

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION

NUMBER *16*

Interview with
Oscar Mauzy
November 3, 1967

Place of Interview: Dallas, Texas

Interviewer: Dr. E. Dale Odom
Closed until notified
Terms of Use: by Senator Mauzy

Approved: See Folder for Letter

Date: July 8, 1968

Oral History Collection

Oscar Mauzy

Interviewer: E. Dale Odom

Place of Interview: Dallas, Texas

November 3, 1967

Dr. Odom: This is E. Dale Odom, November 3, 1967, in an interview with Senator Oscar Mauzy in his office in Dallas, Texas. Senator Mauzy, for this record, I wonder if you would give us just a brief biography up to your election as a member of the Senate in 1966.

Mr. Mauzy: Yes, this is Oscar Mauzy. I was born in Houston, Texas, in 1926. I graduated from public schools there in 1943. I served in the United States Navy from 1944 through 1946 in World War II, overseas, as a radarman aboard the battleship Washington in the Pacific theater. Following my discharge from the United States Navy, I worked from January, 1946, to September, 1946, as a railway baggage clerk, as a machinist, and other employment. I was then at the University of Texas from September, 1946, until January, 1949. I then worked as a pipe fitter at the Shell refinery chemical plant at Deer Park, just outside Houston until September, 1949, when I entered the University of Texas law school. I received my B.B.A. from the University of Texas in 1950, my L.L.B. in January, 1952. Having passed the state bar in October,

1951, I then began to practice law in Dallas in 1952, and I've been here since. My political activity in that period from 1952 to 1966 was solely within the Democratic Party, at various levels as an organizer of the Young Democrats, as a county chairman of the Young Democrats in Dallas County, as a national committeeman of the Texas Young Democrats, as a liberal candidate for national president of the Young Democrats in 1959--a race which I lost by nine votes, 521-512--and as a precinct chairman and leader of the loyal opposition in the Democratic Party in Dallas County. I was then elected to the state Senate in November, 1966, after having run second in the first primary and won the run-off in the Democratic primary and winning in November against a Republican opponent.

Odom: Also it might be of some importance in what you have to say in your reflections on the legislature, on this legislative session. You might tell us just a bit about your election in 1966--what issues were involved and without taking too much time on it.

Mauzy: All right. I, of course, over the years have been identified as a liberal Democrat--that is one who supports the national Democratic Party as distinguished from the Democratic Party in Texas. When I announced, I was immediately branded for what I am, and that is a labor lawyer. As a partner in a law firm that represents the teamster's union and Jimmy Hoffa specifically, I was accused of all the things that are institutional in Texas politics--that is being a wild-eyed liberal, a Communist, a nigger lover, everything else that people can think of that is supposed to be

derogatory. In the first primary, there were three of us--the establishment candidate who had served one session in the House from Dallas County, a member of the American Nazi Party, Gene Guinn, and myself. David Ivy, the establishment candidate, led the ticket by about 450 votes. I trailed by 450, and Guinn, the Nazi, got 1500 forcing a run-off.

The run-off was particularly vicious and dirty. Thursday night before the election on Saturday in the run-off, about sixty of my signs were stenciled with the Communist hammer and sickle seeing to leave the impression with the public that I was a Communist or a Communist sympathizer. The whole establishment opposed me. Both newspapers editorialized against me. The power structure here--all the lobby groups--banks, insurance, oil lobby, all of the financial institutions, of course, opposed me. The election was really won on the basis of organization versus personality. We had a tremendous organizational effort--410 people out door knocking the day of the run-off in key precincts to get out the vote. I won by a thousand votes in the run-off--8500 to 7500. And in November I had the easiest race of all in the county. I defeated my Republican opponent by about 6,000 votes.

Odom: Your district takes in Oak Cliff. What other sections of Dallas?

Mauzy: Yes. My district is what's called the southwest county district. It's everything in Dallas County south and west of the Trinity River. It includes the cities of Grand Prairie, Duncanville, Cedar Hill, De Soto, Lancaster, Wilmer, Hutchins, Cockrill Hill,

and the Oak Cliff of the city of Dallas.

Odom: What about the...when you reached Austin then and began the first session of the Senate the first part of this year? Was it what you expected? Or was it different? Would you reflect just a little bit on the reactions of the liberal rookie senator?

Mauzy: Well, I didn't go completely unprepared. I had been hanging around the legislature for the last twenty years. First as a student at the University of Texas, I had worked as a clerk in the House of Representatives. And then I worked for the Comptroller's Office while I was a student on a half-time basis and always hung around the legislature. I went to committee hearings, watched the legislature in session--both the House and the Senate. After I graduated from law school, I was an unpaid amateur lobbyist lobbying for various things that I believe in--voter registration, repealing the poll tax, increased social welfare programs, workman's compensation, unemployment compensation, and others. So I wasn't totally unfamiliar with the legislative process.

I went down with the thought in mind that I had been unjustly, unfairly singled out as one of the ten rookies because I was the only senator who was elected in a run-off first, and secondly because I was the only member of the Senate who the governor had actively opposed, had campaigned against, who had won. And consequently, I went with something of a reputation which I did not deserve for being a giant killer. I was flattered by it, but I did not and do not deserve it. And I was determined to try my

best the first thirty days to be seen and not heard, to act like a rookie is supposed to act, to do my homework, and to be conscientious. I found the lobby, generally, to be totally antagonistic and frankly fearful of me. Again undeservedly they gave me credit for having a lot more sense than I have. They gave me credit for being a Machiavellian manipulator of others which I am not. I wish I were. They gave me credit for really being a political power which I am not.

So I was disappointed to the extent that the lobby had not done its homework and really didn't know anything about me except what they had read in the newspapers, which was what the people they paid to do their smear jobs on politicians had done, which strikes me as a very unprofessional way to go about lobbying. I found the members of the Senate generally to be friendly. I like to think that I enjoy the reputation as a lawyer, and I always have of being a person whose word is good. I come from the school of politics that practices the fact that if a man's word is no good, he's no good. And one thing I had in my mind that I wanted to achieve by the end of the session was I wanted to walk away from the Senate with the same reputation as a Senator that I have as a lawyer, and that is that I'm not afraid to state my position. I don't care if I'm a minority of one, but that my word is totally good and you don't have to check on me. And I think I accomplished that. I think without exception, every member of the Senate-- the ones that hate my guts the worst and the ones who liked me

the best--will all say that my word is good and that I've never lied to anybody and I've never tried to deceive or mislead. And to me this is the most important reputation a man can have in any phase of his life, particularly in politics.

Odom: Would you comment for a short time on what might be called the power structure in the...particularly in the Senate, though not necessarily limited to the Senate. Somebody said the other day, "Well, you know twenty or thirty men down there really determine what happens." I don't know whether...is that true?

Mauzy: I think so, but it's not the elected members, it's the lobby basically. Now the Senate this year was a little bit unique for several reasons. First of all, we had ten rookies and twenty-one old timers come back, which is an inordinately high number of rookies. Secondly, the age bracket of the rookies lowered the overall age of the Senate considerably. I was forty years old the day after I was elected, and I had expected to be one of the youngsters. Come to find out, I wasn't. Senator Barbara Jordan, Senator Chet Brooks, Senator Joe Christie, Senator Charlie Wilson--all these rookies are younger than I. Actually, I never have looked it up, but I suspect I'm probably about average in age in the Senate. I would fall right about at the average.

The Senate, as I saw it before I went down, would basically fall into three categories--the Connally people, who the governor could vote any way he wanted to anytime he wanted to; the Preston Smith group, which the lieutenant governor could vote anytime he wanted

to any way he wanted to; and a third group that would shift and go on the particular issue as they saw the merits and demerits to be. And basically I think that analysis was correct. I put myself, both by philosophy and practical politics, in the third group. Obviously I'm not a Connally man after the experience I had with him in the primary. On the other hand, Preston Smith is the most reactionary politician I know at the state level in Texas, who is totally unaware of the social problems that we face and the issues really that confront the people of Texas today. And so it was easy for me, kind of by definition I fell into the third group. And before the session was over with, the governor moved more toward the position of the liberals, if you want to call the group of us there that have been characterized as that; and consequently, really the Connally forces and the liberals tended to coalesce more often than the liberals and the Smith forces tended to coalesce. Although, again this is an over-generalization, and you really have to look at it issue by issue. For example, I don't think it's a liberal or conservative issue, but some do...the question of four-year terms for governor. I'm personally opposed to four-year terms for governor, although most of the liberals I know, political scientists, and others, favor it. The lieutenant governor was opposed to four terms for governor because he had a political axe to grind against the governor. My vote was the key vote to block. My vote was the vote that was needed to kill four-year terms. And the governor tried to sweet-heart and romance me about it. The lieutenant governor never

offered me anything and knew he didn't have to because I was just against it in principle. The lieutenant governor throughout the session, a few times did try to romance me by cussing the governor to me, remembering my experience of the governor having opposed me. The...but there were no hard and fast lines in the Senate this year. People tended to roll and shift with the issues.

Odom: May I interrupt just a second. On this third group that you were talking about that were not for either Connally or Preston Smith, a group in the Senate. Ideologically they were not necessarily all liberals were they?

Mauzy: No, they weren't. And some of the liberals from time to time, I would find taking positions that were unexplainable except on a basis of they were out to hurt Connally. Now there were four particularly in the Senate who are fine members of the Senate. They're very progressive-minded, liberal people--Senator Harrington of Port Arthur, Senator Brooks of Harris County, Senator Jordan from Harris County, and Senator Bernal from San Antonio. But their distrust and dislike of the governor is so intense that this tended to shade-- I think it tended to shade and color their thinking. And they would do something just to gut the governor rather than looking at the particular issue. I tried not to do that, and I think I didn't do it. There were nine of us basically in the Senate that I call liberals--the four I've named, myself, Senator Schwartz from Galveston, Senator Wilson from Lufkin, Senator Kennard from Fort Worth. That's...is that nine? Let's see, it was the four of them, and I'm five. Schwartz, Kennard, and Wilson's eight, and ninth would

be...who is it? Well, Jim Bates from Edinburgh is basically a liberal, but he's on the Preston Smith team. He's...Bates is typical of people who hate Connally so bad that they'd die and go to Hell rather than do anything that could be construed as a vote for Connally. But really Bates is not the one I'm thinking of. There were nine of us who met together.

Odom: Patman?

Mauzy: No, Patman doesn't have a philosophy. Hell, he's the world's biggest nonentity which is probably unfair. I'm probably judging Bill by his father whom I admire so much. Congressman Patman I think is one of the truly great men of Texas and it's unfair to judge a son by his father or vice versa. Who was the ninth one? Oh, Jack Strong from Longview met with us and worked with us. Now Strong is not normally considered a liberal because of the area he comes from. But on the economic issues, Jack Strong is as fine a member of that Senate as there is and as gutsy. He doesn't go out and make a lot of headlines and speeches because he's not that kind of a fellow, but...and he's also got more integrity, I think, personal integrity than any member of the Senate. I admire him very much.

Odom: You were talking about meeting with you and so forth. Did you as a group caucus and discuss your problems and your tactics?

Mauzy: Yes, we did specifically on the appropriation bill which was really what the whole fight was about in the legislature this session. As I viewed it, we had a choice of making some advances-- not as many as I wanted to make and not going as far as I wanted

to go, but making some advances in the field of social welfare-- medicaid programs, authorized title 19 of the Social Security Act, the improvements to the unemployment compensation law, improvements in teacher's pay scale, things of this kind. It all really came down to the appropriation bill. How much money we were going to put into mental health and mental retardation. How much money we were going to give the school teachers on a pay raise. How much money we were going to spend for water and air pollution control. And so the nine of us started meeting early in the session. We met with the speaker because he had complete control of the House. And we worked...we made a deal with him that we in...the nine of us in the Senate would write the appropriation bill the way we wanted it. The Senate would first pass their appropriation bill which we knew we didn't have the votes to pass. Then the speaker would substitute the House bill for it, and it would come back to us. Now part of the deal was the governor and the speaker between them were going to liberate other senators to us--Senator Connally, the governor's brother; Senator Wade from Dallas; Senator Berry from San Antonio; Senator Cole from Houston...gee, it's amazing how time robs your memory.

Odom: Senator Christie?

Mauzy: Yea, the governor said he could deliver Christie. I never believed he could. Christie's a political opportunist. He's got more talent than a man ought to have and be a whore. We are off the record, of course. A political whore, I'm speaking of. Let's

see who else. The governor said he could deliver Hightower, which I didn't believe either. We called him the Billy Graham of the Senate. He's so God damned pious and sanctimonious it's unreal. And Ralph Hall from Rockwall and we thought we could get Word...Senator Word from Meridian. And then what happened was we met many times about this--the nine of us with the governor, with the speaker. And the Friday before we were going to vote on the House bill that was sent back to us on Tuesday, the nine of us met in the governor's office with the governor. And this deal was re-affirmed, and everyone committed themselves again in front of each other. Lo and behold, over the weekend somebody, and I can't prove who it is, but I think I know, put the arm on Harrington, Brooks, Jordan, and Bernal. They came in Monday and without talking to the rest of us went to see the speaker and told him the deal was off. Until this day, none of them have told me the deal is off which I resent very much. Just because I think as a human being I'm entitled to that courtesy, and the deal was off. And they wound up voting with the lieutenant governor. We...what we wanted to do was to substitute the House bill and avoid a conference committee. The conference committee system is really what we were striking at, trying to do away with it. We weren't able to, and what we actually had to do is make our fight on a procedural motion that was made was to instruct the conference committee not to delete certain items, and we specified them in a motion that Senator Strong presented. The lieutenant governor ruled it out of order, and then we did some-

thing that is supposed to be just pure heresy in the Senate. We appealed the ruling of the chair. Senator Kennard was absent-- at his mother's funeral--and we needed ten votes. On the rules of the Senate you need ten votes to get a roll call on appealing the chair's ruling. We only had nine. If Senator Kennard's mother had not died, he would have been there; we would have had ten, and we really would have had a good issue. And we really would have separated some sheep from some goats.

