TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE TEXAS STATE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPEACHMENT AUSTIN, TEXAS VOLUME XVI

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 XVI

BE IT REMEMBERED that on Wednesday, July 16, 1975, pursuant to the morning recess, the Committee reconvened at 2:15 p.m., in the Old Supreme Courtroom, State Capitol Building, Austin, Texas, the above-entitled matter came on for hearing, having been continued from July 15, 1975, before the HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPEACHMENT, the Honorabie L. DeWitt Hale, Chairman, Presiding, and the following proceedings were reported by Hickman Reporting Service, 504 Travis Building, Austin, Texas 78701.

HICKMAN REPORTING SERVICE

THE **QUALITY** REPORTERS
Austin, Texas **476-5363**



MEMBERS PRESENT I 2 3 REPRESENTATIVE HALE - CHAIRMAN 4 REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY REPRESENTATIVE CHAVEZ 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE DONALDSON 7 REPRESENTATIVE HENDRICKS 8 REPRESENTATIVE KASTER 9 REPRESENTATIVE LANEY 10 REPRESENTATIVE NABERS 11 REPRESENTATIVE WEDDINGTON 12 REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON 13 14 **APPEARANCES** FOR HOUSE SIMPLE RESOLUTION NO. 161 15 REPRESENTATIVE TERRY CANALES, P. O. Box 730, 16 Premont, Texas 78375. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

24 25

1	INDEX	
3	CONSIDERATION: OF THE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE	
4	ARTICLE II Section 6, Ms. Thompson Motion to delete portion	16-7
5	ARTICLE II Section 6, Mr. Hendricks	16-8
7	Substitute Motion to delete paragraph 6, Article II. Adopted (5-4)	
8	ARTICLE II Paragraph (3), Mr. Chavez	16-18
10	Motion to amend by striking (3) and substitute words.	·
11	ARTICLE II Paragraph (7), Mr. Chavez Motion to delete (7) in its entirety. Adopted (7-2)	16-31
13	ARTICLE II Paragraph (5), Mr. Hendricks Motion to delete (5) Adopted (8-1)	1,6-36
15	ARTICLE III Paragraphs (6) and (7), Mr. Hendricks Motion to delete both paragraphs.	16-45
16	ARTICLE IVE Subsection (1), Ms. Thompson Motion to delete allog. (1)	,1 -6 - 52
18 19	ARTICLE IV Paragraph (3), Mr. Nabers Motion to delete "heavy."	16-54
20	ARTICLE IV Paragraph (7), Mr. Kaster Motion to delete (7) in its entirety.	16-54
22	ARTICLE VII Subsection (3), Mr. Chavez	16-57
23	ARTICLE VII, Mr. Hendricks Substitute motion to strike in entirety.	16-58
25		

4 5

VOLUME XVI

WEDNESDAY, July 16, 1975

(Pursuant to the morning recess, the Committee reconvened at 2:15 p.m., and the following transpired.)

CHAIRMAN HALE: The Committee will come to order.

At this time the Chair will lay before the Committee a committee substitute for House Simple Resolution No. 161 in draft form for action by the Committee, copies of which have been circulated among members of the Committee and also members of the press.

Our procedure this afternoon in consideration of this committee substitute, unless there is objection from some member of the Committee, the Chair would like to work through this substitute on an article by article basis, and a paragraph by paragraph basis to see if there are any further changes that need to be made in the committee substitute with respect to form or language or style, without regard to the merits or demerits of the substantive content. What we will be seeking as we go through it article by article at this time is perfection in the draftsmanship so that each article will correctly reflect the language in the charge which the Committee feels is justified for that particular charge. Voting on each of these will come subsequent to the perfection of the draftsmanship.

No. II.

you.

2.5

Is there any objection to that procedure? (No response.)

The Chair hears none and we will proceed accordingly. If each of you would look on page one then we will start on page one there.

The "Resolving" clause, I presume, meets with everyone's satisfaction on lines four through eight.

Lines 9 through 14 have to do with the Articles of Impeachment, sort of a preamble to the Article of Impeachment. Are there any suggestions for change in that, in the preamble? (No response.)

We would go to Article I. Is there any comment or discussion as to the form of the language in Article I?

MS.THOMPSON: I have some suggestion as to

CHAIRMAN HALE: On No. 1?

MS. THOMPSON: No. I'm sorry; I'm ahead of

CHAIRMAN HALE: Article II. Although the subject heading is on the bottom of page 1, the Article doesn't start until the top of page 2. Is there any discussion on Article II?

MS. THOMPSON: I had some concern about section 6 of Article II. I have some concern with the last part of that sentence, "...of state and local advalorem

taxes." 1 2 CHAIRMAN HALE: What page are you on? 3 MS. THOMPSON: I am on page 3. CHAIRMAN HALE: What would be your suggestion? 4 I would like to delete " and MS. THOMPSON: 5 6 of state and local advalorem taxes." 7 MR. CHAVEZ: Is this the time when you would 8 take motions to delete any part? CHAIRMAN HALE: If there are any changes the 9 10 Committee wants to make the Chair will entertain motions 11 to make those changes, yes, sir, on each Article as we go 12 down. I would like to make a motion 13 MS. THOMPSON: to delete that part of section 6, Mr. Chairman. 14 CHAIRMAN HALE: The phrase "and of state and 15 local advalorem taxes"? 16 MS. THOMPSON: Yes, sir. 17 MR. HENDRICKS: I have a substitute motion. 18 CHAIRMAN HALE: Let me state the motion. 19 Ms. Thompson has moved that the phrase "and of state and 20 local advalorem taxes" be deleted from subparagraph 6 of 21 Article II. Mr. Hendricks? 22 I have a substitute motion, MR. HENDRICKS: 23 Mr. Chairman. 24 CHAIRMAN HALE: What is your motion? 25

MR. HENDRICKS: I would move to delete subparagraph 6 in its entirety.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Hendricks moves as a substitute for the Thompson motion that paragraph 6 of Article II in its entirety be deleted from the committee substitute. Is there any discussion? Do you want to make any statement in connection with your motion, Mr. Hendricks?

MR. HENDRICKS: Mr. Chairman, I just don't feel that enough evidence was brought forth. I know what this sales tax refers to in the "state and local advalorem taxes" and "sales tax" regarding that equipment that went to the ranch. I do not feel that even from the preponderance of the evidence that this was brought forth to this Committee in such form for the Committee to vote on it.

And I would feel the same way regarding the state and local advalorem taxes. If he can't pay his taxes I can't see that that would be an impeachable offense, and I would move to delete subparagraph 6.

MR. CHAVEZ: Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Chavez.

