

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION
NUMBER

Interview with
Oscar Mauzy
July 12, 1973

Place of Interview: Dallas, Texas

Interviewer: Dr. Marcello

Terms of Use: May be released upon my
death, ~~or prior thereto~~ only
with my specific written permission
Approved: *Oscar Mauzy*

Date: *Sept 1, 1973*

Oral History Collection

Senator Oscar Mauzy

Interviewer: Dr. Ronald E. Marcello

Place of Interview: Dallas, Texas

Date: July 12, 1973

Dr. Marcello: This is Ron Marcello interviewing Senator Oscar Mauzy for the North Texas State University Oral History Collection. The interview is taking place on July 12, 1973, in Dallas, Texas. I'm interviewing Senator Mauzy in order to get his reminiscences and experiences and impressions while he was a member of the Sixty-third Texas Legislature. Senator Mauzy, I think to begin this interview I want to ask you a couple of general questions concerning the Legislature before we actually get into any of the specifics of the session. One of the first things I'd like to ask you is do you feel that this Senate was perhaps a little bit more conservative than some of the past ones that you've served in?

Senator
Mauzy:

Oh, there's no question about that. This is by far and away the most conservative, right-wing, reactionary, unimaginative--whatever word you want to use--non-twentieth century Senate that I've served in. This is

my fourth session as you know. And yet having said that, this was also the most productive session that I've ever served in, which on the surface seems like an anomaly.

Marcello: How do you explain the fact that the Senate was more conservative this time?

Mauzy: Oh, as usual the people who traditionally make up the liberal coalition in Texas went to sleep at the switch. Labor has been going through a terrible ordeal and crisis within itself. I hope that'll be resolved the day after tomorrow--Mr. Evans is president of the AFL-CIO, and maybe they'll get on the track again. Labor didn't provide the kind of financial support or other help for the candidates who were running that they should have. Secondly, we lost an awful lot of our good members who sought higher office to Congress. We lost Jordan and Wilson who were successful. We lost McKool who was unsuccessful. Joe Bernal down in San Antonio just had a death-wish and got himself beat, and there's no excuse for it. I never thought Ronald Bridges was all that great, but that district should have elected a liberal, and they elected the most

right-wing son-of-a-bitch I've ever known--McKinnon. Basically, it's because both the candidates . . . the incumbents went to sleep or else sought higher office and because the so-called liberal coalition didn't function properly.

Marcello: What also was interesting to me was one account that I read which stated that the urban senators outnumbered the rural senators by about twenty to eleven, and yet you point out that the Legislature was more conservative than in the past. Is this mainly because a lot of those rural districts stretched into, let's say, urban areas and this sort of thing? Usually you think that if you have a majority of urban senators, they tend to be more liberal than rural senators.

Mauzy: I don't think that's a valid assumption in Texas. I never have. I think you've got to distinguish between urban issues and rural issues on the one hand and liberal issues and conservative issues on the other hand. A great deal of the conservative strength in Texas is in the urban areas. You've got a Republican senator from Fort Worth for the first time and there was a reason for that. Of course, we've always had

one here from Dallas. We've got one from Houston, which is not unexpected. Truthfully, I thought the Republicans were going to elect five or six members of the Senate. We Democrats did better than I thought. But you've also got some conservative Democrats in the cities. There's one other thing that I also should mention as a reason why some of the people got beat the last time that shouldn't have, and, of course, the Sharpstown scandal hurt all of the incumbents. Hell, I had a Nazi and a redneck black running against me that last time, neither one of whom could spell Senate. Not that I'm the greatest candidate in the world, but those guys between them got 31 per cent of the votes. I know damn well that at least 10 per cent of that was because I was an incumbent.

Marcello: In other words, it was a bad year for incumbents all the way around, whether or not one was connected with that Sharpstown business, quite obviously.

Mauzy: Yes. Well, in the public's eye if you were a member, you were connected.

Marcello: As a result, of course, there were about fifteen new members of the Senate. How did the presence of those fifteen new members affect Senate business?

Mauzy: Well, early we ran a lot of stuff past them that they didn't know what we were doing--as any rookie. They were like most rookie classes. There were ten rookies in my class, and the oldtimers ran some stuff by us that first thirty days before we got our feet on the ground, too. But basically, it's really not an outstanding class of rookies, I'll say that. There are three or four that I think have potentiality and talent. But by and large, it's a very mediocre group.

Marcello: Why do you say that?

Mauzy: Just because it's true (chuckle). I think Senator Santiesteban from El Paso came along very well, and frankly, I came away from the session with a lot higher regard for him than I had going in. Clower from Dallas here was outstanding as far as I'm concerned. Gammage from Houston was outstanding. I think Braecklein from Dallas here did a good job. He did what I thought he would do, but I've known Bill for a long time. Nelson Wolff from San Antonio was better than average.

Marcello: When you say these people were outstanding, do you mean from the standpoint that they did their homework,

they learned the rules, they were responsible--things of this nature?

Mauzy: What I consider a good member to be is first of all a guy that does his homework, secondly, that understands the procedure by which you're operating, and thirdly, can be counted on in the gut stuff when it's tough. Of course, I like to know how they're going to vote, too.

Marcello: You mean when it comes down to one of those sixteen-fifteen votes or something like that, you want to know what those guys are going to do.

Mauzy: Or if you're going to bust somebody like we did Mr. Kirkpatrick, I want to know that I've got eleven or twelve to bust him.

Marcello: Okay, also some of these new members actually had had prior legislative experience in the House, and I'm sure that may have helped a little bit, even though the Senate and House rules are different.

Mauzy: I've always thought that service in the House is a hindrance to service in the Senate. I'm really very serious about that for this reason. There's a psychology that develops among House members that I've noticed. They think that you've got to kiss

the ass of every committee chairman to get a bill out, that you've got to kiss the speaker's ass, the presiding officer's ass. That kind of business is totally foreign to me, and it ought to be foreign to the Senate. To my knowledge, there's not a single committee chairman over there except one, in the Senate, who tries to hold you in ransom to let your bill get heard in his committee or get it out. None of the rest of us do it. When they come over from the House with that kind of attitude, of course, you can take advantage of it, and I did. If they come assuming they've got to do me a favor in order to get me to set their bill, I didn't tell them that. I'll sure accept their favors.

Marcello: How did you find working with Bill Hobby during this session, let's say, as compared to having worked with Ben Barnes in the past?

Mauzy: Well, Hobby and I first of all, I think, have a good personal relationship.

Marcello: It didn't start out that way though, did it really?

Mauzy: Yes, it did. There was nothing personal about that fight that we had about the rules. He knew before he ever ran for lieutenant governor how I felt about the

rules because I told him. He sat right in my law office before he ever announced. He and I have a difference of opinion about that. He got out and hustled some votes and beat me. He didn't have to hustle many; they were there already. But Hobby came along very well, I thought. I think Hobby's his own worst enemy in one respect, however, and that's his public image. He's not nearly the bad guy that he allowed the press to paint him. He allowed "P. D. Deuce," Price Daniel, Jr., to out-maneuver him so damned often. Some of us were trying to counsel him. He chose to follow the counsel of the oldtimers over there--Herring, Moore, Aikin--and that's a self-destruct path as far as I'm concerned.

