

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION

NUMBER

84

Interview with  
Walt Parker  
July 29, 1971

Place of Interview: Denton, Texas

Interviewer: Dr. Ronald E. Marcello

Terms of Use: 2-Years After Leaving Office

Approved:

Walter E Parker  
(Signature)

Date:

10-25-71

**Copyright ©2016**

**THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF  
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS  
IN THE CITY OF DENTON, TEXAS**

**All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by any information storage or retrieval system without permission in writing from the Director of the Oral History Program or the University Archivist, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas 76203**

Oral History Collection

Walt Parker

Place of Interview: Denton, Texas

Interviewer: Dr. Ronald E. Marcello      Date of Interview: July 29, 1971

Dr. Marcello: This is Ron Marcello interviewing Representative Walt Parker for the North Texas State University Oral History Collection. The interview is taking place on July 29, 1971, in Denton, Texas. I'm interviewing Representative Parker in order to get his reminiscences and experiences and comments concerning the regular and first called special session of the Sixty-second Texas Legislature. Mr. Parker, one of the first things I guess we should talk about would be revenue. Very, very early in the regular session of the Legislature Governor Smith proposed to finance state operations for the next two years by means of deficit spending. What was your reaction to that proposal? Do you recall that?

Mr. Parker: Yes, I recall that particular situation very well, however, I voted against this proposal as I feel like that, or as rather I felt like, the Texas Constitution says that we have to pay for whatever we spend as we go. And I stuck to this particular theory, and I did vote against the bill.

Dr. Marcello: If the newspapers quoted you correctly, you did mention that you would never be in favor of any sort of deficit spending. I assume this is still your position.

Mr. Parker: Yes. Yes sir, I hold to this position. I feel like we ought

to pay for what we have. And if we have to make adjustments in programs just make them, but at least pay for what we have as we go along.

Marcello: Well, apparently he sprung this proposal on the House without any prior warning. I assume you had no hint at all that he was going to make such a proposal.

Parker: No sir. The first time that I knew about it was when his message was given to the public.

Marcello: Who do you think was advising him to take this particular approach?

Parker: I really have no way of really knowing other than I might say that he probably might have listened to the Texas Manufacturers Association. I couldn't pin this down, but this sounds like them, and in another way it doesn't. They're a real conservative group, but he has listened to their theory pretty well in the past. And a lot of his programs that he introduced are based on the thinking of the Texas Manufacturers Association.

Marcello: Does he maintain a fairly close relationship with the TMA?

Parker: I would say that he does, yes.

Marcello: Why would an organization such as the Texas Manufacturers Association favor deficit financing--simply because it wouldn't require any new taxes?

Parker: I would assume that would have been my opinion. I mean this would be my opinion on this subject. I feel like that this was one way to keep from raising taxes.

Marcello: Well, apparently, to say the least, his deficit finance

proposal received a rather cold reception in the House of Representatives. In fact, I guess, oh, there wasn't any more than about ten minutes debate on it or if there was even that much.

Parker: No, I think each representative had heard from his home district. And I think that this is one thing that all of the people are pretty well united in--at least Texas is--that they're tired of reading in the national level that the budget deficit spending has been raised from 350 to 375 billion, and they don't want to get in the same trap.

Marcello: Well then, of course, after the House had rejected his original revenue proposal. He came back with one that was generally more acceptable to the House. Oh, it featured such things as an increase in the state sales tax to 4 per cent. And it also called for a tuition increase at state-supported schools and so on. Generally speaking, could you live with most of the proposals of that second revenue bill that Smith came back with? Now, of course, it was modified when it got into committee and so on.

Parker: Yes, I could definitely say I could live with it. I felt like that the most popular way to raise revenue at this time, at this session, was the increase of 3/4 cents of the sales tax. And I also felt like that we were long overdue on an increase in college tuition. And so I supported these two parts of his program very well.

Marcello: How much farther do you think we could go with the state sales

tax as a source of revenue? In other words, how high can it be raised? What do you think is the maximum amount?

Parker: Well, I feel like we're almost at that point now; however, there are some states that have as high as 6 per cent. But 6 per cent would be my idea the absolute maximum. However, I feel like we're at the maximum now at 5 per cent.

Marcello: What do you feel is the alternative, or what do you feel will be the next source of income that, perhaps, the state might have to be looking for?

Parker: Well . . .

Marcello: Of course, I think you know I'm leading into now a . . .

Parker: Yes . . .

Marcello: . . . corporate income tax or a corporate profits tax or whatever you wish to call it.

Parker: Well, I think that one thing would be to be sure and remove all exemptions that we have under the sales tax. And we tried to do this two years ago. We ran into quite a bit of static on the food tax on this. But I look down the line, and I think this will be one of the things that eventually will be removed. One of the exemptions that will be removed will be to place food under the sales tax. However, I have not voted for it and probably would not. I think we can come up with the right amount of taxes to pay for our needs if we'll just kind of take a second look at what we need.

Marcello: How close do you think the Legislature is to passing a corporate income tax?

Parker: I personally feel like that we're probably one session away. I doubt if it will be passed in 1973, but I would say in the '75 session. The session of '75, fifth year, it would be a foregoing conclusion that we will pass a corporate income tax, but with it is going to come a personal income tax at the same time.

Marcello: I assume that this is the feeling of most members of the Legislature and perhaps even most members of the Texas business community, that is that it is an inevitable thing. Sooner or later it's going to come.

Parker: I think that probably that it will come. I think that probably the first approach will be to go to a corporate profits tax and the removal of the franchise tax.

Marcello: How well has that franchise tax worked?

Parker: Well, I personally don't feel like it's a very fair tax because . . . but it is a tax that we have to have on business. We have to have some form of tax on them, and this is the tax that we have. But as you know, any business, whether they make a profit or whether they make a loss, is taxed on their assets. And if they have \$100,000 worth of assets they're going to pay \$4.25 per \$1,000 worth of assets whether they make a profit or not. And so a losing business is still going to pay the franchise tax.

Marcello: Were there any other particular items--if you can call them items--that you think perhaps could have been taxed in the revenue proposals that were left out, other than the things

you've already mentioned? In other words, what I'm trying to get up to is, could you live with the tax bill which was ultimately passed by the Legislature?

Parker: Well, I think we came up with the fairest and the tax that I could live with the best of what we actually ended up with. There might have been some adjustments that I would have made, but they would have been minor. The major things, as you know, was the sales tax and the raising the tax on cigarettes and the raising the tax on automobiles--vehicle tax. And these are the major things that brought the money in.

Marcello: Which brings up another question, I suppose. How much more can we tax . . . how much more can we depend on the so-called 'sin taxes?' I'm referring to cigarettes, tobacco, liquor, this sort of thing.

Parker: Well, I think on cigarettes we probably have reached a fairly close to a maximum limit. I don't feel like we've reached a maximum limit on the liquor situation as it is now. I feel like there's more tax that can be placed on that particular one. But I feel like we're pretty close to the top on cigarettes.

Marcello: Now after the House Revenue Bill got to the Senate, among other things, the Senate tacked on the increase in the gasoline tax. How did you feel about that?

Parker: Well, of course, this was a severe tax and a tax that hit most everyone. However, the things that we were trying to accomplish by this tax, I think, overshadows the disadvantages it had. However, after hearing from the people in my district



they were very violently opposed to this, and I did vote against it in the final analysis.