Odom: How do you anticipate the vote would have been on the appeal to...

Mauzy: I really...I really don't know. I really don't know. I tend to think we probably would have lost it, but it would have been... it would have been the gut vote of the session in the Senate. And some people would have not been entitled to claim that their word was good after that one. Now that's one reason I wanted it; I like to put people on record.

Odom: (Chuckle) I see. Let's see here. You might also sort of for the record here, of course, it's elsewhere, but what your committee assignments were and comment on the committee assignment issue or problem.

Mauzy: Well, after I was elected, the lieutenant governor several times sent feelers to me. He wanted me to come see him about committee assignments. I wouldn't do that because to me that's crawling and that's begging for something that as a matter of right you're entitled to as a member of the Senate. The lieutenant governor didn't elect me. He represents the executive branch of the govern-

ment not the legislative branch, and I nor any other member of the Senate should have to crawl and beg for anything or commit himself for anything. And so I just refused to do it. Actually the lieutenant governor treated me fairly on the appointments. I did talk to him the day the session started, or the day after the session began. He called me in and asked me to come talk to him. And I was there in the same building. I could hardly refuse. He asked me what I was interested in, and I told him the things that I was interested in, but I did not ask him to put me on any committees. I did not do anything that would have been a commitment to him or anyone else. He asked me my views about various things. He asked about four-year terms for example, and I told him I was opposed to it.

Actually, I got very good committee assignments, and I have no complaint about that. I was vice-chairman of the Veteran's Affairs Committee, which doesn't do anything but sure looks good on your letterhead, and all the veterans think you're a great fellow. I was vice-chairman of the Claims Committee which presents all the claims that various state agencies and institutions and individuals have against the state treasury which again doesn't do anything. The committee only met once the whole session, but it looks good. I was a member of the Nominations Committee which screens the governors' nominees before they go before the full Senate for confirmation. I was a member of the Education Committee which is a committee I really wanted on because it's something I'm

very interested in, and I enjoyed the work on the Education Committee probably more than any other committee. I was a member of the re-districting committee which I wanted on because I'm vitally interested in re-districting, but that committee never met. We didn't organize until the session had been going on three and a half months because the deal was from Washington and from the lobby that Ralph Hall and Ben Barnes would write the redistricting bill in such a way as to please the governor and incumbents and the president, and there would be no formal hearings and things would just zip through.

And that's exactly what happened. Even though I tried to amend and change the redistricting bills, I just didn't have the votes, and as a rookie I really didn't know the ropes well enough, and Ralph Hall is probably the greatest maneuverer in the Senate. I admire him very much, and I like him very much personally.

Odom: He's a person that's likable.

Mauzy: He's likable and his word is good. Ralph Hall will not lie to you about anything, and I admire that very much. I served on, let's see...we covered what? Four or five. I also served on the Insurance Committee which I wanted to serve on. I've got a real hard on for the insurance industry in Texas, and the way it has been raping the people.

Odom: Did you accomplish anything much here in the way of hearings for the insurance committee?

Mauzy: A little, not as much as we had hoped to. We didn't do but one

constructive thing in the field of insurance. We passed a bill that makes uninsured motorists practically...uninsured motorist coverage on your liability insurance policy for your car practically mandatory. I personally was for compulsory liability insurance. We couldn't get that bill out of committee. We did rewrite and rework some bad bills to make them not quite so bad-- the insurance industry...the life insurance industry did get a bill passed that I was very much opposed to that permits them to invest in real estate and own real estate in Texas which I think in the long run will do away with the home building industry and the mortgage money market. The insurance industry will totally control it which I think is detrimental. But they had to move to suspend the rules eleven times before they finally got it done. Now you talk about a lobby at work and some money changing hands, some money changed hands on that one. Started out, we had fourteen votes against suspending the rules, but after eleven attempts, they finally got us down where we only had ten which is not enough to block. And, Jeff, why don't you go and get my letterhead so I can see what other committees I was on. It's just amazing how you forget.

Odom: Yes, I'm sure it is. We wanted to do these things as soon after the session as we could, but it's been rather difficult to get some of these people with time to meet with us.

Mauzy: I can appreciate that. I don't mean to be critical. I'm not. It's just really I'm criticizing myself, I guess. You just tend to forget so much so quickly. At the time when you're in the

heat of battle, you think you'll never forget it. I was on the banking committee. I guess Preston put me on there so that there'd be one vote against all that special interest legislation. And I was on the Constitutional Amendments Committee. By the way, there was an interesting fight in the constitutional amendments on this four-year term for the governor. I was vitally concerned about that. To me, it's something that I really feel very strongly about. It was a thirteen-man committee, and I'd worked that committee very hard after the House passed the constitutional amendment for four-year terms. And I'd worked that committee every way there was, and it was seven against it and six for it, and there was just no way you could change it because I'd check those fellows out every day. And I wouldn't ask somebody else to ask them, I'd ask them myself. And so I set the thing down, and the lieutenant governor and I worked together on this. I told him I had the votes, and he checked, and he knew I had the votes. And we set it down for hearing on the committee, and the committee met and considered the amendment and the vote was taken. And Senator Bates was in another committee meeting; he was against it. And one other senator whom I've forgotten who it was now was temporarily absent at another committee meeting--Hardeman...Senator Hardeman who's against it.

That was a strange coalition--Hardeman and Mauzy on the same side. (Chuckle) And the chairman, Senator Moore, called for the vote and wouldn't let the...we had an understanding they'd be notified

before any vote was taken. It'd be a roll call. He wouldn't let them vote. Wouldn't let them vote. They were standing right there by him, and he wouldn't record them. So the bill was reported out of committee the next day. It came before the full Senate, and we re-referred it to committee by a majority, which is unheard of in the Senate to re-refer a bill back to a committee. But it was so rotten and so raw what they'd done that thereafter...so the next time it came up I knew I had the votes. You know, I just knew because I had wire worked these fellows to death. But the governor made three phone calls, and the bill came out of committee, 6-5.

Odom: Is Senator Moore an important member of the governor's group?

Mauzy: No, Bill Moore just hates Preston Smith's guts so bad. Now he's the converse of the others I was talking about that hate Connally's guts so bad. Bill Moore and Preston Smith, I think if they had an opportunity would kill each other with broken beer bottles, preferably, because that'd be more painful. And Moore...the governor's the one that did it. He called Senator Reagan and put the arm on him and H. E. Butts, the big food chain magnate who votes Bruce Reagan, you know any way he wants to. I was there when Reagan got the call, and man, he switched--plop! Parkhouse, who's now dead, and you're not supposed to talk about dead people, but God damn it I talked about him when he was alive and I'm not going to change now, took a walk. He didn't have the guts to stay. He was against it. He voted against it the first time, but he got the arm put on him by Dick West and the Dallas News, who are

big Connally fans, and he took a walk. He didn't have the guts to stay. And somebody else switched. Oh, I've forgotten who the other one was now, but it just burned me up. It infuriated me that people's word is no good.

Odom: Then it got back to the floor of the Senate again.

Mauzy: It got back to the floor, and Creighton, who was carrying the bill...we got him in a parliamentary box...the lieutenant governor and I. And we had it at the top of the calendar one day, and we were going to kill it right then, and Creighton tried to salvage it by putting it on the calendar "subject to call" which meant only he could bring it up. And I think we had a vote on some kind of parliamentary maneuver about that point where the vote was 17-14. We didn't quite kill it. We could have killed it outright, and that's what I wanted to do. I wanted to defeat the governor on this issue, and I wanted to do it publicly. And I wanted to be, frankly, recognized as the leader who had done it because I think it's something that politically helps me because the public has voted on this and expressed itself. We weren't able to, but Creighton never had the votes to bring it up and he knew it, and he never tried to bring it up.

Odom: Then it didn't come back up. Oh, yes, I wanted to ask you to comment...you have already by implication and in some spots in some ways directly, but comment on what you think was the overall impact of this conflict between the lieutenant governor and the governor on the legislative process in Texas in the 60th session of the legislature.

Mauzy: Well, I'll be glad because really it's, I think, fundamental to really understand what happened down there and particularly in the long view of history I think that this will be proved significant for years to come. First of all, before the session started, there was a concerted move made to rewrite the rules of the Senate. Now the Senate is a very un-Democratic body. The majority does not rule the Senate. The Senate operates on the two-thirds principle of having to suspend the rules to get a bill up. And Senator Jack Strong from Longview and Senator Kennard from Fort Worth talked to me in December before the session started about trying to make a concerted effort to rewrite the rules of the Senate, basically with the view in mind of establishing the concept that the Senate elects its own committee rather than their being appointed by the lieutenant governor, he being a member of the executive and not the legislative branch. And really what we were trying to do was to model the rules of the state Senate more or less along the same lines as the United States Senate bearing in mind that we don't have a two-party system yet, but that we're moving in that direction, and that we're going to have.

And a group of us...I went down four days early before the session started to help in this process, and I was really very flattered that I should be asked, being a rookie, to participate in the actual draftsmanship of this. And this was really a wild coalition. As the session later developed, it was a wild coalition.

At the time it was very logical. But basically...we had fifteen votes the first day of the session to rewrite the rules. And the lieutenant governor's so stupid and doesn't know how to count, he didn't know whether we had sixteen or eighteen or twenty-one or how many we had which I'll get to in a minute because that's significant. But that group was basically the group of us that spent the weekend before the session started on Tuesday trying to rewrite the rules were Senator Strong, Senator Kennard, Senator Charlie Herring from Austin, who's probably the best overall member of the Senate in terms of ability, parliamentary skill, being able to work hard, touching all the basis, knowing where all the bodies are buried, and personable. Charlie Herring is a very personable fellow. I don't have as much respect for him at the end of the session as I had at the beginning of the session because, frankly, I think Charlie prostitutes himself.

But...and we met with Bob Johnson, who's the director of the Legislative Council, and he and his office were actually doing the typing and the reworking. But this is what we were trying to do. We met then, the morning the caucus...let's see. The session started at 11:00. The caucus was at 10:00, and we had finalized everything and got it all together. We met at 9:00 that morning--the four I've mentioned plus Senator Jordan from Houston was with us, Senator Brooks, all the liberals were with us on this...Brooks, Jordan, Harrington, Bernal, Wilson, the others. In addition to that, the governor. You see, part of this deal again was the gov-

ernor was going to help us. He was going to get us some votes in the Senate.

Well, we counted fifteen. We counted all weekend. We really hoped to get Senator Hall and Senator Word. They would not commit themselves, and we understood. And there are no hard feelings because they were honest with us, that if we got seventeen they would go with us. They didn't want to be the ones that made the majority. If we had seventeen, and they'd become number eighteen and nineteen, well, once you get to nineteen in the Senate, God damn, it's just like the domino theory. They all start falling over, and hell, you wind up with twenty-three or twenty-four. It's that sixteenth one that kills you, and this leads me to Bill Patman.

The night before the session started, Charlie Herring had a party at his house, you know, for the members of the Senate. And Patman would not commit to us on the rules change. Patman is a fellow who hates Connally with a passion, too. I've heard his side why he hates him. I've heard Connally's side. I don't know who's telling the truth. I tend to think they're both childish frankly. But Patman is the kind of fellow who will never commit himself to anything. He'll never tell you what he's going to do, and he'll pussy foot with you. And we worked on Patman at Charlie's house that night--a bunch of us--for hours. And I had been in law school with Bill; he was a year behind me and a classmate of my brother's

in law school. And as I say I admire his father so much, and I've known his father so long that I just couldn't believe... and Bill Patman's voting record is so good. I couldn't believe he wouldn't be for this because this is a progressive thing. It really brings democracy to the Senate for the first time, but Patman would not commit. We had fifteen votes committed and he would have been it, and he could have been the hero and the leader. And, you know, we promised him the capitol dome for God's sake. Told him we'd call them the Patman rules or whatever he wanted to do. And I learned a little lesson there that the best way to get Patman committed is to get his wife committed. And we had his wife committed, but she couldn't swing him because he wasn't gutsy enough.

Odom: Do you attribute part of this to his dislike for Connally and the fact that he was helping you on this?

Mauzy: Purely and simply that. Yea. Now actually we had sixteen votes and didn't know it as it turned out. The governor had gotten Red Berry for us and hadn't told us. Well, we get in there that day, and we held our caucus and the Senate goes into session. We all get sworn in, and then the next thing is to adopt the rules. And Senator Aikin, the dean, makes the motion to adopt the previous rules. And we had decided that since we didn't have...well, not that we had decided...Jack Strong decided that rather than embarrass people because we didn't have the votes, he went to the lieutenant governor and told him, "Now this is what we've been up to. We've got fifteen votes. We think we can get sixteen, but

rather than cause a big fight here the first day, we will not seek to change the rules. If you will agree to appoint a committee to study these rules this session...a fair committee that'll do some thought and study to it, and we won't change the rules this session but looking toward changing them in 1969."

