

and after having previously declared she would not.

The only difference in the two situations is that the county judge of LaSalle County is credited with having contributed \$25 to the Ferguson fund, and that affidavits from Marshall Hicks of San Antonio, from Lee Satterwhite of Amarillo, and A. B. Martin of Plainview show that Martin and Hicks were the real contributors and not Satterwhite and Bobbitt. Whether the LaSalle County Judge really contributed the \$25 or whether the contribution was erroneously credited to him, it is now up to Mrs. Ferguson to explain.

But after all it is good for a laugh these hot summer days to find that after such charges against Mr. Moody and such strenuous efforts to bar his name from the ballot that Mrs. Ferguson's own expense account shows her guilty of the same thing she charged against him. Were the charges against Mr. Moody true, which has been proven not to be the case by affidavits of men in position to know the facts, there would be no difference between the candidates on this issue.

The same report from Austin shows that if those in charge of Moody's campaign were unaware of the provision of the election law prohibiting a candidate for one office contributing to the campaign fund of a candidate for another office, there are other lawyers in Texas and other politicians equally unaware of it. The report shows that Barry Miller of Dallas, Lieutenant Governor and candidate for re-election without opposition, gave \$500 to the campaign fund of his friend John Davis, candidate for the State Senate from Dallas county. Both Mr. Miller and Mr. Davis are lawyers of recognized ability. One has served in the legislature and been Lieutenant Governor. The other was chairman of the important Finance Committee of the Senate at the last Legislature. Neither of these gentlemen, apparently, was a-

ware of any such provision. And the fact that there was no effort on their part to conceal the contribution, but that it was listed and sworn to, is as much evidence of their ignorance of this provision of the law as it is conclusive proof that there was no intent at violation.

That precisely is the situation with regard to Mr. Moody. Even had the \$250 contributions been made by Mr. Satterwhite and Mr. Bobbitt, the fact that they were listed, credited to them and sworn to by Mr. Moody should be clear enough evidence that there was not the slightest intent to violate the law, but a scrupulous endeavor to comply with its provisions. That is why the latest action of the Fergusons will meet with derision from Texas voters. That is why they will have not the slightest sympathy with such charges and the reason why if court action is brought it will re-act against the Fergusons rather than in their favor.

The voters of Texas have shown they want Mr. Moody as their Governor. They expressed their will in unmistakable terms in the primary of July 24 by giving him the largest vote ever accorded a candidate in a primary in which more than two were entered. They don't propose to sit idly by and see their will as expressed at the ballot box set aside by resort to flimsy charges, court technicalities, injunction and mandamus suits. And especially not when such things are resorted to on no more basis than has been shown to exist in this case and for no other purpose than to enable the Fergusons to continue in office until the expiration of their term.

But if the Fergusons want an answer they will get it on August 28 and the answer will be the biggest vote for Dan Moody that has ever been given any candidate in the history of Texas and the most stinging rebuke of the many that have been administered to the Fergusons and Fergusonism since the days this issue came to plague Texas.—The Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

Texas Press Clipping Bureau
DALLAS

From Moody

Date 8-13-24

IT'S TO LAUGH

The bomb touched off by the Ferguson forces to discredit Attorney General Moody and bar his name from the ballot as a candidate for Governor has proved a "dud" and now comes the report from Austin that Mrs. Ferguson's own sworn expense account shows that a county judge in LaSalle County, who was renominated in the July 24 primary, contributed to her own campaign fund. That was the basis of her charge against Mr. Moody of violating the election law and on which she sought to bar his name. The fact that his sworn statement showed contributions of \$250 each from Lee Satterwhite and R. L. Bobbitt, both candidates for re-election as members of the Legislature, started all the hue and cry from the Ferguson forces and provided a pretext, slim though it may be, for Mrs. Ferguson to re-enter the runoff campaign after having been ignominiously defeated