Marcello: Well, then, of course, eventually after the tax bill was passed it got to the President's desk, and then that's when he more or less dropped his bombshell indicating he was not going to sign the revenue bill as long as the gasoline tax was in it. Here again, obviously, he had given no forewarning that he had been opposed to the gasoline tax. Is this correct?

Parker: This is absolutely correct. I was in several conversations in groups of which the Governor was amongst the group, and taxes was discussed and at no time did he ever say that he was opposed to the gasoline tax. And this came as a complete surprise because normally speaking the business lobbyists will, if there is something that they are opposed to they probably will advise the Governor. Like the TMA or various large groups, the oil industry and so forth, would advise him. And we thought it had all been worked out between all the lobbyist groups and the governor and the speaker and Governor Barnes, and it really came as quite a surprise to us. And I personally feel like it was a political thing that he did to probably help his own political campaign in the future.

Marcello: In other words, do you feel that Governor Smith was perhaps doing a little bit of demagoging here?

Parker: I think . . .

Marcello: In other words, he could set himself up as a man of the people

perhaps or champion of the people.

Parker: 100 per cent, 100 per cent, without reservation.

Marcello: Now this procedure that he used in announcing his opposition to the gasoline tax, I gather, was something that has been rather characteristic of him ever since he's been governor. Have you found this to be true since you've been in the Legislature? In other words, how much guidance--if guidance is a good word--how much guidance has the Legislature received from the Governor, let's say, so far as legislation is concerned.

Parker: In the raising of taxes I'd say absolutely none. However, if he has some particular bill that he would like to see passed, he has enough men in his office to send over there, and it would only take one man about ten minutes to notify several members of the House that he was opposed to the gasoline tax and he could do the same thing in the Senate. And then we in those things would take a second look at that item. He's done that on some other things that he was opposed to, but he certainly didn't do this on the gasoline tax. And so this is why I made the statement I did awhile ago. He knew before it was passed--two weeks before it was passed--that it was going to be included in there. And he could have stopped it, or at least he could have voiced his objection to it which would have made members of the House and members of the Senate take a second look at it.

Marcello: Apparently Ben Barnes was one of the more vocal backers, I

guess you could say, for that gasoline tax. And here again, do you think this perhaps in part explains why Governor Smith might have vetoed it--just because of the fact that Ben Barnes had come out in favor of it.

Parker: There's a good possibility. Yes, there was a feeling, I'm sure, between them. And each one is kind of going down his own lane, and I'm sure that this had some bearing on it.

Marcello: Okay, let's move on to another topic then if there's nothing else that you wish to add with regard to revenue. Let's go on and talk about appropriations. We might as well stick to money matters right now. I don't know exactly how to phrase this question, but was there a definite feeling, perhaps more so than usual, in the Legislature this time that there's got to be some economy someplace in government? Now again, of course, every political leader talks about economy. I mean, you know, it's like apple pie and motherhood. But was there a definite feeling this time around so far as appropriations were concerned that, you know, we've got to hold the line?

Parker: This being my second session, I can only speak for my particular thoughts on it, but I felt that there was a definite feeling amongst all the legislators that there should be some form of a line held on appropriations. I saw this especially true being on the Appropriations Committee and listening to people make their pitch. And I just felt that we were definitely going to try to hold it to even a lower figure than what we finally passed.

Marcello: Why do you think this consensus or this feeling was prevalent in the Legislature? Do you think it was a result of general business conditions or general economic conditions or what?

Parker: I think that people read the newspapers, and they see that the unemployment ratio was going up. And especially the people that are in my age bracket or older or people that have gone through periods of depression certainly felt like it was time for us to take a look at this. And I think . . . and also I even had many, many younger people who have never been associated with a depression who felt like the economy was such that we had to set our priorities on building programs and increasing in higher education fees and increasing public schools and increasing roads that maybe we ought to just kind of not put additional tax burden on the people but try to hold what work with what taxes we had available..

Marcello: As you mentioned, you are a member of the Appropriations Committee, and as such, of course, you obviously have or have had quite a bit of contact with Mr. Heatly. Would you make a comment briefly about Mr. Heatly and his activities as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Exactly what kind of a chairman is he in your opinion?

Parker: Well, Mr. Heatly is a very strong chairman. He's one that carries out the wishes of the Speaker of the House of Representatives 100 per cent. He's a very conservative man. In fact, I would say he is ultra-conservative along certain lines. And he runs a committee with a iron hand, and if you

expect to be on the committee and stay on the committee—and this is one of those fallacies that I . . . the last time we talked, I talked about the committee system as we have it-- you're going to have to adhere to his particular rules because he's carrying out just exactly what the speaker wants carried out.

Marcello: As you said, then, he does rule the committee with an iron hand. The newspapers are not incorrect or inaccurate when they speak about this?

Parker: I only want to say that he will listen to you and he certainly during this session was more open than he has been in the previous session that I served on. We at least discussed many items of appropriations this time that we didn't have an opportunity to discuss as committee members last time. But we did get a full hearing from him this time. He still ranted in the manner that I'm saying, but we at least got a chance to present our views on things that would be of special interest to our particular districts--each member's district. And I'd say that each member of the Appropriations Committee was able to get for his particular district certain things that we certainly weren't able to even get a hearing on during the last session. Now I don't know whether this was brought about by the problems that we faced with regard to Mr. Heatly and the speaker and two or three other members of the Legislature, but we did get a fair run on the appropriation bill this time.

Marcello: I was going to ask you if you perhaps might care to comment on

why he did seem to be a little more lax this time, and I think you've just answered the question. It probably could have been a result of his recent troubles.

Parker: I really think it's a result. He was trying to overcome a lot of the material that had been put in the papers.

Marcello: He received quite a bit of bad publicity.

Parker: That's correct. And I want to say that this man is a . . . personally, this man is one of the most sincere and highly sensitive people that I've ever met in my life. And he does have a feeling for you, but he has a certain sense of loyalty that he expects you to be loyal to him. And as long as you're loyal to him, he'll do anything in the world for you, but if you cross him and you go against his wishes and so forth, then he's just the other way.

Marcello: What can he do to you? In other words, what power does he hold over the members of that Appropriations Committee if you were to buck him?

Parker: Well, you see, he's tied in with everything that passes the House.

Marcello: Uh-huh.

Parker: There's not a district in the area that doesn't survive on the funds that they receive from the state, and he certainly could have a strong effect on eliminating the things that are needed in your particular district. He also would have an effect upon other members of the Legislature. He could say to them, "We've got to vote against Parker's bill," and people are going to

listen to him because he controls the purse strings. And when you control the purse strings you're real powerful. In any form of business you go in or Legislature or political or personal business, whatever it is, the man with the purse strings is the power.

Marcello: And he is not beyond using this power when the occasion calls for it or when he feels that the occasion calls for it.

Parker: I'd say that he knows the effect of it.

Marcello: And so do all the other members of the House.

Parker: Yes, yes.

Marcello: Well, apparently one of the targets that was--and maybe I'm being unfair here--but it seems to me that apparently one of the targets that was singled out by Mr. Heatly and by other members of the Legislature, perhaps the speaker, were the state-supported colleges. For example, apparently both Mr. Heatly and Mr. Mutscher were dragging their heels at funds for organized research or for raises for college professors. Why do you think they were so opposed to this? Was it simply a matter of economy, or were there other reasons involved here?