And the lieutenant governor in the presence of other members of the Senate, promised him he would, and in fact promised Senator Strong that he, Senator Strong, could name the committee so it would be fair which is where Preston Smith gets his reputation for being a liar because he flat didn't do it. And the committee was to be appointed immediately. The committee was appointed the last week of the session, and it's stacked 6-1 against changing the rules.

Anyway, we didn't...if we'd known we had that sixteenth vote we probably have made a fight of it, but the point was the lieutenant governor didn't know whether we were going to or not even though Jack told him we weren't going to. And so when the rules were proposed, Senator Schwartz then sought to amend only certain of the rules rather than rewrite the whole thing. And it was at this point that the lieutenant governor made the most stupid, idiotic, childish ruling I've ever seen. He ruled that it took a two-thirds majority to amend a pending simple resolution which could be adopted by a simple majority, which is outlandish and irresponsible and totally in keeping with his character. He didn't know whether he had the votes or not so he was using the power of

the chair. And it's unprecedented and unheard of in any civilized society that I know anything about, and that ruling came back to haunt him during the session many times, because we made him reduce it to writing and put it in the Senate journal, where it has become a precedent now.

And we lost on the rules changes that Senator Schwartz proposed, which were basically to do away with the secret sessions and the executive sessions. As I remember, I've got the journal here I can check, but as I remember we were getting twelve and thirteen votes and along there that first day. But, by the way, before the session was over, we did pass a simple resolution, that we got a majority for to do away with secret sessions. Now it didn't amend the rules because once the rules are adopted, then it does take a two-thirds majority to amend them. But the Senate has expressed itself...a majority has expressed themselves as being against it, so I'm hopeful next session we will actually do away with the executive sessions. Yes, the votes were 12...18, nay and 12 yea, pretty much up and down the line. That first time. We got thirteen here one time. And then six of us voted just not to adopt any damn rules at all; we were so mad. Six being Barry, Harrington, Kennard, Mauzy, Schwartz, and Wilson. (Chuckle) I guess you'd call those the hard heads. That might not have been a smart vote, but I was so mad, and I just don't understand it. If you believe in something, by God go down with it. I don't understand other people who don't.

Odom: Well, this is the kind of thing we're hoping to...kind of get... we're hoping to fill for future historians. We have correspondence for 17th and 18th century on things in the heat of emotion, you know...writing to their friends or somebody else, but historians of the future are not going to have many letters like this... journals, or diaries, or anything like that.

Mauzy: No, and really correspondence can't really tell the whole story either.

Odom: No, it can't.

Mauzy: I mean the inflection in a man's voice as it's recorded tells a lot, I think, about it. And I'm sure that this tape will reveal that I feel kind of strongly about some of these things.

Odom: And a historian can tell that, and a good transcriber is supposed to bring that out by underlining, and by various techniques.

Mauzy: Well, it was an interesting experience, and it taught me a great deal--that first day. Many people criticized us for making this fight the first day, because the session...normally, the first day's only supposed to be about thirty minutes, you know. You're supposed to adopt the caucus report, adopt the rules; everybody loves everybody. And everybody hugging each other's neck, and you cut out. Well,...and a lot of people got mad. I had many friends came down from Dallas to see it, and you know a lot of people didn't believe I was really going to get there. And they were kind of disturbed with me because we didn't get to go to lunch until about 2:30 that afternoon.

But it's the kind of fight that needed to be made, and it needed to be made the first day. And the people of Texas and the lieutenant governor and the press and everybody else needed to understand at the beginning that this was going to be a session with conflict in it. And that we--the people that have been characterized as the liberals, I personally don't like that word, by the way, because it's not used in its dictionary sense. If everybody would use it in that sense, I would have no objection to it, but that we--the newcomers to the Senate, particularly--were not going to fiddle-faddle around and engage in this old crap that's been going on down there for years. And if we had eleven, we were going to block when we could. And by God, it wasn't going to be any holds barred. We wanted the Old Guard to understand at the outset that we were rookies, many of us, and we were going to be respectful. But by God, we were going to be voting, and we were going to be heard; and we were not going to be intimidated. Now I think we pretty well established that the first day.

Odom: What about this term, though, apparently in the House there was not near so much conflict or so much strength, or certainly not any cohesion on the part of the group that are designated liberals in the House. Do you attribute this to the speaker's skill or what do you attribute this to?

Mauzy: Well, I'm not really sure I'm qualified to talk about the House. I've never served in the House, and I...perhaps I'm being unfair in what I say.

Odom: We'd just like to get your view of it.

Mauzy: Well, I'll be glad to tell you, but I want to say that to start with in the interest of trying to be objective. The House, as I viewed it, there was really...they called themselves the dirty thirty over there, and that was about right. They had about thirty people that I considered gutsy and right on the issues, which is only one-fifth of the House. Now the House is a different legislative creature than the Senate. The speaker had done his homework well. He was in complete control of that House. He ran that damn thing any way he wanted to, because of his ability to appoint committees, and because everybody in the House runs every two years, and because of the close liaison between the governor and the speaker, and because of the lobby influence. And the establishment--the whole business...and consequently the speaker had complete control of the House.

Now actually many of things...again it's an over simplification but the speaker before the session was over with, tended to take a much more progressive point of view than the lieutenant governor did, which I think's explainable for many reasons. One of which is there's a generation difference between the two men. I think the speaker also has more native intelligence than the lieutenant governor, which is not saying a damn thing. That's like saying tuberculosis is not as bad as cancer. But, in any event he controlled it, and it was futile from the standpoint of getting something done for those fellows to butt their heads against the wall. I think if I'd been a member of the House, I'd have

been a member of the House, I'd have been one of the "dirty thirty." I'd have been butting my head against the wall, because I'm just that kind of an animal. But he did some progressive things--the new rules for the House, for example, that'll take effect next session are really a tremendous improvement. And I...by the way, I think the speaker's going to be the next lieutenant governor. And we've already got him committed...a group of us...to letting us rewrite these rules and do away with this whole conference committee system. That's really the evil we're driving at, and you've got to do it both in the House rules, the Senate rules, and the joint rules.

See, we never adopted any joint rules the whole session. There were no joint rules. And many things that the lieutenant governor did, there was no provision for appointing conference committees. Many things he did are totally unauthorized by the rules, and everybody just kind of winks and giggles and goes on about their business. But that's a hell of a poor way to run a government.

Odom: So, in other words, you imply here that this would have been a considerable different session had you had a lieutenant governor who's committed to the Connally forces. It seems sort of an implication that...

Mauzy: Well, I don't...I don't mean to say that. Let me...let me phrase it more accurately. I really don't blame the lieutenant governor for what he did. I understand people trying to use power,

and particularly when there's precedence for it. I blame the members of the Senate. Anytime sixteen senators are willing to stand up on their two hind legs and demand something, they're going to get it in that Senate if they've got the guts to ask for it. And where we lost the battle and the war was the first day when we didn't get Bill Patman. And I hold that little bastard personally responsible for the whole thing. Bill Patman, by the way this is not just my opinion...Bill Patman is the only man in the Senate who does not have a single friend. I at least have one. He doesn't have any. No member of that Senate will tell you privately that Bill Patman's word is any good, even though he votes right. Now he votes like I do most of the time, but he's gutless and he's not willing to do his homework. He's a prima donna. Well, everybody's a prima donna, hell, that's not fair. I'm a prima donna, too.

Odom: So in other words, you think that this would have been a different session had there...had you had the votes to make that change on the first day here in the rules.

Mauzy: No question about that. I've always felt the rules, whether you're in a legislative body or trying a law suit, really are more important than the substance of the matter, because you can accomplish the substance you want if you've got the procedure under control. You get me to determine a procedure, and you can determine the substance of the law, and I'll whip you every time, whether it's a law suit or anything else.

Odom: I might ask you, also, while we're talking about it here, in what

other significant way you might think of that this conflict between the governor...essentially it was between the governor and the lieutenant governor rather than between the speaker and the lieutenant governor. What other significant ways it may have affected this particular legislative session?

Mauzy: Well, I think it affected it in many ways. When the governor took the position he did on taxes, actually his tax proposal was a pretty progressive thing. A group of us worked all night one night, and we came to the conclusion that it was 78% on business and 22% on people, which in Texas is the most liberal tax program I can ever remember. Of course, the lieutenant governor is a total creature of the lobby, and he's opposed to any new taxes, which means he's against any form of progress. You can not progress in this state unless you raise taxes. We've got programs to finance, and things to do. But the governor doesn't do his homework. The governor's a very arrogant man. He refuses to do the things that the system requires. For example, he never had a reception for the members of the Senate the whole session. I don't know whether he had one for the House or not. He didn't have to over there, but...

Odom: Is this a precedent? I mean...

Mauzy: It's just one of the things you do. If you want to get a fellow to go along with you, you try and establish a personal relationship. Now frankly, it didn't matter to me. I could care less. I've never set foot in the governor's mansion in my life, and I don't care whether I ever do or not, truthfully. It's one of

those things that doesn't matter to me, but let me give you an example. Now Senator Jordan, whom I admire and respect greatly, I think flaked off on us because she, after all, is a woman first. And she got her feelings hurt because she hadn't ever been invited to the governor's mansion. Although, actually she did get invited over there for a tea, I think, during the session that Mrs. Connally held. But anyway, I...just for example, if the governor had invited her in and the rest of us...had us in the office for coffee just shooting the breeze or invited us over to the mansion or something, she would probably not have flaked on this deal. But she got her feelings hurt about it, and this is an example of the governor not doing his homework. He's a very arrogant man, and he doesn't approve of the legislature, really.

Odom: Is this partly due, perhaps, to the fact that he was elected by such a large majority by the public that he feels that he has enough of a lever that he doesn't have to, as you would put it, work with the members of the legislature to establish personal contact in order to be able to get his things accomplished?

Mauzy: I think that's part of it, but I also think another part of it is the governor has never served in a legislative body. And the thing that I have never understood about the governor--he learned that the feet of the greatest legislative tactician of all time--Speaker Rayburn is who I'm speaking of, not Senator Johnson, President Johnson--he learned from Mr. Rayburn through President Johnson, and Speaker Rayburn, I think, was the greatest legislative tactician that ever lived. And he understood the power

of the legislative branch, and as you know, historically he brought the presidency to heel many times while he was speaker.

Now Connally knows this, but he's too arrogant to do it, and that's all you can call it is arrogance. But here again, the governor doesn't do his homework. And this is typical of him. He never does his homework. I attribute it to arrogance. He's got the press in Texas. They're lap dogs for him. Anything he wants to do, by God, they're for. And he tends to forget that... for example, the three of us from Dallas County--Parkhouse and Wade and I. Now I went down there with the reputation of being a big anti-Connally man and a wild man. You know, I was going to go down there and throw bombs and blow up the capitol and all that jazz. When the session was over with, the governor told me himself I'd supported his program better than Parkhouse and Wade put together. Well, it wasn't because I'm a Connally man. It was because he was right on issues. Of the alternatives I had facing me, he was on the right side more often than he wasn't. And particularly if you get it down, it's an over simplification, but if you put it on the Smith vs. Connally, I'm going to be with Connally most of the time for a very simple reason, he's more progressive than Smith. Smith's reactionary; he's retrogressive in his attitudes and his approaches. He doesn't believe in the twentieth century. He would like to really be living back in about the eighteenth century. He'd fit in there pretty well, too.

Odom: I wonder if you would now, perhaps, in taking up some of these various issues that I've given you. You might just look over them there. You would probably save time. If you'd look over them and see which ones you would like to comment to some extent about.

Mauzy: Well, I'd like to comment about all of them.

Odom: Okay, that's fine.

Mauzy: Take them up in order--the teacher's pay raise. I was committed to the entire legislative program of TSTA, although I did so with reservations. I think that their proposals were mediocre at best. They didn't go far enough. They didn't ask for enough. They weren't really trying to upgrade education in Texas sufficiently to suit me. But I like to think I'm a realist, and I understood that they felt that this was the best they could do. And they were in a better position to judge the makeup of the legislature than I was before I got there. But I am on record as being critical of them beforehand...before I was ever nominated for not asking for enough. Now, Senator Aikin enjoys the reputation of being the father of education. And he always sponsors all their bills. Senate bill 16 was the Senate...was the teacher pay raise bill, and it called for the TSTA proposal. And I'm a little hazy on figures right now, but as I recall the total cost of the package was 61 million, I believe to start with. That includes the retirement phase of it, too.

Odom: It came down to 55 million, I think.

Mauzy: Yea. After we passed the appropriation bill, then we took...

which was Senate bill 15. Then right behind it, he moved with Senate bill 16. Now we'd passed it out of the education committee unanimously. There was 19 or 20 of us as co-sponsors. Obviously we had the votes in the Senate. Then Aikin moves to amend his own bill to reduce the amount of the teacher's pay raise. And I came unglued. The very idea. His argument was that there wasn't enough money, and it would require a tax increase. And I say if that's true, by God, let's have a tax increase. Anyway, nine of us voted against his amendment to reduce the amount of teacher's pay raise, and we caught hell from the TSTA, because we had fought their bill. Hell, we weren't fighting their bill; we were trying to keep what they started out asking which was... all they were asking was to come to the national average in teacher's pay, which to me is condoning mediocrity, and I personally am not willing to condone mediocrity. But then to ask me...it's an insult to me to ask me in addition to condone mediocrity, reduce it below mediocrity. And nine of us just raised hell about it, and voted against the amendment, and then voted for the bill when the amendment was put on. We had to. Again it was one of those things. But Charlie Wilson and I particularly just raised hell about it, and it's something I'll never understand how Aikin gets his damned reputation of being a great friend of the teachers and pulls that kind of shenanigan on them.

