

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION  
NUMBER  
514

Interview with  
REPRESENTATIVE TIP HALL  
August 13, 1979

Place of Interview: Denton, Texas  
Interviewer: Ronald E. Marcello  
Terms of Use: OPEN #  
Approved: *Tip Hall*  
(signature)  
Date: 12/2/80

COPYRIGHT © 1980 THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF NORTH TEXAS STATE  
UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF DENTON

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 Coordinator of the Oral History Collection or the University Archivist, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas 76203

*Notice: This material may be  
protected by copyright law  
(Title 17 U. S. Code)*

Oral History Collection

Representative Tip Hall

Interviewer: Ronald E. Marcello

Place of Interview: Denton, Texas

Date: August 13, 1979

Dr. Marcello: This is Ron Marcello interviewing Representative "Tip" Hall for the North Texas State University Oral History Collection. The interview is taking place on August 13, 1979, in Denton, Texas. I'm interviewing Mr. Hall in order to get his reminiscences and experiences and impressions while he was a member of the House of Representatives of the 66th Legislature for the State of Texas.

Mr. Hall, since this is the first time that you have participated in this project, why don't you give me a brief biographical sketch of yourself. In other words, tell me when you were born, where you were born, your education--things of that nature.

Mr. Hall: Well, I was born in Ellis County in the town of Ennis, but I don't remember a great deal about it because we moved to Denton when I was two weeks old. We lived in Denton County. As I say, we moved to Denton, moved out in the western part of the county. Then we moved to where my father and mother lived until they died--about

four miles southwest of Denton. I attended Denton High School.

I attended Texas A & M, where I got my bachelor of science degree. Then I went into the service and served for four years. I came back and taught school at John Tarleton Agricultural College for about a year-and-a-half. Then I came back and took over my father's dairy. I returned to North Texas State University, where I got my master's degree, and I have done a considerable amount of work beyond my master's degree. Then from 1959 to 1978, for nineteen years, I was the principal at Krum High School. That's the story.

Marcello: When were you born?

Hall: In 1922. I didn't mention that, did I? I just celebrated my fifty-seventh birthday on the fifth day of August.

Marcello: What was it that prompted you to get into politics?

Hall: Well, I'd always been interested in the political arena, so to speak. I served as president of the Texas Association of Community Schools in 1970 and 1971 and worked with the Legislature a great deal. After serving as president . . . for about seven years, I was their legislative chairman and worked with the Texas State Teachers' Association and the Texas Association of Community Schools, so I held an interest in politics.

Marcello: What prompted you to make a race for the Texas Legislature?

Hall: Well, the thing that really set it off was . . . I'd talked to Walt Parker before about the possibility of him running for the Senate so I could run for the House. I didn't want to run against Walt. I think it would have been almost an impossibility to defeat him, and, besides, I thought he was doing a great job, and I didn't have any reason to run against him. But when he resigned to take over as the head of the School Tax Assessment Practices Board and left the office open, with a little bit of encouragement from some other people, I just went ahead and announced and ran. I didn't realize when I started that I'd have four races, and possibly five, in one year. But I want to tell you, that's no way for a beginner to start in (chuckle).

Marcello: Do you want to elaborate on that a little bit?

Hall: Well, the first race was in the special election in which there were five of us running, and I got in the run-off with former Mayor Bill Neu of Denton; and then in that run-off--I believe it was on March 21st--I won that election. Then the Democratic primary came up on the sixth day of May, and there were five in that race. I was real fortunate in that race because I won it without a run-off. That made three races, and then, of course, there was the general election in November against my Republican opponenet, Jim Horn. It's a long year when you campaign for four races, but it was a lot of fun, and I

enjoyed every minute of it.

Marcello: In those four races, did you detect any one or two particular issues coming to the forefront?

Hall: Oh, perhaps I was not well enough versed in the realm of politics to think about it, but I guess the thing that I did that perhaps drew me more votes than anything was to make a big deal about the grass roots, the hometown boy, the understanding of the people in Denton County. But as far as any one particular issue, I couldn't see that there was any one particular issue other than the fact that all of the people were anxious to reduce government spending, whether it be state or federal, in areas where it could be reduced. I don't think the American people--I don't think the people in the State of Texas--have ever reached the point where they say, "We've got to cut out all spending." They just want to cut out the frills. I think this is the big thing, and this is what I endeavor to do in the Legislature--cut out frills where it was possible to do so.

Marcello: By "frills," what particular things are you perhaps referring to?

Hall: Well, I'm talking about things that we could do without and still have society move on at the same capacity that it is. Take welfare, for instance. I'm all for welfare where welfare is needed, but I believe we need to establish some guidelines and be a little bit more limited with welfare.

I believe that we ought to have unemployment compensation, but I don't believe unemployment compensation ought to exist for people who can work if a job is available. I don't believe that they ought to be able to be so selective about the job that they're going to take. If there is work to be done and there are people without a job, I believe that before we ought to pay that person money for unemployment, he ought to fill those jobs. It may not be something that he's skilled in or particularly wants to do, but I don't think that should be the criterion. I once made a statement during the campaign that I thought that people ought to be put to work before they received any compensation, even if it were just digging a hole today and filling it up tomorrow. Of course, I guess that's a little bit absurd. I'm not talking about people that are not able to work. I believe we ought to have welfare for these people, but I think we've gone a little bit overboard.

I guess there's another area where I feel there are frills. I've been in education for years, and I think we've got some frills in education. I'm not talking about college level; I'm talking about the high school level. I think we've gone overboard on free lunches; I think we've gone overboard on the breakfast program. I think that we are rendering some services in schools, and where the cry by many is "Back to basics," I'm not sure that I'm in accord with

that. I think that some of the kiddos come into school with a pretty good comprehension of the basics, and I think it'd be ridiculous to put them back to those basics. But I think we do have some nursing programs, and I think we have some counseling programs, and I think we have some special education programs that are going beyond the guidelines that were established for them in the outset. These are what I refer to as "frills" in education.

Marcello: Philosophically, where would you place yourself on the political spectrum? I'm referring now to liberal, moderate, conservative, and so on.

Hall: Well, I was asked this question when I was campaigning, and I borrowed a phrase from Harry Truman. I said that I didn't really know what I was, but I just let my opponents label me because they do a lot better job of it. But I suppose that on some issues I'm liberal; I suppose on some issues I'm conservative; and I suppose on some issues I'm ultra-conservative.

I noticed in one of the publications that came out in Austin that they had me pegged as a conservative populist, and I thought that was great until I read the same paper a few months later, and they labeled Governor Clements the same way (chuckle). I say that in jest. I haven't had a great deal of trouble with Governor Clements. He and I have agreed on a great many things. I get amused sometimes at



the way he phrases things and the way that he stands for one thing and changes the next week. This amuses me.

But I don't know, really, what I am because I think people are liberal about things that affect them, and they're conservative about things that affect other people. So I think every issue pretty well stands on its own footing as to how you stand on that particular issue. This makes you a conservative or liberal in the eyes of some of the people.