Marcello: Are these the people that seem to have been perhaps closest to him during the session--the people that you've just mentioned?

Mauzy: Well, he had a cabal going of basically five--Moore, Aikin, Herring, Schwartz, and . . . who was the other one?

Marcello: Hightower?

Mauzy: No, Hightower was not really that close. Hightower's not that kind of an operator. I can't remember. But from time to time Ike Harris was in on it, too.

Marcello: How do you explain this particular group of senators gathering around Hobby?

Mauzy: They seek power.

Marcello: Care to explain that any further?

Mauzy: No, it's just that and there's nothing wrong with people seeking power. I do, too. I use power in the sense that John Kennedy used it--the ability to effectuate change in excess of your numbers.

Marcello: Let's talk about one of the first issues that came up even before that session started, and we've alluded to it briefly here, and this was the . . . I don't know if we can call it a fight or a struggle or what have you, concerning the appointment of committee chairmen and appointment to the various committees. Now let's go back just a little bit. During one of the past special sessions last summer, the Senate made some rules changes so far as committee assignments were concerned, based, I think, primarily on seniority and this sort of thing.

Mauzy: Yes, we adopted a limited seniority system in the fourth called session in September.

Marcello: And in essence now, with the new session Hobby wanted to change all that, isn't that correct?

Mauzy: And did.

Marcello: And did. Why did Hobby want to change?

Mauzy: Well, like all lieutenant governors, he wants to control the Senate. He wants to be in a position to say to people who are interested in legislation, "I can pass your bill for you, or I can kill that bill you're against." In order to do that, he felt, as all lieutenant governors in the past have, that he had to, first of all have the power to appoint all committees, secondly, to refer all bills, and thirdly, to influence the chair in that committee as to when bills would be heard, and what kind of reception they'd get. It's really the fundamental fight that I've been carrying on for four sessions now. I just don't believe, under the constitution, that if you're going to have separate and co-equal branches of government you can permit that. I think the Senate's a bunch of fools for permitting it.

I told Hobby before the session started, and he and I've talked about this many times, and it's a fundamental thing with us, and it's nothing personal as to him or me, but I've told him before the session started, one reason that Barnes got beat for governor

was he had that public image of running the Senate. It was less true in Barnes' case than it had ever been, by the way. But as far as the public was concerned, whatever passed the Senate was because Barnes wanted it, and whatever didn't pass the Senate was because Barnes was against it. And having had that image, when the Sharpstown bill passed and when all the scandal hit, then it was Ben Barnes who was responsible, not the members of the Senate. I said, "Bill, take my word for it. There's going to be at least one bad bill passed during this session. That's inevitable. And you're going to be the fellow who's going to get hurt by it. Conversely, if there's something good that doesn't pass, because of this damn two-thirds rule business, you're going to be the fellow that's going to get blamed for it. I'm not." It came home to roost. Hobby was for the unitization bill, and a majority of the Senate was for it. The vote was seventeen to suspend, thirteen not to suspend, and one present and not voting. That's the only issue Hobby really got involved in and worked the floor trying to pass. And it didn't work out because of his set of rules. Now if he had adopted the rules

I proposed--to work from a calendar, and it'll take a simply majority to pass a bill--we would have passed the unitization bill. It sounds like I'm patting myself on the back and claiming to be a prophet, but this kind of thing is inevitable under those set of rules.

Marcello: Now very shortly after he decided to rescind the Senate seniority rules and this sort of thing, he called a meeting of the senators, did he not, at El Campo?

Mauzy: No, that was before the session.

Marcello: Oh, yes, right. Yes, that was before the session. Did you attend that meeting?

Mauzy: Yes, I did.

Marcello: What went on there?

Mauzy: Well, it was actually about a three-day, two-night deer hunt on a ranch just outside of Wharton. By the way, that ranch sits right in the middle of Providence City Independent School District which has a scholastic enrollment of three and a tax base of \$30,000,000. It's a very famous school district. I've forgotten the name of the family that owns all that down there, but Bill Jenkins, who's one of Hobby's assistants, is

married to the daughter of this family. But it was primarily a deer-shooting contest, hunting, drinking whiskey, and playing poker--the kind of things that most lieutenant governors do. That was not the purpose of it. I'm the one that raised that issue and insisted that we talk about it down there. Everybody got good and drunk and let their hair down, and everybody knew where everybody else was at and how they were going to vote. I knew he was going to win the vote, but I think it's important that these kind of fights be made and that people be made to vote on them.

Marcello: How was it that he was able to muster the votes that he needed to get his particular set of rules passed?

Mauzy: Well, first of all, a majority agrees with him.

Marcello: Well, yes, I know that. But how did he get the majority?

Mauzy: Well, they've grown up under that system of the old rules where they toady to the Chair, and the Chair pets them on the head and says nice things about them and theoretically helps them get re-elected and theoretically helps them with their legislative program. The truth of the matter is that about, oh, at least ten people

in that Senate are what I call "Chair people." They vote with the chair on whatever the Chair says. If he says vote present, they vote present. If he says vote yesterday, they vote yesterday. And it's always been that way. It's no new phenomenon. Some people just like to get along with the Chair rather than represent their own point of view or their constituency. I don't understand that thinking, but it's damn sure there.

Marcello: How about these fifteen new members? Would the lieutenant governor have had a certain amount of influence over them, also?

Mauzy: Well, of course, that's the next group he picked up. Sure, he picked up a bunch of the freshmen. A bunch of them didn't know anything about the rules, didn't understand them at all. I've had several of them since then, now that they begin to understand the rules, tell me they're going to change their mind, but I'm going to have to see that record vote before I believe it, frankly.

Marcello: Well, you sponsored one amendment, did you not, to have the committee members chosen by a caucus of the political party?

Mauzy: Yes.

Marcello: And, of course, I think that was defeated. Here was one of those issues where you and Schwartz were on opposite sides, were you not?

Mauzy: Oh, Schwartz was against me on all my rules changes this time. He's always been for them in the past, except one. I'm not being unfair when I say that. Babe believes very strongly in the filibuster. I happen to not believe in it. That's the one thing that in the past we've not agreed about. But this year Schwartz, for reasons best known to him, decided he wanted to be a "Chair person" also. He carried the wood and water for Hobby--whipped up on me pretty bad.

Marcello: I noticed in my research throughout the session that you and Schwartz seemed to be on opposite sides quite a few times. I noticed also that in the selection of the members of the Finance Committee that there were no members from Dallas, or the Dallas area, on that committee. How come?

Mauzy: Nobody from Dallas.

Marcello: Yes.

Mauzy: I don't know. There again, that's what a lieutenant governor gets himself into with his power of appointment,

see. Now, frankly, I don't give a damn whether anybody from Dallas was on. I wouldn't want to serve on a Finance Committee. Truthfully, I have never had any desire to. But Braecklein did, and Hobby ripped it from Braecklein because in a thirteen-man committee, out of the thirty-one man body, the county with 12 per cent of the population of the state and four of the thirty-one members ought to have at least one on there. It just really was bad judgment in my part for Hobby to do that.

