

From TimesDate 12-7-25**Folly Rebuked.**

Texans with any pride left in their state's dignity and self-governing efficiency will enthusiastically welcome Attorney General Dan Moody's ruling that supporting an impeachment session of the legislature by a private fund would be "against public policy."

How seriously "against public policy" this ruling itself helps to prove. For, after the attorney general rules that such a session is illegal, it is fair to assume that if the session is held on a private contribution basis regardless, the attorney general will be called on to test the validity of any impeachments it may secure.

Thus, in addition to the disgrace of this peculiar financial arrangement, Texas might present to the world for weeks, or months of extended court argument, the absurd spectacle of a state which had gone through the forms of impeaching its governor without being sure that it could make the impeachment stick.

Merely on the legal side, the disorders which the privately supported impeachment session is capable of causing, might be fittingly compared with the political pandemonium which reigned in various southern states when rival factions clashed over the possession of the legal government during the reconstruction period.

By accepting the attorney general's ruling as valid, and rejecting the loans, or gifts, of private individuals to their impeachment cause, the legislature, if it must impeach in spite of common sense and the evidence, can at least do the job in a clean-cut fashion that will last, instead of merely leaving a political mess around to plague us until a year from next January.

But Mr. Moody is right in declaring the private contribution method against public policy on other grounds as well. Former Governor Ferguson himself has scarcely over-stated the case in declaring that "the members of the legislature who responded to such a call would sit as jurors in a criminal proceeding, and if they permitted anybody to give them a nickel for their services they would be just like any other bribed juror in a criminal case."

This would be essentially true, were the proposed impeachment of the governor an extreme public necessity instead of a mere political opportunity, and if the underwriters of the impeachment fund were stimulated to make their contributions by the loftiest motives of patriotism and public duty. For it would be hard to imagine a governor so corrupt or so dangerous to the state that it would not be safer to keep him in office than to establish the precedent that anybody but the properly qualified officials of the state treasury can pay an impeachment session's way.

Such logic may be painful to the impeachment brigade, and it is possible that Mr. Moody's ruling may defeat the plans for holding the session. But if this is what happens, it will be a pretty good sign that the motives for impeaching Governor Ferguson were never worth much sacrifice anyway.