TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE

TEXAS STATE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPEACHMENT

. AUSTIN, TEXAS

VOLUME XIII

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE

TEXAS STATE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPEACHMENT
AUSTIN. TEXAS

· ·

IN THE MATTER OF HSR NO. 161

JUDGE O. P. CARRILLO

CONTINUED HEARING

VOLUME XIII

BE IT REMEMBERED that on Monday, June 23, 1975, beginning at 1:55 o'clock p.m., in the Old Supreme Courtroom, State Capitol Building, Austin, Texas, the above-entitled matter came on for hearing, having been continued from June 12, 1975, before the HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPEACHMENT, the Honorable L. DeWitt Hale, Chairman, Presiding, and the following proceedings were reported by Hickman Reporting Service, 504 Travis Building, Austin, Texas 78701.

HRS HK2

HICKMAN REPORTING SERVICE

THE QUALITY REPORTERS
Austin, Texas 476-5363



25

24

1

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	MEMBERS PRESENT
2	
3	REPRESENTATIVE HALE - CHAIRMAN
4	REPRESENTATIVE LANEY
5	REPRESENTATIVE KASTER
6	REPRESENTATIVE HENDRICKS
7	REPRESENTATIVE NABERS
8	REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON
9	REPRESENTATIVE CHAVEZ
10	REPRESENTATIVE WEDDINGTON
11	REPRESENTATIVE SLACK
12	
13	APPEARANCES
14	FOR HOUSE SIMPLE RESOLUTION NO. 161
15	REPRESENTATIVE TERRY CANALES, P. O. Box 730,
	REIRESENTATIVE TERRI CANADES, 1. 0. Box 750,
	Premont, Texas 78375.
16	
16	
16 17 18	
16 17 18	
16 17 18 19	
16 17 18 19 20	
17 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	
16 17 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	
117 118 119 119 119 119 119 119 119 119 119	

MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1975

THIRTEENTH SESSION

(The hearing was reconvened at 1:55 p.m., pursuant to the recess on Tuesday, June 12, 1975.)

CHAIRMAN HALE: The Committee will come to order and the Clerk will call the roll.

(The roll was called by the Clerk.)

CHAIRMAN HALE: There is a quorum present.

The Chair had a communication from Mr. Maloney
to the effect that he was otherwise engaged today and would
not be able to make the meeting today, but would be here
for the meeting tomorrow.

Members of the Committee, as you all know, we have had the statement of facts reproduced through Volume XII, I believe, which was the last volume up until Friday. The Chair was provided with the last three volumes of the statement of facts by the court reporter late last week. Those either or being reproduced now or perhaps have been; the reproduction may have been completed by this time, and as you know from the previous volumes each of you can check out a copy of that from the Sergeant at arms. That will bring the record of the hearings up to date, as far as all the public testimony is concerned.

Where we stand at this time is for the Committee

2

1

3

4

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

.. 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

to decide at this point—and in that connection let the Chair make a few very brief remarks as to our position as I see it at this point in time.

We have completed all of the public testimony that either Mr. Canales or Mr. Mitchell cared to offer to the Committee. We have numerous exhibits and a tremendous amount of testimony which has been reduced to a statement of facts. The unfortunate nature of that testimony is that it is not organized in any particular form that would be useable or useful to the Committee. Chair, as you know, has asked Mr. Johnson and the legal staff of the council, who have been assisting us on this matter, to do several things during the past week while the Committee was not in session. One of those things was to start through the statement of facts and attempt to put it in organized form. As I see what we must do is go through the entire statement of facts, plus all the exhibits, and reorganize that material either on paper or in our own minds in terms of specific charges that have been made against Judge Carrillo; and then to go back, having determined everything that we have in the way of evidence on each particular charge, and review that evidence to determine several things. One, are there other areas of evidence that we need to obtain on any particular charge? Do we need to subpoena additional records? Are there

witnesses available who have knowledge of that particular charge that we need to give the Committee the benefit of their testimony? If so, then the Committee would need at that point to make a decision on another public hearing and to issue whatever subpoenas were necessary to bring that material before the Committee.

In addition to that, we need at the same time to be reviewing all of the records before the Committee in terms of each of those charges, in order that the Committee could determine to what extent do we now have hard evidence? that is, evidence that is admissible in court that would back up each of those charges in order that each member of the Committee can make a determination in his own mind as to whether he feels it justifies voting for that particular charge or not.