Parker: Both Mr. Heatly and Mr. Mutscher felt that an increase in college tuition was necessary. They felt like that the figure of \$102 per semester was a fair basis of raising the tuition. Governor Barnes' opinion was that we did not need to raise resident tuition above the \$60 figure, and therefore, he held to this figure, and the speaker held to the . . . of an increase above the \$60. And they used this, "Well, if you're not going

to allow tuition to be raised so that this tuition could help pay for some of the things that higher education is asking, for the many programs that they're asking, then we're not going to vote or we're not going to throw our support behind these particular programs such as faculty raises for college professors and other programs that higher education wants." Now let me say that the college presidents of all these schools favored an increase in college tuition above the \$60 figure, and the more realistic figure that was brought was \$75. And even though I've voted for the \$60 and I would have voted for a \$75 or even an \$85 figure, my personal belief was that \$85 was a more reasonable figure. And even then at \$85, we're in the lowest possible quartile of states in this tuition. In fact, we'd be right on the bottom at this figure. And so I don't think this was being unrealistic to ask for this particular thing. I do think that the speaker was unrealistic in not looking above this. He held to this figure, and he wouldn't allow the faculty increases which I felt like we should have made at least a token deal. And I bring this out because it would have cost about \$25,000,000 to raise faculty increases on the ratio that we had planned on. And yet we allowed almost \$22,000,000 to be raised in the conference committee on things that neither the House or the Senate had voted on. And, you know, when you appoint the conference committee, why then the way we operated this year, we allowed the conference committee to just the same as rewrite the appropriation bill.



Marcello: Do you think this is one of the House rules that eventually will have to be changed? Are you in favor of changing this particular procedure?

Parker: I'm very definitely in favor of changing this procedure. And I'd like to see the conference committee restricted to just the differences between just the House and Senate version.

Marcello: Well, this was apparently one of the gripes of the "Dirty Thirty," and I suppose it was the gripe of a good many other members of the Legislature as well. It seems to me anyhow that there's more or less a feeling. . . . that the rules along these lines have to be changed, that perhaps the power of the conference committees have to be curbed.

Parker: I feel like this is one thing that will be changed in the next session of the Legislature. And I believe that before we are able to have really an effective voice--each member would have an effective voice--that this is going to have to be changed.

Marcello: Okay, let's move on to another topic then. Let's talk just a little bit about legislative ethics and the stock fraud allegations. I think we can more or less lump the two together. First of all let me ask this. What sort of effect did the revelation of that Sharpstown case have upon the Legislature, in other words, the day to day activities of the Legislature? What sort of feeling could you detect? Or what sort of a current could you detect as a result of that Sharpstown case?

Parker: Well, it had a tremendous effect upon the whole session in that each day was a new day, and each day you knew that someone was

going to try to--either for his own personal gains--bring up something in relation to this stock fraud or Sharpstown Bank. Of course, this was the theory of the so-called "Dirty Thirty," and this was the part I opposed so much. They capitalized on this and they used this as a means of getting publicity for their individual cause. And I think that most of the time that it was . . . I personally felt that their remarks and everything were directed not to necessarily help the State of Texas, but to help each one of those individuals. I certainly feel like they had some good points, and I have never failed to back those points or will not fail to back them in the future as far as that goes. But I felt that most or a lot of the time they were just aiming at publicity just keeping this thing going. And it was just more than just a "Dirty Thirty" against the speaker. You'd have to go back to the political philosophy. It was the ultra, ultra-liberal people against the conservative faction within the Democratic party.

Marcello: That's what I was going to say--within the Democratic party--because what made that "Dirty Thirty" kind of paradoxical perhaps was the fact that Republicans voted with them. Isn't that correct? They were members of the "Dirty Thirty."

Parker: That's correct. They joined.

Marcello: And they, of course, could be conservative.

Parker: That's right. All of these people that are in this group, so-called "Dirty Thirty," will vote to spend the money, but they never vote to tax anybody to pay for it. And I felt like

and have felt since I've been down there that if you have the responsibility to vote something, then you also have the responsibility to vote to pay for it. These people never vote to pay for anything. And so I have a strong feeling against these particular people because I think they're doing more lip service than they are actually trying to get something good done for the State of Texas.

Marcello: All right then just by way of going back a little bit, you would say then that certainly the stock fraud allegations and what have you plus the activities of the "Dirty Thirty" did have a detrimental effect on the Legislature. In other words, do you feel that the Legislature could perhaps have been much more effective had this whole thing never come up?

Parker: Oh, there's not a doubt in my mind that it had a detrimental effect, and it had a detrimental effect on our redistricting that we had.

Marcello: Which we'll talk about a little later on, I'm sure.

Parker: But I mean it had an effect upon it.

Marcello: Right.

Parker: It had an effect upon probably the amount of money given to higher education. It had a strong effect on everything that we did. Everything we did came back, in my opinion, to the start of the session when the stock fraud broke.

Marcello: And then I assume it is your opinion then that the "Dirty Thirty," I think, have to at least share a part of the responsibility for . . . oh, for keeping this thing obviously

hanging over the heads of the legislators throughout the session.

Parker: I personally feel this. I think that they have to assume their responsibility for it. There was never a day that went by when some reference wasn't made to it. We knew all the facts. We heard it over, and over, and over, and over again. And I just don't believe it was one of the things that was necessary. If the people that are investigating this or the people that come up with something and they come up with . . . were to come up with some sort of an indictment against these people, why, then I feel like we'd have to ask for certain people to be removed. And I would support this particular phase of it.

Marcello: Do you remember the banking legislation which perhaps was at the crux of this particular matter? Do you remember when it passed through the House? Apparently not too many people gave it . . .

Parker: Well, let me say this.

Marcello: . . . much attention at the time that it passed.

Parker: At the time that it was passed, there were many, many things on our minds.

Marcello: Sure.

Parker: We were in a special session as I remember on this, and this bill was carried by one of the strong leaders of the House. And normally speaking, the bills that had been carried by the House leadership had never been anything that you could worry about at all. Now I will say in defense of these people that

carried this bill that I never heard from one of my bankers. And this bill was discussed for about a two or three day period. And not one of the four banks in Denton nor the two banks and two savings and loans in Cooke County . . . not a person voiced any objection to this.

Marcello: Now the state banks are the ones who would have benefited by this legislation. Is that correct?

Parker: That is correct. And to further this point just a little bit, if there is something that pertains to banking, every banker is notified immediately by the banking lobby which is one of the strongest that there is in the state. Now these bankers never contacted their representatives, and this is not true in other matters that pertain to the bank. They'll get in touch with you.

Marcello: You hear from them.

Parker: You definitely will hear from them. And so we didn't hear anything and I took it upon myself to think that it was a good deal in the fact that I thought that it would give the state banks a little bit better lee-way in that they wouldn't be as controlled by the federal government as they are now. And so the theory behind all of it, I thought, was real good. Of course, I want to reiterate that I knew nothing, or no one ever asked me to vote for this bill in any way. I voted for it on my own free will, and I voted for it because I thought it was a good bill at that time. And I did not realize at that time that the things that we were trying to do in this

bill would not actually take effect. In other words, I thought we would eliminate federal control of it. And as we later found out through all the newspapers and testimonies, this was a false thought that we had. But I think that I could speak for most members just like myself that are not involved in this in any way. We just thought that it was a bill that had been requested by the banking people.

Marcello: Well, let me ask you this. Do you think that the activities of Mr. Mutscher and Mr. Shannon and Mr. Heatly and what have you were more or less simply unwise activities rather than illegal or unethical or something like that?