Marcello: In other words, it depends upon the issue. What I think you're saying is that you don't have what I would call a knee-jerk position. Your position depends on what the issue is.

Hall: I guess, as long as I was in the field of education, everybody considered me pretty much of a liberal because I worked for those issues that were beneficial to education. But if I had been in the position to work for some other issues, I wouldn't have come into that same category.

Marcello: In general, what sort of a constituency do you represent? Again, I guess I'm referring to the liberal, conservative, moderate, and so on.

Hall: Well, Denton County is rather a strange constituency to represent because if you take the northern and western part of the county, and some of the northeastern part of the county, you're representing an agriculture group. The

agriculture people are pretty conservative. All right, when you go into the southeastern part of Denton County, and I'm talking about The Colony and Lewisville and Highland Village, portions of Lake Dallas, Roanoke, particularly the new section of Roanoke to the east over there, which is what's referred to as the Trophy Club. Well, at any rate, all of these are people that have moved down into Texas in recent years, and they do not label themselves particularly as Democrats or Republicans; they call themselves Independents, and they vote for people and issues, and they're not party-aligned at all. But they are a relatively conservative group, particularly with those issues that do not directly affect them. In Denton, of course, which is pretty education-oriented . . . not only the students, but a majority of the people that live inside the city limits of Denton are education-oriented because they have a great influence from the colleges. If they're not affiliated with the colleges, many of them have moved here in order that their kids can attend college. So I'm going to say that they're not as conservative as the groups that are in the northern part of Denton County and the western and the southern part of Denton County. So this is the mixture that you have, so it's not a case of changing as you go from one group to the other, but it's a case of understanding to which group you're speaking at the time.

Marcello: I think that the first session of Legislature that you would have attended as a representative would have been the second called session of the 65th Legislature.

Hall: That's correct.

Marcello: That was a rather interesting one to be thrown into, I guess, since it dealt with the beginnings of tax relief and so on. Was there any sort of an orientation for you and the other newer members of the Legislature before you went down to Austin for that second called session?

Hall: Oh, no, there wasn't. Each of us that had been elected during the special session--and there were about seven of us-- had gone down and had taken the oath of office at different times. We had been explained the activities of the Legislature individually and not as a group like the thirty-some-odd that were elected then to take part in the 66th Session was concerned. Of course, we got in on that, too, but we didn't have this orientation before the special session.

However, I am going to assume that I was more fortunate than most people because several things happened to me that . . . when I was elected and went down to take the oath of office, Walt Parker, my predecessor, took off from his job for the day. He was present and he stood with me on the speaker's stand when I took the oath of office. He spent his entire day going around with me and telling me how the procedure of the Legislature works. Then Walt took his

legislative assistant, who had worked for him when he was our representative, with him when he went to the Tax Assessment Practices Board. Her daughter had also worked for Walt. When I got my office in Austin, I hired the daughter, Kathy Robinson, who is my legislative assistant. Her mother had worked for Walt all these years. So Walt and Kathy's mother were both there in Austin. So if I needed anything or if Kathy needed anything--we needed any information--we were just a telephone away from Walt or Mama, and we could find out just whatever procedure we needed to know. So I relied a great deal on Walt.

Marcello: Her name was Kathy Robinson?

Hall: Her mother was Suzette Robinson, and Suzette is still the chief assistant to the Tax Assessment Practices Board.

Marcello: Incidentally, did Walt give you any support during the campaign itself?

Hall: No . . . well, I don't know. He didn't . . .

Marcello: Publicly, he remained neutral, did he not?

Hall: He remained neutral, right. He talked to me and told me, even after I'd won the special election, the reason that he had left himself in this position was so he could work with whichever representative was elected. I understood this, and after I was elected in the special election, he worked with me real close. But as far as taking an active part, even in the Democratic pri-

mary for the next election, he didn't take a part. He voted for me. I feel quite certain that he did. He told me he did, and I have no reason to think that he would tell me otherwise.

He was a tremendous help, he really was. As I've said before the news media, I couldn't begin to tell everything that Walt did to help me out as a representative, and I think he made me much more effective.

Marcello: In talking to other state legislators, I got the impression that Walt was a very respected member of that body.

Hall: Highly respected, because of his genuineness. They tell me that when Walt told you what he was going to do, he did it. When Walt told you how he felt about a particular issue, you knew that that's how he felt; when Walt told you how he was going to vote on a particular issue, they knew that that was the way he was going to vote. If he changed his mind, he went back to people that he had talked to and told them. That was the reason that he was so highly respected.

Marcello: I guess what I'm saying is that, since he was so respected, this, in a sense, like you pointed out, would have eased your entry into the Texas Legislature a little.

Hall: Yes, and after I was elected, his being in Austin and still being associated with these people . . . he had told them about me. As I told somebody down there one time, I really didn't have to prove myself. All I had to do was to prove

that what Walt had said was true, so he had done all this for me, laid all this groundwork for me. It really put me in a great position.

Marcello: While we're on the subject of personalities . . . well, let's just go back to what we were talking about. You were mentioning that you did receive some help in acclimating yourself to the inner workings of the Legislature and so on, and you had mentioned Walt Parker and his role. Then I believe I interrupted you, so would you like to go back to that again?

Hall: Oh, I was just going to say that he took the time off from his job at the Tax Assessment Practices Board for that full day and went with me to every unit there in the Legislature and explained to me what they did and introduced me to all the people and just showed me the complete workings of the Legislature.

That's the one good thing about going in on a special election like this--when you go down and take the oath of office, you have everybody working with you on that particular day, and nobody else. You're the center of attraction, so to speak, and you get their undivided attention, and they tell you everything right down the line. Then when you go in--there's a group, some thirty-five of you--they take you off and just tell about it, and they don't walk through with you like they do when you're elected in a special election.

Walt told me that when he was elected, because of some of the circumstances that existed, he didn't have all of this insight into what to do, and for him it was a time-consuming thing to find all this out. Recognizing the need, he took the time to do it for me.

Marcello: I've heard several freshman legislators say that one of the most difficult and time-consuming things is obtaining a grasp of the House rules. Did you find this to be so in your case?

Hall: Yes. It's extremely difficult, even in one session and a special session, to get a grasp of the House rules and understand them. It demands a whole lot of study and constant going back and rehearsing the rules, and when we go back into session, I'll have to go back over the whole rule book again. In fact, I keep a rule book here in my desk. I keep one in my desk on the House floor, and I've got one in my desk in my office, so when anything happens, you can look up the rules. They are there for a purpose, and you can use them to your advantage, and you can use them to other people's disadvantage if they're trying to pass something that you don't want passed.

Marcello: I guess at one time, the person who knew more about the rules than anybody in the House was DeWitt Hale, isn't that true? At least among the state legislators themselves. I guess he wrote the book on rules, almost.