It occurs to me that all of that is going to take a great deal of time on the part of the Committee, and it's my thinking that we can probably move faster in doing all of that work by doing it collectively rather than perhaps individually, although I would hope each member of the Committee would do a great deal of work on his own in reviewing the record and familiarizing himself along those lines.

In addition to that, Mr. Johnson and his staff
have also been working with certain financial institutions

in South Texas, in an effort to obtain the additional records which the Committee voted to subpoena at our last meeting, and the Chair would expect shortly to have a report from Mr. Johnson on the progress that is being made in obtaining those records. Some of the records, I believe, are already in our possession—photocopies of the recordsand I believe there are some communications that will be made available to the Committee concerning the status of the additional records which we desire to see. Then from that point on, of course, it will be up to the Committee then, having assimilated all of the evidence that is available, if necessary by additional public hearings. we need to move in two directions, or along two paths in the same direction; one, toward drafting a report to the House and, secondly, toward specific articles of impeachment on which the Committee would ultimately have to vote "yes" or "no" to recommend those to the House.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As I see it that is the task before us. The Chair would welcome comments or suggestions from any other member of the Committee, or ideas along that line. Do any of you have any differing ideas?

MR. CHAVEZ: Not different ideas, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to ask Mr. Canales a question. One of the charges I think that probably could come from his testimony, as I remember from some of the testimony, might

be the improper make-up of the grand jury, and I understood— Maybe you remember, Bob—that somebody mentioned
some information either to you or Mr. Maloney about that.

Are we going to follow that up and subpoena somebody on it?

MR. JOHNSON: I have no idea. We may or may not. It will be up to the Committee to decide. I will discuss it with the Committee.

CHAIRMAN HALE: As I see it, Mr. Chavez, that inquiry is exactly the type of inquiry which the Chair envisions that we will be asking about each of these charges in our deliberations; as to what are the charges, to delineate the charges in certain broad areas, and then by reviewing the record in detail determine whether or not there is sufficient evidence to justify the Committee voting to recommend such a charge to the House; or, in the alternative, voting to attempt to obtain further testimony with respect to that particular charge, either to prove it or disprove it without having any particular objective in mind.

As I see the role of this Committee, contrary to the press release that was issued by Mr. Mitchell, I do not see this Committee in the role of going out and simply digging up evidence to support the charge. What I have tried to do by subpoenas and the recommendations I have made to the Committee is attempt to obtain any evidence

that is available on these charges. Whether it is favorable to Judge Carrillo or unfavorable to him is of no consequence. What I think the Committee should hear is to determine what are the facts concerning these charges. The Chair would subpoena unfavorable testimony just as quickly as he would subpoena favorable testimony. I think that the Committee needs to learn the facts from the sources where those facts are available, and we have tried to do that up to this point.

Are there any other comments or ideas from members of the Committee on our general procedure?

(No response.)

If not, then it occurs to the Chair that what we need to do at this time is to start this afternoon on our review of where we are; and in that connection I think that we need to go into a conference with Mr. Johnson and his staff on the progress with respect to the subpoenas that have been issued, the progress that they have made with respect to reviewing the record in the case and assimilating it in more useable form, and then probably start with each member of the Committee itself going through and sort of working through the record and putting these things in a little more logical order.

I do not know what the pleasure of the Committee is on this. I suggested to the press a moment ago in an

1

2

interview that I granted in the hall shortly before the Committee meeting, that it was my thought that the Committee would probably want to go into executive session for this purpose; Number one, to review the situation with our lawyers as to what has been done and what hasn't been done, which occurs to me that probably should be an executive session for a number of reasons: One, that it is so easy to bandy names about in these investigations and that most of the people that have appeared here as witnesses before the Committee are innocent in the sense of having any criminal intent on their part. And other people's names that have been brought in are also innocent. The Chair has tried to be extremely careful in trying to protect innocent people from being unduly criticized or maligned in the press simply by having their names associated with this investigation. Also it has been my experience on other committees that you cannot get a free discussion among members of the Committee on the matters before us if they are fearful that everything they say is going to be recorded and reported by the news media, and it occurs to me that we are at the point now in discussing this evidence where a grand jury is after it has finished hearing the testimony of witnesses and is trying to decide on whether to return an indictment or not. They need an area where each member of the grand jury feels completely free to say

whatever he thinks about that evidence or about that witness, to say that he either believes or disbelieves that witness without being fearful of being quoted in the newspaper, saying "Somebody lied to the Committee." That is essentially what we have to do with respect to this testimony. We've got to decide which of these witnesses we are going to believe and which ones we are not going to believe, and the Chair feels like it would be unfair to the members of the Committee for them to make statements like that and then, under the threat that they are going to be quoted in

-į

 I think it is essential that we have complete freedom of discussion on this where the members of the Committee can say whatever they think about any of this testimony, evaluate it in any way they want to and then collectively we have to make a determination ultimately on this status of that testimony with respect to these charges.

the news media as having made such statements.