Now I see movements a foot in the teaching profession in Texas that's going to change that, and it's good. The TSTA presently

is dominated by the superintendents and the principals. Every committee they got to study anything is about 40% teachers and the rest administrators and school board members and principals, superintendents--what I call management. That's going to put it in pure labor versus management. And they got the sorriest lobby down there. I'm...

Odom: Oh, really?

Mauzy: Oh, God. It's unreal.

Odom: Some of the legislators I've interviewed both biographical and this special project have maintained that the TSTA lobby is one of the most powerful that they have to contend with.

Mauzy: I don't think so. Now I know they can get a bunch of school teachers to write you a bunch of letters. You know, hell, they wrote me letters up the Kazoo about all their bills. And I was co-sponsoring every one of them. You know, so I looked like King Tut. But the reason I say they're ineffective, they haven't got any guts. First of all, their lobbyists are all principals and superintendents. And they're looking at the administration's view, not the school teacher's view. And I say there's a conflict there. It's inherent. It has to be there, and it's good. Their continuing contract bill, I put an amendment on that strengthened the bill and helped the individual teacher. And they cussed me for a week around there. Told me I was anti-teacher, and all my amendments said was before a school board can fire a teacher, they've got to give him in writing what they've got against him and give him a hearing. Now a common criminal is entitled to that under

our system of jurisprudence, and I'm a dirty bastard because I insisted that a teacher was entitled to that. And the teacher's lobby is the one cussing me about it. Well, this is the reason I say they're sorry. And specifically Sturgeon, who's their chief lobbyist down here, is a phony. Hell, he doesn't believe in education. He believes in feathering his own nest. And Bell--I forgot some of the rest of their names, but they're all alike.

Now this militant group that's coming along, the Classroom Teacher's Association, is going to do something. And the reason I say they're not an effective lobby, they didn't do anything to help me when I was running. And I had the best...the establishment candidate I was running against, Ivy, had promised to vote for the TSTA bill in '65, and then had catfished on them and voted for the governor's bill, which cut them down from what they were asking for. And you think they were out to get him? Hell, no, they were supporting him, see. Well, now, to me that ain't the way I play politics. Boy, you vote against me, and I'm going to get you if I can. And if I support you, I'm going...I mean if you support me, I'm going to help you if I can. And they tried their damndest to beat me too--the teachers did. And, hell, they can't influence their own members because I got to the individual member and explained my position to them, and I cussed them to their face for not being militant enough. And they responded.

Odom: You got the teacher's votes pretty well?

Mauzy: The individual teacher, now, that's the reason I say their lobby is ineffective. They can't even control their own membership. And I'm not suggesting any group can. No group is monolithic. But, for example, I see they're going to ask for a thousand dollar raise next year. I'm for it. Hell, I'd give them \$1500 if I had my way about.

Odom: While we're talking about it here, I realize it's sort of off the subject you were commenting on, but in contract what about the lobby for higher education?

Mauzy: Higher education does a much better job. What's it called--TACT?

Odom: Texas Association of College Teachers, yes.

Mauzy: They did a much better job. And I don't know, maybe it's me; I may be being a little bit unfair in what I'm saying. I hope I'm not, and I'm trying not to be. I've got some very good friends on the faculty at Arlington, and I feel very strongly about that faculty there. I think it's going to be a great school some day. The day of the run-off I had eleven Ph.D's knocking doors for me from the Government and History Departments out there. And I think you have to elevate education at both levels at the same time in Texas. We're so far behind in both. But there's been an interim faculty compensation fringe benefit committee, as you know, which came in with some good recommendations. And the lobbying that was done for those bills was much superior to the lobbying that TSTA did for their bills.

The problem that we had with the higher education bills just since

we...since this is confidential. Roy Harrington's one of the best friends I've got in the Senate, but Roy's a dummy. He hasn't got any sense. He votes right. Hell, I voted him three-fourths of the session to tell you the truth. Roy was carrying the bills, and Roy hates Connally so bad that Preston manipulated him. Now I hate to say it, but Roy Harrington is dumber than Preston Smith. He's the only man I know that is, but Preston Smith could manipulate Roy Harrington. And Roy, bless his heart, he...you know he wants to do the right thing. He's right on the issue and everything, but he's limited in his capability. And that's one reason we didn't get to pass all the faculty compensation bills we wanted to. We had the votes to do it, but Roy wouldn't...didn't know how. And under the rules of the Senate only the sponsor can move a bill, and Preston would wire work him around and jazz him around, and poor old Roy just...bless his heart, he'd try so hard, but it's unfortunate. That's one of the things I hope to correct next session. By God I'm going to carry a couple of those bills, and I'll pass them because I'll make a deal with anybody to pass a bill.

Odom: Anything else that you wanted to say about the teacher's pay raise thing or is that about your...?

Mauzy: Well, yea, one other thing. The teacher pay raise thing was significant in these four senators flaking off on the appropriation fight I told you about earlier. Joe Bernal, particularly, was insistent that we had to give the teachers every penny they were asking for. Now the truth of the matter is the teacher lobby had

told us they were willing to settle, and again I'm not sure about these figures...I think the original package was 62 million. They had told us privately, the lobby themselves--Sturgeon, Bell, their lobbyists there. They were willing to settle for 45 million. And Bernal was holding out for 62 and the rest of us were saying, "Okay, we'll hold out if you will, Joe, if that's what it takes to firm you up. And we're going to have to pass a little tax bill, and that's all right with us, too." But he was saying, you know, the teachers, "I'm obligated to the teachers," and yak, yak, yak, yak, yak. And he...that was the excuse Joe gave for flaking off, see, because the House bill was going to give them...the Senate bill gave them 51 million, as I remember.

Odom: I thought the Senate bill was 55 million.

Mauzy: No, the Senate bill as originally passed the appropriation. The House bill gave them 55 million. Joe wouldn't go along with the House bill because it was only going to give them 55, as distinguished from 62, but he was willing to go along with the Senate bill that only gave them 51. And I just told him, "You're a confused, damned Mexican is your problem. You can't add plus the fact that the teachers are a paper tiger, and you're helping the damned superintendents." You see, another thing about this teacher pay raise bill. It really helps the superintendents and the principals more than it does the average teacher, and I wanted to shift the emphasis. I want to help the teacher not the superintendent. To hell with him--I ain't interested in him.

Odom: Why is it that it does that? I mean what is your?...

Mauzy: The formula, and TSTA always insists on that formula because they're dominated by the principals. If I had my way about it, I wouldn't give the principals and superintendents a damn thing, and I'd take that same amount of money and spread it out among the teachers. That'd mean a hundred dollars a year more for the teachers.

Odom: What about this...I'm sure you've got several things to say about this local option city sales tax. Your own record is pretty well known on that. I would like to give you a chance to comment on what might be involved there, too.

Mauzy: (Chuckle) Yea. Well, the significant thing about the city sales tax...the lesson I learned from this and the Sunday closing law-- we have to consider them together for this purpose. I learned a little lesson in parliamentary procedure on this. They passed them through the House early, and they came over, and they worked their way up to the top of the calendar in the Senate. Now we had twelve votes against both these--the Sunday closing law and the...not the same twelve...and the city sales tax. And, of course, if the bill had...Monday and Tuesday are Senate bill days in the Senate. Wednesday and Thursday are House bill days. If they had gone the regular route of having to suspend the rules to bring them up, they would--either one of them--gotten up. And so the other side got pretty cage, and I give the lieutenant governor credit and Senator Hardeman, who's really the brains in the Senate for the lieutenant governor and his forces. They let them work their way up to the top of the calendar, and we went to the calendar

that day instead of going the suspend the rules route, he just laid the bill out, which meant that a majority could then work its will rather than taking a two-thirds majority. And, of course, as you know this is where we had the filibuster. And we did something here that hadn't been done, the old timers tell me, in many, many years and had never been done by our side in the Senate. We busted a quorum one night.

We were in a filibuster on a bill, and about midnight we had a roll call for some damn reason. Everybody came in, and so then we decided that we were going to bust a quorum. Now the rules of the Senate require there has to be twenty-one members on the floor at all times to conduct business--a quorum is twenty-one. So Senator Berry and Senator Moore were out screwing around somewhere--one of them literally. (Chuckle) And so we left Senator Wilson on the floor. He was doing the talking. Patman, this is another example of his lack of guts, wouldn't walk out with us to bust the quorum. We had to have somebody there to ask the questions anyway, and we got Murray Watson to vote with them on this one thing although he was for the city sales tax, and the rest of us left. And then we suggested the absence of a quorum, and sure enough there weren't but nineteen members they could find. Well, when that happens then they passed...they put a call on the Senate, which means they are authorized to go out and arrest you and bring you in. Now I've got the warrant for my arrest hanging in my office. We all went and hid out together,

except Hank Grover, the Republican, who didn't want to be seen with us. He went to a hotel; we got him a room and registered him under another name and hid him out. Moore and Berry were gone. And the rest of us were against the city sales tax all hid out together all night long.

This happened about one o'clock in the morning as I remember, and they couldn't round...they found Berry about three in the morning and had...and they found Moore about seven o'clock in the morning, flew him back in a Department of Public Safety plane, which then gave them...we had to leave two of our people on the floor. And that gave them twenty-one then so...but anyway we kept them up all night long, and the Old Guard...God Almighty they came unhinged. Senator Aikin told...I saw him at lunch that day, and he said, "Oscar, that's the worst thing that's ever happened. Boy, that's hard on us having to sit there all night." And I said, "Well, senator, you better get used to it because there are going to be a lot of things happen like that." I said, "I'm God damn sick and tired, and a lot of people are sick and tired of the way you'll are running that damn Senate. The establishment's running it, and we don't like it, and if we can punish you physically, we're going to. And we're younger than you are, and we can sit up all night." And literally I did sit up all night. I got a little sleep sitting in a straight back chair, but you see, I can take it. I'm twenty-five years younger than that fellow, and our side is twenty-five years younger than their side collec-

tively. The Hardemans, the Parkhouses, and the Aikins, and the Ratliffs and Reagans are a bunch of old fuddy duddies, and our side are the Wilsons, and the Schwartzs, and the Mauzys, and the Jordans, and the Brooks. We're just twenty-five years younger than they are, and we taught them a lesson with that.

And we threatened them with it the rest of the session, and we got some confessions because of it. Anyway, it really gave our side a shot in the arm. And this was along in March--fairly early in the session, because we proved that if we hung together, we could do something. And that was what was so frustrating when the four of them flaked off on us late in the session on the appropriation bill. I really thought we had established this business of coalition and hanging together, and that was what was so frustrative about it. The bill itself was a terrible damn bill. It's...in many ways, what it's going to lead to is probably good. It's going to lead eventually to an income tax in Texas, which publicly I don't say I'm for. It's obviously the only answer to our problems.

Odom: Do you foresee many cities adopting it?

Mauzy: Well, up...when it was adopted, I really thought the people would vote it down. I've been very surprised by the number of cities that have passed it. We're going to have a little set-to here December 5 that a group of us are working at. I don't think, truthfully, we can defeat it in Dallas, but we're going to give it a good old-fashioned country rattle. A lot of people

tell me I'm foolish for getting out in front and leading this fight against it, that it's going to hurt me politically. I don't think it is, but to hell with that whether it does or not, that's the way I feel, and I'm not going to be a prostitute about it.

Odom: There apparently, they're working pretty hard to combat the one thing they're afraid of and cause this passage and that is that other cities around will not pass it and therefore will possess some sort of shopping or trading advantage.

Mauzy: Well, I think they would. And really the proponents of the sales tax are conducting a very smart campaign in the Dallas-Fort Worth area, because they're all voting on it at the same time. And I think it would give one merchant in a municipality that doesn't have it an advantage over another merchant who does. The sales tax is just the most regressive form of taxation there is, and it's terrible. It's a tax on poverty. Now I really enjoyed this filibuster. One of the highlights of it--Senator Jordan made her maiden speech in this filibuster, and I knew of her ability before because I've known her for many years. But she really impressed the gallery and the lobby because when she got up to speak it was her maiden speech, and boy, she was ready. And, man, she was quoting from Galbraith and all the great economists and was very dynamic. She spoke for about an hour and a half or two hours, and one of the few times I've ever heard the Senate applaud any member of the Senate for anything. I mean even the people that disagreed with her. Her delivery was good.

She was so well prepared. She had everything right there at her fingertips--completely germaine.

Odom: I've heard that she impressed most of the Senate a great deal.

Mauzy: Well, I think so. I think before the session was over, Senator Jordan had the respect of the members of the Senate. A lot of them privately hated her guts just because she's a Negro, but she worked hard. Barbara probably did her homework as well or better than any member of the Senate. She had the best briefing staff. She had a better briefing staff than I had, for example. She's very diligent. She never missed a committee meeting. She asked intelligent questions. She never asked a question if she didn't know the answer. She's a damned good lawyer.

Odom: On this sales tax business, at least it does represent some element of progressivism that it's not on food and some things like that.

Mauzy: Yea, but let me tell you what...that's a myth. You see when this city sales tax passes, then it's a piggy back sales tax. It follows the state sales tax. So the legislature next session can take away the exemptions and the people in the municipalities never get to vote on that. The city sales tax automatically includes doing away with that exemption. So it's a myth, and there's going to be a lot of heat on next year at that special session when we're going to have to raise taxes to do away with these exemptions.

Odom: They'll have to find them somewhere, aren't they?