Hall: That's right. I got a letter from DeWitt the other day, inviting me to receive help from him any time that I needed with this area in which he's lobbying now. That's true. Of course, he served with me in the special session last summer, tax relief session, and, yes, he was very instrumental in the rules that were written. He had been there a long, long time.

Marcello: We're talking about personalities, so give me your comments and impressions of Speaker Clayton, with whom you would obviously have to be working as a member of the Legislature.

Hall: Of course, I don't have any other speakers to compare him with, but in conversation with all the members of the House that have been there and served under other speakers, everybody says, without exception, that Bill Clayton is the fairest speaker that we've ever had. When I say "fair," I mean that he's fair to all the members--anybody that has anything to say. He's always got time to talk to you and will listen to your point of view. If he's not going to back an issue, he doesn't make you think he is going to back it, if he's not in favor of it, he doesn't mind telling you that he's not in favor of it. He's just as square as they come, and I mean that in a good sense, of being a square. He's very down-to-earth, and there's not anything superficial about him at all. He doesn't always say what people like to hear, but he says what he thinks is right.



Marcello: What particular committee assignments did you desire when you went to Austin, and how did you make out in terms of having your desires fulfilled?

Hall: Well, I listed about . . . of course, in the interim period, when I was elected, before the special session, he assigned me to two committees--the State Affairs Committee and Judicial Affairs. I enjoyed working on both of them. Actually, the Judicial Affairs Committee had already completed all of its work, and I didn't have anything to do, as far as that committee was concerned, other than to read the report of the committee. With the State Affairs Committee, I was immediately placed on the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs with Gene Green, who's the vice-chairman of the committee. He was chairman of that subcommittee, and we went to the Tigua Reservation in El Paso and listened to their proposed budget for their needs, so to speak. Then we met again in Houston to talk about Indian affairs.

But then before we went into the regular session, the 66th Session, we got a paper from the speaker, asking us to indicate the committees on which we'd like to serve. Of course, I would like to have served on the Appropriations Committee because you get a greater insight into all the activities of the Legislature in the Appropriations Committee than any other committee. The next committee would be the State Affairs Committee, and, actually, in the last session,

I believe the State Affairs Committee stayed in session more hours than the Appropriations Committee did. We have more bills come to State Affairs than any other committee.

Marcello: The State Affairs Committee is sometimes referred to as the "speaker's committee," is it not?

Hall: Yes, and it's also referred to as the "killing committee" (chuckle). Every bill that comes to the State Affairs Committee will go to subcommittee. No bill is passed without going to subcommittee. We hear a real cross-section of the bills. Sometimes bills that could be channeled to most any other committee will come to State Affairs. The chairman of State Affairs is Tom Uher from Baytown, and I guess it's legal to say that Tom's going to be running for speaker when Speaker Clayton serves as long as he desires to serve. Tom would make a good speaker. He's a good committee chairman, and I really enjoy the State Affairs Committee.

But I asked for the Appropriations Committee, and I also asked for Agriculture Committee. I just put down about five of them, and I got State Affairs, which was my second choice; I got Agriculture Committee, and I had asked for that; I listed the Education Committee and the Higher Education Committee. I didn't ask for these because I had no preference to serve on these, but I asked for State Affairs because I'd already been on State Affairs, and I knew what the work was in State Affairs and

knew what the interest was and how much one could see there. I asked for Appropriations because Walt had served in this capacity, and we have such a great need for appropriations in Denton County with the state school and the two colleges that I thought I'd have a good footing there to help the colleges in this respect. I asked for Agriculture because this is one of my fields; I asked for Education because this is one of my fields; I asked for Higher Education because of the institutions here. But the speaker put me on State Affairs and Agriculture, which was fine. I've got no quarrels with either one of them, and both of them are real interesting work.

Marcello: Awhile ago you mentioned that all the bills going to the State Affairs Committee automatically are sent to a subcommittee. Why is that?

Hall: That's a rule that we established within that committee before we consider a bill. Our rule is that every bill will go to subcommittee, and then if it's a bill that we want, immediately the subcommittee will meet and put it back to the full committee, and we'll kick it out. But it gives us an opportunity to hold bills for a period of time that need some work done on them or that we don't want to get out at all, period. It makes everybody see that we're not partial to anybody, so we just put every bill in subcommittee and then bring it back out. There are several committees that do this; we're not unique

in this respect.

Marcello: Awhile ago I referred to this particular committee as being the "speaker's committee." I would assume, therefore, that Mr. Uher and Speaker Clayton are very, very close friends, agree on a great many things, and so on.

Hall: Yes, I would say that this is true. However, we passed out some bills that the speaker was not particularly in favor of. It's not that he wasn't in favor of them; he just didn't see how we could handle them.

One of them was my bill that raised the salaries of the Department of Public Safety, which passed the House by a tremendous vote and died in the Senate. We even got it put on the Appropriations Committee, and the night we were studying the Appropriations bill, I got an amendment to the appropriations bill to put on this \$6 million for the biennium. When I was on the House floor talking about it, I said, "We're just talking about \$6 million like this wasn't any money," and it is not, as far as the state budget's concerned. But when you talk about the fact that from the time we put a man in the Department of Public Safety into training until the two years he goes off of probation, it has cost the state \$30,000. Because of the salary we're losing from 150 to 200 troopers a year. If we lose 200 at \$30,000, it doesn't take us long to find you that we've spent \$6 million in one year in training, and this was my basis for the bill.

I have asked Governor Clements to extend the call of the special session to include this, and the reply that I got was that he was seriously considering it. I don't know what that means (chuckle), if anything.

Marcello: We're back to personalities once again. You were meeting in Austin for the 66th Session. Obviously, the Legislature was controlled by the Democrats, and the Legislature would be working with a Republican governor, the first one in over a hundred years. You'd worked, very briefly, of course, with Governor Briscoe, but, nevertheless, what was the attitude, what was the atmosphere in the Legislature, in having to work with a Republican governor? Obviously, Republican or not, there was quite a contrast personality-wise between Governor Clements and Governor Briscoe.

Hall: Oh, a big contrast.

Marcello: I don't know if that's the best way to start or not, but I'll let you respond to my question, and maybe I can fill in with some additional questions.

Hall: Well, as far as their philosophy of conservatism, contrary to what many people would like to think, there's not much difference in Clements and Briscoe. Briscoe was just as conservative as Clements, even though this was an issue. The House of Representatives is very conservative. In fact, I imagine that we had a large number of the representatives in the House that voted for Clements instead of Hill.

Now I know a number of them that did. In other words, their conservatism was a force greater than . . .

Marcello: Party loyalty.

Hall: . . . party loyalty. So, as far as the work was concerned and the view of the Republican governor, this didn't seem to bother a great number of the representatives because I know several issues came up on the House floor, and we'd have to fight these issues, and I had some of the representatives say to me, "If Attorney General John Hill had been elected, we wouldn't have had to fight this issue every morning." I mean, this was their view. I'm not saying it was right or wrong, but this was their view. So the view of a number of the representatives, as far as this was concerned, was that we didn't make any great change as far as conservatism was concerned.