MR. CHAVEZ? If I desire to move on subsection 7 also-

MR. JOHNSON: Wait until we get to it.

MR. CHAVEZ: - Wait until after this motion

is over?

CHAIRMAN HALE: Yes, sir. I think that would be a separate motion, if you want to make some change in that.

MR, CRAVEZ: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Ms. Thompson, do you have anything you would care to say on your motion or about Mr. Hendrick's substitute?

MS. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, I recall from the testimony that we did receive that there were several purchases made by the Farm and Ranch Store, which materials were alleged to have been repurchased by the person who has been—by O. P. Carrillo and which there is no indication that sales taxes were paid nor did Mr. Mitchell ever produce evidence in forms of checks, et cetera, receipts which show he did pay the sales taxes for those materials that he had purchased from the—Morehouse Company was one of the companies, I think I recall. And I was concerned about several of those things that did occur during the course of testimony.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Any other comments?

MR. HENDRICES: I would like to comment on that in that there was no evidence, really, that the sales taxes weren't paid. It's a vague area and is strictly, to me, a guess on whether they were or weren't paid. I would

3

4

7 8

6

9

11 12

13

15

16 17

18

19

21

22

24

25

think the benefit of the doubt there should be resolved in the Judge's favor.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there any further discussion? (No response.)

Ms. Thompson offers an amendment to delete a portion of paragraph 6. Mr. Hendricks moves as a substitute to delete all of paragraph 6. The question will recur on the substitute motion by Mr. Hendricks.

All those in favor of the substitute motion by Mr. Hendricks will vote "Aye"; those opposed will vote "No" as your names are called.

The Clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Maloney.

MR. MALONEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Chavez.

MR. CHAVEZ: Aye.

THE CLERK: Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Hendricks.

MR. HENDRICKS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Rester.

MR. KASTER: No.

THE CLERK: Laney.

MR. LANEY: No.

THE CLERK: Nabers. Ī MR. NABERS: Aye. 2 THE CLERK: Weddington. 3 MS. WEDDINGTON: No. 4 THE CLERK: Slack. 5 MR. SLACK: (Absent) 6 THE CLERK: Thompson. 7 MS. THOMPSON: No. 8 THE CLERK: Five "ayes" and 3 "noes." 9 CHAIRMAN HALE: There being five "ayes" and 10 three "nays"- Is that correct? That's not right. 11 have more here than that. 12 THE CLERK: Four "nays." I'm sorry; it is 13 four. 14 CHAIRMAN HALE: There being five "ayes" and 15 four "nays" the Hendricks substitute is adopted. 16 MR. DONALDSON: Mr. Chairman-17 CHAIRMAN HALE: Just a moment. Is it about 18 this? 19 MR. DONALDSON: No. 20 CHAIRMAN HALE: The question now recurs on 21 the Thompson motion as substituted. 22 All those in favor, let it be known by saying 23 "Aye." 24 (Voice vote.) 25

Opposed, "No."

(Voice vote.)

The "Ayes" have it and the motion as substituted is adopted.

Mr. Donaldson?

MR. DONALDSON: I have a motion relating to subsection (3) of Article II. I would move to delete from that specification No. (3) there the language at the end of the sentence which says "...for his own personal and political purposes."

I would like to be heard on my motion.

MR. CHAVEZ: Where?

MR. DONALDSON: To delete the language in specification No. (3) in Article II, the language "...for his own personal and political purposes."

CHAIRMAN HALE: Do each of you follow us?

On paragraph (3) of Article II beginning at the bottom

of page 2, line 25 on page 2, the phrase "...for his own"

and then it continues at line 1 of page 3 "personal and

political purposes."

Mr. Donaldson moves to delete that phrase. The Chair recognizes you, Mr. Donaldson, on the motion.

MR. DONALDSON: I think it would be proper to delete that language because if the members of the Committee are satisfied with the evidence that he did

conspire with others to influence the membership and proceedings of the grand jury then, as far as I'm concerned, it's makes no difference what the purposes of that conspiracy was, and it would place a higher degree or burden of proof under that specification, and I would move to delete it. If we have sufficient evidence to show the conspiracy in the tampering with the membership and proceedings, it makes no difference in my opinion as to what his purposes were.

MR. CHAVEZ: I agree.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Hendricks.

MR, HEMDRICKS: Question.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Do.yeu-yield for a question,

Mr. Donaldson?

MR. DONALDSON: I yield.

MR. HENDRICKS: Mr. Donaldson, is it your intention there that it should thus read, "...for the purpose of whether it was for his personal and political purpose" or "...for the personal and political purpose" of anyone? Is that your intention there?

MR. DONALDSON: It would simply read like this if my amendment is adopted: that "he conspired with others to influence the membership and the proceedings of the grand jury of Duval County."

MR. HENDRICKS: Whether it be for his purpose

or someone else's purpose. 1 MR. DONALDSON: Regardless of what the pur-2 pose was. 3 MR. HENDRICKS: 4 Thank you. CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there further discussion? 5 MR. MALONEY: Although I recognize the point 6 Mr. Donaldson is trying to make, I believe that if you 7 read specification (3) as he would have it read it becomes В a very vague specification. Certainly under the grand jury 9 system as it is provided by law in Texas at this time, it 10 does allow and almost presupposes that a district judge in 11 selecting grand jury commissioners will influence the 12 membership of a grand jury, and any instructions or riding 13 herd on the grand jury in any county of this state would 14 be influencing the proceedings of the grand jury; and I 15 think that without putting a motive in that indicates wrong 16 doing that the specification really has no meaning. 17 MR. DONALDSON: Bob, what about changing the 18 word "influence" to "interfere with"? 19 MR. CHAVEZ: Or "improperly" or "unlawfully." 20 MR. DONALDSON: "tamper." 21 MR. MALONEY: I would rather have "influence." 22 think the fact that the "influence" was to his personal 23 or political benefit implies the wrong doing. It is not 24 necessarily an interference because the testimony, as I 25

heard it, from start to finish, there was very little interference.

R

MR. DONALDSON: What I am thinking specifically about is the testimony we had about the meeting where the secretary of the grand jury was there and, according to the testimony of the secretary of that grand jury, in his interpretation Judge Carrillo was making a definite recommendation as to whether or not indictments should be returned against one or two or three people. Now, if in fact the evidence is strong enough to substantiate that he did make that recommendation in that meeting, then I think that that is a specification that ought to be included, regardless of what his motive was in doing it; because he was discussing and making recommendations on matters pending before the grand jury.

MR. CHAVEZ: People weren't as political—
MR. MALONEY: Well, I think I'm trying to
look at it in perhaps too technical a point of view as to
what it is going to say if someone read this Article. And
what it says it implies, to me, no wrong doing unless you
attach a malicious intent to the word "conspire."