Parker: Well, of course . . .

Marcello: In other words, let me put it to you this way. Suppose somebody came up to you and offered you this stock tip and at the same time offered to loan you, let's say, a couple hundred thousand dollars to buy the stock without any collateral. Now you as a businessman know that you probably couldn't go to the bank yourself and get a loan without any collateral. Do you think that you perhaps might start asking questions about it?

Parker: Well, I think very definitely I would ask questions. And I would want to know why, and being in the political end of it, I would want to know the political ramifications before I would accept something like this. I've been offered stock tips and I've bought stock, not recently in this line. But I think all of us in business are offered these opportunities every day of which we either take or we decline. And several pieces of

paper that I have now worthless as a result of these type of things. But I think that since I'm in a political situation, I think that if you're offered something like this when you're going to have to take a little stronger look at it than you would rather than just being a straight businessman. And I think they were at fault along this line. And, of course, looking at it now is a lot easier than when they looked at it at that particular time.

Marcello: While we're on this subject, of course, after the stock fraud allegations did break and so on, and then after the Legislature came into session, there was a widespread movement for some sort of an ethics bill. I would assume that after the stock fraud case everybody was on the ethics bandwagon, or just about everybody was. Again, it was one of those things you couldn't very well oppose. Is that correct?

Parker: That's very, very correct. There's not a way we could oppose it and be reelected. However, I certainly favored it, and I voted for everything along the line of ethics. The strongest ethics bill they had, I voted for anything along this line. However, we voted an ethics bill in this last time, right in the end of the session, but I can already see that the haste in sometimes voting for something causes problems. Now we've got every member of the board of regents now, he and his spouse have to file under this situation. And I personally feel like such people as Mrs. Luther Stark, who is on the board of regents at Texas Woman's University, probably won't continue

to serve on the board because she doesn't necessarily want her husband's financial record being put out for public knowledge. And I think that by including these people in this thing it's going to be detrimental to our getting more competent people and people that could help us in these institutions to serve on these various boards.

Marcello: Now did the final bill call for a public disclosure of income, or is this a private thing which was filed with the secretary of state?

Parker: Well, it's filed, but, you see, anything that's filed with the secretary of state is available to people to go there and look at. I've got this statement here, and it doesn't require that I have to make a statement stating how much money I made last year. But I have to state in there if I bought any stocks and who I purchased them from. I also have to state in there any money I borrowed from any state controlled organization. Well, all banks are state controlled. And being in the building business, I borrow many, many, thousands and thousands of dollars. And I can just foresee right now newspapers taking up and say, "Well here a bank that loaned Representative Parker," we'll say, "a half million dollars." And this will look . . . you'll look real bad in the newspapers by this implication. Yet, going back and explaining it, in my particular business if I build fifteen houses and borrow so much upon each house, over a period of time it's not very much money to borrow \$500,000. But this figure has to go in this ethics form. So



if it's used in a correct manner, I don't think it will hurt anything, and I'm not opposed to exposing anything. I personally would rather have to have filed with the commission my personal income tax for the year with the stipulation that it could only be looked at by a special committee that has been set up--like we tried to do in the original ethics bill of which we could not get.

Marcello: Wasn't it true that the income tax is usually considered by the Internal Revenue Service as being a rather private document? Is it not?

Parker: That's correct.

Marcello: A confidential document . . .

Parker: And I would have been happy to . . . you know, we wanted to set up a commission made up of three members appointed by the Supreme Court and three members appointed by the Civil Court of Appeals and three members appointed by the Circuit Court, and they would have appointed nine people and then have limited this information to those nine people except if some charges were filed against some person, and then those facts would be brought out in a trial. I had nothing against anyone of this group. But I hate for a witch hunt to be allowed to where a newspaperman has the right to go in and look at my personal . . . how I make my living and everything else and then just pick out the things he wants to use and write a story about it. I just don't feel like this is the right thing.

Marcello: I would assume that the ethics legislation provided a field

day for demagoguery in the House or in the Senate for that matter because there were ethics bills in both houses.

Parker: Yes . . . but we have a certain group of people that demagogue in both houses, and it doesn't make any difference whether it's ethics or not. They're going to talk if they feel like the papers will listen to them or the TV media will listen to them.

Marcello: Would you care to identify some of these people in the House?

Parker: Oh, well, I'd say Dick Reed of Dallas and Curtis Graves of Houston, and I have no respect whatsoever for either one of these people. They'd demagogue on anything, even against motherhood, I'd say. (Chuckle)

Marcello: I guess from here then we can actually go in and talk a little bit about the stock inquiry which, of course, the House eventually did form, that is the House formed a committee eventually--a general investigating committee--to look into the allegations. Were you in favor of establishing such a committee or a commission or an investigative body, whichever you wish to call it, to look into these allegations which involved some of your colleagues?

Parker: I think as serious as they are and as many people that I represent, that their feelings were that such a committee should be appointed, and I very definitely favor the committee on this. But I'm not one to want to jump up and just create something just because some newspaper article has come out and made some statement that you don't know whether it's true or it's not true. And this was proven pretty effectively during

the last few days when the I believe it's called the Atlantic Review ran this article, and it was a deliberate misquote of things and a deliberate attempt to mislead the American people. The editor of this just showed that the newspaper media and the TV media could sell something to the American public just by their saying so. And so I didn't feel like we should just jump up and eliminate these people on the evidence that was presented to me in the newspaper.

Marcello: Now it took a while for Speaker Mutschler to come out in favor of or even to appoint that investigative body that he eventually did appoint. Do you think this was a real mistake that he made? Do you think he could have saved himself quite a bit of trouble had he appointed a committee from the very beginning? For example, Ben Barnes appointed a committee almost as soon as this thing broke.

Parker: I think this possibly was a mistake on his part, but not being personally involved, I can't say what I would have done under the same circumstances. But now having had the time to look over it and think about it and have time, I feel like it was a definite mistake in not appointing the committee quicker--not making a statement quicker--in relation to this particular situation.

Marcello: But it seems to me in this case that when he eventually did get around to appointing a committee, it looked as though he was doing it almost strictly as a result of the pressure . . .

Parker: I was sure that . . .

Marcello: . . . and the public opinion that was building up against it, which I am sure was the case.

Parker: I feel the same as you do. I mean I support your particular thought on this the same way.

Marcello: I assume that the "Dirty Thirty" had a field day when Speaker Mutscher was hesitating or procrastinating on the formation of this committee.

Parker: Oh, this could have been eliminated . . . I think personally by coming out and appointing the committee probably during the first two weeks or three weeks of the session, we could have eliminated a lot of heartaches and a lot of hard words and hard feelings and probably done a much more effective job if it would have come out. But again let me say that we're talking after everything's over, and making decisions at that time is sometimes a little harder to make than they are after you have all the facts such as we have right now.

Marcello: While we're on the subject, we talked a little bit about the "Dirty Thirty." But in your own mind, how would you identify them or define them if you will?

Parker: Well, I think I define them. There are certain members that voted with them that are very fine people. Within this group, I think there are several that don't seem to want to do anything except further their individual political selves to gain notoriety, and they are happy to gain it without any factual information a lot of times. They'll make half-truths and say things that they absolutely know are not true. But there are

only a few of these. There are probably only five or six.

Marcello: Who were some of these people?

Parker: Well I mentioned two, Dick Reed and Curtis Graves. These people would say things without any factual information at all.