Now as far as dealing with the House of Representatives was concerned, there was a great deal of difference. Governor Clements will talk to the press and talk to the news media, and he'll make these brash statements. But when he came in to speak to the joint session of the houses, the House and the Senate, he never did make these statements. He was very docile when he was speaking to us. Of course, some of his brashness turned a lot of people off. Some of it bothered me, but I respected him. I respect him highly. I didn't have any trouble working with him.

I know on one occasion he invited about six or seven of us into his office to talk to him one morning, and we were talking about these issues. He had some paintings in there. They were beautiful paintings that somebody down in south Texas had painted, and he was trying to figure which one he was going to hang in his office and which one he would hang over in the mansion. There was a picture there of a turkey, a wild turkey, that he had painted, and I said, "You ought to hang that one in your office." I didn't have any underlying meaning at all, but when we got out, some of my colleagues asked me, "What do you mean, calling the governor a turkey?" I didn't mean that at all (laughter), and I hope he didn't get that impression. I don't think he did, but they were kidding me about calling the governor a turkey. But I didn't have any trouble with him.

I was asked to join the Urban Caucus. I never have figured out why, but be that as it may, I was asked. That's a number of the representatives from Houston and Dallas who get together, and we formed what we called the Urban Caucus, and we met every so often and had different people speak to us. Hobby spoke to us, and Clayton spoke to us, and the governor spoke to us. They appointed me as the representative to keep the Urban Caucus informed on bills that came up before the State Affairs Committee. Governor Clements, when he

spoke to us at the Urban Caucus, I commented to him one time, "Governor, you made the statement that you were going to try to reduce the state employees by 25,000." He said, "Now, Tip, stop right there. I didn't say I was going to try to; I said I was going to, and I am." I believe he will. He's just that determined when he sets his mind to do something.

It's going to be the same way on the special session. A lot of people have gotten the idea that we're not going to have a special session. Jim Kaster told me the other day, "I can relieve your mind. We are going to have a special session. In fact, we may have several." He didn't say it, but his insinuation was that if we didn't pass initiative-referendum, the governor was just going to keep on calling sessions one right after the other until we do. He also left the impression that we had asked the governor to include these various things in the call, but he's not going to include anything except wiretapping and initiative-referendum. If we pass those, he will extend it to meet some others, but until we pass those, he's not going to bring up anything. That was the impression that Jim Kaster left with us.

Marcello: Is it safe to say that Governor Clements has been a much more activist chief executive than was Governor Briscoe? It seemed to me in doing my background research that Briscoe



seemed to be very content to let the Legislature run its affairs free of virtually any interference. Again, maybe there were things going on behind the scenes that we don't know about.

Hall: There were things going on behind the scenes, but Governor Briscoe is a bashful individual. I never realized this until I went down there and met with him. Talking to Governor Briscoe, I can't figure out why a man that is bashful ever got into politics. He's very quiet and talks very quiet when he's talking to you and is just the opposite from Clements, as far as brashness is concerned.

Yes, Clements was an activist in comparison to Briscoe. Briscoe might have asked us to do something, but he would ask the speaker and ask the lieutenant governor to see if they could do it, and they in turn would tell us. Very seldom would he come and speak to us and tell us.

But when you got with Briscoe on a one-to-one basis, and not in a crowd, he was just as big a talker as Clements. I never realized that this existed, like I say, until I had the opportunity to serve in the special session and had an opportunity to go into his office and sit down and talk with him. I know while I was in the special session, my first time down there, some people came to me and wanted something done, and I just called up to Governor Briscoe's office and asked if I could have an appointment to talk

to him, and within five minutes I was in his office. I explained to him that what I was wanting done was something that was passed the past session, and the attorney general had ruled it was unconstitutional, the way it was passed. I just don't know whether it was because the attorney general had just defeated him or what the reason was, but the next morning, what I went to see him about was on the call, and it passed and became law. Of course, that being my first experience, and getting the reception and the reaction that I did from it, it kind of gave Briscoe a spot in my heart that all the criticism can't remove. I just appreciate the man a whole lot more after being able to serve down there, not particularly because of that, but because I just got to know him better. And he is difficult to get to know.

Marcello: Maybe this isn't a very fair question to ask you, since you were basically a freshman legislator, but I get the impression that the Legislature did have to perhaps teach Governor Clements something about the art of politics, that is, that he wasn't running Sedco.

Hall: Well, I made the statement in my campaign, after he had won the primary and had made some of the statements that he did, I said it would be contrary to what he thought. He was going to have to learn that the governor didn't run the government in Texas. The House and the Senate still ran it, and all he did was to carry out what we did. But

he didn't tell us what to do. Like I say, when he was talking to the news media, he said one thing, and when he was talking to us, he said something else. He talked different to us than what he did when he was talking to the media.

Marcello: And there were times, of course, when he would make some rather strong, or maybe we can even call them brash, statements and then later on he would have to retract them. For instance, we can talk about the so-called usury bill and things of that nature.

Hall: But that didn't seem to bother him to retract them. He never did say he was wrong. He just said, "Well, we're going to have to change here and do something else." I know I made up my mind about some bills, and then, through the process of argument, presentation on the floor, and people that were coming to see me, I would change my mind. I tried to go in looking at every bill as open-minded as I could, and sometimes it was difficult to really make up your mind on how to vote on some issues because, whether we like to admit it or not, after you've been down there awhile and get to know everybody and get to know their political philosophy and get to know how they stand on different issues, a person introduces a bill, and it is real difficult to divorce the bill from the individual that's introducing the bill and arguing for the bill on the floor. Sometimes when you're

introducing a bill and there's somebody in favor of it, you'd rather they wouldn't say anything because they might hurt you (chuckle). That's exactly the way we feel about it.

Marcello: You mentioned that you were again assigned to the State Affairs Committee. In your opinion, what was the most important bill that came before that committee during the 66th Session?

Hall: Oh, there were several, and I suppose the three main ones, two of which passed--consumer bills--and that's the interest rate and the deceptive trade practices and the products liability bill. All these were considered consumer-oriented bills or anti-consumer-oriented bills. This Legislature, I understand, in comparison to those that we've had in the past, dealt with more money bills, more finance bills, more interest bills, than any session in history. I suppose we did it because of the inflation and so forth.

I would really think that it is not true that we were more consumer-oriented in this session than in any other session . . . , anti-consumer, I believe, is the word that would be more appropriate. Some things that happened in the past made it necessary in State Affairs that we come up with a new concept of product liability and with a new concept of deceptive trade practices. Of course, concerning the interest bill, I can truthfully say that I don't think

anybody down there was in favor of raising the interest rates. That was not the argument. The argument was, are we going to have to raise interest rates to keep money in Texas, or are we going to leave them like it is and let the money go out of Texas and make it difficult for us to get loans in Texas. Now this was the question. It wasn't a question of whether or not we want to raise the interest rate. Nobody wants to--I wish we didn't even have any interest--but we have to. This was the question.