MR. CHAVEZ: I think we ought to put in there improperly before "influence." "...to improperly in-fluence."

MR. NABERS: Well, he conspired to subvert

the principles of-

MR. DONALDSON: Refer it back to the general Article.

MR. JOHNSON: What about "improperly"?

MR. MALONEY: That, to me, does it, just what Mel suggested.

MR. CHAVEZ: Offer a substitute motion then.

MR. DONALDSON: I will withdraw my amendment at this time, Mr. Chairman, and offer a substitute.

MR. HENDRICKS: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to subparagraph (3).

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Donaldson, do you want to withdraw you amendment, you say?

MR. DONALDSON: I will withdraw my amendment.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Donaldson withdraws his amendment. Mr. Hendricks?

MR. HENDRICKS: Mr. Chairman, I would offer an amendment to that same subparagraph (3) in which it would read "he conspired with others to influence the membership and proceedings of the grand jury impuneled in February, 1975, in the 229th District Court of Duval County" and so on and so forth. I think we had better pin that down as to what grand jury it is, because if you don't, well— There have been many grand juries down there and I think you should specify which grand jury we are

 talking about.

the last-

hear you.

MR. CHAVEZ: I would offer a substitute motion to that, if I could, Mr. Chairman. He wants to leave this in, doesn't he?

CHAIRMAN HALE: What is your substitute?

MR. JOHNSON: You don't want to leave in

MR. CHAVEZ: I don't understand; I couldn't

MR. HENDRICKS: What I would like to do is to have the staff draw it in such a way that this particular grand jury that is now impaneled in Duval County is specified as the grand jury subparagraph (3) is speaking to; because it doesn't specify any grand jury. It says "of the grand jury." We all know what we are talking about but I don't think you could put that in an indictment or charges against anybody without specifically stating what grand jury you are talking about.

MR. DONALDSON: What about this, Bob? After "Duval County" put a comma "February term 1975 229th
Judicial District Court."

MR. HENDRICKS: Well, I wasn't positive what term that was. I do remember the testimony. I believe it was impaneled February the 2nd or 3rd of '75.

MR. NABERS: But still take this out.

MR. DONALDSON: Yes. Take out the part "for his own personal use and benefit."

MR. HENDRICKS: Any way that could be worded I would think would satisfy a glaring error there to me.

MR. CHAVEZ: Could I offer a substitute motion. Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN HALE: What is your motion, Mr.

Chavez?

MR. CHAVEZ: I would move to amend subsection

(3) to insert between the words "to" and "influence" on

line 24 the word "improperly" and strike, beginning on

line 25 the words "for his own" and on line 1, page 3

the words "personal and political purposes" and insert

in lieu thereof "impaneled February 3rd, 1975."

MR. DOYLE: That will do it.

MR. NABERS: Read the whole thing.

MR. CHAVEZ: "he conspired with others to improperly influence the membership and proceedings of the grand jury of Duval County impaneled February 3, 1975."

MR. NABERS: I will buy that.

MR. HENDRICKS: I will accept the substitute, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Would we be better not to say Webruary 3"? That worries me when you specify that specific date. Why not just "the February term"?

MR. MALONEY: "on or about." 1 MR. HENDRICKS: Is it the February term? 2 I don't know. 3 MR. CHAVEZ: I think it would be the February 4 term. 5 MR. MALONEY: It might have been the January 6 term. We could use "on or about." 7 MR. HENDRICKS: It could possibly be "the 8 grand jury term." 9 MR. CHAVEZ: "impaneled on or about." 10 MR. DONALDSON: "on or about" will get it. 11 MR. DOYLE: Leave out the date. Sav "im-12 paneled in February." 13 CHAIRMAN HALE: Are we sure of the month? 14 Are we positive of the month? 15 MR. DOYLE: Yes. 16 MR. DONALDSON: That is my birthday is the 17 reason I remember that. 18 MR. CANALES: Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt 19 the Committee briefly at this point and bring to the atten-20 tion- I don't know whether it has been overlooked inten-21 tionally or left out intentionally or whatever. The Chair 22 will notice that in all of the charges the charges or not 23 for acts committed but simply for conspiracy. In talking 24 to Mr. Doyle I was suggesting the possibility of inserting 25

well, taking, for example, subparagraph (3) that is under consideration right now, instead of saying "he conspired with others" simply stating that he conspired with others but also that he conspired and acted with others; not only that he conspired with others but he also acted. They are actually two different offenses; one the conspiracy and one the act. I just throw it out for the consideration of the Committee.

MR. MALONEY: Point of order.

CHAIRMAN HALE: State your point of order.

MR. MALONEY: It is my understanding this is a formal meeting of this Committee and it's my understanding of the rules of the House only the members of the Committee participate in mark-up sessions.

CHAIRMAN HALE: I think that is entirely proper. Under the rules of the House, Mr. Canales, I believe you will find that on the work sessions of the Committee the deliberations should be confined to members of the Committee.

MR. CANALES: I will apologize, Mr. Chairman.

chairman hale: I think you could readily understand and appreciate the reason for that because if we allow one non-member of the Committee to participate then we have to allow other non-members to participate, and then it becomes totally unmanageable and unwieldy.

The Chair would suggest to you that we would— I know all members of the Committee would appreciate any suggestions you have and what the Chair would suggest is that you pass it to some member of the Committee individually and if he feels it has merit he can then bring it to the attention of the Committee.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. Chavez, see if this does what you want, so that Article III would read like this: "he conspired with others to improperly influence the membership and proceedings of the grand jury of Duval County impaneled in February, 1975."

MR. CHAVEZ: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Doyle, let the Chair ask you a question, and the members of the Committee too.

Although with the point of order on Mr. Canales was sustained, the idea which he brought forth was one, if you members of the Committee will recall, I raised some question about during previous deliberations was the continuing use of the word "conspired." My question to you, Mr. Doyle, is on the prosecution, are we unnecessarily limiting ourselves if we are going to confine it to "conspired"? Let me think out loud with you on the alternative. I am thinking everywhere we used the word "conspired" if perhaps we ought not to change the language to read something

like this: that "he acted individually or in concert with others to improperly influence the membership" so that whether he had anybody else acting with him or whether he did it all by himself you are covered either way; and then you get away from necessarily the conspiracy. A "conspiracy" to me implies more or less an agreement, whereas you might well act in concert with others with no preservanged agreement whatsoever. Now, am I thinking hazily and foggily or is there some merit to that?