Mauzy: That's right, and frankly I'm afraid we don't have the votes to keep from doing it, because it's going to be a special session,

and the House'll pass a bill first. It's a tax bill so obviously it has to originate in the House. It'll be on the top of the calendar. It'll just take a simple majority. Now we'll have twelve or thirteen against it, but twelve or thirteen won't be able to block, because again we're going to have to suspend the rules to get to it. And I'm...

Odom: Do you think there are that many legislators who are...who will, when it comes down to getting some new taxes, favor taking out these exemptions in the sales tax?

Mauzy: Yea, I sure do. I'm very pessimistic on the subject. I would like to think otherwise, but the governor's not doing his homework. And he's not going...I think he's going to call the session in June, which is after the primaries, when he doesn't have the hammer on any of these fellows. Boy, if I was governor, I'd call that thing in January, and I'd call these cats in one at a time, and I'd tell them, "By God, you go along with me or I'll get an opponent to run against you." And I'd play the game politically, and I'd be governor of Texas. And I'd use my muscle, but he ain't going to do it. He's too damned arrogant.

Odom: Originally, I thought he'd call it in January, but like you I now feel that he's probably going to call it in June.

Mauzy: Well, I keep encouraging him to call it in January (chuckle), but my advice doesn't go very far with the governor.

Odom: I kidded Alonzo Jamison I was going to run against him if he voted to raise taxes.

Mauzy: (Laughter) You know Alonzo is one of my favorite people down

there. You know why?

Odom: Why?

Mauzy: Alonzo doesn't take himself seriously. He knows the world's going to keep turning whether he's there or not. Too many of those guys get down there, and they really think they're Christ reincarnated, you know. They all become prima donnas, and they're so damned...I like to think that I don't take myself seriously. Maybe I do. I may be patting myself on the back here. But, you know, it don't make a damn. I think I can accomplish some things by being there. And we had a lot of 16-15 votes this year that we won. So I feel like the fact that I was there was meaningful. But, you know, the world ain't going to end if I die tomorrow.
(Laughter)

Odom: I think that in every field we need more people who don't take themselves quite as seriously.

Mauzy: Well, Charlie Wilson and Babe Schwartz, of course, are my two favorites of the Senate, and that's one of the reasons. They don't take themselves seriously. They've got a good sense of humor. They like to poke fun at themselves and everybody else. And they give as good as they get. Charlie Wilson, particularly, used to harangue old Parkhouse something fierce, and just infuriate that old man. And George would try to get back at Charlie. He called him "Greasy Ankles." Charlie wears peg-legged pants. Charlie's a very young guy--about 33. He's a real sharp dresser. He's tall and skinny as you know, and he wears these pegged pants. And somebody told him one day, said,

"You must put grease on your ankles to get your feet through there. They're so tight." And George called him "Greasy Ankles" and "Stupid." He'd say, "Hey, stupid." And old Charlie would just gig back, say, "What'd you say, Senator Outhouse," (laughter) or "Senator from Highland Park," or "Senator from Preston Hollow," or "Swellsville," or...you know Charlie's just a great, great guy. I really...plus the fact that he's right on the issues. Even if he wasn't, I'd still like him.

Now liquor by the drink, which you've got here next, of course, we never got to in the Senate. The lieutenant governor told me, and I believe him, that he was going to refer that bill to State Affairs Committee, which is his committee, and that it would never get out of committee. Now he thinks that this a great political issue for him to run against Connally if Connally runs next year. I don't think so. I personally think the public generally favors liquor by the drink. And again this is something I can't say publicly. I've got the only completely dry senatorial district in Texas. The only completely dry one. There isn't a wet foot in my district, no sir. And man, you talk about blue-nosed Protestants, (whistle) man, I've got them out there. Anyway so I never did say how I was going to vote publicly. I never have, and I never will say publicly.

Odom: I don't blame you.

Mauzy: But I had sort of decided in my own mind, although I never did reach a hard and fast determination because I was convinced

that the lieutenant governor did have the votes so we would never have to vote on it. Because I had drawn a four year term I probably would have voted for it this session because I'd had three years to get over it. Now if it comes up in '69 I don't know what I am going to do, truthfully. I would like to vote for it because I think it's good. But I'm not sure I am going to be able to politically. And this is just something I am going to have to resolve in my own mind.

Odom: After all you do represent a district.

Mauzy: Well, I...that's true. But really I just don't want to take on any more political fights than I have to. I'm gonna vote my convictions as best I can. This thing is not really that important. I don't want to sacrifice my entire political career for something that is meaningful, something that's fundamental with me. I will sacrifice it for a sales tax, I'll sacrifice it for something of that magnitude. I don't think...I don't know what I'll do, but I don't think I'll sacrifice it for this. But here now--now here again on this liquor by the drink, it's another example of the governor not doing his homework, damn it. Good God Almighty, he had the forces, the lobby arrayed that'd go out and do this job for him and he could have done an educational job and his prestige was enough that he could have passed that thing through the House. Once it got through the House then the heat really would have been on the Senate. I don't think he could have passed it through the Senate but at least he could have gotten it through the House which would have made his position

politically more tenable with the public. At least part of the legislature agreed with him and he could have blamed a few old cluck-heads in the Senate which is what I would have done if I had been governor. But he didn't and he...got McKissack and Field, who are not two of the great minds of our time, got their necks out a foot and a half here for him and he walked off and left them. And you know, political loyalty ought to mean something to a fellow and now if I were John Field or Dick McKissack next time a governor asked me to do something I think I would look at my hole card before I--really, he wasn't fair to those fellows the way he walked them out on the plank and then sawed it off behind him.

Odom: He really didn't know when he started this thing that he didn't have the force to get it through, or what?

Mauzy: Well, he did have the forces to get it through, or what? He could have passed it through the House. But he didn't do his homework. He let a vacuum create itself, and then the dry forces go in and start chopping him to pieces because they're operating in a vacuum. Some of the House members told me that they had never heard from the governors office asking to vote for the bill and the dries were in there giving them hell, you know. Well, if a guy only hears from one side, you know, especially these boys-- you see it's different between the House and the Senate. They have to run every two years and I can appreciate that problem. You know I might not be nearly as courageous as I was if I had only drawn a two year term. I would like to think I would have

been but truthfully I'm not sure I would have been, truthfully. That's part of what representative democracy is truthfully.

It's also, but more important to me, it's significant of another thing. Nobody really has a political organization in this state. One of the things I hope to accomplish during this four-year term is to build myself up a real block precinct organization in my district where after 1970, if I get re-elected, and I think I'm gonna be. I feel pretty cocky about that. I'll have the kind of organization I can go vote any damn way that I want to and get away with it because I'll have an organization that I can explain things to and they'll go out and get the votes for me. This is what I...I'm an organization man politically. I'm not a personality man. I believe in organization and I'm going to try to build that kind of--call it Tammany Hall or whatever you want. I'm gonna try to build that kind of political organization in my district and I intend to run it. I think that's my job as a leader. I take leadership seriously.

Odom: Do you think the public is not too well informed on most of the issues and it's a matter of an organization then really...

Mauzy: I sure do. I'm the kind of fellow who runs three hundred and sixty-five days a year. I never quit running. Hell, I go out to box supper and church socials and PTA meetings, and any place I get invited and I...or three weeks ago Saturday I didn't have anything to do one Saturday afternoon, I just went out to a shopping center and stood around there introducing myself to

people, "I'm Senator Mauzy, and I want to know what you think about this and that." And people remember this, you know, the average voter is never contacted by a candidate individually, never in his life. And people are going to remember. I won't remember them, but they'll remember me. And any time anybody says something about me, they'll say, "Why he's not such a bad fellow. He spoke to me; he talked to me; he asked me my opinion."

Odom: What kind of responses do you get from people, you know?

Mauzy: You'd be amazed about what's really bugging people. It's totally different from what I thought. People are very concerned about many things that are, and I don't really understand how government works first of all. I will tell people who I am and they will say, "Oh, yea, I voted for you last year. How are things in Washington, Senator?" You know, they think I'm a United States Senator not a state Senator. People are concerned right now about taxes; they're concerned about foreign policy, Viet Nam, the war. The President is very unpopular right now, but I think he is going to get over it. The average citizen really doesn't know what is going on. And this...you got a tremendous vacuum when you're an incumbent that you can work in because you have got the prestige of your office; you've got a title, you know, theoretically know it all. You can tell them this is what is going to happen, that's what's going to happen, and I'm for you, baby. Anybody who gets himself elected once and can't get re-elected there's gotta be something wrong with him, I think. I may regret that statement, (laughter) right away.

Odom: You also might comment on pari-mutuel betting. They are somewhat related. However, the Senate did get involved in this one.

Mauzy: Yes, we got a little involved in this one. They are related and here again, this is another example of the governor. Now the governor is for pari-mutuel betting. Just like he is for liquor by the drink. But he had a poll made in January. He showed me the poll. It showed fifty-three per cent for liquor by the drink and only thirty-nine or forty per cent for pari-mutuel betting. So, he didn't put his prestige on the line for pari-mutuel betting. He did the next best thing. He got his brother Senator Connally to...you know, big deal, this doesn't kid anybody; this doesn't fool anybody. This is charades. They got that bill out of the committee because of the governor. He twisted Joe Christie's arm. Christie was the swing vote on getting the bill out of the committee.

Odom: From El Paso. It makes a difference there.

Mauzy: Yea, and what the governor did...I've commented about Christie earlier. I like Joe Christie personally, very much. But I'm disappointed in Joe. He's got a lot of ability. He's bright. He's attractive; he's articulate; he's lucid; he's intelligent; he's basically progressive about things. But Joe has got the damndest case of personal egotism I ever seen. He thinks he's the prettiest human being in the world and he loves to see himself on television and he likes to posture himself as the great statesman and all of that crap. Joe...the way the governor got Joe, he got the mayor of El Paso to come in there and the editor of

the paper and the four of them sat down and Connally said, "This is what I want, and it will be good for El Paso." And the mayor said, "That's right. It sure will." And the editor of the paper said, "It sure will." And Joe said, "What the hell, I'm for it then." And that's exactly what happened. Christie told me this himself. Well, you know, to me that's so amazing.

Now they can get Eric Johnson, and Dick West, and Felix McKnight, and everybody else from Dallas come down here and put the arm on me, to hell with them. You know they ain't going to vote me, but Christie's that kind of a fellow. Now on pari-mutuel betting I don't know what I would have done if it had ever come up. I would tend to think that I would vote for it because it does have a local option feature and you can always explain your vote that way. Now there was a move made. Wayne Connally made a move to set the bill for special order which requires two-thirds vote. And I had never committed myself to them that I was going to vote for it. He told me that he was going to move it. And I got to thinking about and when the roll call started--Wayne sits right behind me in the Senate--and I turned to him and I said, "Wayne, you're gonna lose." Because as they got down to about the C's and all, it was obvious, you know. And I said, "You probably ain't going to get more than ten or eleven votes, but you know what? I'm going to vote with you for a very simple reason--by God, it's right. Now you'll be entitled to a vote on this bill. The majority is entitled to work its will on this bill or on any other bill.

And I'm going to vote for you even though you're going to hurt me politically, to hell with it, I'm going to do it."

And I did. And I've never regretted it. You know, I got criticized by the Baptists and some people about it, but it's like I voted for the referendum to put horse racing on the referendum next year. And by God...now they don't criticize me for that because Jimmy Allen, who's the director of the Christian Life Commission of the Baptist convention, lives over in my district and is a damn good man. Jimmy Allen's a fine human being, a good liberal, and I told Jimmy in advance. I said, "If it comes down, how in the world can you all be against letting people decide? You say it's a moral question. I don't agree with you, but you say it is. Now if it's a moral question, let's put it on the ballot, and let's let everybody vote, not just the members of the legislature. Let's let everybody vote." And Jimmy agrees with me, by the way on this, and he's defended me to some of his Baptist brethren, who raised hell because I voted to put it on the ballot. Well, and I appreciate that. That's one of the things I like about Jimmy. He told me at the time, he said, "Listen, doc"--he calls everybody doc--he said, "Doc, I can't be against democracy." He said, "That's all you're doing is letting people vote." And so...he's...some preachers called me up and raised hell, and he heard about it because I told him. (Chuckle) And he called them up and raised hell and told them to get off my back.

Odom: Red Berry's been on this horse for a long time, hasn't he?

Mauzy: Poor old Red. You know, he's bad news, that guy. It's...he's a one shot man, and Red'll lie to you. You know, he'll promise you, "If you'll do this for me, I'll do that," and, of course, that's all he's interested in is the horse race deal.

Odom:: Why is he so interested in this?

Mauzy: Oh, I think he believes in it. He owns some horse race...race horses, (chuckle) some race horses himself, and he believes in it. And...but Red's what I call a one issue senator, you know. You can get his vote on anything else, if you'll promise him a vote on this. (Chuckle) And he's a very poor spokesman, by the way, for it because he tends to insult people when they testify against his bill, why he takes it personal. You know, you can't do that. And then there is the emergency appropriation bill, you've got next--the Hemisfair thing--and this is a funny thing. I wound up voting with Parkhouse, or I like to say Parkhouse wound up voting with me because I vote first. We vote alphabetically. I voted against Hemisfair for a very simple reason. It was an emergency appropriation, and I thought other things were more of an emergency than Hemisfair. For example, we passed the emergency state employees pay raise bill, which cost 5.2 million. Hemisfair was 5.5 million.