Marcello: Why was it that those bills would go to the State Affairs Committee rather than to some other committee? I'm referring to the consumer-oriented bill, whether we're talking about products liability, interest rates, or whatever the case might be.

Hall: I don't really know. Of course, the parliamentarian and the speaker--and I don't know who else--get together, and they refer these bills. I do know this, that many people that introduce the bills go to the speaker and request which committee that they go to. We had about three or four bills introduced on these different issues, and one of the men that was strong as far as deceptive trade practices and products liability was concerned was a member of our committee.

Marcello: And who was this?

Hall: Bob McFarland, and he's from Arlington. Bob is a Republican, but as far as I was concerned, he was one of the greatest

friends that I had in helping me in many capacities. I worked with Bob on products liability, and I worked with him on the deceptive trade practices, both, because it was his committee that had to take all of these bills and come out with one bill.

Like I said, I'm truthfully of the opinion that the original laws that were written by the Legislature on deceptive trade practices and products liability were good laws--they were good bills--but some judges got hold of them and rendered opinions on them that were not what the bill was intended to be at all. For instance, on the deceptive trade practices, the original bill ruled that if a person really deceived somebody and caused him some damage, the judge may render triple damages. The judges ruled "may" to mean if they were found guilty, it meant mandatory triple damages. That was not the intent of the law at all.

We had to go back and change this, and now we've got it triple damages up to a certain amount if they're found guilty. This was not intended to protect anybody that did practice deceptive trade. Anybody that practiced deceptive trade needs to be held accountable for it and pay triple damages, but it had gone to the extreme where a real estate dealer had gone out here and shown a house to somebody and said, "Now this is a good house," and two years later the foundation had cracked, and you'd have to render triple damages.

Well, that's absurd. Anything that anybody couldn't foresee is not deceptive, but it had reached this point. This was the reason that we had to do something. It wasn't a case of "want to."

The same is true with products liability. I think every manufacturer ought to be liable for the product that he puts out to the public, and I think we ought to have laws protecting the consumer. But anytime that a man buys a skill saw and finds out that he could cut wood faster by taking the guard off than he could with the guard on, and then because he took the guard off, he cut a finger off, I don't think that the manufacturer ought to be liable for that product when a man takes the guard off. But some courts ruled that such was the case because the guard ought to have been put on in such a manner that he couldn't take it off. I mean, it actually got to the point of absurdity, as far as I was concerned. But I told some of those lawyers down there that I thought it was really a conflict of interest for them to come down there and make the laws and go back and sit in a courtroom and interpret the law. I thought they really have a conflict of interest. I believe they do.

Marcello: In talking about these various modifications that were to be made in previously passed consumer legislation, are you saying, in effect, that you do not consider this legislation to be anti-consumer legislation per se, as it was

labeled in the press and in some other areas.

Hall: No, it was not intended to be anti-consumer at all. Like we said in our committee, anybody that uses deceptive trade practices ought to pay for it, and they ought to be punished. Anybody that puts out a product, they need to be liable for that product. But some of the things have been carried to the point of absurdity, and that was the reason that we felt it necessary to change the laws.

Of course, products liability didn't change. It didn't pass the Senate. It's still like it is. We don't have very many cases, but we have a few cases like that.

Marcello: I would assume this type of legislation to which we're referring subjected the committee to pressure from perhaps all types of special interest groups. For example, I'm sure that the trial lawyers would have been very much interested in this legislation, not to mention those on the other side, such as realtors and bankers, if we're talking about the higher interest rates and so on and so forth.

Hall: Yes. You mentioned special interest groups. We listened to the trial lawyers in our committee, who were in opposition to this; we listened to the real estate people, who were in favor of it. You mentioned Dave Allred a few moments ago. I remember when we were discussing this bill on deceptive trade practices on the House floor that Dave Allred got up on the back mike and pulled one of his usual jokes. He said,



"Mr. Speaker, I understand that there's somebody in Wichita Falls trying to buy some real estate, and they can't find a real estate dealer because all of them are in Austin sitting in the gallery." Yes, we had much input from the different lobbyists in all capacities.

But in all fairness, I want to say--and I made this statement to the high school classes that I had the opportunity to speak to--you learn to appreciate lobbyists because they give you insight into all the bills that you can't get by study. In all the time that I was there during this session, I never did have any lobbyist that tried to pressure me, that used any kind of undue pressure to get me to vote for any bill. They'd come in and present their viewpoint and go their way, and I'd just tell them I appreciated it and I'd give it some thought. Then I'd go on and vote what I felt I had to vote. From that standpoint, I appreciate lobbyists very much. But they were all there to give testimony, yes, sir.

Marcello: In your own case, did I hear you correctly when you said that your immediate reaction to raising the legal interest rates was one of opposition, and then the more you studied it and the more you thought about it, you changed your mind on it?

Hall: Well, I don't know that it was particularly opposition. I tried to be open-minded about it. But my opinion was, as I

said, the opinion of everybody. Of course, we didn't want interest rates to go up, but we recognized the necessity of their going up in order to have money available for our loans in Texas. Of course, we also tried to put it on the basis . . . most people think that because we said interest can go to 12 percent that it's automatically going to go to 12 percent. That's not true. We had a 10 percent ceiling for years and years and years, and for a long time there it was 5 and 6 and 7 percent. It depends on the demand just like anything else.

Marcello: And it is a floating interest rate, is it not?

Hall: A floating interest rate, yes.

Marcello: And doesn't that particular piece of legislation come up for review or renewal in the next session?

Hall: The next session. Yes, sir, we didn't make it a permanent thing like they did years ago when they said 10 percent interest would be the ceiling, and it'd float anywhere in between. Well, we just raised that ceiling two points, and it can float anywhere in between.

Marcello: How did the speaker himself feel about this type of legislation to which we're referring? Were you getting any sort of feedback from him or from the governor, also, relative to this legislation? I know in the case of the governor, there were even some public statements made about interest rates in particular.

Hall: I don't know that I ever got a direct statement from the speaker about this particular bill.

Marcello: By this particular bill, you're again referring to the one concerning interest rates.

Hall: Yes, interest rates. Of course, the speaker was wanting us to come up with a bill that would be satisfactory to all segments concerned. He was wanting us to do the same thing with product liability, and he was wanting us to do the same thing with deceptive trade practices. Contrary to what many people might think about these bills, most of them, where we have four or five bills introduced in State Affairs or some other committee that deal with a particular subject, we get those legislative liaison people for the various groups together with us, and we'll say to them, "Look, what would be the best for your people in this bill?" We will reach a point of compromise that's satisfactory to all segments, and then that's what we try to come out with. We have to compromise a whole lot. I'm sure that there are some issues that eventually I'm going to have an experience with that there's not going to be any compromise between two groups, and that's when it's going to be a little bit difficult to make up your mind. But so far all of my experience has been with the state of compromise.