MR. HENDRICKS: Mr. Chairman, is the Chair advised whether or not Mr. Mitchell and his client plan to attend any more sessions of this Committee?

MR. JOHNSON: He was here this morning. He came by my office. He thought the meeting was at 9:00 o'clock. He came by my office immediately after that and I advised him that I did not anticipate that he would be

 CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Slack, had the Chair known you were going to make a complimentary remark like

needed here today; that we weren't going to take any testimony; that if we did--

MR. HENDRICKS: The main point I wanted to make, I sure wanted him to have the opportunity to place the Judge on the witness stand if he so desired.

MR. JOHNSON: That wasn't the topic of our conversation this morning. I advised him this morning if we were going to do anything, take any action or anything in open session today, I would call him immediately, but I was advised by the Chair he didn't think we would today, so he is available at the pleasure of the Committee.

MR. NABERS: Mr. Johnson, did he indicate to you when he would be filing his suit in federal court?

MR. SLACK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in connection with what the Chair has said previously, I feel that I speak for the entire Committee when I say I should like to commend the Chair on not only a thorough but the eminently fair manner in which the Chair has presided over this sensitive area of investigation. I can't see how there could possible be any criticism of the way the Chair has presided.

executive session.

And with that remark, I would like to move the

that I would have had it on tape. I'd have had the tape going if I had known you were going to make a statement like that. But I do appreciate your remark. I will say this, despite Mr. Mitchell's criticism, I don't see— I have presided over lots of Committee meetings and I don't see anything, looking back over the record, I don't see anything that I would have changed in the way this Committee has been handled. I have tried to be as completely fair and unbiased toward Mr. Mitchell and his client as I conceivably could, consistent with the work of the Committee.

.4

- 17

else to make a circus out of this proceeding. It is a serious matter; it has far reaching consequences not only for Judge Carrillo but the State of Texas. It has historical implications, and I simply want the entire Committee proceedings to be conducted in such a way that whatever footnote in history this impeachment proceedings has it will be looked on by future legal scholars as having been done in a completely legal, ethical, honorable and a fair manner. I have tried to conduct it in that way, and I think it has been conducted in that way.

Mr. Slack moves that the Committee now go into executive session for the purposes mentioned.

MR. JOHNSON: May my staff remain?

-í

CHAIRMAN HALE: Yes, sir. Of course, your staff, Mr. Johnson, is a part of this Committee meeting. We need to go over with them the work they have been doing and the status of their analysis of the records.

Is their any discussion on the motion?
(No response.)

All those in favor of the motion will vote "Aye" and those opposed will vote "No" as your name is called.

(The motion was put to a voice vote and carried unanimously.)

CHAIRMAN HALE: There being eight "Ayes" and no "Nos" the motion prevails. The Committee will go into executive session at this time.

MR. CANALES: Mr. Chairman, are there any plans for any additional meetings at which we will be able to participate?

CHAIRMAN HALE: That will be up to the Committee to decide. Again, in response to Mr. Hendrick's question a moment ago, let the Chair state my position on that. I would say any time before our final report is written if Mr. Mitchell wants to bring Judge Carrillo in, the Chair would recommend to the Committee that we let him take the stand and say whatever he wants to at any time. I have made that clear to Mr. Mitchell, but in view of Mr. Mitchell's taking the Fifth Amendment on behalf of his

client at our last meeting with respect to numerous documents and so forth, and subpoenas, I seriously doubt that he will ever put Judge Carrillo on the stand.

i

The Committee will meet again tomorrow, but probably it may all well be in executive session also. We will keep the press advised as to if and as and when there will be any more public hearings; and Mr. Michell and Mr. Canales will be advised also.

(Whereupon, at 2:15 p.m. the Committee went into executive session.)

CERTIFICATE

_

COUNTY OF TRAVIS

THE STATE OF TEXAS

I, Walter H. Hickman, a Notary Public in and for Travis County, Texas, do certify that on the 23rd day of June, 1975, the foregoing proceedings before the HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPEACHMENT were reported by me and that the foregoing 15 pages constitute a full, true and accurate transcription of my Stenograph notes.

GIVEN under my hand and seal of office this 7th day of July, 1975.

Walter H. Hickman, Notary Public in and for Travis County, Texas.