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DOYLE: Generally, alleging of conspiracy broadens what you can introduce into evidence to prove up the misdeed which you are alleging. In this particular instance, on the subparagraph that you are dealing with which is subparagraph (3), it depends on how you interpret the word or the phrases "to influence." It would appear to me by definition "to influence" would take some act, some overt act. You can't influence without letting somebody know what your thoughts are. "Conspiracy" wherever it is alleged and I have looked it over, and in more than one place I think you could show, you could introduce evidence or that there is ample evidence to indicate a conspiracy, as well as an act by the individual acting alone. For instance, the testimony we received yesterday from Mr. Correa indicated that the discussion about indictments took place in the presence of

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

CHAIRMAN HALE: Supposing that the evidence on this particular one, supposing the evidence before the trial tribunal is such that the presiding judge or officer excludes all of the testimony concerning the improper influence of the grand jury except that which Judge Carrillo himself alone did. Now, would that destroy it if you limit it to a conspiracy? My question to you is, does a con-

spiracy require that more than one person was involved?

Yes.

CHAIRMAN HALE: It would have to-

Mr. Manges, Mr. George Parr, and the Judge. Whether or

not you would, you know, a proper forum would believe

that that was a conspiracy or not would be for them to

overabundance of caution" it certainly wouldn't hurt the

spiring with others" or, you know, "attempted to influence"

allegations if you put "acted alone" as well as "con-

collectively or alone. I don't think it would hurt a

But to use a phrase of the Chair, "out of an

18

19

20 21

22

with yourself.

23

24

MR. DOYLE: No.

MR. DOYLE: Yes.

MR. DOYLE:

CHAIRMAN HALE: So you are automatically, it seems to me, by use of the word "conspiracy," you are

CHAIRMAN HALE: Because you can't conspire

automatically excluding therefrom any act which he may have done on his own inititive and acting by himself, would you?

MR. DOYLE: No, not necessarily because that goes to the question of believability of the evidence.

That goes to the interpretation of what he did. Was the conversation on the telephone with the witness Correa, while Correa was in the presence of Manges in Manges' automobile, was that enough to get to the conspiracy angle?

If the tryer of fact doesn't believe that it was then the evidence is not any good, but I think it is a question on the weight of the evidence and not one of the admissibility of the evidence. But in this particular instance, I think you would probably be improving the document if you put in language such as was suggested, to indicate he acted alone and with others.

MR. CHAVEZ: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding of conspiracy that a conspiracy doesn't become unlawful until somebody commits an overt act. If we are going to tie the Judge into this, if the evidence is to substantiate this, then he must have committed some overt act for the conspiracy to be unlawful. He might have discussed it with somebody else to improperly influence the grand jury, but that in itself is not unlawful unless they do some act to actually carry out the conspiracy.

CHAIRMAN HALE: But the Judge himself would not have to do that act. Anyone of the coconspirators could do the actual act, and all coconspirators would be equally guilty, would they not?

MR. CHAVEZ: That is correct.

MR. DOYLE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN HALE: If I understand the law of

conspiracy

MR. CHAVEZ: Once they had that conversation in the Judge's chambers, I think that is enough to reflect that the conspiracy was carried out.

MR. DONALDSON: Terry, as I undersstand the format of these Articles, we have alleged a general Article in this format considered to be an impeachable offense.

Then under that we have stated that the conduct, to the knowledge of the Committee at this time, that would indicate that he had committed that impeachable offense included these specific items. But it is not limited to those. So as I understand the intent of drawing the resolution in this manner you're not limited to proving these specific acts in proving the overall Article of impeachment, so that if in fact one of those where it stated that he conspired if, in fact, he only acted to improperly influence the grand jury or something, don't you think under this Article that you could introduce evidence to prove that?

MR. DOYLE: What you are alleging, for instance, in Article III, Mr. Donaldson—excuse me; you are working on Article II.

MR. DOMALDSON: Right.

MR. DOYLE: —is that "while holding office as District Judge he used his official powers in a manner calculated to subvert the principles of democratic justice and obstruct the fair and impartial administration of justice." And then by way of example you are saying he did 1, 2, 3 and 4, 5, 6, 7. Now, I am assuming that the presiding officer at whatever stage would allow the introduction of evidence which would substantiate that allegation. I don't think the presiding officer would keep out evidence that he attempted to influence a grand jury member with someone else or alone. I am really not concerned about that.

MR. DONALDSON: Of require, wendon't really a know what the rules are going to be.

MR. DOYLE: We don't know what the rules are going to be, but I cannot imagine that being the case.

But I think that the point raised by whoever raised it—

I don't remember; I think Mr. Canales did first—is perhaps well taken because if the Committee, the House, the Senate or whoever, is at anytime criticized for "shotgunning" this thing, if you put a little— You see, what we are

doing in these numbered articles, subsections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, is giving out some specific examples of what the Committee feels is misconduct to fit within what we have alleged in the broad paragraph that starts off Article II. If you're going to get specific, then you might as well go ahead and get pretty specific.

As Mr. Bendricks pointed out, perhaps you ought to say "the February grand jury." I don't think it makes any difference, but it seems to me the reason you would want to do it is just to show that not only do we think he did things that were calculated to subvert the principles of democratic government and obstruct the fair and impartial administration of justice, we think he did these things, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. It brings it more in line with the nature of an indictment, although it is not; and it doesn't have to meet those requirements. It will, at least, that portion of the charge—

MR. DONALDSON: I would presume this is subject, of course, to some procedural due process.

MR. DOYLE: Well, historically, the Senate has passed a resolution which governs, and I would assume the Senate will pass a resolution which governs evidence, allegations and so forth on this occasion.

I certainly see no reason, if you're going into specifics, if it will make the Committee members feel a

- 25 iittle more comfortable to go into more specifics, I don't think it will do any harm to the instrument.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Well, while you all have been talking I have been tinkering around here with language, and actually I think you could do the entire thing by adding two words to this. As it reads now, "he conspired with others" to do so and so. All you would have to do would be to add in there "he acted alone or conspired with others" to do so and so.

MR. CHAVEZ: We ought to make up our minds whether he did or didn't. I think he conspired with others. I think that is what the evidence shows.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Well, on this particular one I'm thinking in terms of the use of this word "conspiracy" throughout the articles, as we might do.

MR. CRAVEZ: Well, I think we ought to take them one at a time.

CHAIRMAN HALE: On this particular one, I am inclined to agree it doesn't make any difference.

Don't you, Mr. Doyle?

MR. MALONEY: A point of inquiry.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Maloney?

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Chairman, I am concerned a little bit from the technical point of view when you are switching from "ands" and "ors" just in pleading, you are

going back and forth from the disjunctive to the conjunctive pleadings, and frankly I have not briefed it enough to give my opinion of what it would be in this. Will we be able, in the event the Committee votes any articles of impeachment, will these be amendable on the floor, from a technical point of view, on the floor of the House.