This was what happened on the education bill. Of course, I was fighting for a greater percent raise for all segments

of education. The governor said he'd veto anything beyond 5.1 percent, even including their step raise. But we finally got it to 5.1 percent with their step raise included, and in the year that they didn't get their step raise, they got 2 percent more, which is really going to figure out better than a 7 percent raise. So they did fare better than most people. I'm speaking of public education now. That doesn't apply to higher education.

Marcello: Did you mention awhile ago, however, that you were not on the Education Committee?

Hall: No, but I did work with Ron Coleman in getting this 2 percent added to the appropriations bill for this off-year. Just because you're not on the committee, if you have a special interest in these things, you get to work with them, anyhow.

Marcello: Were there any other pieces of legislation that you would consider ultra-important and that we ought to get as part of the record? Again, I'm referring to legislation that came before the State Affairs Committee.

Hall: Well, another piece of legislation that we worked with didn't pass the Senate, and I'm sure that it's going to come up again. This is where we deal with the utility companies. They're having a hearing. When the utility companies want to raise the price of electricity, or the telephone company wants a raise in telephone rates, or the gas company wants to raise the price of gas . . . in other

words, it's serving a particular city. Right now they have to go to the PUC, Public Utilities Commission, and then to the Public Utilities Commission they have to present all the evidence as to why this is necessary in this particular area. The Public Utilities Commission views all of this evidence, and then they'll make their decision as to whether or not they have the right to increase the rates. If the Public Utilities Commission says they do have a right to increase these rates, then the city can demand a hearing. The companies have to go back and then have to prepare all of this same material for the city as it deals with this particular city. Then the city can approve or not approve it. But that's not the final decision. That has to go back to the Public Utilities Commission, and they have the opportunity to make the final decision.

When this particular bill was introduced, what we were trying to do was to cut out this step where, when they applied for an increase in the rate, it would go to the PUC. The cities would be invited as a participant here, and they would listen to the testimony there, and they would give their input, also. Then when the Public Utilities Commission made up their mind as to what the rate was going to be, that's what it would be. I talked about a consumer bill. They said this was anti-consumer, and we thought it was pro-consumer because it would be actually saving money for

the consumer. If they didn't have to go through this other hearing, it would save them money. They were still a vital part of the decision that was made at the Public Utilities Commission hearing. It passed the House, but it didn't pass the Senate, so we don't have to worry about it, except we'll probably have to do it again when we go back.

Marcello: Okay, let's shift from the legislation that was coming before the State Affairs Committee and talk about some of the other important pieces of legislation which the House of Representatives would have to deal with. Let's talk about appropriations, first of all, and then I guess we can talk about tax relief and the education bill. I don't think you can separate the three of them. Obviously, when you're talking about appropriations, everything is dependent upon it, but certainly I think tax relief and education are both tied in with the appropriations bill. There was quite a bit of variation, was there not, between the appropriations bill put forward by the Legislative Budget Board, by the House, and by whatever the governor wanted. There were about a billion dollars difference, or maybe even more.

Hall: That's right. The appropriations bill, as put forth by the Legislative Budget Board . . . of course, they're working right now--the Legislative Budget Board is--for appropriations for the next biennium. They work all during this period. They go to all of these different places; they have a hearing

on things that are needed; and they go back and make their decision. All right, when we go into session, all of the various facets of government will go through one of these committees. We will listen to all of these. In the Agriculture Committee, of course, we listen to the Extension Service, and we listen to the Forest Service, and we listen to the Animal Sanitation Service--all of these. They'd come before us with their budget, and on the appropriate committee of the Agriculture Committee, and the same in the Senate . . . I was on one of the appropriate committees in State Affairs. We would listen to these. They were doing it in all committees, and we listened to all the testimony, and then we made recommendations and sent this on to the Appropriations Committee.

Then the Appropriations Committee listened to the same testimony and studied our recommendations, and then they came up with an appropriations bill. They would have before them the proposal of the Legislative Budget Board, and they would have before them the governor's recommended budget. In this case, they had the out-going governor's recommended budget and the in-coming governor's recommended budget, so we had all of these three to work from. But I would say that the greatest emphasis is put on what we have recommended from the appropriate committees and what the people from these different groups have to say.

This is really the primary thing that brings about the final appropriations bill because many things are added between the time the Legislative Budget Board asks for a study on something. They'll go ahead and prepare their budget, and then their study will come in telling them what it's going to be, and it may be a two- or three-million-dollar difference in what they put down. The Legislative Budget Board will come back and say, "Well, we recommend that you change this so much." This is where some of this increase came from, because of natural inflation--from the time the Legislative Budget Board prepared it until it was in its final state. There are just a host of things to look at when you get into appropriations. My, my!

Marcello: What sort of pressure or response was the House getting from the governor with regard to the size of the state budget? Like I said awhile ago, the governor's budget was approximately a billion dollars, or maybe even more, less than the recommended expenditures of the House of Representatives.

Hall: Well, I think he exerted some pressure, because the House appropriations bill and the Senate finance bill . . . when they were passed and went into conference committee, the conference committee came out with a bill that was less than either of them. So I think there we can see that effect that the governor had because they were endeavoring to come out with a bill that the governor would sign.



Of course, he still vetoed a lot of line items. On some items, I think the attorney general is questioning whether or not he had the authority to veto line items, particularly in riders. Many of those riders that he did veto really don't change the price of the appropriations bill because these were line items that were taken care of out of the residue money of the ten-cent ad valorem tax, and it really wouldn't have anything to do with the state budget. I think there are some questions as to whether or not he has the authority to veto those. I guess that's still in question. It may stay in question, I don't know. But at any rate, he had his influence because the conference committee worked desperately to keep it down to a point where they thought that he would sign it. I think the people wanted this, too.

Marcello: In cases like this, where there is quite a variation between what the governor wants and what the Legislature evidently wants, how much activity or contact do you have with people such as Jim Kaster, whom you mentioned awhile ago and who was one of the governor's legislative liaisons?

Hall: Jim comes to the House floor, and he walks through the House floor and stands at the back of the House floor. If you go by, he'll talk to you. Of course, he's not necessarily lobbying; he's just talking to us about questions that we might . . . he's just making himself available to us about

questions that we might have, as far as the governor is concerned. Most of this talk is done between him and the speaker or between him and the committee chairmen, and then it's passed on down to us.

Marcello: I guess at this stage, then, we can go on and talk a little bit about tax relief because this is something that you obviously had to deal with. It goes back to not only that special session of the 65th Legislature, but also to the constitutional amendment that was approved by the voters in November of 1978. In terms of tax relief, where did you personally feel that the people of Texas needed to have cuts in terms of taxes?