Marcello: Now could you always expect the same people to be members of the "Dirty Thirty," or did the membership vary? Obviously there wasn't thirty people all the time. Did the membership kind of vary according to the issue? I'm sure there was a hard core which were always members of it.

Parker: Of this thirty, there were probably about twenty-five of them that voted all the time within this group. And then only eight or nine other people fluctuated within this group. However, let me state that these same twenty-five people were the same twenty-five during the 1969 session of the Legislature that were against every program that was introduced in that session. They just didn't have a title during that session. But they're the ultra, ultra-liberal people, and you also have the ones that are more militant within this group. And this is the condition that we had during the last time. I mean it wasn't anything new; they just had a new name.

Marcello: I see. We talked a little while ago about the fact that Republicans were also members of this "Dirty Thirty." What was the thing that these two opposite groups, I guess you could say, had in common? Was it an opposition to Speaker Mutscher? Was this a thing which cemented them together more than anything else?

Parker: Well, I think that the Democratic group were opposed to Mutscher. I think the Republican group were opportunists. Having only nine members, I believe, in the House of Representatives, they . . . or ten, that they saw an opportunity to increase their particular party during the next session of the Legislature. If they opposed this then . . . and they're using the publicity that they could get out of it to enhance their party. I don't think they personally had any feelings as far as helping the State of Texas and so forth. I think their number one feeling of the Republican party as far as I'm concerned was to help the Republican party, and they thought this was the vehicle with which to do it.

Marcello: In other words, the Republicans joined this coalition for strictly partisan purposes.

Parker: I very definitely feel that way because the things that these people--these twenty-five hard-core people that represent this group--there's no way that the Republicans could ever vote the bills that these people presented themselves. These same people would vote for a corporate income tax and a personal income tax, but these Republicans didn't vote for that issue.

Marcello: Uh-huh.

Parker: I mean I could go down the line and pick out many, many cases in which these twenty-five presented bills that the Republicans did not back. But they only backed them on the things that they could get the notoriety on.

Marcello: Now so far as you know, was this group tightly organized? In

other words, did they perhaps hold their own particular caucus, or did they hold meetings and plan strategy and things like that? Do you know anything at all about that--if they did that sort of thing?

Parker: I can only say from hearsay. I never, of course, attended one of these meetings. But they very definitely did have meetings, and some of the ring leaders of this, of course, were Mr. Tom Bass of Houston and Mr. Curtis Graves and Mrs. Farenthold, the lady representative from Corpus Christi, was involved in this. And they definitely tried to be organized, and they did a real good job of it incidentally. But they had a lot of things working for them, and they took advantage of it.

Marcello: When you say they did a real good job of organizing, in what way?

Parker: Well, they would have their meetings. And, you see, most of these people were not on very strong committees.

Marcello: Uh-huh.

Parker: And so they didn't have the responsibility of sitting on these committees and having these public hearings and going over the bills that affect all of Texas. If you remember, Tom Bass gave up all of his committee assignments except the one that was going to affect him on redistricting. And he didn't give this one up, although it didn't help him. But he didn't give this up. He could have given up this one, too, which showed me the shallowness of him because if he could have given up one, he

could have given them all. He's on five committees and he gave up four of them. But the one that affected him personally he didn't have the guts to give it up.

Marcello: Now which committee was this?

Parker: Redistricting.

Marcello: This was the one on redistricting.

Parker: Redistricting. You see, he was a member of that. Now he could have showed me his colors, and I'd of said he was a strong man if he'd said, "I'm just going to give that one up, too." But he didn't have that. You see, he wanted to hold onto that because that affected him personally. But he and Mrs. Farenthold and Curtis Graves and Dick Reed of Dallas . . . oh, there was several others, but they were the ones that were what I'd say were the real leaders of this situation. They were the ones that would get the things together, and the other people would just come follow along.

Marcello: What was the axe they had to grind against Speaker Mutscher? By that I mean, most of these people were obviously opposed to him or certainly did not see eye to eye with him even prior to the breaking of this stock fraud case. Was it mainly a matter that they weren't getting the committee assignments to which they felt they were entitled or what sort of axes did they have to bring against the speaker?

Parker: Well, I think it's the same that's true in almost in any state and the same that's true in the national government. It's a question of political philosophy. Mr. Mutscher adheres to the



philosophy of more . . . or leans more to the conservative philosophy, and the "Dirty Thirty" went toward the more liberal philosophy. And as a result, if you're in power and the majority of the people in the House favored a conservative approach--or else Mutscher would not have been elected--then naturally if you're in power, you're going to appoint your committees, and it's going to be a conservative committee.

Marcello: In other words, it was a case of the ins against the outs.

Parker: As far as I'm concerned that would be it. And I don't think they had anything personally against Mutscher; it's just a question of political philosophy.

Marcello: While we're on this subject of the "Dirty Thirty" and Speaker Mutscher and the stock fraud allegations and what have you, I think perhaps one of the . . . well, perhaps the climax of this whole struggle between the "Dirty Thirty" and the House leadership. . . . Well, let me just go back here a minute. Let me ask you one more question about the investigating committee that was set up. Do you think that generally speaking the people or the choices that Speaker Mutscher put on that committee were good choices?

Parker: I think generally speaking . . .

Marcello: As you recall, there was . . .

Parker: Menton Murray, who is the dean of the House. He's served the longest number of terms and has been through not exactly this type of situation but has been through similar situations before. He was made the chairman, which I think was a very wise choice.

Marcello: DeWitt Hale was on the committee, as I recall . . .

Parker: Yes sir. He's the leading legal person in the House. He is what I consider an ultra-liberal. But he is a well thinking person. And he thinks real hard before he makes a lot of statements, and he's been in the House a long time. I think he was a very fine choice. And both of these people--now that doesn't seem to have been brought out--both of these people have liberal voting records. Now there were other people on there who do not.

Marcello: Mr. Nugent and Mr. Slider and Mr. Haynes, I think.

Parker: Yes, Mr. Haynes is a liberal voting member from the Beaumont area. And Mr. Slider is a conservative member from Naples, Texas, and he's probably as much conservative as probably some of the others are liberal. I mean he's just on the other side. Now the other one was Mr. Nugent, who is . . . I don't know you would classify him. They carry him as an independent. He votes one way one time and one way the other, but he's a real strong individual with a real strong legal background. As far as these people go, sure, they're all people that have been associated with Mr. Mutscher. But they're certainly . . . there's three of them that are liberal, and one of them is conservative, and one of them is the independent. I don't know how you could load the committee any differently unless you put some of these people that were on the "Dirty Thirty" on there.

Marcello: Do you think, perhaps, he could have done this at least to

have alleviated some of the criticism, maybe just one member, perhaps.

Parker: Oh, he probably could.

Marcello: I'm not sure if he could have put a constructive member on there . . .

Parker: Yeah.

Marcello: . . . but it seems, you know, that . . .

Parker: Well, there probably was somebody . . .

Marcello: . . . perhaps . . .

Parker: . . . on this group that probably after looking over the situation and had the time to think again on this . . .

Marcello: Uh-huh.

Parker: . . . I think it would have been probably a wise idea to have placed at least one of these people on the committee.

Marcello: While we're talking about this trouble between Speaker Mutscher and the "Dirty Thirty," I think we can perhaps go into the next topic I want to talk about, and this is redistricting.

Parker: Okay.

