Ferguson has been governor in name only or whether Jim Ferguson has been the real governor—as has been charged and everybody expected him to be—is not the cause of the opposition to the Ferguson administration at this time. It's not a question of who has been governor; it's a question of what has been done; what has happened. It's not a question of personalities, but a question of official conduct in the branches of her administration.

It's a question of whether the state's highway fund has been handled with the same reckless disregard of business principles and commonsense in every case as it was shown to have been handled in the case of the American Road company.

It's a question of whether road contracts were awarded on a basis of personal or political friendship or on the merit of the bids.

It's a question of whether the state highways have been maintained properly and at a reasonable expense to the state and a fair profit to the contractors, or whether these transactions, too, have been characterized in degree by the waste shown in the others that have been aired in court.

In short, it's a question of what have the taxpayers of Texas to show for the approximately \$17,000,000 turned over this year to the highway commission for spending?

These are facts the public wants and facts the public is clearly entitled to have. And the refusal of the Ferguson administration to give the public these facts, through a thorough and complete investigation, is the cause of the opposition it is now facing, rather than any fancied and sudden discovery upon the part of Texas that Jim Ferguson is the real governor.

But, then, it should be recalled that the Ferguson administration resisted the suit of the attorney general against the American Road company from the outset, even to the extent of employing attorneys to fight a suit which aimed to and did recover \$600,000 for the state.—Fort Worth Star-Telegram.