MR. NABERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HALE: It's the opinion of the Chair that the entire resolution would be subject to any amendments on the floor of the House that anyone would care to offer. I think, without attempting to prejudge what the House might do, but from a procedural standpoint it occurs to the Chair that this would be, just as any other resolution, would certainly be subject to floor amendment.

MR. MALONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HALE: So that on later study, if we did find some defect in some of these articles, and the Committee votes them out and we reach that point, then amendments could be offered on the floor of the House to correct any errors.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, were your words
"he acted and conspired with others"?

CHAIRMAN HALE: "acted alone or conspired with others."

MR. DOYLE: "he acted alone to influence."

CHAIRMAN HALE: "he conspired with others."

In other words, you would have a two-pronged allegation there.

MR. DOYLE: You could probably get the same result by just saying "he acted and conspired with others to influence." "He acted to influence and he conspired with others to influence."

MR. MALONEY: Say what you mean.

MR. CHAVEZ: It is the same thing. If he acted he conspired. It is proving the conspiracy.

CHAIRMAN HALE: I am constrained to say in this particular one it doesn't make any difference.

MR. DOYLE: I agree.

chairman hale: Because I don't recall any evidence where he acted alone on this particular one, but there may be others of these articles where there was some act alone.

Mr. Hendricks had offered an original amendment here and you were going to accept it. Why don't you just withdraw yours, Mr. Hendricks?

MR. HENDRICKS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Hendricks withdraws his amendment and Mr. Chavez submits the following amendment:

That we strike paragraph (3) and substitute in lieu thereof, the following: "he conspired with others

to improperly influence the membership and proceedings of 1 the grand jury impaneled in February, 1975." 2 Is there any discussion on the Chavez amendment? 3 (No response.) All those in favor of the adoption of the Chavez 5 amendment, let it be known by saying "Aye." 6 (Voice vote.) 7 Opposed, "No." 8 (Voice vote.) 9 The "Ayes" have it and the Chavez amendment is 10 adopted. 11 CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Johnson, who is going to 12 keep a running tabulation on all of these amendments? Do 13 you want these where they are in writing, shall I give 14 them to you so we can incorporate them in their proper 15 place? 16 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, sir. 17 MR. CHAVEZ: I move to amend Article II by 18 deleting subsection (7) thereof. 19 CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Chavez moves to amend 20 Article II by deleting paragraph (7). 21 MR. CHAVEZ: The way the Article or the subseq-22 tion is written it says that "he handled his financial 23 affairs in a manner that caused him to be indicted." I 24 don't know that the manner in which any individual conducts 25

his financial affairs would be an impeachable offense. Of course, he hasn't been convicted of that offense and it seems to me that people that are tried and acquitted, then for all practical purposes we would have a judicial finding that he didn't commit a violation. But still this "financial affairs" I think is what this thing speaks to, the manner and type of business man he might be, and I think that is not an impeachable offense. At least the testimony we have here, in my opinion, would not substantiate such a charge.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there any further discussion?

MR. MALONEY: I am in agreement with Mr. Chavez. I think that (7) would move into an area in which there really has been very little testimony before this Committee, and the fact that a person has been indicted under our system of law has never been any evidence per se of him being guilty of what he is charged with. I really think that it would be going too far to hold that simply being indicted and handling your affairs in such a way that you were indicted was any type of impeachable offense. Because if that were to be the case—the Judge has been criticized in one article for influencing the grand jury and in the other case where you had a grand jury that just didn't like a district judge they could

3

4

5

6

8

10 11

12

14 15

16

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

return an indictment and that would be the end of him. I tend to agree with Mr. Chavez

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Kaster.

MR. KASTER: Mr. Chairman, I disagree with Mr. Chavez. I think the predicate was laid in the Judge's actions in removing various officials because one of the reasons given in the testimony was that they were under indictment, so if it is fair enough for him to remove people because they are under indictment I feel then it is fair enough to consider this in the same light.

MR. CHAVEZ: Mr. Chairman, I think he is referring to the removal of Judge Parr, but in that case there was a conviction. He was tried and he was found guilty. That goes a little bit further and in every charge, criminal charge, there is an instruction from the court to the jury that the indictment is no evidence of guilt.

MR. MALONEY: In addition to that, there is a specific statute that says a county judge can be removed if he has been convicted of a felony by a petit jury which is undisputed in the evidence we have.

MR. CHAVEZ: That's right. So that is a little different from this situation.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there further discussion?

(No response.)

Is there further discussion on the Chavez motion?

2

4 5

6 7

8

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

(No response.)

Mr. Chavez moves that Article II be amended by deleting paragraph (7) in its entirety.

All those in favor of the motion will indicate by voting "Aye"; those opposed to the motion will vote "No" as your names are called. The Clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Maloney.

MR. MALONEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Chaves.

MR. CHAVEZ: Aye.

THE CLERK: Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Pass, right now.

THE CLERK: Hendricks.

MR. HENDRICKS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Kaster.

MR. KASTER: No.

THE CLERK: Laney.

MR. LANEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Nabers.

MR. HABERS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Weddington.

MS. WEDDINGTON: No.

THE CLERK: Slack.

MR. SLACK: (Absent.)

1 THE CLERK: Thompson. 2 MS. THOMPSON: Aye. 3 THE CLERK: Donaldson. 4 MR. DONALDSON: THE CLERK: Seven "ayes" and two "nays." 5 6 CHAIRMAN HALE: Seven to two. There being seven "ayes" and two "nays," the amendment is adopted. 7 8 Mr. Hendricks. 9 MR. HENDRICKS: Mr. Chairman, I would move 10 to amend Article II by striking in its entirety subparagraph (5). 11 12 I would like to be heard on my motion. 13 CHAIRMAN HALE: The Chair recognizes you. 14 MR. HENDRICKS: It is my feeling that this matter covered by paragraph (5) here is sufficiently 15 covered in another article- I can't put my finger on it 16 right now; in the Part trial is the one I am speaking of. 17 MR. MALONEY: (2) of Article II. 18 MR. HENDRICKS: (2) of Article II. 19 Well, I was trying to go faster. I feel like it is suffi-20 ciently covered in paragraph (2) of Article II and it 21 should be deleted at this point since we have covered it 22 23 sufficiently. MR. CHAVEZ: Which one do you think covers 24 25 it? I couldn't hear you.

. 25

MR. HENDRICKS: Article II, paragraph (2).

I am moving to delete subparagraph (5) in that I feel like it's covered in subparagraph (2).

CHAIRMAN HALE: Let the Chairman ask you a question. Subparagraph (2) speaks to his refusal to recuse and disqualify himself. Paragraph (5) speaks to a conspiracy to dominate control. Those are two separate and distinct matters, aren't they?