Marcello: Well, on the other hand, I think there were at least three members from Houston on that committee.

Mauzy: I don't really remember, but they were taken better care of than we were if that kind of thing means . . . I truthfully don't really believe it means anything.

Marcello: How did the lieutenant governor go about selecting committee chairmen and committee members?

Mauzy: I don't know. All I can tell you is what he talked to me about. Of course, as I say, for over a year and a half Hobby and I've been having this argument back and forth about how you select them. We agreed before the session started that we wouldn't get into the rules fight until after Hobby was sworn in and

took the Chair, which, as you know, is a week after we convene, and that then we'd just get out there and get it on. During that week's period when Barnes was still lieutenant governor, Hobby asked me to come down and see him a couple of times. He was really very amateurish in the manner which he went about it. He had told me at a cocktail party before the session started--I can't remember where it was. It was either here in Dallas or somewhere else that he wanted to appoint me chairman of Education again and kind of hinted that he'd like for me to ask him. I said, "Bill, you know you and I ain't ever going to get along with each other if we don't understand each other. Number one, I've never asked for a committee appointment in my life because I don't think the Chair ought to have that power, and I'm not going to change that now. That's number one. Number two, I'm not going to bargain with you about it. Number three, I'll serve wherever I'm appointed, and I'll do the best job I can. But I'm going to be Oscar Mauzy's senator and the Oak Cliff senator. I'm not going to be the Chair's senator, so let's don't have any bad feelings about that." Then in that week

period, he called me down and said, "I understand that you're going to be opposed to the confirmation of Shivers, Clark, and Byerly to the board of regents of the University of Texas." And I said, "Well, I don't know where you heard that because I haven't told anybody and truthfully haven't totally made up my mind, but that's a fair assessment of my position at this point. Why?" "Well, I was thinking I might appoint you chairman of Education." I said, "Well, here again, I'm not going to bargain with you. If I decide to vote against Allan Shivers and Ed Clark and Byerly, I'm going to vote against them. And I don't give a Goddamn whether anybody else does or not." He said, "But under these rules we're going to have, we're going to start referring confirmations to the committee that has jurisdiction over the subject matter, which would mean that these would have to be referred to Education, and if you're chairman, of course, you could kill them by sitting on them." I said, "Well, let's just go back now to the conversation we've had before. I don't believe in killing bills by not hearing them in committee. I refuse to do that. And the same thing's true of confirmations, if we

start acting on confirmations. So regardless of whether I'm for or against Allan Shivers, Ed Clark, or Dr. Byerly, if I'm chairman of Education, and if they get referred to us, they're going to be heard promptly, fully, publicly, openly, just like any bill is going to be." Well, he changed his mind, and didn't refer them to Education. He referred them to State Affairs. So evidently, he didn't really trust me. I'm sorry he didn't because if I've got one reputation, it's that my word is good. That kind of cut a little. I did vote against all three of them. I'm the only member that voted against all three of them. I knew I couldn't win. I knew they were going to be confirmed. But I don't believe in rewarding Republicans by Democrats giving them appointments like that. It's just that simple. I remember he told me at the time, he said . . . I told him that was one thing that was going through my mind, and he said, "Well, hell, under that definition, my mother couldn't get appointed to the board of regents." I said, "That's right. That's exactly right." I said, "That's right, see, it's nothing personal at all. That applies to everybody who supports Republicans. I don't believe

that us Democrats ought to give them a pat on the back or a nickel for their trouble." And I really don't. If that makes me a bad guy, then I'm a bad guy. But that's the way I think you ought to play this game.

Marcello: Well, like Jim Farley always said, "There's just as many good Democrats for an office as there are good Republicans, and vice versa."

Mauzy: Absolutely. Absolutely. I've forgotten what your question was. I was kind of wandering around here. I'm sorry.

Marcello: Well, we were just talking about how the lieutenant governor went about appointing committee chairmen, and, of course, you were using your own case as an example.

Mauzy: Well, now, of course, he's restricted to some extent in that we did retain the rule there are only nine committees, and those nine committees have a membership of ninety-three, and each member gets to serve on three committees. Therefore, he's somewhat restricted in that extent. What he told me was that there really wasn't a helluva lot of talent around to be appointed as chairmen of the committees anyway,

and that's true. The Senate of Texas isn't a body of geni by a long shot. Actually, the chairmanships that he named were really very good, I think, by and large. Max Sherman and Jim Wallace were really, I think, two outstanding men. But they were in their second term, and yet they were appointed committee chairmen, whereas Blanchard and Patman, who'd been there for ten years, weren't. And in both cases, I think he made the right decision. Sherman and Wallace are more able than either Blanchard or Patman in my judgment.

Marcello: Well, let's talk about some of the business that occurred during the legislative session. Most of what we've talked about actually occurred before the session up to this point. Let's get right into ethics legislation, since that occupied a great deal of the Senate's time as well as the time of the House. Let's talk first of all about the lobby control act or the lobby control bill. Now, of course, that came over from the House. I suppose that you could say that it was initiated by the House as one of Daniel's reform packages. And here again, without going into the details of the bill, which anybody can

read about, I think one of the major points of contention was that State Ethics Commission, was it not, when it got over into the Senate? Now the House bill provided for an Ethics Commission.

Mauzy: Yes, I favored the Ethics Commission for lobby registration. But losing the Ethics Commission was not the worst thing that we lost in the lobby bill in my opinion. The two things where the Senate really gutted that bill . . . and they did this on the individual amendments, voting me down when I sent them up. First, the law now does not require that the employer of a lobbyist to register and list how much money he's paying that lobbyist. Secondly, the lobbyist does not have to report by recipient as to who he spends his money on in the Legislature. He just says, "I spent so much money during this quarter" without saying, "I gave Oscar Mauzy \$5,000 for that vote" or something like that. And to me the final conference committee report on lobby registration was a pale image of what it started out to be and what it should be.

Marcello: Who were the ones that were mainly responsible for watering down the bill?

Mauzy: Charlie Herring, period.

Marcello: Any special reason why?

Mauzy: Sure, his law firm's been making their living for years lobbying. He's got about a twelve-man law firm, and about eight of them are registered lobbyists. One of his partners lobbies for the savings and loan associations. One lobbies for Safeway and the chain stores. Oh, hell, a bunch of people. Charlie's firm is one of the most influential lobbying outfits in Texas.

Marcello: Ike Harris also played a role in watering this down, did he not?

Mauzy: Sure. Oh, he's a whore for the lobby, too. They own him.

Marcello: Throughout this session, of course, in regard to a great deal of this ethics legislation is that this topic of the State Ethics Commission came up again and again and again. Now you mentioned awhile ago that you were in favor of the Ethics Commission, that you thought it was perhaps the best vehicle to enforce these . . .

Mauzy: For the lobby bill, not for the ethics bill. I was opposed to it . . .

Marcello: Yes, right, okay. Well, it was on . . . it came up

in several bills, however. Why did you like the idea of having a State Ethics Commission for this lobby control bill?