Hall: Well, the only tax, really, in Texas that I think that the people are crying about is the property tax. I think the reason that they're crying about it is the fact that it's a lump sum tax every year. When I went down to the special session on tax relief, my statement to the committee was, "If we really want to do something beneficial for the State of Texas, we'll abolish the property tax and come up with some other tax basis to finance education." I thought that then, and I think that now. I don't particularly like the sales tax, but I think the way we have it in Texas is real good. We don't pay a sales tax on food; we don't pay a sales tax on medicine, I believe, or things of this nature. When we have a sales tax, you just pay a little bit of it at

a time, and it doesn't hurt so bad, and it's that lump sum property tax that kills everybody. As long as we have that lump sum and can't figure out some way to pro-rate that tax out over the year . . . even like the federal income tax, we scream and cry about it, but people that pay it by the month, it doesn't bother them near so much. If they had to pay it in a lump sum, there'd be the same cry. So the relief that we needed was in the property tax. I'm not sure that we got it, but we tried. I particularly wasn't in favor of it. I didn't vote for Senate Bill 621 . . .

Marcello: I'm not sure what the number of it was.

Hall: That's the one on the single appraisal. I didn't vote for it. I didn't like some things that were set up in it. I didn't think it ought to be under the county clerk. I'm in favor of one appraisal and one taxing entity and one tax bill--just have it broken down into what the various things are for. But, you know, if everybody's going to raise taxes to fair market value and assess at different values, which is fine--they can assess where they need to--I still think all land ought to be appraised at fair market value in the State of Texas. Then there won't be any question of one being appraised at one value by one group and a different value by another. Then they can assess them where the needs are for that particular entity.

Marcello: Now you brought up the subject, and maybe I need to pursue it a little bit farther to make sure that we're clear on

what we're talking about. In the tax relief bill, there was a provision whereby land would be taxed on its productive value rather than its market value. Is this the same thing that we're talking about here on the basis of the statements you just made?

Hall: All right, I'm talking about fair market value. For instance, all houses and everything--real estate, all kinds of real estate--would be assessed at fair market value. There is a stipulation in there that agricultural land would be taxed according to productivity. I voted for that. I was not in favor of some stipulations. I think that a person ought to get a major portion of his income from the land to be subject to this. We didn't pass that, but I was in favor of that. I voted for it. I voted against any corporation being in a position to enjoy this tax break. But I think that you ought to have to show that a major portion of your income is from this particular area of ground before you enjoy the fact that the land is taxed according to productivity.

But I was speaking of houses. We've run into a lot of difficulty in our metropolitan areas because a house here was built years and years ago, and it cost so much. Now a new one's being built right beside of it, and one of them is being valued at \$10,000, and the other one is being valued at \$60,000, and they're the same type of house. This is the thing that we have to get away from. We have to tax this

real property according to what it would sell for. This is what the School Tax Assessment Practices Board endeavored to establish across the State of Texas. They got the guidelines established whereby land will be taxed.

Marcello: When I look at the tax relief measure that passed, it seems as though there's a little bit in it for everybody, but not a whole lot for anybody.

Hall: That's right.

Marcello: Is that basically your impression?

Hall: Yes, sir. I think the good part about the tax relief measure was that for people that are sixty-five years or over, their tax did not increase as long as they owned their homestead. I think this was probably the best measure that was put in there. I think this ought to be a perpetual thing because, when you get on a fixed income, it's kind of difficult to pay escalating taxes with a fixed income. For some reason, it doesn't pan out, even with new math. I told somebody the other day when they asked if I enjoyed my birthday, "I'm thirty-nine years old, base sixteen." That figured out just right (laughter).

Marcello: How was tax relief going to affect the public school finance bill? There's a correlation between the two, is there not?

Hall: Yes, sir, when we passed the tax relief bill, we also passed a bill setting aside the amount of money needed to reimburse the school districts for all the money lost from land . . .

the money that they'd have to give up on farmland that was taxed according to productivity, for exemptions that would be given the elderly, and the \$5,000, \$10,000 homestead exemption. I believe it was \$450 million that we set up for this purpose. This was also going to be based on some other things. It was going to be based on increase or decrease in ADA, Average Daily Attendance. As a result of this, it is also going to be based on the available tax base.

Well, when we got to studying this, and all of this got put in the computer and came out, we found that Dallas and Houston were really going to hurt from this because they're growing so fast. They got so much more available tax base than they had, and, for instance, Dallas at the same time is going to wind up with about 6,000 scholastics short. I don't know whether it's white flight or what-have-you, but they're going down in school population, and they're going up in taxable base, so they were going to lose a lot of this money. Houston and Dallas . . . we called it our "cry-baby bill," because we had to introduce some legislation that provides some money for Houston and Dallas to supplement the fact that they were going to lose so much money.

My concern is, what are we going to do two years from now? If we're going to continue the same tax break--and I don't see anything to do but to continue the same tax break--what are we going to do for that \$450 million that we

had before to reimburse the schools if we don't come up with this \$450 million again to reimburse the schools for the money lost? The only way they can get this money is by increasing the taxes again, so it's going to defeat the purpose from whence it started unless we come up with the money. And I think we will.

Marcello: We talked about this awhile ago, and maybe we need to pursue it just a little farther. There are also some differences between the governor and the Legislature concerning the size of pay increases for teachers.

Hall: Yes, sir. The governor didn't want them to get any more than anybody else, and that was 5.1 percent. He wanted the step-raise to be included in that 5.1 percent. That was it; that was all that they were to receive. TSTA had a 9 percent raise, and they called me out and asked me if I'd be willing to carry this amendment. Ron Coleman had a 7 percent raise in mind . . . he's from El Paso, and he had a 7 percent increase for the teachers. "Hap" Adkinson, when we adjourned one day at noon, called Ron and me, and we met in Ron's office and decided what we were going to do. We decided to go with Ron's 7 percent. What we finally got out of the Appropriations Committee was the 2 percent on the off-years when we didn't have the step-increase. That's what we wound up with for public school education.

Marcello: Again, how much pressure were you receiving from TSTA on

this particular portion of the public school finance bill?

Hall: I didn't receive a great amount of pressure from TSTA. I talked to them a whole lot, of course. They knew how I felt; they didn't have to pressure me. They knew what I was going to work for.

I guess the greatest pressure that I got in the whole session--and I hadn't thought about this--was the night that we were taking up the appropriations bill, and I wrote an amendment to abolish the drug education program by taking \$7 million out of the House appropriations bill. Then I introduced another amendment, and it was passed, to take out another million dollars on school bus driver safety education. On the latter one, I was successful in taking it out of the House bill, but they put it back in in the conference committee. My argument was, we've got a Department of Public Safety, and we've got a driver training teacher in every school, so why should we spend a million dollars to have them to go to some other school when they've got a driver education teacher? Besides that, most of the bus driver safety education classes are a farce, anyhow. They do not do anything but stand up there and read to them out of a book. But on the drug education bill, my argument was that the basic concept of drug education today is to never mention drugs. We just try to build up the self-image of the child and make them see and understand



what their worth to society is and what they owe to themselves and what they owe to their country and not ever mention drugs. I said we don't need \$7 million to do this because we've got all the tools we need. All we need to do is give the teachers an opportunity to teach it. Well, I was successful here, and then they took it out in the Senate, and we kept it out.

Fort Worth and some of the schools really screamed, but most of the money had been used to devise curriculums, making studies as to how we could best teach drug education. We've been appropriating all this money, and we never did anything with it. We've just been figuring out how to do something with it. But we took it out.