MR. HENDRICKS: I feel that's true, but I've got a personal feeling that is just mine that maybe what he did was right but I just don't appreciate the way he did it.

MR. KASTER: Mr. Chairman, I disagree with this motion. Specifically, I think that no. 2 deals with his conduct in judging a case which he had already acted on. I didn't think it was proper for him to be listening to a case when he made public pronouncements that he was a political enemy now of Mr. Parr. Article V deals with his method of arbitrarily suspending and removing from office a political opponent and very specifically reappointing one of his allies from the court which gave him another chance to replace that commissioner that he elevated to the county judge with another ally, effectively giving him control of the court. I think they are two separate and distinct offenses and I think that they should

both be in there.

MR. HENDRICKS: I would like to respond to that, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Any other discussion? (No response.)

MR. HENDRICKS: It is just my feeling that we have not received concrete testimony concerning the catual removable of Judge Parr from his bench down there. The only thing we have received is the fact that they had a fight in the papers; they were enemies, and he presided at his trial. I feel like we are on concrete ground in subparagraph (2) and that we are not in (5) and we have not received the testimony to back this up and we would just be guessing on it.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Kaster.

MR. KASTER: I would respond to that, Mr. Chairman, that the evidence certainly did show that there are, in fact, two county commissioner's courts. The bank refused to honor the drafts down there because of the chaotic condition caused by this arbitrary removal and the manner in which he held it, and the people couldn't qualify. They are holding dual offices. I think there is ample evidence and Article V should be in there just from the evidence, and I would disagree with Mr. Hendricks.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there any further

discussion? 1 (No response.) 2 MR. CHAVEZ: Could I ask Mr. Kaster a ques-3 tion? 4 CHAIRMAN HALE: Yes. 5 MR. CHAVEZ: Wasn't most of the testimony concerning removals with respect to the trustees, school 6 7 trustees? There was hardly any real concrete testimony 8 on Archer Parr that I remember. 9 MR. KASTER: I think no. 5 demonstrates the 10 testimony showing that the people down there haven't been 11 paid for a couple of months; that there are not warrants 12 being honored by the bank because of this situation. 13 certainly do think it was arbitrary and I think that no. 2 14 deals with an entirely different matter. It deals with 15 his conduct in hearing the case, which he shouldn't have 16 done, in my opinion. 17 MR. CHAVEZ: But this subsection speaks to 18 dominating and controlling the county. 19 MR. KASTER: That's right. 20 MR. CHAVEZ: Well, most political organiza-21 tions—isn't that the purpose, to try to control the-I don't think that a district 22 MR. KASTER: 23 judge can be dominating and controlling anything. 24 MR. DONALDSON: Mr. Chairman, will Mr. 25 Kaster yield?

MR. KASTER: Yes, sir.

MR. DONALDSON: Mr. Kaster, don't you think under that paragraph (5) when you say "he conspired with others to dominate and control the county by arbitrarily suspending and removing from office a political opponent," which I presume to be Archer Parr, that if he did that arbitrarily that presupposes that he had no valid reason for doing it when, in fact, Archer Parr had been convicted of a perjury and that that is specifically stated in the statutes for proper reason for removal from office. So it was not arbitrary, to that extent. That would be the way I would look at that. And the way he handled it, I think that is a different thing and I think it is covered under (2).

MR. RASTER: I think (2) speaks only to the method of his handling the trial-

MR. DONALDSON: I agree with that, too.

MR. RASTER: —but it is the situation, the dog and pony show he ran between Rebbronville and wherever else he was running it.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Maloney.

MR. MALONEY: It is my feeling that since there is a specific statute that does give the district judge the power to remove a judge, a county judge, under these circumstances that we pretty well have to be

4 5

7 8

6

9 10

11

13

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

23

24 25 governed by that. You can not say that a man who followed the statute has done something wrong regardless of political reasons behind it. The fact that he appointed a political ally, reprehensible though that may be, I think we are ignoring political realities. A person who is going to appoint a political ally is not going to appoint an enemy.

I would agree that it is convered in (2), the damage that he has done to the judicial system, which is by and large the heading for Article II is amply covered in subsection (2).

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there any further discussion? (No response.)

Mr. Hendricks has moved to amend Article II by deleting in its entirety paragraph (5).

All those in favor of the motion will vote "Aye" and those opposed will vote "No" as your names are called. The Clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Maloney.

MR. MALONEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Chaves.

MR. CRAVEZ: Aye.

THE CLERK: Donaldson.

MR. DOWALDSON: Aye

THE CLERK: Hendricks. 1 MR. HENDRICKS: Aye. 2 THE CLERK: Kaster. 3 MR. KASTER: No. 4 THE CLERK: Laney. 5 MR. LANEY: Aye. 6 THE CLERK: Nabers. 7 MR. NABERS: Aye. 8 THE CLERK: Weddington. 9 MS. WEDDINGTON: Aye. 10 THE CLERK: Slack. 11 MR. SLACK: (Absent) 12 THE CLERK: Thompson. 13 MS. THOMPSON: Aye. 14 THE CLERK: Eight "ayes" and one "no." 15 CHAIRMAN HALE: There being eight "ayes" 16 and one "nay," the Hendricks amendment is adopted. 17 Are there further amendments to Article II? (No 18 response.) 19 Let's move on to Article III then. Are there 20 amendments to Article III? 21 MR. HENDRICKS: Yes. 22 CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Hendricks. 23 MR. HENDRICKS: There in the first paragraph, 24 "While holding office as district judge for the 229th 25

Judicial District of Texas, O. P. Carrillo conspired with" and so on and so forth, I feel like maybe here we should insert the words "acted or" conspired with others. To divert the services. I don't feel like it would do damage to the Article and would—

MR. CHAVEZ: What-

MR. HENDRICKS: Add the word after "O. P. Carrillo" "acted or" "conspired with others."

MR. CHAVEZ: Why couldn't you say "conspired with others-"

MR. HENDRICKS: "acted or conspired with others."

MR. CHAVEZ: Well, I was going to suggest another way to say "conspired with others" to "and did convert the services of governmental employees."

MR. DONALDSON: Then you would have to prove the conspiracy any time-

MR. DOYLE: That wouldn't change the burden.

MR. CHAVEZ: That's okay. I withdraw my suggestion.

MR. HENDRICKS: You point specific conduct in that second paragraph. I think it is covered down there when you start pointing out the specifics that he did it, if it's voted, and then you point out the specific instances of when he did it.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Wouldn't we get back there, Mr. Hendricks, on the same discussion we had before? You have two possibilities; one, he either acted alone in doing certain things or he conspired with others to do certain things.