Marcello: Now obviously from all of what the newspapers said and so on, when the final redistricting bill came out of committee--I'm speaking now of the House committee--that it looked like a deliberate effort on the part of the speaker to eliminate practically every one of his political foes. Is this about the way that you saw it?

Parker: Well, it's pretty hard to look at it any other way. However, I have thought several times that it would be pretty hard not

to do otherwise if you were sitting there for five and a half months and hearing people call you every name that they could legally call you on the House floor and make reference to everything about you as being bad and everything to not try to retaliate someday. I think it was a vindictive redistricting bill, and I really don't expect it to hold up. There's three or four cases of which I don't expect to hold up.

Marcello: Well, now on the other hand, I have also heard from one of the other people that I have interviewed--one of the other legislators, one of the other representatives that I interviewed--that the alternative which was presented by the "Dirty Thirty" would have eliminated practically every one of the speaker's . . . what shall we say . . . the . . .

Parker: Oh, I'm sure that this was true.

Marcello: . . . his top supporters. I don't know if you had heard this or if you had seen this bill.

Parker: Oh, I saw the program. Yes, this was true. They came up with a program that would have placed Speaker Mutscher against some strong friend of his. And they went in other districts and placed the conservative people against the conservative people, and their program was based to help them. Speaker Mutscher's program was based to help him. Actually it's a deeper thought than really vindictiveness. It's a political philosophy struggle of the conservative group against the liberal group. And I keep emphasizing this . . .

Marcello: Uh-huh.

Parker: . . . but this is the way I look at it more than I do on a vindictive thing. I think that he's trying to eliminate the liberal people in certain areas, which is basically the Houston area and the San Antonio area and the Corpus Christi area where the liberals . . .

Marcello: Right.

Parker: . . . reside. And I think that he was trying to do something about this.

Marcello: Well, is it not true that his . . . and obviously Speaker Mutscher did have quite a bit to do with the redistricting.

Parker: 100 per cent.

Marcello: (Chuckle) It is true, is it not, that even some of perhaps his most loyal supporters were disgusted, however. I don't know if disgusted is a good word to use or not, but they were quite upset over the rather high-handed method that he was using here to eliminate some of his enemies.

Parker: Well, let me say that I supported Mutscher's program throughout the session. Being a representative from an area that is the eleventh largest receiving county of state funds in the state of the 254 counties. I don't think I had any choice but to support him in order to be able to take care of the many state institutions that I have here. I felt like this; however, I told the members of this committee that I was very, very disappointed in this. We're talking about state redistricting, but I'm thinking in terms on congressional redistricting also. I was very bitter and upset at the congressional redistricting

bill that was finally passed as well as the other even though I voted for the redistricting bill. The state redistricting bill, I still didn't approve of the way it was done. But I did vote against the congressional redistricting bill, but this was brought up later after I'd . . . and I got real bitter about this and . . . I don't know. I don't feel like the state one will hold up.

Marcello: Well, we'll talk about the congressional redistricting bill in a minute. But let me ask you this. Now the last time we had talked, you had mentioned on several occasions that you had been a member of the Mutscher team. Do you feel that you can still continue to be a member of the Mutscher team?

Parker: I'd say that I feel that what I'd talked about before--that I was a member of his team and I stayed on it--however, I feel like that that team will no longer exist in the next session of the Legislature, and I don't plan to be on that. In other words, I'm talking about something that I don't think's going to exist. But I'm very definitely going to wait and see what events take place before that time comes, and I'm not going to say that I'm a member of his team at this time and am not. I supported him all through the session, but this session is over. And if we're called into a special session or anything like that, then I'm going to take a stronger look. And my loyalty to him really ended when we closed this first special session as far as I'm personally concerned. And I know lots of others--what I consider strong people--that feel the same way.

Marcello: When you say your loyalty ended, over what particular issue--  
just things in general?

Parker: Probably just in general. Of course, I probably felt stronger  
about the redistricting than the other. I had a personal  
thought because of my area. I had a deep feeling pertaining to  
faculty salaries for college professors, but naturally I would.  
I represent many, many hundreds of these people. But I felt  
like this was handled unfairly, and because of it and the  
redistricting and other just little general things that went in  
there, I just feel like we're probably going to need a change  
in that particular field.

Marcello: What do you think Mutscher's chances are of being reelected as  
speaker if he chooses to run again?

Parker: I personally don't feel like he'll . . . that it'd be a close  
race, but I don't think he has enough votes. I mean I don't  
think he could get elected.

Marcello: Who do you see as a likely candidate at this time?

Parker: Well, in my opinion . . .

Marcello: The strongest candidate.

Parker: . . . there is only one candidate that's very strong, and  
that's Rayford Price of Palestine, who is . . . I want to  
compliment him for the way he handled himself. As you know,  
he was ostracized by the speaker, but this man managed to hold  
his head up and went on about his business and wasn't vindictive  
and didn't try to tear anybody up. And this redistricting  
bill, as you know, put two of these people together. It put

him against Bill Bass, who was one of the members of the "Dirty Thirty," and a pretty strong member from that particular area. But I feel like he's about the only candidate that's in the race.

Marcello: We talked a little bit about the House redistricting. Let's talk just a little bit about the congressional redistricting. I'm sure you were upset because apparently one of the few congressmen who was really hurt by the redistricting was Graham Purcell. Is this not correct?

Parker: That's absolutely correct. Graham and I--besides he being my congressman--we're very close friends. And I made every effort to see that he was not hurt, and we thought up until the very last minute we had it worked to where he wasn't going to . In fact, I had a group of people from my area down there as late as the day before the bill came out, and they were led to believe that day that everything was going to be fine. And so was I. But I did not know how the bill was going to be until it was put on our desks about an hour before we voted on it. And no one else did either, I mean, other than just the four or five members of this committee. But basically it got down to . . . it was a question of what Governor Barnes and Speaker Mutscher . . . what they wanted. And this is what ended up. And, of course, we were real upset because we'd talked to Governor Barnes with this group of citizens that I had down there the day before this thing came out. And we were kind of lead to believe--in my opinion--we were led to believe that



what happened was not going to take place.

Marcello: Why do you think Purcell was singled out? Any special reason?

Parker: No. I personally don't think that there was anything done . . . Purcell as a person.

Marcello: Uh-huh.

Parker: I think what was done was that we were trying . . . the man that was heading the committee was Delwin Jones of Lubbock. And he was trying to protect George Mahon of the Appropriations Committee in the federal government.

Marcello: In other words, all the redistricting started there. Is that correct?

Parker: Yes sir. It started at the small place and worked in. Now there's an opinion that it should have been in the large place and worked out. But they were protecting George Mahon and Mr. Fisher and . . . basically these two people were being protected. And then you've got to protect Mr. Patman over in East Texas because his son is the . . . he is in the Senate. And so when you start trying to protect these people who are in districts that need people and that are very short of their quota, this causes problems. And I personally feel like that they were trying to get an opponent, and when I say they I mean members of the committee--Redistricting Committee--were trying to get an opponent for Republican Bob Price of Pampa. And they wanted a strong opponent for him, and they felt like Graham could beat him. And therefore they set that district up to defeat Bob Price, a Republican.

Marcello: But it's not a very good district for Graham to run in. Isn't that correct?

Parker: Oh, not as it finally turned out. I doubt if he can win in it.

Marcello: Well, this seems to be the concensus. One of the other districts that was formed as a result of this committee's work was this 24th district--this so-called "Mid-Cities" district. Who was responsible for that district? Has anybody ever found out?