Marcello: You mentioned awhile ago that on the teachers pay increase, you were working very closely with Representative Coleman from El Paso. From everything that I've read and from what people have told me, he is one of the more impressive of the newer legislators in Austin. Is this your impression, also?

Hall: Yes, he's very impressive. He presents strong arguments. Of course, I like Ron! I also like John Bryant from Dallas. John's another one. But they're not on the speaker's team. They're considered very liberal. I try to stay on everybody's team. I try to work with all, and can. I think Walt did this, and this was some advice I got from him. I mean, if the

speaker needs me, he just feels free to call on me, and he knows that I'll work for anything that he wants, within reason, and listen to any of his arguments; and if I'm opposed to it, I'll tell him why. But I don't try to align myself with any particular group. I just stay friends with everybody, and I think you can get much more accomplished this way. If I see fit, I can help them with their bills, and they'll help me with mine.

Marcello: Now Bryant, I know, was one of the members, and I guess the ringleader, of the so-called "Gang of Four." Coleman was among those four, also, was he not?

Hall: Yes, he was. They were called the "Dirty Thirty" and the "Filthy Fifty" or something. I don't know what all they were called, but I appreciate all of them--appreciate their conviction, appreciate their stand. I can agree and I can disagree and still be friends with them, and I think this is what the whole thing's about.

Marcello: As you look back upon that 66th Legislature, what do you see as perhaps being its outstanding accomplishments; and at the same time, what do you see as being its greatest failures?

Hall: Oh, I guess that would be a real difficult question for me. I really hadn't thought about its failures, and I really hadn't thought about its accomplishments. Of course, I felt like we had a successful session. We did give everybody

a raise. I don't know that the raise was enough to meet inflation, but maybe it was kept low enough that it will to some degree help to thwart inflation. That's a concept, I guess, that anybody would agree with so long as it didn't affect them directly (chuckle). I think we did, to some degree, try to meet the needs of all segments of Texas and didn't do it at the expense of any segments.

I think this is the whole of government; this is the whole of our society. This is one of the things that I campaigned on, that I didn't think any segment of our society ought to advance at the expense of any other segment. I don't think we ought to have tax relief at the expense of paying a living wage to our teachers and state employees. Neither do I think that we ought to pay our state employees a salary that would be detrimental to all the other segments of the society.

So tax relief, I guess, right now, at least, is going to be viewed as the great accomplishment of this session, if, indeed, it proves to be tax relief. I think this might be something that we'll have to look to in the future. But at least we had a downward trend.

Marcello: Where do you have some misgivings about tax relief?

Hall: Where do I? What we're going to do in the future session . . .

Marcello: I see.

Hall: . . . about maintaining the tax relief status where it is.

Are we going to keep appropriating this money, extra monies, or are we going to have to raise taxes again to meet these decreases that we've made? This is the thing that bothers me.

Marcello: I guess we can look at this from another angle and ask just how long Texas can expect to have so-called treasury surpluses?

Hall: Well, yes. I hope it's forever. In fact, we'd have to change our constitution. The way it is right now, if we pass a bill that something is to be done, and there's not any money in the comptroller's office to do it, it's not done. That's the way it stands right now, and perhaps this is the best way. But we have so many things that need to be done, but they cost money, so we have to just decide what can we do.

Marcello: How did you feel about the initiative and referendum? Of course, this is a subject that the Legislature did fail to act upon, and if there is going to be a special session, probably this is going to be the reason that the governor will call it. How did you feel about initiative and referendum?

Hall: I voted for it. I told the governor that I would vote for it, and that's the reason I voted for it. However, I'm opposed to initiative-referendum if it's confined to too small a geographic area. I've got no quarrels with

initiative-referendum on the state level, provided we have to have the number of signatures on the referendum--a certain percentage of the people that voted in the previous governor's election--and that they be appropriated to the districts across the state in that same percentage. In other words, I don't think it ought to be set up to where two or three of our metropolitan areas could call an election. I don't think it ought to be in a small enough area, such as a school district that has 500 people, registered voters, so that fifty of them could call an election on something or stop an election. You could keep a school district tied up all the time with that small a number of people that have to sign a petition for a referendum. My statement has always been that I voted for it, and I said I would vote for it, but I'm not ready to give up in the representative form of government. I have never had it proved to me that it's bad because just about anything you can do by initiative and referendum will take two years, and within that time, you can get rid of your representatives (chuckle). We have the basic concept anyhow, so far as I'm concerned. But I would vote for it if we keep it on a large enough geographical area.

Marcello: Well, Representative Hall, that exhausts my list of questions. Is there anything else relative to the 66th Session that you think we ought to get as part of the record?

Hall: Well, I went to Governor Clements after North Texas started

having some of the trouble it has up here.. I don't know whether this is good for the tape or not. Is it all right?

Marcello: Fine.

Hall: I just told the governor that, under the circumstances, I believe for the good of the college and the state and the students and all concerned that it would be wise if we had a complete change in the regents. He agreed heartily with me and asked me to make some suggestions as to people that I'd like to see serving on the Board of Regents. I really didn't know anybody, and I talked to various people around, and I made some recommendations. I recommended Lamar Hunt's wife. She's a former graduate of North Texas State University, had a special interest in it. I also recommended Winfred Brown, who was appointed to the board, from out at Midland. He's now a member of the board of regents.

But when I started talking to the governor about it, I said, "Don't you think it would be wise if I got somebody that supported you?" He laughed and said, yes, he did. But I made some recommendations, and that was two of them. I recommended another man from San Antonio, but I've forgotten his name. The way I did that, I asked some of the Republican representatives in those areas who they knew that had a special interest in North Texas and that had supported Governor Clements. This is the way I went about it, and one of them got appointed.

I still thought it would have been wise to get completely new blood, and we got two-thirds of them that way. I don't know Mr. Chiles, but I'm sure he'll make a good regent. But I'm a little bit doubtful of appointing a man seventy years old to a board of regents. I know he's very young for his age, and probably younger than I am at fifty-seven, but I just think maybe that younger people that are not so far removed from the college will have a greater interest in the activities of the college. That was the reason for my asking the governor this question, the reason for me seeking out these people as appointees to the board of regents. I thought maybe we needed a woman, and that's the reason I suggested Mrs. Hunt to serve in this capacity.

Outside of that, that's about all I know. I did work real close with Mr. "Gib" Lewis on the TCOM-North Texas situation. I hope we got this thing straightened out. I think most of it was lack of communications, misunderstanding, and personality conflicts. So maybe we got it all straightened out, I don't know.

I enjoyed serving in the Legislature. I hope I get another shot at it.

Marcello: Well, this is probably a good place to end this interview. I want to thank you very much for having participated. You've been most candid. I certainly do appreciate the details that you gave.

Hall: Thank you.

Marcello: I'm sure future scholars will find your comments very valuable, Representative Hall.

Hall: Thank you.