MR. HENDRICKS: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN HALE: I would get back to that phrase I had a minute ago, "acted alone." In other words, "O. P. Carrillo acted alone or conspired with others."

MR. HENDRICKS: Well, if you just used the word "acted," doesn't that necessarily mean acted alone?

CHAIRMAN HALE: If you said, "acted or conspired with others," the "with others" might be interpreted to apply to 'acted' too. "Acted with others" or "conspired with others."

MR. HENDRICKS: Well, I will amend my motion to say "acted alone" then.

CHAIRMAN HALE: I mean that is the danger,
I think, in not putting the word "alone" in there.

MR. HENDRICKS: When we get down to these specific things I think the word "acted" should go in there.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Hendricks moves that Article III be amended; in the opening paragraph there, immediately following the words "O. P. Carrillo" by

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

14

15

17 18

19 20

21

22

24

25

adding the phrase "acted alone or" so that if the amendment were adopted the opening paragraph would read:

"While holding office as district judge for the 229th Judicial District of Texas, O. P. Carrillo acted alone or conspired with others to divert the services of governmental employees," and so forth.

Does everyone understand the amendment? (No response.) Is there any further discussion on the amendment? (No response.)

All those in favor of the adoption of the amendment let it be known by saying "Aye."

(Voice vote.)

Opposed, "No."

(Voice vote.)

The "ayes" have it. The amendment is adopted.

Mr. Hendricks.

MR. HENDRICKS: Mr. Chairman, I would move to delete both paragraph (6) and paragraph (7) of Article III. I would like to be heard on my motion.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Hendricks moves to amend Article III by deleting paragraphs (6) and (7).

The Chair recognizes you on the motion.

MR. HENDRICKS: My reason is that both

Tomas Elizondo and Roberto Elizondo testified before the

Committee and there was no contradiction in their testimony that both of them ran cattle on the Judge's ranch,
and we had no way of contradicting and it wasn't contradicted. Thereby, there would be consideration passing
from the Judge to them for any work they might have done
on the ranch, and I do not feel like they belong in this
article of impeachment.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there further discussion on the motion? (No response.)

Mr. Hendricks moves Article III be amended by deleting in their entirety paragraphs (6) and (7).

All those in favor of the motion let it be known by saying "Aye."

(Voice vote.)

Opposed "No."

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HALE: Let's do that again. All those in favor of the motion let it be known by saying "Aye."

(Voice vote.)

Opposed "No."

(No response.)

The "ayes" have it and the amendment is adopted.

MR. CHAVEZ: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Chavez.

2

3

the motion.

5

6 | 18 | 7 | CO | 8 | em | 9 | I | 10 | t1 | 11 | I | 12 | th | 13 | up | 14 | th | 15 | th | 16 | km

19 20

17

18

21

23

24

25

MR. CHAVEZ: I would move to amend Article
III by deleting subsection (5) thereof.

CHAIRMAN HALE: The Chair recognizes you on

MR. CHAVEZ: The reason I say that, there is testimony on Patricio Garza that he did work for the county of Duval but for the last year and a half he was employed with the Judge and was being paid by the Judge. I don't think that we can really tie that in as the testimony would tie in the other fellows up above that, and I know that in the event this thing is going to be tried that the prosecutor is going to have enough trouble proving up the others without being saddled with proving something that I don't think all the evidence is there. I think there is too much doubt on Patricio Garza and I don't know of anybody that testified he was out there all the time prior to the year and a half ago. I think there was some inference and invendo, but I don't think there was concrete evidence like there was on Ruiz and Pat Gonzalez and Cleofas Gonzalez.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Hendricks.

MR. HENDRICKS: Mr. Chavez, we did have testimony, I believe, from Mr. Saenz that he was making up these warrants or claims to the county for Patricio Garza, and my memory is vague right now but was the only witness

3

4 5

6 7

9

10

8

11

13

15

16

17 18

20 21

19

22

24

25 say that I don't-

testifying definitely he worked on that ranch the lady that testified yesterday?

MR. CHAVEZ: No. She never went out to the ranch and she only met him once, and that was-

MR. HENDRICKS: She testified it was her understanding or general knowledge that he worked on the ranch. I believe that's correct, was the testimony yesterday.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Chavez, will you yield to the Chair long enough to get the microphone over a little closer to you? On these things I am fearful we may not be getting all of this on tape and history will be the loser.

MR. CHAVEZ: (laughing) I doubt it.

MR. HENDRICKS: In addition to her, Cleofas testified he worked on the ranch. Isn't that correct?

MR. CHAVEZ: I don't think any of those people definitely testified that he worked on the ranch prior to a year and a half past. Now, he has been on the ranch for the last year and a half, that's true, and Garza told us that. Then, as I recall his testimony, these claims that were notarized by Saens—and I think that Mr. Hale asked him specifically the six months in '73 that he did not recognize as his having signed before Saenz, but that he was working for the county during that time. That is why

MR. HENDRICKS: Well, it's my recollection—

I don't have the transcript in front of me—that Cleofas

Gonzalez testified that he definitely worked on the Judge's ranch while he was drawing county money.

MR. CHAVEZ: I think we are assuming that Cleofas was testifying that he worked at the same time he was employed by the county, and I don't think that transcript reflects that.

MR. KASTER: I disagree with Mr. Chavez. I think there was testimony given, in fact all testimony given other han Mr. Garza's and Mr. Garza never worked anywhere other than the ranch; in fact, he never did work and perform services for the county with the exception of Mr. Garza saying he worked for the county. I think Mr. Gonzalez made it clear; I think, as I vaguely remember, Mrs. Ysaguirre said that Mr. Garza came and picked up groceries to take them out to the ranch for many years past, and not for just the eighteen months, but he has been with the Judge since 1971, and I recollect, I draw the impression from the testimony that Mr. Garza had worked at the ranch since 1971.

MR. CHAVEZ: I think if you will review Mrs.

Ysaguirre's testimony she did not say "for many years past."

She testified he did pick up groceries, and this can be—

I don't disagree he picked them up in the past year and a

half. He admitted that. I just also just, from the demeanor of Mr. Garza— You know, he's an old gentleman came up here and testified, and I don't really think he mislead the Committee; I think he was honest, and I don't—

MR. KASTER: I think Mr. Garza works for the Judge, has worked for the Judge and is not going to say anything that would hurt the Judge, but I think there was other ample testimony that he never worked for the county and always worked for the ranch, as far as I'm concerned, and I think the evicence—

MR. CHAVEZ: Who testified to that effect?

MR. KASTER: I don't know of anybody that ever said he worked for the county other than Mr. Garza.

MR. CHAVEZ: Well, who said he worked for-

MR. KASTER: Mr. Garza said.