Parker: I can truthfully say that I've never been able to find out who concocted this district. The only thing I know is that there were members of the Redistricting Committee from the Senate and Redistricting Committee from the House. They theoretically were the ones that formed this, but I have to go back to the same thing. I think the chairman of the Senate Redistricting Committee and the chairman of the House Redistricting Committee and Governor Barnes and Speaker Mutscher were the ones that made the final decision--in fact, I know they did. And this is where I got so bitter. It's the fact that this was set up really just to help the Dallas . . . two representatives they have right now--Mr. Collins and Mr. Cabell. They just took what they wanted, and threw out the hard parts of their districts. And the hard parts that they were having trouble running in--Mr. Cabell--was basically the poor or black or brown district, whatever you want to call it. And this was placed in with this "Mid-Cities" district.

Marcello: Uh-huh.

Parker: I just think it's a very poor district. We have nothing in common with the people that we're thrown in with. We would have had something in common if we would have been placed in a district as it was originally set up, which would have placed us with Carrollton and Farmers Branch and Grapevine, Hurst, part of Arlington, and part of Grand Prarie. Now we would not have been the predominant factor in it, but we would have had what I consider an equal representation of people in it.

Marcello: Their problems would essentially be our problems and so on.

Parker: That's right. We would have taken in the University of Texas at Arlington and broke across and picked up parts of Grand Prarie, and then we would have had Hurst and Grapevine, and these places along with Carrollton and Farmers Branch would have given us a pretty representative district. And I could have had no real complaint, although I didn't want it for Graham Purcell's situation. I couldn't really have complained about this district. And this was the district that we were led to believe was going to be our third choice. In other words, we were led to believe that Graham would come down and possibly take in Denton County but eliminate Dallas County from us. And we'd be the tail-end of Graham Purcell's district. And a second alternative was that if they couldn't work that out, that then we would be placed in Ray Roberts' district, which would come over and pick us up from Collin County and connect us with other places of similar interests and everything. And the third thing, if they couldn't work these two

out, we would be placed in the "Mid-Cities" district which would encompass Carrollton, Farmers Branch, part of Irving, part of Grand Prarie, part of Arlington, Grapevine, and Hurst. Now this was our third choice. And what we ended up with we had never heard of, never talked to anybody about, and had given no thought to it at all.

Marcello: From what you've said thus far and from the tone that you've taken, I gather that this was perhaps your major sticking point so far as any difficulties with Speaker Mutscher and the House leadership was concerned . . .

Parker: This was.

Marcello: . . . with redistricting.

Parker: Yes, very definitely.

Marcello: Well, while we're on this subject, I assume then . . . well, maybe I shouldn't assume this, but were you essentially in favor, let's say, of moving from the cities out to the rural areas in redistricting?

Parker: I felt like at least for awhile that we needed to come up with a program that would leave some rural representation within the state. I know that in the future they will be changed again as we changed it in 1966, I believe it was. We changed and we took away a little of the rural situation at that time. We took away a little more this time, I think. Probably in one more redistricting we'll have no vote or voice in the rural areas in the State of Texas; it'll be completely dominated by the city representation. And some people adhere to this policy

because they say that, "Well, the people live there let them vote." And this is what . . . one-man-one vote rule, this is the way that the court wanted them to do it. But I don't really believe this is what the court . . . and they haven't ruled this way so far. They say that you have to have one-man-one vote, but they don't say that what percentage of that one-man-one vote has to be within one area. Now they may rule on this, but I don't feel that they will.

Marcello: Let's take a look at some other issues then, which are perhaps a little bit closer to you, some perhaps within your personal interest. I don't know what we can add to the controversy or your opposition to the University of Texas at Dallas, which already isn't in the record. Are there any comments that you would like to make on it or about it that you feel ought to be in this record?

Parker: Well, the only thing I hope is that the facts that have been presented to me by the universities that I was trying to help-- East Texas, North Texas, TWU--that the facts that we presented to the committee turned out to be the actual things that are going to take place.

Marcello: In other words, you're speaking now of such things as declining enrollment, so on and so forth.

Parker: That's correct.

Marcello: And costs per student.

Parker: And the fact that the junior colleges in Dallas are ample to take care of freshman and sophomore students and that we have

enough universities and enough junior colleges to take care of all the programs that we need for freshmen and sophomore students. And I, for one, have always felt like I'd rather have something a little bit better and not have as many of those things than I would be to just have a lot of things and have poor quality. And basically I think that this school in Dallas is being created at the personal whims of just two or three people. And as much as I think of him--and I think he's one of the most brilliant men that I've ever been around is Mr. Frank Erwin--but I think that this is his personal desire to put this school in Dallas. And without his particular drive to push this school in, I don't think that it would have a chance because I office with two men from Dallas, representatives from Dallas, and neither one of those were really strongly in favor of this. They voted for it, but they really didn't support it. And I don't think the average person in Dallas felt like it was necessary, except for just two or three individuals. And that's the thing that really upset me about this and the thing that I tried to work so hard for. I don't think it's the wishes of the citizens of Dallas. I think it's the wishes of two or three people in Dallas and Mr. Frank Erwin.

Marcello: Did you foresee this issue cropping up again in this session? In other words, going back to the Sixty-first Legislature, you know when the UT-D was established to begin with, established as a graduate institution . . .

Parker: Yes.

Marcello: . . . and an upper level . . .

Parker: Yes, yes.

Marcello: . . . undergraduate institution.

Parker: Yes.

Marcello: Did you foresee the advocates of UT-D coming up with the proposal to make it a four year institution in this session?

Parker: Well . . .

Marcello: Were you ready for this? Had you expected it?

Parker: Yes, I had. Representative Jack Blanton from Carrollton-- personal friend of mine, with whom I had dinner last night-- had advised me that they were going to try to do it again. Now I can certainly see his viewpoint. He represents those people over there, and they've come to him and said this is what they're going to do. And I certainly don't hold any animosity toward him. In fact, last night he told me they're going to try it again in '73. So I'm well aware that they're going to try. That's why I prefaced my statements to the first. I hope our statements hold true because if they do it'll make us stronger. I was aware that it was going to be brought up. I had the facts prepared ahead of time. As you know, we held it in the House. We held until the pressure got so great that the speaker had to let it out. But the speaker did me a favor in the fact that he held it as long as he did because if he had let it out a week earlier, we could not have had the time to filibuster it in the House to have killed the bill.

Marcello: Did you . . .

Parker: In the Senate, rather.

Marcello: Were you able to observe any of Senator Kennard's filibuster?

Parker: Oh, yes sir. I was over there giving him water. (Chuckle)

Marcello: I see.

Parker: No, I was over there and I visited with him. And he did a tremendous job, but what Kennard did was that . . . you see, he . . . the man who really swung the vote was Senator Mauzy of Dallas. And if he would have voted with the UT of Dallas Bill, it would have carried because, you see, we got down to a matter of one vote, and if you change one vote it actually changes two. You just go the other way. So I don't know. I look for them to bring it up again, and we'll have a harder time each time unless the facts start to bear us out.

Marcello: You talked a little bit awhile ago about the influence of Frank Erwin in this UT-D bill and the efforts to get a grant to the University of Texas at Dallas. I assume, as you say, that he packs quite a bit of influence . . . I guess you could say he packs quite a bit of influence in the Legislature mainly because he does his homework. Is this correct?