Now when I had to balance those two things in my mind, 71,000 state employees and their welfare is a hell of a lot more important to me than a damn carnival, which is all that thing is. And the

state...we're not going to get back what we're spending down there. And I don't know this, but I've just got sense enough to know that somebody's making some money out of this deal down there. Some politicians are making some money. Some contractors are making some money. Some other people are making some money, and I just don't want to be a party to that kind of thing. Now a lot of people interpret that as an anti-Connally vote. I didn't cast it for that reason. I just...to me, Hemisfair is not as much an emergency as the welfare of the state employees, and that...pure and simple, that was the reason I did it.

Odom: I've heard this from others.

Mauzy: Oh, they...listen, they really had to twist arms to pass this thing. Ralph Hall really didn't want to do it, but Ralph's a politician. And he was trying to make a deal with the governor. He was supposed to run for lieutenant governor, and John waltzed him around a little, and...it's all right. You know, I'm not mad at him about it. But you can't get mad at Ralph because he always levels with you, and he's such a likable fellow, and he'll do you favors if he can. You know, he gave me some votes on like the bus drivers' bill; he voted to suspend the rules, and then voted against the bill, which I appreciated. That's the key vote--the vote to suspend. So I...anyway, that's the reason I voted against it. Let's see, appropriation and tax, I...

Odom: You commented some on that earlier, but I don't think you really got around to the one-year appropriation.

Mauzy: Well, I'm for the one-year appropriation for two reasons. First,

it makes more sense when you're planning to have only a one-year budget rather than a two-year budget. You're projecting only from twelve to eighteen months in advance, whereas with a two-year budget you're projecting from twenty-four to thirty months in advance. Now the comptroller, Mr. Calvert, whom I like very much personally. I used to work for him, and if it hadn't been for him, I never could have finished law school. He gave me a job when I really needed it after my GI bill ran out. And I like Mr. Calvert, but Mr. Calvert never has hit close on his estimates. He's the most conservative old bastard I guess has ever been there. And he misses...you know he doesn't miss a little bit. God Almighty, he misses by eight, ten percent. That's not within the range of legitimate error. And he...I know why he does it. He winds up looking good that way.

But the net result is we pass a bigger tax bill than we have to. And I think, now this is one place where the governor is really right. He's right on this one. We need to get the annual sessions and we need to get the annual appropriations. And this is the vehicle by which he's leading us to annual sessions. This is where the conflict between Smith and Connally evidenced itself-- pretty drastically. Of course, if Preston had his way about it, there wouldn't be a legislature, couldn't ever meet, you know. And we go back to having Indian raids and Mexican invasions, I guess. But this is how we're going to get the annual sessions. Preston cussed me out about annual sessions speaking of that.

Grady Hazelwood, from Amarillo, is so conservative, he squeaks. He's one of the nicest old men down there. He's getting kind of senile now, but Grady is, I think, the third senior member of the Senate. He's been there about twenty-six, twenty-seven years. And Preston just cut Grady's guts out. He wasn't chairman of a single committee this year. Rookies were chairman of committees. Joe Christie's chairman of a committee, and Grady Hazlewood isn't, you know. And there ain't no way to cut that except Preston hates Grady, and it's mutual, believe me. Preston...

Odom: I've wondered about the criticism...the strong criticism that he levelled right after the Senate adjourned.

Mauzy: You know, Preston and I have a love affair compared to what Grady and Preston are having. And Grady just...he'll do anything for that. He told me, and I believe him, that if Preston Smith ran for re-election, he, Grady Hazlewood would run against him just to cut him up. He said, "I don't want to win. I couldn't win." He's got a four year term so he could do it. And he said, "But I just want to cut that son of a bitch up." And Grady is a mean man when he gets exercised. Well, anyway, Grady is for annual sessions. He carried the constitutional amendment two or three sessions ago. I'm for annual sessions. We're both on the Constitutional Amendments Committee. We added...the House had passed, sent it over to us. We voted it out of committee. We're both for it. Everybody knew we were for it. It wasn't any secret. Preston came down there on the floor after that committee meeting broke up, and just raised hell with us. "What the hell

are you doing voting with Connally, God damn it?" And I said, "What do you mean voting with Connally?" "You voted for annual sessions." I said, "Hell, I was for annual sessions before I ever knew a John Connally or you either." And he said something to Grady, and Grady said, "You God damn stupid son of a bitch." He said, "Don't you know I sponsored that resolution three sessions ago? And don't you remember when you sponsored it, Preston, you stupid bastard?" And he says, "If for no other reason, I'd be for it just because you're against it, God damn it." And man, he hates him. (Whistle)

And I, of course, this works to your advantage. I got some votes out of Grady because he hates Preston, and he knows I don't like Preston. We pulled a stunt one day. This is funny. This is the kind of thing that I think your thing is going to be so good for. One day, the seating arrangement--Grady sits on the back row on our side of the Senate. He sits next to the aisle. Blanchard sits next to him, who is Smith's errand boy. Then Wayne Connally next to Blanchard, and Charlie Wilson next to him. And up on the next row, Bruce Reagan sits on the end, then I'm next, then Jack Strong, and then Babe Schwartz. One day we were trying to figure out some way to needle Preston. So--I've forgotten whose idea it was, I think it was Charlie Wilson's.

Somebody said, "Let's all go pull our chairs up around Grady's desk and get the rule book." And so we did. Me, and Strong

and Grady and Wilson, and Wayne Connally came over, too. And we're all sitting there around Grady's desk, and we're getting the rule book out. And we're pointing at the rules and pointing at him, at Preston. And we're all saying, "Yea," and a couple of us shake our heads, "No, let's do it this way." And we flip over a couple of pages and look at another rule, you know. And then we look...and Preston's sitting there watching us, you know, because he don't know what the hell we're saying or what we're doing. And finally we sit there for about five minutes and go through the motions, and, then we finally reach an agreement, so we stand up and ceremoniously shake hands with each other like we've just made a deal, and each go back to our seats smugly watching Preston, you know.

And God damn, I thought that old bastard was going to come unglued. He didn't know what the hell we were up to, but it wasn't three minutes until he was back at Blanchard's desk. Blanchard sits right in this den of thieves, you see. And he comes back, and I could hear him. "What the hell they doing over there, Blanchard? What were they saying?" you know. And Blanchard said, "Hell, I don't know. I don't intrude in other people's conversations." Blanchard's a damn decent human being, and I like Doc. He's so God damned...he's like Grady. He's so conservative he squeaks, and he's Preston's boy, because he has to be. He's from Lubbock. But Blanchard's a damn good human, and he wouldn't overhear anybody's conversation if he could help it. And he said,

"Hell, I don't know what they're doing over there." He said, "By God, they're plotting against me." He said, "Well, I don't blame them the way you treat them, God damn it. They ought to." (Laughter) But you know we did that about three times during the session, and it just bugged old Preston something fierce, and Grady Hazlewood got the biggest kick out of that. He told me one day, he says, "You know, I'm having more fun with you young farts around here." He said, "You'll have got some good ideas about how to bug." And he just, you know, he really enjoyed it. And I just like old Grady.

Odom: Has this kind of thing you're talking about here--personalities, personal conflict, and personal friendships...do you see this as having been a big influence or major influence in past sessions of the legislature? Do you think it was a greater one this time?

Mauzy: I think it was less this time. Yeah, now I like to think that I can get along personally with everybody in the Senate. I dislike some of the intensely, personally. But I try to get along with people. I make a studied effort. I do my homework. I go to all my committee meetings. I try to be prepared. I don't speak, and I don't argue unless I know what I'm talking about. I don't engage in a lot of business that the older heads do. And I think I've got the reputation among the other members of the Senate of being a good fellow whose word is good, and who'll go out and have a beer with you and drink and laugh and carry on and be personal although he disagrees with you. I like to think I've got that

reputation.

Now in the past, it's been more of a club than it is now, because there are more of us there who are really dedicated to some principles. Babe Schwartz symbolizes it. Schwartz was down there so long by himself--(chuckle) poor bastard. Then in '62 Strong and Kennard got elected to help him some, and Bates. And then in '64 he got a little bit more help. And then in '66 he got a bunch more help. We're interested--those of us that I call the liberals, although again that's a misleading term--in progress...social welfare programs, primarily--medicaid, things like this. And I don't politically like Charlie Herring, for example. I like him very much personally, but Charlie sold out and got on Preston's team because he and Connally split the sheet about a judgeship. And Charlie is the most personable fellow in that damn Senate. I get along with Charlie, and I like him. I like him very much. Between sessions when I got to Austin, I always call Charlie, and we go out and have a beer together. And we're just that...I like him personally. I tell jokes with him and all. But Charlie votes wrong on...lots of times, and he shouldn't. Charlie basically and philosophically is a pretty good fellow, a good liberal, but the fact that I've got a personal friendship with Charlie doesn't influence my vote, and it doesn't influence his either.

So, to answer your question, I think there's less than there used to be. It's not the same club atmosphere down there it used to

be. Hardeman and those guys are so frustrated because it isn't, it's not funny.

Odom: I think it's particularly so in the Senate which you really have the knowledge of.

Mauzy: Yea, I don't know anything about the House. Hell, I never got over there during the session. I didn't have time. I was too busy trying to learn what I was doing, and besides I...this bunch of knot heads from Dallas that are in the legislature, I don't get along with them. They hate me, and I hate them, and there is not anybody kidding themselves.

Odom: Well, while I remember it. You said something earlier that I wanted to ask you about and sort of forgot to before you got on to this, I'm afraid I might forget it. I said something about twenty or thirty people running or determining things that happen down there. And you said, "Yes, but it's the lobby."

Mauzy: Yea. That's right.

Odom: I wonder if you'd comment...you commented some by implication on it, but comment again on that statement. I might ask you more about it.

Mauzy: Well, it's your oil and gas lobby, the insurance lobby, the bank lobby, the financial lobby, the vested interest. They still run things down there. They determine...you know they're the ones that go in to see the speaker every morning before the session, and the lieutenant governor before the session. They're the ones that determine which bills are going to be heard and which ones aren't, and what's going to happen to them. The lobby still runs the

legislature. Now they don't run it as much as they used to. We've made a little progress, and I'm kind of proud to be a part of that. But the truth of the matter is when you get right down to the "nitty gritty," the lobby still runs the legislature, because we don't have sixteen yet in the Senate. Now I think we're going to have them next session. I think we're going to beat Bruce Reagan. Parkhouse is dead. I think we're going to beat Dorsey Hardeman. He only won by sixty-one votes last time--old Landslide Dorsey. And if we just make those three changes, then we get sixteen. Anybody we pick up is an improvement, see. And so we're going to get sixteen some time where we haven't had it in the past.

And I think what we're looking at really in '69 in the session, is probably stalemate between whoever is governor and the legislature. I don't think my point of view will be in the Senate. So we'll have conflict first between the Senate and the House. And I don't think whoever's governor is going to be willing to be progressive enough to satisfy me and the others in the Senate. So we'll have also conflict between the Senate and the executive branch. And in one way, that's good. In one way, that's bad.

Historically, it's something I think we have to go through. I think this is part of the evolution--the political evolution of Texas, and it's going to result in stalemate, which is going to mean that we're going to be criticized by it. Some of us are

going to be put in the position of blocking things, and we're just going to have to stand the heat politically to do it. We may have to filibuster the hell out of a bunch of things, have a bunch of special sessions. In '69, I think we'll have the votes-- for example, to beat a sales tax. I don't think we're going to have in this special session. And if we do, it's going to cause special sessions because the lobby ain't going to give in. We're going to have to beat them over the head, but I for one am willing to stand that. And I think the others are going to be willing to.

Odom: How do you think the two-party issue in Texas is going to go in the next few years, and what kind of part could it play?

Mauzy: I think it's going to play a very significant part. I think the Republicans are going to elect probably...well, first of all Ike Harris, I think's going to win this special election here November 11 without a run off. Boy, that guy's got a bird next on the ground out there. I think the Republicans are going to elect some other members of the Senate and the House. I look for them to elect somewhere between twenty-five and thirty-five members of the House next year, depending on whether I win my lawsuit for single member districts or not. I think, for example, they're going to sweep Dallas County. I think they're going to elect every member of the House, if they run county-wide next year here in Dallas County. I think they're going to elect four, maybe five members of the Senate in the '69 session.

I think this is good. I am all for a two-party system. I'm tired of this business of the Republicans coming in the Democratic primary to pick the worst Democrat to hold the office. And we...there's nothing wrong with conflict. There's nothing wrong with differences of opinion. There's nothing wrong with legitimate debate and discussion of issues, and we don't have it down there now. We've had...we had more of it this session than we've had in the past, but we still don't have it to the right degree and the right extent. And partially it's our fault that we don't have it. Let me be honest about it. We don't have the resources to do our homework properly right now. This thousand-a-month interim expense that we voted ourselves, I'm using primarily for people to do research for me, because I don't have time. I've got to make a living practicing law, and there's lots of things I need to know that you're just going to have to get in the books, and you're going to have to spend time, and you're going to have to do it.

Now one of the things I hope to do is to organize a kind of a brain trust, not just for myself but for all of us in the legislature who think alike and pick the brains of people like you and others on faculties around the university system here to do our research for us where it will be legitimate, honest, objective research--not slanted toward our point of view, but objective. So that when we start debating a sales tax issue we've got all the facts and figures there. When we start talking about

a natural resources tax, which is my pet, by God we got the economic data. I know what the law is. I can argue the law--part of it. I can handle that. I can write a bill that's constitutional, and we're going to have one written within a month. Jack Strong and I are doing that right now to have for that special session next year. But we need this research done. Now the way the lobby has always controlled the legislature is through the Texas Research League.