Mauzy: Because it strikes me as a good, effective enforcing mechanism. I don't think that same thing's true as far as ethics is concerned for this reason. Every proposal I saw to appoint an Ethics Commission had it appointed by politicians. Each one of them appoints two people--the governor, the lieutenant governor, the speaker, the attorney general, the chief justice of the Supreme Court, the presiding judge of the Court of Criminal Appeals. All those people run for office, and they all get elected. They're all politicians like I am. Now the history of Texas is that the attorney general and the lieutenant governor are maneuvering and elbowing to run for governor, against the incumbent. I'm not talking about the present officeholders. I'm talking about history. Now who are they going to appoint to that Ethics Commission and what instructions are they going to give them? I'll tell you what they're going to do: "You go in there and get all the goodies you can for me on the governor, and we'll embarrass that son-of-a-bitch,

and I'll beat his ass next year." Now that's just inevitable, I think. That's the first reason I'm opposed to it. I don't like the idea of politicians appointing their hatchetmen to go do their political dirty work for them. Boy, if Watergate hasn't proved anything else, it's proved that. Secondly, it just permits McCarthyism all over again to run rampant in our state, where people's reputations can be ruined, their characters assassinated by people who are not responsible to the public. They didn't get elected to the Ethics Commission; they got appointed. They owe their loyalty to one man--the man that appointed them. I just am unwilling to go back twenty years to McCarthyism. Now I understand honest, good, legitimate people whom I admire and respect disagree with me about that. I'm not suggesting that they believe in McCarthyism or anything like that. It's an honest difference of opinion.

Marcello: In other words, here with the lobby control act the State Ethics Commission would not be dealing with politicians--people who are running for office--and for that reason you think it would perhaps work a little bit better here than it would . . . much better here than it would, say, in the ethics bill.

Mauzy: Yes. And in the field of ethics, I've always felt that the real thing you're striving for is public disclosure. That's the key. Once you get public disclosure, there is a very good enforcement mechanism there. It's called the voters of Texas. When I have to file . . . and, of course, I always have filed my financial statement for the record, but next year when everybody has to file it, if somebody doesn't like what some guy's doing or where he's making his money, and if they think that that may have some connection with how come he votes a certain way, you can be assured somebody will run against that fellow, and they'll get out that record and that financial statement, and they'll point it out to the voters, and if there's any substance to it, the voters are going to unelect that fellow. I can tell you. So you've got a very good enforcement mechanism in the voters. Secondly, you've got a good enforcement mechanism as far as criminal activity is concerned through the grand jury system and the criminal courts of this state. I just don't think it's any necessity to create still another enforcement agency that, I don't think, would get the job done.

Marcello: Well, before we go on and talk about the ethics bill, there is just one other question with regard to that lobby control act. How active were the representatives of the various lobbies in working against this bill?

Mauzy: Oh, they were very active. They were working the floor, of course, the whole session. They were doing their thing like they're being paid to do and which they're expert in. They were there during the conference committee. Frankly, their strategy was to stall the conference committee along and not have a conference report that could be adopted by either the House or the Senate, and but for Bill Hobby, they would have succeeded, by the way. Hobby's the one that finally made those Goddamned Senate conferees sit down there and sign a report. And he ought to be given credit for it. Admittedly, it's not as good a bill as . . . it's not as good a bill as Hobby wanted either. Hobby happens to be pretty damn right on lobby registration. I guess when you're rich you can afford to be (chuckle).

Marcello: Let's talk next about the ethics bill over in the Senate. As I recall, one of the first things that Hobby did was he formed that Citizens' Conference on Ethics.

Mauzy: He had said during the campaign that if he were elected, he was going to do that--call a Citizens' Conference on Ethics to get the views of the people as to what ought to be done--and my only quarrel with him about that was his timing. He said that during the campaign. He should have appointed them and had that conference convened early in the session instead of waiting until the middle of March when he actually had it because it just left him wide open to the charge that this was a mechanism to stall ethics, and that's exactly, of course . . .

Marcello: I was going to ask you why he waited until March.

Mauzy: I don't know why. I think it was probably lack of organization in his staff. I don't think there was anything malicious or evil about it. I think it was just really poor planning and organization.

Marcello: Which brings up another interesting question, I think, with regard to Hobby. What sort of a staff did he assemble around him during this session?

Mauzy: The best staff I've ever seen. He had the best organized lieutenant governor's office I've ever seen. He had good people there, top-notch people. Everybody had their area of responsibility. Hobby has a good

sense of what it is to be an executive. He delegates authority. He holds people responsible. He hires good people. He's really got the best organized office I've ever seen with the exception of Lloyd Benson's office in Washington. Benson's got the best organized political office I've ever witnessed.

Marcello: Benson, I think, is surprising a lot of people.

Mauzy: I'm one of them--favorably.

Marcello: Right, right. Exactly. But getting back to Hobby again, who were some of these people that were working under him?

Mauzy: Well, his administrative assistant's a fellow named Steve Oakes, who's a lawyer in Houston. Steve's about, I guess, thirty-four, thirty-five, a very able lawyer, bright, hard-working, pretty liberal, very urban-oriented. Now the key to Hobby is Hobby is the first state-wide elected official who's urban oriented. Hobby's right about most all urban questions. There's no race animosity in his heart at all. He's right about pollution. He's right about education. He's right about the causes of crime in highly, densely populated areas. Then he had Dr. June Hyer, who's since gone now. She's a provost or vice chancellor of the University of Houston campus at Clear Lake, I

believe. He had a Dr. Delores Hunter working for him, who used to work up here at McKinney at the Job Corps center in charge of research. I'd never known her before. I knew Steve, and I knew June. But Delores Hunter is one of the brightest people I've ever seen. And in this connection it's interesting, I think, that she's the first black that has ever been hired in a major policy making role in any lieutenant governor's office that I've ever known about. Got a kid named Tom Hagen, who I think's got a lot on the ball. He kept Jason Pearlman, who had worked for Barnes and who I think is able. He kept Margaret Behrens, who was Barnes' secretary, whom I think is just a fine person. He just surrounded himself with damn good people, and he delegated to them. That's the key.

Marcello: And I gather from talking to other members of the Legislature that these people were very, very active on the floor, making sure that the senators knew what the lieutenant governor wanted, what he didn't want, and this sort of thing.

Mauzy: Not as much so as Barnes had done.

Marcello: Is that right?

Mauzy: No. Steve was the only one I ever saw working the floor, and each time it was . . . everybody understood.

And, of course, anytime you don't like it, you can just throw his ass off the floor because under the rules he ain't got no right to be there. Occasionally that happened, too. Nobody ever got mad at Steve because he's just the kind of fellow you don't get mad at. Peyton McKnight ran him off the floor because he was lobbying for the unitization, and Peyton was against it but . . . Hobby did less of that than I've ever seen, or at least with me. And from what the other members tell me, that's true also.

Marcello: Let's go on and talk a little bit about the ethics bill. Now in the Senate, what do you see as being the major points of contention in the ethics bill?

Mauzy: Well, there's some people in the Senate who don't believe in an ethics bill. There's about ten or twelve of them.

Marcello: The old saying that you can't legislate ethics and this sort of business?