Parker: I'd say this is correct.

Marcello: He's on top of the facts.

Parker: He knows the facts, and he doesn't misrepresent them to you. He just . . . he's there. And this man devotes most of his life--and I don't know how he makes a living, because he's



there as much as I am during the session of the Legislature-- but he devotes all of his time. And I think the man has primarily one goal, and that's that he wants the University of Texas to be the biggest and the greatest university in the nation. And I think this is his goal. And he wants it run by the people that are in the administrative staff. And this is his political philosophy, and he's strong. He's very strong politically.

Marcello: What personal legislation are you most proud of that you were able to get passed during the past session?

Parker: Well, we didn't have a tremendous amount of things. We had several situations that pertained to some of the communities in my area, bills that were local in nature that I was able to get taken care of. Of course, I was on the bill that raised the out of state tuition and in state tuition. There were three of us involved in that, but the three people involved were people that represent large universities. And I think that we need another adjustment in this factor. We raised the tuition from \$200 to \$600, and this seems outrageous to some people, but even at \$600 we're way, way under what the average is in other universities. Well, I received some criticism from people saying that we were going to eliminate a lot of brilliant people that could be brought in from other states. But let me say that within this bill is the greatest scholarship program that the universities have ever had. In fact, North Texas State University will have about \$75,000 in scholarships next

year that they haven't had before. And those scholarships are controlled by only one person, and that's the president of that university. Not by the state at all. So I was happy that we did get an adjustment in the tuition, but with it we got a tremendous scholarship program for the schools. We had other minor pieces of legislation. I handled about twelve or fifteen bills, but they mostly pertained to a local situation and not statewide problems.

Marcello: Okay. I have two general questions, and we can close this interview. You've completed two sessions . . . you have almost completed two terms as a member of the Legislature. Have your feelings or anything changed, let's say, between this term and the last term so far as the Legislature is concerned, so far as being a legislator is concerned? Do you think you were much more prepared this time? Do you think you were able to do a much better job this time with the benefit of your experience?

Parker: I very definitely feel like the experience that I had helped me tremendously. It helped in many, many ways. There's no question but that it takes . . . really I can see that it takes two or three terms before you really can get yourself in a position to accomplish the things or goals that you would like to accomplish. I haven't changed my thoughts. I think that when we interviewed before I told you that I felt like that the speaker of the House of Representatives was too powerful, that he was the most powerful man in the state government. I

I still feel that way. I still feel that we need to make some changes in the committee system, but I believe that there ought to be something in the committee system that would give some person a little bit of seniority . . .

Marcello: Seniority, right.

Parker: . . . because, as you know now, if we take . . .

Marcello: You're not guaranteed that you'll be back on the Appropriations Committee again . . .

Parker: The only way I'll be on the Appropriations . . .

Marcello: . . . in the next session.

Parker: . . . is if I guess who the next speaker of the House is and I help and support that man. That's the only way that I'll be on the Appropriations Committee. It won't be because I've studied and I've had the experience . . .

Marcello: Right.

Parker: . . . of being on there, and I feel like I have certain knowledge that a lot of members do not have that have not served on Appropriations. But I have no guarantee on that at all. I've got to pick the right horse, and that's the bad thing that I think is absolutely wrong. I feel like that my time and my experience and my knowledge of what's going on in Appropriations and everything is valuable. And I'm being egotistical when I say this, but I feel this way. But I have no assurance. In fact, if I do not support the man that is elected on that, I'm sure I'll end up on committees of minor importance. And this would hurt me tremendously because I'd

feel like I was wasting my time. And this is, I guess, the way that some of these "Dirty Thirty" felt like. There's, I'm sure, some sincere people on that that felt like they were wasting their time. And this was the reason . . . this was the way of expressing their business. I think the main solution would be to go to some type of a seniority system on committees such as we have in the federal government. I'm not saying that they run theirs effectively, but I'm just saying that there's some sort of system that could be had.

Marcello: And finally in closing, of course, there's going to be a second called session of the Legislature mainly because the governor vetoed the second year of the appropriations bill. What was your reaction when you heard that news?

Parker: Well, I was greatly disappointed in this. I feel like the governor made a tremendous mistake. I feel like that instead of cutting down on appropriations I can almost assure you--I don't know the dollar figure, but I have it right here in this book by my hand--but I'm willing to venture that when we come up with the appropriation bill next time, it'll be larger than the one that's in this book at the present time, or I mean that would have been in this book at the present time.

Marcello: What did you think about the governor reversing himself? You know, during your first session in the Legislature he was opposed to one-year appropriations?

Parker: He just didn't believe in one year . . . we had to follow the constitution, and now we've given that up. Well, I'll tell

you what. Governor Smith realized that we were 100 per cent right the last time, and he knows this. There is only one solution to the State of Texas, and that's annual sessions even though I was opposed to it when I was elected for the first time and spoke against it. But I told you in my last interview I have since changed my opinion on this. And I have not changed my opinion because I've become liberal but because I see the real disadvantage of biennial sessions. And I think there's no question that the governor does too. And as far as him changing like this, I don't understand it. I can't see how he could have been opposed to it this time and change this quick. But he realizes now that we just can't operate on a biennial situation with the federal government controlling the majority of the money that goes into our state finances.

Marcello: Well, here I think is another case, is it not, of Governor Smith simply springing something on the Legislature again without any prior warning or notice.

Parker: He certainly gave . . . it would have been the easiest thing in the world to have had a one-year appropriation bill passed. All of us wanted to. He never once asked us to pass a one-year appropriation bill. This could have passed so easily it would have been unreal. But he didn't do it. And this again is those things . . . I think he does these things to enhance his own political situation. And I don't believe in a governor serving three terms. And I'm going to say this. And the reason I don't is because every board that we have is made

up of members that are appointed over a six year period. And if he is elected governor the next time then he will control every board within the state. Now John Connally served three terms, and this was very evident in this thing. I'm not criticizing Governor Connally because I think he did a masterful job as governor, but I'm saying that when you control all the boards you sure can make a lot of things change that I just don't believe should be that way.

Marcello: Well, you were saying awhile ago also with regard to the called session. These are sessions that the governor essentially dominates, does he not, in that he specifies the agenda . . .

Parker: Oh, they're the only bills that can be . . .

Marcello: . . . that are going to be . . .

Parker: . . . brought up are ones . . .

Marcello: Right.

Parker: . . . that he includes in his message.

Marcello: And here again this would be a way, as you pointed out earlier, of enhancing his own political stature . . .

Parker: That's correct.

Marcello: . . . at the expense, let's say, of Ben Barnes.

Parker: That's correct. This could be done, and I feel like this probably was done.

Marcello: Let us suppose that Smith is going to run again against Ben Barnes. Which one would you support?

Parker: I'd support Ben Barnes. However, there's a third member that's going to run just for the record, and that'll be Ralph Yarborough.

Marcello: You think Yarborough is going to run?

Parker: I feel that way. So I think it will be . . . I don't think he can win.

Marcello: Uh-huh.

Parker: But I think he's going to run.

Marcello: Why would you support Barnes over Smith?

Parker: I think he's a little more consistent in his workings. I think he's got a little bit more understanding on the part of young people, and very definitely we need a little more of that. I think the main reason I'd support him was that I would only support him if he was elected for two terms. I have a strong feeling on three terms as governor because of the board situation, not because of the individual, but just because of the appointiveness of the boards.