Odom: Texas Research League?

Mauzy: That's right, and the Texas Research League is a total unofficial thing. It's supported by the lobby. It's supported by vested interests of corporations in Texas, and the people don't have any research arm. Some day we're going to make the Legislative Council that, when we get control of the legislature, which is as it should be. In the meantime, we're going to have to lean on fellows like you and others around the state at the university levels to help us. We passed a bill this year to create these institutes of urban affairs. There's one at Arlington, one at the University of Houston, and that's exactly what we had in mind. Don Kennard and I wrote that bill, and that's what we got in mind is to create us a legitimate brain trust for the people of Texas through us in the legislature to use to legislate properly. Until we do that, the lobby's going to continue to run things.

Odom: Well, the lobby has the information you need much of the time, don't they?

Mauzy: That's right, and...but we can get it if we establish the Legislative Council, if we properly staff it and fund it, we can give them subpoena power, you know. No legal problem about getting the information, but we need objective research, and we don't have anybody to do it for us.

Odom: How does the committee testimony--committee hearings fit into this thing? Do you get such a slanted viewpoint from each of the people who favor and people who oppose it that it makes it?...

Mauzy: Yeah, the committee hearing system in the legislature largely is a farce. I seldom get my opinion changed in a committee hearing, and it's really kind of a ritual that you go through. And you see, this is particularly true in the Senate. It's awful easy to vote a bill out of committee, because it still takes two-thirds to get it up, see. And so, you know, you protect yourself politically. You vote for this old bad bill in committee, knowing that you can kill the damn thing on the floor. You never get it up. So, you know, this is a kind of game Senators play. And I do it, too. I'm not excusing myself. We all do it. It's part of the game.

Odom: Well, you might after that, might go ahead on some of these issues then--the criminal code revision, you have...

Mauzy: Yeah, this criminal code revision is a damned good example of the stupidity of Jim Wade and Jack Hightower. Grady Hazlewood... Dorsey Hardeman, excuse me, Dorsey Hardeman really put the big britches on those guys on this bill. Now here again, this is something I happen to agree with Dorsey Hardeman about. My atti-

tude toward the code of criminal procedure and his are pretty much the same. I'm not concerned. I think the Supreme Court's right in all of these opinions they've been writing. I think the damned law enforcement people have been violating the rights of Americans for years and generations and for centuries, and it's been done in Texas. And in Texas it's been particularly bad. Damned Texas Rangers go around kicking people with their boots, holding them incommunicado for a week. I've had clients that they've done it to. I know what I'm talking about--third degree methods, sticking matches under your fingernails and burning you. I've been through it all. I've seen it all.

Now old Dorsey really put the big britches on them here. And Jim Bates was helping him. Jim Bates again is one of my favorite people, although he hates Connally so bad he can't be objective. But they came out with a...the bill that came out of committee--all three bills went in--the Wade-Hightower bill, the Hardeman bill, and the Hazlewood bill. Now Hazlewood and Hardeman really hate each other good. You talk about two old timers, ooh boy, do they go at it. It's not a fair fight, because Dorsey is so much smarter than Grady, and Dorsey's so much more glib and suave. And as I say, Grady's getting a little senile. Anyway, we had some good fights on the code of criminal procedure. And it's...one day I really had a lot of fun with Christie. He's an old prosecutor, and he's all on this jazz that's popular publicly, and all of us have to say a little

of it. But I got him on this business of, you know the present code says you shall take a defendant before a magistrate immediately. They wanted to change that to...the first suggestion they had, Christie's amendment, was give them eight hours. They didn't have to take them, and I said, "Senator, how long do you think a Ranger ought to be able to beat the hell out of a fellow? What's the difference between eight hours and two hours?" I said, "Don't you think he can beat him bad enough in two hours to get a confession from him? You know, don't you think two hours worth of burning matches under your fingernails is enough? Don't you think two hours of cutting him up with a knife is enough? Why should you give them eight hours? Why should you let him beat him with a wet rope for eight hours? Let's say two." You know, and old Joe got so damned mad. Boy, I thought he was going to come over and hit me in the mouth, because I was really cutting him up pretty fair.

We basically won most of the fights on the code of criminal procedure actually. Now the Senate did one bad thing. We put in oral confession. They did, by 16-15 as I remember, or it was 17-14. It was pretty close. The House took it out, and we kept it out. When it came back to us, we were able to maneuver around there, and that was really the...we won a real fight there when we kept oral confessions out.

Odom: It was pretty close in the House, too, 70-78 vote.

Mauzy: Yea, that's one of the few real fights they had over there. And

here again the line up's kind of amazing when you check that record vote in the House. This is the reason the words liberal and conservative don't mean anything in most things. Now this is actually a pretty liberal-conservative fight. Either you believe in civil liberties or you don't. Now this is a legitimate liberal-conservative issue.

Odom: Well, some of the people that...who are conservative on other things, may be liberal on this, though.

Mauzy: Yeah, it's amazing. That's what I mean. You check the votes. Some of the guys that are the big liberals are over here voting wrong in my view on this thing. I can't see how they can vote that way. Some of the biggest damned conservatives down there voting right. And it gets back to where a fellow makes his living. Whether he tries criminal cases or not for a living, that's what it gets back to.

Odom: Oh, really?

Mauzy: Yeah.

Odom: Is that the real reason?

Mauzy: Or whether this guy likes his local sheriff, you know. There are all kinds of reasons why people...

Odom: You don't think, perhaps, in some cases there might be a genuine concern?

Mauzy: Damn seldom. Most of those guys ain't got no concern in the House or the Senate either one. The truth of the matter is out of the

181 members down there, I'll bet you there's not, I wouldn't think there are 20 people in both Houses that really got any damn concern. They all think they're God's gift to the people of Texas, and they're great leaders; and the world revolves around them. I've got an expression I use that the 181 people get together under that dome, and they sleep with each other five months, and they interbreed like the Martins and McCoys. And they get to where they think there ain't but 180 other people in the world. And they talk to each other. They forget that out there beyond the horizon, there are 10 1/2 million human beings. They've got back aches, ingrown toenails, and their wife didn't fix their breakfast right, and you know, they've got all kinds of problems. They're human beings, and they've got all kinds of problems, but they tend to forget them down there.

And that's where a lot of these guys go wrong. They forget where they came from. Well, overall this past one is not a bad bill. There were some things that needed to be corrected in the code as passed. But old Hardeman just worked all around Wade and Hightower and Hazlewood. And I dislike...I disagree with Dorsey Hardeman very much politically and philosophically, but you've got to respect a man who knows his way around. And Dorsey is a master of the rules, and he's a...he's got a tremendous tongue. I mean, boy, he can cut you up something fierce.

Odom: That's what I've heard.

Mauzy: Because I've been on the same side with him, and I've been against him, and he don't ask any quarter and he don't give any. And...but there's one thing about Hardeman: he won't ever lie to you, see. Here again this thread keeps running through what I'm saying. But I get along with Dorsey Hardeman, although I don't like him and don't agree with him, because he ain't never lied to me. Now the first time he does, he and I are going to have trouble.

Odom: It's strange that good professional lobbyists who've worked with the legislators and worked with them for a long time have this same concern as you have about this.

Mauzy: I think so.

Odom: They respect the people who are on the opposite side of them if they don't lie to them. They know where they stand.

Mauzy: Oh, I think for example, some of the lobby here that damned sure don't like me. They don't like the way I vote. I think they respect me, because I tell them, "I'm against your damn bill, and I'm going to kill it." And I try to. I don't always accomplish it, but they'll never wonder about how I'm going to vote, because I'll tell them.

Odom: What about constitutional revision?

Mauzy: Well, this is something that really I think is a cornerstone of all progress in Texas. We need it. In 1948, I was president of the Young Democrats down at the University of Texas, and we came out for it, and we were called Communists and everything else. Today the Governor of Texas is for it so it's okay, you know.

Big John's for it so that makes it all right. Well, some of my liberal friends are against it now because Connally's for it, you know. I don't understand this kind of thinking. I never have, and I never will. I don't give a damn who's for something or who's against it. If it's right, it's right. Constitutional revision is long overdue. I had hoped to be on the Constitutional Revision Commission. I helped write the House resolution that passed that created this commission, because it was obvious Parkhouse and Preston were killing Schwartz's bill, which was the only bill that got out of committee in the Senate to do this. And I had commitments from the governor and the speaker, and they had fifteen of the twenty appointees that elected the five senators to get on there, but I got double-crossed by the governor and the speaker, and I ain't going to forget that any time soon either.

The commission they've got is a sorry damn commission. Most of the people on there don't believe in constitutional revision, but I'm hoping that they'll come up with something that we can change around in the legislature and make it decent and submit it. Politically, I don't think we're going to be able to.

I think it's probably another two, four, six years down the road yet.

Odom: You do foresee it? How of the various ways that have been proposed? What...will you comment on those?

Mauzy: Yes, idealistically I would like to see a convention rewrite

the constitution. And that that convention would be elected by individual member legislative districts if we have them in Texas. If not, then by senatorial districts on the ballot by the people elect say three members of the commission from each senatorial district in Texas. The only reason I use that is because they are more equal in population than any other political subdivision we have. They're more equal in population than the congressional districts. And I would be opposed to electing them by legislative districts, as they exist today, because it would run county-wide in Dallas County, for example. And instead of getting 45 different view-points, you'd get one view-point with 45 votes. I know what would happen. So I'd be opposed to that, but if you elect them on a ballot, this is what I would really favor.

Now politically, I don't think that's ever going to happen, because I don't think the legislature's going to be willing to give up that power. There's a certain amount of power that we have under this system that the majority's not going to be willing to give up. I'd be willing to, because...if I thought it were necessary. If I really had my way about it, I'd have a convention elected on the ballot who would report back to the legislature, come through the legislature to go back to the people on the ballot. I don't think that can be done either, truthfully. But if I were doing it, that's the way I would do it.

Odom: Do you think the primary opposition to constitutional revision is by those who are afraid that such revision will remove many of the spending limitations?

Mauzy: Yea, they don't say it, but what really bugs the lobby is they're afraid they won't write in this pay-as-you-go constitutional thing, so we can't have deficit financing, if you want to call it that in Texas, which we're going to have to have. You know it's ridiculous. (Chuckle) No family can buy a house without deficit financing. The state can't operate any better.

Now this pay raise for state employees, I'd commented on earlier, but there's one thing that happened in that that I do want to explain. On the first time around to suspend the rules to bring it up, it was during the first sixty days required a four-fifth's majority to do it in the Senate under our rules. I voted to suspend the rules the first time around, because I wanted to give the state employees a raise. They were entitled to it. In the meantime then, it became obvious to me it was a political thing that Preston was trying to do to embarrass the governor, which is all right with me, too. But the governor issued a statement in which he said hell, he didn't know whether he was for it or against it being an emergency, because nobody'd ask him.

So, the next time around, I voted against suspending the rules, because--and I said at the time I voted against suspending the rules and my vote was the one that kept the rules from being

suspended--it was 24-7 that time--because I said, "The governor has asked us to let him think about it, so I'm going to vote against suspending the rules, and take this opportunity to tell the governor that I want him to think about this, and I'm going to give him ten days to think about and tell us whether or not he considers it an emergency. And if he responds unfavorably or fails to respond in ten days, then by God I'll vote to suspend the rules and embarrass the hell out of him." And that's exactly what I did. He pussy-footed and wouldn't ever do anything, and he wasn't really honest. He was against it the whole time and didn't tell the truth. And so I voted not to suspend the second time, and it failed to suspend. The next time around, the ten days had come and gone, and by God I voted to suspend the rules and embarrassed the hell out of him with it. And, of course, the speaker killed it over in the House with a very amateurish performance, but he had the votes over there. We all knew he was going to kill it, and so here again this helped Preston and hurt Connally. But I don't care about that. I voted the way I voted because the state employees were entitled to it, which also explains my vote against Hemisfair. And I don't give a damn. I don't mind embarrassing Connally. If he's wrong, to hell with him, and if it helped Preston, I don't particularly want to help Preston, but if it had that effect, to hell with that, too. I'm talking about the employees.

Odom: Well, they did receive a pay raise though.

Mauzy: Yea, but not an emergency pay raise. See, this was to give them

a pay raise from March until September. The pay raise we did pass in the appropriation didn't take effect until September 1st, so they got beat out of six months' pay raise what it amounts-- 5.2 million. It was the best investment we could have made.

Now equality under the law...yea, I was one along with Kennard that put on that little kicker. I was against the amendment as originally drawn, because it created more legal problems than it solved. This business of amend the constitution to say, you know, no woman...no right shall be denied or abridged because of sex. Legally, it creates a hell of a lot more problems than it solves. As a lawyer, I know this. And Hardeman is right on this subject by the way, and Mrs. Tobolosky and the women's group are wrong. They don't understand. Mrs. Tobolosky does; she's a lawyer. She understands, but she demagogues it. It's all right, you know; it's part of the game.