Mauzy: Well, of course, that's true, and everybody knows that. That's a nonsensical thing to say. Certainly you cannot legislate morality. You cannot legislate ethics. But you can damn sure require people to report and require public disclosure, and then the

public will take care of legislating ethics. You had some other people who didn't want to do anything that would embarrass their colleagues. They didn't want the reporting to be as strict as I wanted it, for example.

Marcello: In other words, they didn't want the detailed public disclosure.

Mauzy: That's right. You see, one of the amendments that I sent up would have required everybody to file the first page of their federal income tax return. Well, I can see that there's a legitimate argument there. It is an invasion of privacy. There's no question about that. I conceded that at the outset. It's an invasion that I think the times require today if we're ever going to restore confidence in government, which is really what it all gets down to. When you're talking about an ethics bill, a lobby bill, any of these . . . the whole reform package is directed at one thing--restoring public confidence in state government. To me, it's a sacrifice I'm personally willing to make. I've done it voluntarily for seven years now. But I thought it should have been required this year. I got beat. Okay. The other main thing that I keep getting back to about ethics, though, is

public disclosure. I really thing we . . . that conference report on the ethics bill, House Bill 1, is about 85 per cent of what I would have gotten if I'd been allowed to write it myself. It's really a pretty good bill.

Marcello: Was it not true that your bill was virtually rewritten in the Jurisprudence Committee, was it not?

Mauzy: Well, what happened, the House sent over the bill. There were some constitutional questions about a couple of parts of it. Let me say right now that Hill did a great job as attorney general, keeping us advised on those things. It was then sent to subcommittee. In the subcommittee, I sent up a complete substitute. Ike Harris sent up his substitute, and I got beat four to one. The subcommittee was stacked against me. Charlie Herring appointed the subcommittee. That was no surprise to anybody. Then in the full committee, I tried again. This time I tried to substitute mine for Harris', because we were in juxtaposition at that point. I got beat nine to . . . no, eight to five, as I remember, but I'm not . . . the record's there. Then on the floor I did not send up a complete substitute because I

wanted to make those sons-of-bitches vote on every one of those issues, one at a time. And, of course, the vote was different, which proved that I was right in doing it that way. As I recall, there were two tie votes that I lost on that Hobby voted against me. It was the dumbest thing I've ever seen. He didn't have to do anything. But now he's got a voting record that he's going to have a little trouble explaining to some people next year. But the deal was stacked and the votes were against me and I knew it. But my whole purpose was to get it out there, and first of all make all thirty-one members vote on the record on each individual item. Secondly, to get it to conference as soon as possible. And thirdly, frankly, just to get the media to do our work for us and to zero in on that conference committee and make those sons-of-bitches do something. The House conferees cooperated beautifully. The press cooperated beautifully. And the Senate, the dumb asses, cooperated beautifully, too, by not showing up and making themselves look like just what they were.

Marcello: In fact, as I recall, you were the only one that showed up for a couple of those meetings. I think

you and the House members finally had to go round them up or find them or go to them or something of that nature.

Mauzy: That's correct. Yes, we programmed all that for maximum public exposure because it was necessary, truthfully. We never would have gotten a conference report if we hadn't done that.

Marcello: What was going on? Sooner or later they were going to have to meet with you, were they not?

Mauzy: No, they weren't. Their plan was not to. That's the way people play the game down there.

Marcello: That's unreal and I don't understand it.

Mauzy: Well, they've been getting away with it for years. What they didn't realize was that times have changed, and you couldn't get away with that kind of thing anymore. And the heat just got too damn hot on that one.

Marcello: What would be the advantage? As long as they could avoid you, of course, you couldn't arrive at any compromise which meant that pretty soon the session would be over.

Mauzy: Which is what they wanted.

Marcello: Well, also in the conference committee, there was some

question about whether the bill should include both elected and appointive officials.

Mauzy: Yes, the House was very much for including everybody. The Senate was opposed to that. I personally am for including everybody.

Marcello: In the conference committee, as I recall, you sided with the House members on that.

Mauzy: Yes, I was the chairman of the Senate conferees, but I had one vote out of five, and it takes three to agree to anything. I knew that that wasn't going to happen. We just didn't have enough votes.

Marcello: Well, what would be the advantage, or why did they want to have a separate . . . not really a separate ethics bill but a separate reporting system for elective and appointive members?

Mauzy: The argument is that people who serve on state boards and agencies do not get paid for that service. If you require them to file the same thing as elected politicians, then good, honest, decent people are not going to serve on state boards and agencies. Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson would not be willing to serve on the board of regents at the University of Texas if she had to file the same financial disclosure that I

do. Well, I think that's hogwash. I just don't believe it. But that's the argument: that the governor will not be able to find good, capable people to serve. It's just something I don't agree with, but that's the argument.

Marcello: Well, eventually what happened was that the House, I guess, had to drop their demands for an Ethics Commission, and in return, certain groups or classes of appointive officials were included.

Mauzy: Yes, here again the Senate started out by a majority vote not to include appointees and this was another amendment that they voted on. As I remember, they beat me on this one eighteen to thirteen. A majority of the Senate was opposed to requiring any appointed person to have to file anything. Now the compromise that was arrived at . . . and here again Hobby's entitled to some credit. What we actually came up with is really better than what the House had. Their fall-back position was anybody who was appointed to any agency that spent more than \$1,000,000 a year had to report. Anything less than that didn't. Well, that's kind of nonsensical. We decided that the way to go about it is what kind of people is it that you

want to require some kind of report from? Well, those people who make decisions that can adversely or beneficially affect economically other people such as Parks and Wildlife Commission. Where are you going to buy that state park? If you know in advance, you can go out and get an option on the land and jack up the price. The Highway Commission. Where is the highway going to be built? You can go get an option on the land. The University of Texas board of regents--where is the campus going to be built in San Antonio? Now what we did was just go through the appropriations bill and find every agency that we thought made those kind of decisions regardless of how much money was appropriated to them, and those are the ones we required to report. I think it's a damn good compromise, frankly. It's really better than covering all appointees . . . you know, requiring everybody who's appointed to everything is a little bit burdensome. A branch pilot in Galveston Bay, for example, has to be appointed by the governor and confirmed by the Senate. Well, who gives a damn? Why should he have to report. I mean really, what public interest is served by it? This approach makes

a lot more sense. And that's how we . . . Hobby and I sat there in his office and went through the appropriations bill and put a check mark by every agency that we thought had that kind of decision making power, and that's what we finally got. Hobby's entitled to a lot of the credit for it. It was his idea, not mine, even though I claim credit publicly (chuckle).

Marcello: Something that I don't understand that occurred here. Somewhere in the midst of your bill being gouged and rewritten and so on in the beginning there were some comments attributed to you in the newspaper that Hobby had something to do with what Herring was doing in this bill.

Mauzy: He did. He absolutely did. You see, during the June special session in '72, Hobby was down there after he'd won the primary and the run-off, and we were down there. He and Steve came by to see me one day and said, "What are your thoughts about lobby control and ethics?" I said, "Well, here are my bills, the same ones I've been introducing ever since I've been here." He said, "Can we look at these? We're interested." Bill said, "This is something I've run on,

and I want to do something about it, and I want something to look at to see what's going on." They took them and that's one of the things we talked about that day down at El Campo or Wharton or where in the hell ever that ranch is. Basically, Hobby said, "I think you're too strong and going too far." And I said, "Well, you may be right. It's like any other suggestion. If I haven't got the votes, I can't pass it. Everything's a compromise that gets out of here. But this is what I would do if it were up to me individually." I even had lobbyists wearing badges saying that, "I'm a lobbyist" because I really think that that's proper. So then Steve came down to see me the second or third week of the session and said, "We're going to have our own plan." Well, in the meantime what had happened, though, Hobby started listening too much to Charlie Herring, Bill Moore, A. M. Aikin--people like that. They persuaded him--and they did persuade him, and he was gullible enough to be persuaded by them--that this other approach was the better approach. Hobby and Steve Oakes and Charlie Herring actually wrote that substitute. Now after that had happened though, when we were in

conference and the glare of public opinion got put on that one issue, Hobby again changed his mind for the right position, and he came back closer to where he started out to be. It's an interesting exercise in seeing a guy who is willing to change his mind. It's also an interesting exercise in a fellow having to learn the ropes and learning who he can rely on and who he can't.

Marcello: Just one other question with regard to that ethics bill. Now in its final form, what does financial disclosure encompass? Now it's a rather general thing. Of course, like we mentioned, it's not nearly so specific as yours. But don't you only have to list certain areas where you have . . . from which you get your income and this sort of thing?

Mauzy: Ron, as I remember you report by category. For example, you don't say, "I own twelve shares of A.T. and T. at \$100 a share for a total of \$1,200." It's from one to a hundred . . .

Marcello: It's in categories such as 100-~~100~~, 500-1,000 or something like that.

Mauzy: Yes, which doesn't make any sense as far as I'm concerned. That's not enough disclosure, I don't think.

Marcello: Well, it's a very, very general thing.

Mauzy: It's better than nothing, though. You run into a constitutional problem if you require, for example, every member who's a lawyer to list every client that he's representing because that's invading that client's right of privacy. We do have some reporting requirements in there, however, as to retainers, which is important and it should be. The secretary of state is required to prescribe and promulgate forms that are to be used. Until we see what he actually comes out with, I really don't think we can be very precise about that.

Marcello: Okay, one of the third pieces of ethics legislation that we need to talk about very briefly is the one concerning the election finances, disclosure of election finances and so on. I think probably of the three bills that we've talked about so far, this one's probably the least controversial of the three, isn't that safe to say?

Mauzy: Well, no, in one way it really wasn't. Even Schwartz was right on this one. Schwartz wasn't right on the other two. We came out with a pretty good campaign reporting bill, and again it's not everything I wanted.

Here again, I'm in the position of sponsoring a bill and having to send up amendments to the very bill I'm trying to sponsor because they gutted me in committee. But of the three, I would say that we did better on that one than either ethics or lobby.

Marcello: This is what I thought, yes.

Mauzy: I'd rate them campaign reporting first, ethics second, and the lobby a poor, poor, poor third. For example, a lot of my labor friends are mad at me, and a lot of my friends in the Trial Lawyers' Association, because now they're going to be required to report. We cover all political committees. Well, damn it, that's what you ought to do! I'm a member of LIFT, Lawyers Involved For Texas, the political arm of trial lawyers. I contribute \$10 a month to it, and I have ever since it was formed. In fact, it was formed at my suggestion. I've got no objection to the public knowing that I contribute \$120 a year to this organization, which in turn contributes it to candidates. I've got no objections at all, and I don't think anybody else has any legitimate objections. If they don't want it to be known, they shouldn't give the damn stuff. Again, if Watergate's proved anything, it's proved the

efficacy of that argument. There ain't no more cash floating around in suitcases, as I understand it. Now I wasn't on the conference committee on the campaign reporting bill, and I'm really not totally familiar with that one.

Marcello: How did you feel about the State Ethics Commission being the enforcing agency here?

Mauzy: I thought that was proper there, also.

Marcello: It would have worked here also?

Mauzy: Yes, yes. I sure do. There's no other mechanism available. Hell, under the old reporting law, there were crimes committed every day that people would call to the attention--I have--of the district attorney of Dallas County, and the grand jury hasn't yet indicted anybody. And they're never going to.

Marcello: Two of the other pieces of ethics legislation that I think, in a way, we can kind of lump together--correct me if I'm wrong--would be the open meetings bill and the open records bill.

Mauzy: Yes.

Marcello: I think we can kind of lump those two together.

Mauzy: Those were really not very controversial.

Marcello: No, not at all.

Mauzy: I think that what we did was very good in both instances. Here again, public disclosure is, I think, the key to the whole thing, and both of those are going to require a lot more public disclosure. I'm not foolish enough to think that that means the public's going to flock down to every meeting or go down and check every record. But at least the information's available to them if they want it, and I happen to trust the media by and large to get it out to the public. So I think both of those were good pieces of legislation.

Marcello: You know, some people have said that all this concentration on ethics legislation detracted from some of the other . . . a great deal of the other legitimate business of the Legislature. How would you answer those critics?

Mauzy: Hog-wash! The fact is that the House, see, did a very smart thing. They suspended the constitutional rule, so that during that first sixty days they could pass bills. They passed their whole package. All of Price's ten bills in the reform package were passed in the first sixty days and sent to the Senate. But for that, we never would have gotten anything done.

Now the truth of the matter is that this session produced more major, substantive legislation than any Legislature I've served in and I think more than any Legislature in my lifetime, and I'm forty-six years old, and I'm a native of this state. We passed a damn good consumer protection act. We passed a damn good bilingual education act--been trying to do it for eight years. We passed a damn good adult education act. We revised the penal code. We passed not as good a drug reform bill as I wanted, but nonetheless it represents progress. We totally revised the family code that deals with domestic relations and parent-child relationships. The eighteen-year-old bill, I think, is a major piece of legislation. Competitive automobile insurance rates, something I've been screaming for all my life, has now become law. There's some others that I temporarily don't recall. But in terms of substantive legislation, that affects the lives of 11,500,000 people every day in this state, we did more this time than any session in my lifetime. The reform thing didn't slow down anything, and people who say that just haven't looked at the record.

Marcello: On the other hand, would it even be safe to say that even if nothing else had been done except the reform legislation, it may have made for a very successful session.

Mauzy: Yes.

Marcello: In other words, was this needed to restore the confidence of the people of Texas in their government?

Mauzy: No question about that. The answer to your question is yes. If we hadn't done anything else, it would have been worthwhile. I just thought of two more things that were passed of particular delight to me. One is a great workmen's compensation bill that I've been concerned with. It telescoped forty years of progress into one session. And a comparative negligence bill that Governor Smith vetoed after I passed it in '71.

Marcello: Well, both of these have been pet pieces of your legislation program ever since I've been interviewing you, I think.

Mauzy: Yes, yes, they have been.

Marcello: We might as well talk a little bit about those and get those into the record here. It looks like you've been dying to get it into the record anyhow, so we might as well talk just a little bit about them.

Mauzy: Well, the workmen's comp bill has largely gone unnoticed in the rush of things but . . .

Marcello: Well, there isn't too much dramatic about workmen's compensation, I don't think, to the general public.