But we had earlier--the background, that is--we had earlier passed Senate Bill 185, which was a civil rights bill. The first civil rights bill ever passed in the history of Texas. Don Kennard, Barbara Jordan, Babe Schwartz, and I were the authors of it. It says that no political sub-division or the state can deny employment or any other right because of race, color, creed... race, color, creed, or sex, no...race, color, creed, or national origin. We passed it out of the Senate and sent it to the House. And Mrs. Tobolosky came unglued. She said, "It's a great thing,

but you didn't include sex in there. You know you can discriminate because of sex. This hurts women." And it was a bunch of crap. She was trying to kill the damn bill is what she was trying to do. But anyway we fought off the amendment and saved it in the House as it was. I didn't care; I'd be willing to put sex in it, except it would have killed the bill. Anyhow, we passed the bill. Well, we had this telegram from her raising hell about we had to put sex in there. So when this constitutional amendment of hers came up we added race, color, creed to it with sex that was already in it. And then we passed it. And God damn, she came unglued. I want to tell you she...you know, we'd caught her at her own game. And I think the thing passed 29-2 as I remember, finally. Parkhouse and one other voted against it. I've forgotten who the two were who voted against it, as I remember. But the House never did pass it. It won't be on the ballot, but it was an interesting experience, because we caught her doing something that she shouldn't have been doing, see.

Odom: What about any other issues you might want to comment on or bring up, either your own particular interests or some in which you recall things that might be of interest.

Mauzy: Gee, I don't know. Well, there was one bill that was passed that allows the policeman and the guards of various campuses throughout the state to carry firearms. I'm the only member of the Senate that voted against it. And I didn't make a big speech or a big deal out of it. It was just something I felt strongly about. I think it's a mistake, and I think the purpose of it

was to hold down, particularly civil rights and Negro demonstrations on our campuses. I want to see the maximum amount of freedom on our campuses, both academic freedom for the faculty and political freedom for the students. I think it's healthy. A lot of things students do, I think are kind of childish, and I don't agree with. But hell, I did the same thing when I was a student. It's part of growing up, and I don't want to restrict that right. Now this bill let them...let these old bastards hang around these campuses that we pay about \$200 a month--You can imagine what kind of...well, you know better than I do what kind of people we get--carry pistols. And I just think it's a mistake. We don't live in a frontier society any more, and you shouldn't have to have a gun to enforce the law. The law ought to be respected by everybody, but you shouldn't let people like that carry guns. They're going to kill somebody.

And it's...the only reason I mentioned it is it reminds me of something I think is sort of symptomatic. One night we were sitting around Schols Garden drinking beer like a bunch of us always do. And all my liberal friends around, what I call the knee-jerk liberals around, sitting there. And they're raising hell with me that I'm a sell-out, and this and that and the other thing like they always do, and how great Barbara Jordan is. And I agree with them--Barbara Jordan's great, and there's no personal jealousy here in what I'm saying. Any way, they were talking about, "By God, that Senate's a sorry bunch. You son-of-bitches are supposed

to be so good and pass that damn bill that let the guards carry pistols out here at the university. Only one senator voted against it." And I just thought, "All right, I'm going to trap you bastards." And I said, "Yeah, I know...I know." And they said, "By God, it's wrong. Shouldn't be allowed to carry pistols, and they're going to pistol-whip people and it's just to hold down Negro demonstration. God damn police state, and part of the Connally team," and all this crap, you know.

I let them talk for about thirty minutes. And they got through, and I said, "I agree with every God damn thing you say." And they said, "Why didn't you vote that way?" And I said, "Get the journal and see who the one vote was against it." And they said, "Hell, we don't have to look. It was Barbara Jordan." And I said, "You're full of crap. And you look at that damn journal, and the only vote against it is Mauzy." "Oh." And I had the journal with me, and I showed them. And they said, "Well, so what, God damn you should have done it." Now this is symptomatic of the God damned liberals, see, what I call the knee-jerks. I don't expect a pat on the back for that vote, because I did what I thought was right. Bit I'll be a son-of-a-bitch if I'm going to get criticized for not doing something I didn't do.

I mean, they ought to be consistent, but see, I'm a pragmatist. That's my problem. And I'm a half-a-loaf man too. If that's the best I can do, I'll settle for half a loaf, and I'll come back next

year and try to get a little more. Some of these folks would rather be 110% right and lose, than be 99% right and win. Now I'd rather be right and win. I'd rather be right as much as I could. I'd like to be 100% right. Politically, you just can't do it. And as I say, it kind of bugs me a little, really. We've all got our pride, and I've got my share of it. I'm proud of myself; I'm proud of what I have been able to accomplish. I hope to accomplish more, and I don't mind my enemies criticizing me. In fact, I worry about myself when they don't. And I don't mind the power structure out to gut me. They ought to. But criticism like that is just not right, and it's not peculiar to me. I don't mean to suggest that.

Babe Schwartz catches hell. A bunch of these damn liberals cussing Babe Schwartz because he supported the Democratic nominee, Waggoner Carr, for the United States Senate. Well, by God, I did too. I happen to believe in party loyalty. But they cussed Schwartz. Hell, he's been down there bleeding and dying for them for fifteen years in that legislature. Many times it was thirty to one against him, and I just don't think he's entitled to that kind of treatment. He's entitled to better than that. They criticize Kennard particularly. Kennard makes deals. You damn right he does. He gets along with the governor. He gets things done. I don't always agree with Kennard, but by God, you look at his record over the years, and he was there when it was tough. He was there in the McCarthy days in the '50's. He and Maury Maverick and A. D. Downer

and Edgar Berlin and those guys really had guts in those days.

And Don Kennard has been right so damned many more times than he's been wrong, and if he makes a little deal to help himself, I can forgive him, see. I'm not a purist, I guess, or maybe that's my problem.

Odom: You're a realist and a pragmatist and for getting things done.

Mauzy: Yeah, that's right.

Odom: Was there anything you recall that might be interesting or significant about the daylight savings time?

Mauzy: Of course, we never got to it in the Senate. The House killed it, you know. We never did vote on it.

Odom: Oh, I see.

Mauzy: See, they had...the national law would take effect unless we passed a bill exempting us, and the House killed the bill. We never got to it. I was going to vote against the bill, which would have the effect of permitting daylight savings time, just because I think it makes more sense. Hell, we're part of the union, and they say, "Well, all that does is help television and the airlines. You sold out to them cats." Well, I don't give a God damn who it helps and who it hurts. I mean, I didn't vote...I wouldn't have voted on that basis, and it's...that's right, it's really not that important, truthfully. It hurt a few people. I admit it hurt the motion picture people and the drive-in people, particularly. And I regret that, but any time you make any kind of a change, you're going to hurt a few people. And it really was not that significant. I was amazed at the amount of controversy that got built up over

it, because really I thought, "What the hell, so either we have it or we don't. The world ain't going to come to an end." But it was an interesting little thing. I...let's see; there was something else--some other little thing that I thought kind of was nit-picking and just...man, they had a big fight about it in the House. I've forgotten now what it was. It was something kind of like daylight savings time that man, they really went at hammer and tong over there.

Odom: I've about exhausted all the specific questions that I have. Do you recall anything else that you'd like to talk about?

Mauzy: Well, just this one thing. I was very disappointed in the caliber of the members of the Senate. I really expected better. I thought some of these guys, they'd been there so long they should have been pros, and they're not. Hell, they don't know nothing about politics. They don't know how to organize or nothing. You can work circles around them. I was, as a rookie, able to work circles around some of them old timers. Hell, I pulled some shenanagins on them that no rookie should ever be able to pull on anybody. And it's not that I'm that smart, I'm not saying that. You've got some real dumb bells down there. David Ratliff ain't never had an original thought in his life. Dorsey Hardeman's a smart cookie; he's the real brains of that operation. Aikin is another dumb bell, who's got a great reputation and don't deserve it. Hightower's a nothing, you know. We called him Billy Graham in the Senate, because he's so sanctimonious. I was disappointed in Chris Cole. I'd known Chris growing up in Houston, and I admired him. Chris

doesn't have any real convictions. I was disappointed in Chet Brooks. I like Chet, and I admire him, and he's right on most issues, but he's an egomaniac. Preston Smith got him hooked, because he let him read the Declaration of Independence on March 2, you know. Some member of the Senate always does, and he thought that was such a big honor he flaked...that's one of the reason he flaked on the appropriation bill. Now that's stupid. You know, somebody had to read the damn thing. So, big deal what if you're a rookie, and you get to read it--big deal!

I guess I expect more of my friends than I do of my enemies. I was disappointed in Joe Bernal. Joe thinks emotionally too much. There's nothing wrong with being emotional, but you ought to be realistic, too. I've got a high regard--Babe Schwartz, Charlie Wilson, Barbara Jordan--I've got a real high regard for these folks. They're all damn good human beings, and I like them. They're good to work with, and they'll level with you. And they'll play the game. You know, if you need a favor done, they'll do a favor for you and take you off the hook and take the heat themselves. And I asked a couple of them to do it for me a couple of times during the session when there was a local thing that I was against, but I couldn't afford to be against publicly. And they helped me, and I didn't... of course, I did the same thing for them. You've got to scratch each other's back to get along down there.

The over-all caliber of the Senate, I think, is less than the people of Texas are entitled to. I don't consider myself to be a genius, and I don't consider myself anything great except in that company. I looked pretty good down there, which is no compliment to me really. It's just a derogatory thing to say about them. And I really think the House is worse, although I really don't know what I'm saying here, because I haven't had enough exposure to them, and I know the members of the Senate pretty well. It's pretty sad, really. I wish that we would televise the meetings of the Senate, for example, state-wide. I would love to see it happen. Man, you would have the damndest revolution in Texas when people see what those jerks do down there. You know, we meet at 11:00 in the morning and adjourn at 11:20 until the next day. We haven't done a damn thing. We've eulogized five people who died last week.

We pass more resolutions for dead people than we pass bills for live people; and this is absurd. There's still a little bit of the country club attitude down there, and as I say, the club atmosphere's not as great as it has been in the past. But there's still too much of it to suit me. I want to go down there and do my business and get it over with and come home. And that means we stay a month, fine. If we have to stay eleven months, that's okay, too; but I want to spend my time down there trying to do something constructive. And let's debate the issues, and let's let the majority decide, and let's get on with the next

one. And we don't do that, and the people of Texas are suffering.

Odom: What you say sure speaks poorly for the Senate in the past, because I think it's generally been the conclusion that the overall caliber of the legislature, not just necessarily the Senate, has improved over the past twenty or thirty years.

Mauzy: Well, I agree with that. I sure do. Listen, ten years ago, we really had a bunch of dumb dodos down there, and I say I used to lobby down there; I know. And twenty years, it was really horrible. Good lord, you talk about the snuff dippers and the nowhere boys, man, we had a beau coup of them. And it's true-- the legislature is better today; and it is more responsive than it used to be. But you're still not saying a hell of a lot when you say...

Odom: Is part of it perhaps due to the growing...or a better reflection of the urban society?

Mauzy: Yes, it's basically because Texas has become urbanized and because of redistricting. Redistricting really is the fundamental thing that underlies all of this. That's the reason I think we're going to make progress after the '70 census and '71 when we redistrict, we're going to have even a better Senate because from Dallas County instead of three we're going to have four; Harris County, instead of four, they're going to have five. And the rural areas are not going to dominate the legislature any more after 1970. Now that doesn't mean that all four senators from Dallas are going to vote alike, they're not. God knows Wade and Parkhouse and I don't vote alike. There ain't nothing wrong with that.

You can't have a county of 1,200,000 people, and think everybody thinks alike all the time about everything; they don't. There's nothing wrong with conflict; it's a good thing; it's healthy.

Odom: You see...did you see in the Senate any sort of geographical basis for division on the issues of importance?

Mauzy: No, Preston tried to use it. He killed the dental bill. We had a bill to create a dental school here at the University of Texas in Dallas that he killed on the West Texas thing, because he wants a medical school for Lubbock. That was the only thing I saw of a regional nature. Preston is a regionally-oriented individual, and he's just against progress. And he made a deal with the Baptists; that explains Abner McCall being on his advisory committee. Abner McCall was...he thought that dental school bill was a life and death matter. (Chuckle) And that's how he got hooked with Preston. Yea, Preston killed that dental bill, and when he did, he picked up Abner; and he thinks all the Baptists...I don't think he did. But you know, Baptists are just like everybody else. (Chuckle) They put their britches on one leg at a time, and they think for themselves. They're not monolithic, and they're going to vote the way they think their economic interests lie just like everybody else, I hope.

Mauzy: I recall the 1960 election where Dr. James of the Baptist Standard took...really took them to task on the Roman Catholic issue. Yea, that was a shameful and disgraceful thing in 1960. Everybody in Texas ought to be ashamed of what happened. By

God, if you can't think of a better reason to vote against a fellow than where he goes to church, you're in bad shape.

Odom: We had some individuals get up in congregations and challenge the pastors.

Mauzy: I know they did, and they're to be admired and respected. We had some preachers here in Dallas--some fundamentalist protestant preachers--who stood up and fought the hierarchy of the Protestant church. Talk about the Catholic hierarchy, and it's pretty bad, but there's some hierarchy in the Protestant church, which I happen to be a member of, too, that they don't have anything to be proud of.

Odom: Well, unless you have any last thing to add...

Mauzy: Well, just this one thing, Dr. Odom. I really have enjoyed this. I've talked too long, and I apologize to you for that. I kind of like to hear my own voice, like most politicians. But I am very impressed with this thing you all are doing. I think it's great. I wish that it were possible for you to have this kind of discussion in depth and with the same candor that we've had here today with every member of both legislative and executive and judicial branches of the government. I think it'd be a fine thing for history and hopefully we're working toward that. I hope you all are. It's just such a great source material for future generations, and again I'm not patting myself on the back when I say this. I'm speaking from the standpoint of history. I wish that we'd had this, for example, twenty years ago when I was a student. I would have loved to have been able

to really find out what was happening from people down there.

It's great.