Mauzy: Except to the 300,000 people a year who get hurt in this state every year.

Marcello: Right, sure, that's right, yes.

Mauzy: And to the 1,300 families where the breadwinner's killed. It's really major. Well, first of all, we increased the compensation benefit rate from \$49 a week to \$63 a week this year, \$70 a week next year, and then it automatically has a built-in escalator clause that, for every \$10 that the average factory wage goes up a week in Texas, there's a \$7 comp increase, unlimited death benefits for the widows and orphans, for the deceased worker's spouse and children, minor children, up to age twenty-five, of the deceased, or until the spouse remarries. The present limit's 360 weeks, period. We dropped the coverage from three or more employees to down to one or more employees for the first time--all public employees, state, local, school district, I don't care. They get hurt, too. They've got families to support, too. Unlimited

freedom of choice to pick your own doctor when you're hurt, instead of the Goddamned insurance company sending you some quack. The most important part of that bill is that every insurance company that writes workmen's compensation insurance in Texas is going to be required to have a safety program to build in job safety. What we're trying to do is stop accidents, not compensate people after they get hurt. It's good sense--from business' standpoint, from labor's standpoint, from everybody's. A year from now you're going to see a dramatic drop in my opinion. Texas today has the highest rate of industrial accidents in any state in the union per capita. Absolutely the highest death rate on the job of any state in this union per capita. This time a year, year and a half, two years from now, you're going to see a dramatic shift in that. I'm really very proud of that. I feel if I haven't done anything else in my lifetime, I'll have accomplished something decent.

The comparative negligence bill, of course, was really a particular delight to me because when Preston vetoed it last time, I had the votes in the Senate to override him, but I couldn't get the votes in the House. In fact, the night that Briscoe signed that

bill, several of us went out partying, celebrating, telling each other what great men we were. I'd had a few drinks, and I called Governor Smith in Lubbock, Texas, and found that he was at Toledo Bend fishing, and so I called him at Toledo Bend and didn't get a hold of him. It was probably a good thing because I was going to endear myself further to him by a few choice remarks that I'd been saving up. But I did call Barnes to tell him because Barnes helped me when I passed comparative negligence in '71, and he was for that bill. But there again, it's a major breakthrough for not just plaintiffs' lawyers. Hell, lawyers can take care of themselves, but the people who get hurt in this state, who are entitled to be compensated, it's going to speed up the judicial system. It's going to have a lot of effect on unclogging the courts. But most importantly, it's the right thing to do. Damn it, people are entitled to some justice at the courthouse, and they're going to have a better chance to get it now than they did in the past.

Marcello: Something else that I noticed that you sponsored or were very much in favor of during this past session

was the placing of a moratorium on the expansion of education facilities and this sort of thing. As an educator, I think it's a great thing.

Mauzy: Well, I've always believed that if you're going to have a Coordinating Board, you ought to give them the power and authority to do what they're supposed to do. If you're not going to do that, abolish the Goddam thing. By the way, this is another area that Hobby and I are in total and complete agreement. The Senate passed two of those three bills. One of them got killed on me. But the House didn't get around to either one of them, which proves the effectiveness of the lobbying of one Frank Erwin because he went over and killed both those things in the House. You know, the House is supposed to be more liberal than the Senate. And this year it was, no question about it. But still, they wouldn't pass those bills over there. We passed, I believe it was Senate Bill 408, the one that declared a moratorium and said that before you can create any new ones, it takes a two-thirds affirmative recommendation from the Coordinating Board to the Legislature before you can even consider it. That's pretty stout. We passed that thing twenty-three to eight, as I remember.

Marcello: What was the reasoning behind that moratorium?
Was it just a concern that Texas was getting wall-to-wall schools and universities, that the attendance, or what shall we say, the college population had more or less leveled off, and it was declining in some cases? I guess all of these were factors.

Mauzy: Well, yes. All the studies show that we will plateau out in '76 or '77, and beginning in '81, we'll start declining. Now, to me it's a waste of the taxpayers' money. I'll vote for the biggest tax bill in the world if it's necessary, if we need to build some more colleges and universities. I'll be the first one to do it. But we created a bunch since I've been down there, and most of them were not justified. I voted against almost every one of them that was created because nobody has proven to me yet that they were necessary. The University of Texas of the Permian Basin--the very idea. The University of Plano up here. The so-called University of Texas at Dallas. They just nibble you to death. They come in and, "Create an upper level school this year. "We'll never ask for a freshman and sophomore class."

Marcello: Tyler Junior College and Tyler State College now, something of that nature?

Mauzy: Yes, Victoria. You know, the whole business. They're not providing educational opportunity to people. If they were, I'd be for it. But it's just gotten ridiculous. Frankly, I really thought those bills would pass the House. I underestimated Erwin and his ability.

Marcello: Well, you told me in previous interviews that whatever one's personal feelings toward the man, he is a very able person, a very effective one, I should say.

Mauzy: Yes, I've always recognized Frank's ability, but I didn't realize that it was as great as it is. He told me at the time he was going to kill all of them. Frank and I have a great relationship. When we agree, we agree. When we disagree, we disagree. Nobody gets mad at the other. He's really a very charming guy, personally. Drinks too much.

Marcello: Yes, he's had all sorts of troubles with that problem.

Mauzy: Well, I'm afraid Frank's not going to live much longer. He's really developed a hell of a drinking problem. It's sad.

Marcello: Another thing we need to talk about, I think, are the comparisons or contrasts between Governor Dolph Briscoe and ex-governor Preston Smith. How would you compare the two, or contrast them?

Mauzy: Well, Briscoe is a much more decisive man than Preston Smith. Briscoe is a man of much more honesty and integrity than Preston Smith. He's a much more accessible man than Preston Smith. Smith is a much more petty man than Dolph Briscoe. Briscoe's a much more intelligent man than Preston Smith. Briscoe has been a very pleasant surprise to me personally. I was for Barnes in the primary, Fahrenthold in the run-off, and Briscoe in November because I'm a loyal Democrat, but I really . . .

Marcello: You've had a helluva year, haven't you?

Mauzy: Yes, I sure did (chuckle). Yes, my candidate carried my district in every race, though, I'll have you know. Barnes carried the district the first primary, Sissy carried it in the run-off, and Briscoe carried it in November. The guy's got some substance to him. His public image is terrible and largely undeserved, but I have a very high regard for Briscoe as a human being. I think he's a very compassionate man. I really do. He's still rural-oriented in his thinking. We never could bring him around on the drug bill, for example, but he really doesn't understand the problem. He really doesn't. If he understood it, I think he'd do the right thing. But I have absolutely no question

as to Briscoe's honesty and integrity. I think he's as straight as a string.

Marcello: Did you more or less know what the governor wanted during this session? This was always a problem with Governor Smith, a common complaint, that the legislators never really knew what Governor Smith wanted.

Mauzy: Well, I think I pretty well knew . . . Briscoe and I actually got pretty close. I wound up carrying a helluva lot of Briscoe's legislation for him. He and I got pretty close. I was in and out of that office three or four times a week the whole session. I had no trouble knowing what he wanted. I helped him on most things. Some things I disagreed with him about. But, no, I didn't have any trouble at all knowing . . . once he makes up his mind . . . now Briscoe's a kind of a cautious guy. He studies things pretty Goddamn thoroughly. He makes his staff do their homework before he decides. But once he decides, he'll stay hitched, nine times out of ten. The best thing about Briscoe, though, is some bills that be vetoed. His veto record's the best of any governor I've ever seen. I agree with all of them except, I think, two or three.

Marcello: Would you care to elaborate on that a little bit?

Mauzy: Well, early in the session Bill Moore passed a bill. It's the worse Goddamn thing I've heard of--making railroad detectives peace officers. Just Goddamn creating a Gestapo is what you're doing. I slowed it down for about three weeks in the Senate. Finally they ran over me. I went over to the House, and I talked with the speaker about it. He agreed it was a bad bill, and I thought I had it killed. I'm sitting there one day--fat, dumb, and happy--and the damn House has passed it all of a sudden. At that point I just gave up. I said, "What the hell! Another battle fought and lost. Don't worry about it. Move on to something else." I didn't think any more about it. Briscoe vetoed that damn thing, and there was no pressure on him to veto it. He didn't get one letter asking him to veto it. Of course, the railroad lobby was very much for it, and the railroad industry. Well, the whole lobby was. He just screwed up his courage and did it. He did it early in the session, where there was still time to override him if anybody'd wanted to. But he made it stick. He vetoed that mortgage bill, the point bill that Patman and I were raising all the hell about. Here's a guy who's a banker himself. His hand-picked Democratic National

Committeeman Jess Hay, president of Lomas and Nettleton, the biggest mortgage bankers in Texas, his state Democratic hand-picked chairman, Calvin Guest, owns a savings and loan association. They're all for it, of course. Briscoe just thought it was wrong, and he vetoed it. Now I've got to take my hat off to a fellow like that. That tells you something about a fellow's character, really.

Marcello: In summing up, then, it seems as though you were highly pleased with the way things turned out this session. You didn't get everything you wanted, that you'd like to have seen passed . . .

Mauzy: Probably never will.

Marcello: Right. But it was still a pretty good session.

Mauzy: I really think so, and from my own individual standpoint, it's easily the most productive session I've ever had, at a time when I had fewer votes in the Senate than I've ever had. The reason for that is, first, Briscoe helped set a tone this time. Secondly, these ideas' time had come in history. It was the right time for it. The workmen's comp never would have passed but for the fact Nixon had a Presidential commission that he was required to appoint. They came out with some very sweeping recommendations, that if

the states don't do at least this much, we're going to federalize the workmen's compensation system, and that scared everybody to death. So I was able to get the right thing done for the wrong reason. Comparative negligence, the state bar finally came out for that because they're scared to death of no-fault. Again, doing the right thing for the wrong reason. But nonetheless, it was done. Adult and bilingual education, I give Briscoe major credit for. Some of us had been down there bleeding and dying for that. He came out for it in his first State of the State speech and worked like hell with us on it.

Marcello: What sort of a staff did he assemble around him, around himself?

Mauzy: Well, he was late assembling it, and I'm not really impressed with many people that worked with Briscoe. He's got a couple of very bright and able people over there. He's got a guy named Bob Hardesty, who was press secretary to Lyndon Johnson at one time. He's his press secretary and the only real straight-out liberal on his staff. Hardesty is a swinger. He and his wife, they're great people. Charlie Purnell, his executive assistant, who's a former corporate

lawyer here in Dallas. Charlie, well, he's a Goddamn corporation lawyer like John Mitchell. That's all I can say about that. The one quality about Briscoe's staff that he insists on and which he maintains is loyalty, and I approve of that. Let's see, who else has he got? Bob Alcock, I don't even know him. Dr. Ervin Baden, I don't know him. Arthur Bernhard, I don't know him. Reagan Brown, I've met. He's special assistant for Community Development, and I'm not really impressed with him. Ken Clapp, who's special assistant for Administration and Itinerary. I worked with Ken on the school financing. He's adequate but he's not . . . that's about all I can say. Mrs. Carter Clopton, I just got the governor to fire as director of the governor's Committee on Aging because she was stealing. She had been under Smith, and we caught her at it. Mike Cooper, I don't know him, administrative assistant. Lauro Cruz, special assistant. Lauro used to be in the House from Houston and ran for state treasurer last year, and I think he's a very able guy. Alan Erwin, I do not know. Rudy Flores is a special assistant who used to work with Briscoe in his bank down in Uvalde and strikes me as

a very decent fellow. Robert Flowers, administrative assistant on legal matter, I've met but I don't really have an opinion about him. Jay Floyd is a former lawyer from Dallas, who's a legal administrative assistant. Pat Fuller, I do not know. Bob Hardesty, I've talked about. George Lowrance is his guy in charge of appointments. I'm really not particularly impressed with him, either. Chick Morris, I do not know. Danny Pounds, I do not know. Jim Ray, the executive director of the Committee on Human Relations, is a decent guy. Jim Ray, special assistant for Military and Youth Affairs is a decent guy. Howard Richards is an easy guy to work with. Again, I don't think he's very deep. Warren Skaaren, I don't know. Rex Stallings, I don't know. Walter Tibbitts, I don't know. Dickey Travis, I don't know. Mack Wallace is in charge of the Criminal Justice Council. He's kind of a redneck, frankly. He's a former district attorney from over in Athens.

Marcello: Is there anything else you think we need to get as a part of the record?

Mauzy: Oh, you know, it's amazing how I quickly forget. It's been what--five weeks since the session's over. I was

in Austin yesterday. I was telling the staff . . . we were doing some work on the Education Committee, and then I had to testify before the Constitutional Revision Committee. They were saying, "Now we got to do this and that and the other thing." And I said, "Goddamn, don't you people ever think about anything but politics?" In five weeks, I've totally made the transition back to being a lawyer again. Things that when we're in session I just automatically do, and I zero all my attention in on it. Then I'm criticizing them for doing what they should be doing. I mean that's what I'm paying them for.

Marcello: I think we've really covered most of the major points. We could have given a blow by blow account of every one of those ethics bills.

Mauzy: ABC News, by the way, came down and taped that whole conference, and they're going to do a nation-wide documentary on ethics.

Marcello: I'd read that.

Mauzy: In fact, Bill Gill is also going to do another documentary on how the Republicans used the IRS to gut the Democrats in six or seven states, and I'm the spokesman in Texas. You may recall I was called in by a gentleman from the

Treasury Department, task force on organizing corruption, early in the session a guy named Caldwell. He wanted to know who all was stealing so they could indict everybody in Texas. It was the clumsiest, most amateurish Goddamn thing I've ever seen. It leads me to believe that Wagoner Carr and John Osorio were right in these motions they filed now to quash these second indictments. Gill tells me, though, that the same thing happened in Illinois, California, Pennsylvania. They just deliberately went at it. Again, I think Watergate is showing us that that's probably true. This country's in a . . . you know, in one way Watergate's the best thing that ever happened to this country. It's going to make some people start thinking again. I'm just pleased as punch to go home every night and turn on Channel Thirteen and watch that rerun.