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Maloney.

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Chairman, I would call the Committee's attention to Volume V of the transcript, page 169 in the testimony of Tomas Elizondo. He was asked:

"Did you say that Mr. Patricio Garza, you don't know if he has any cows out there either? Answer. No, he don't.

Question. He doesn't?

No.

1 Question. Where does he work? 2 Answer. There at the ranch. 3 Question. At the ranch? 4 Yes, sir. 5 Question. How long has he worked there at the ranch? 6 7 Answer. Ever since I have known him. 8 Question. Ever since you have known him? 9 I mean ever since I have been there at the ranch." 10 I think there is enough testimony by Tomas Elizondo 11 himself that showed that Patricio Garza worked at the ranch! 12 MR. CHAVEZ: Well, it's just like Tomas and 13 They worked there on weekends and have for many 14 years past, but that doesn't reflect that they were doing 15 it at the time that-MR. DONALDSON: He said he had been working 16 there ever since he had-17 MR. CHAVEZ: Well, he was working there on 18 19 Isn't that the testimony by Tomas? weekends. MR. DONALDSON: He said he had been working 20 there ever since the Judge took office. He said Patricio 21 22 had been working there all that time. 23 MR. CHAVEZ: All right. CHAIRMAN HALE: Any further discussion? (No 24 25 response.)

Mr. Chavez sends up an amendment to amend Article 1 III by deleting in its entirety paragraph (5). 2 The question recurs on the Chavez amendment. 3 All those in favor of the amendment will vote "Aye"; those 4 opposed will vote "No" as your names are called. The 5 Clerk will call the roll. 6 THE CLERK: Maloney. 7 MR. MALONEY: No. 8 THE CLERK: Chavez. 9 10 MR. CHAVEZ: Aye. THE CLERK: Donaldson. 11 MR. DONALDSON: No. 12 THE CLERK: Hendricks. 13 14 MR. HENDRICKS: THE CLERK: Kaster. 15 MR. KASTER: No. 16 THE CLERK: Laney. 17 MR. LANEY: No. 18 19 THE CLERK: Nabers. MR. NABERS: No. 20 THE CLERK: Weddington. 21 MS. WEDDINGTON: 22 No. THE CLERK: Slack. 23 MR. SLACK: (Absent) 24

25

1 THE CLERK: Thompson. 2 MS. THOMPSON: No. 3 THE CLERK: One "aye," eight "no's." 4 CHAIRMAN HALE: There being one "aye" and 5 eight "nays," the amendment fails of adoption. 6 Are there further amendments to Article III? (No 7 response.) 8 Are there further amendments to Article III? (No 9 response.) 10 Article IV. 11 MS. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman. 12 CHAIRMAN HALE: Ms. Thompson. 13 MS. THOMPSON: I would like to be recognized 14 for an amendment to delete No. (1) of Article IV. 15 CHAIRMAN HALE: Ms. Thompson moves to amend Article IV by deleting paragraph (1). The Chair recog-16 17 nizes you on the motion, Ms. Thompson. 18 MS. THOMPSON: According to the testimony 19 we received in this Committee, Mr. Chairman and members, 20 I don't feel like we have sufficient testimony to substan-21 tiate this part of this Article. CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there further discussion? 22 23 (No response.) Is there any further discussion on the motion? 24 MR. MALONEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, what 25

response.)

R.

was the motion?

CHAIRMAN HALE: The motion was to delete from Article IV all of paragraph (1).

MS. WEDDINGTON: Mr. Chairman, I think the evidence that we can substantiate that the grain owned by Carrillo was delivered to the warehouse by county employees, but I don't think we could substantiate for sure it was county vehicles used to deliver it. We couldn't seem to get evidence of that, mostly because the trucks didn't have any license plates on them.

MS. THOMPSON: And they said it was transported by A and R.

MS. WEDDINGTON: Yes, by somebody in A and

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there any further discussion on the amendment? (No response.)

Ms. Thompson moves that Article IV be amended by deleting in its entirety all of paragraph (1).

All those in favor of the motion, let it be known by saying "Aye."

(Voice vote.)

Opposed, "No."

(Voice vote.)

The "ayes" have it and the amendment is adopted.

Are there further amendments to Article IV? (No

Are there any further amendments to Article IV? 1 MR. NABERS: Mr. Chairman? 2 3 CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Nabers. 4 MR. NABERS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that we strike the word "heavy" out of section (3). 5 CHAIRMAN HALE: Paragraph (3)? 6 7 MR. NABERS: Paragraph (3). To where it would read "the use of equipment" rather than "heavy equip-8 ment." 9 10 CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Nabers moves to amend the paragraph (3) by deleting the word "heavy." 11 12 Is there any discussion? (No response.) 13 All those in favor of the motion. let it be known 14 by saying "Aye." (Voice vote.) 15 Opposed, "No." 16 (No response.) 17 The "ayes" have it and the amendment is adopted. 18 19 Mr. Kaster. MR. KASTER: Mr. Chairman, I would move to 20 delete paragraph (7). I think that there was evidence 21 given that he did in fact lease some bulldozers and he 22 produced the leases. I do think that the county fixed 23 his bulldozers, but that is not in this particular Article, 24 and I am not sure that we could sustain that, based on the 25

evidence that we were given. 1 MR. HENDRICKS: Mr. Chairman, I would like 2 to add the further reason that subparagraph (7) is vague 3 and indefinite. I don't know what "private purposes" is. 4 MR. DONALDSON: It may be prejudicial. 5 CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there any further dis-6 cussion on the amendment by Mr. Kaster? (No response.) 7 Mr. Kaster has moved to amend Article IV by de-8 leting in its entirety all of paragraph (7). 9 All those in favor of the motion, let it be known 10 by saying "Aye." 11 (Voice vote.) 12 Opposed, "No." 13 (Voice vote.) 14 All those in favor of the motion by Mr. Kaster 15 will vote "Aye," those opposed "No," as your names are 16 called. 17 The Clerk will call the roll. .18 THE CLERK: Maloney. 19 MR. MALONEY: Aye. 20 THE CLERK: Chavez. 21 MR, CHAVEZ: Aye. 22 THE CEERE: Donaldson. 23 MR. DONALDSON: 24 25

THE CLERK: Hendricks: 1 MR. HENDRICKS: Aye. 2 3 THE CLERK: Kaster. 4 MR. KASTER: Aye. THE CLERK: Laney. 5 6 MR. LANEY: No. 7 THE CLERK: Nabers. 8 MR. NABERS: No. 9 THE CLERK: Weddington. 10 MS. WEDDINGTON: Aye. THE CLERK: Slack. 11 12 MR. SLACK: (Absent) 13 THE CLERK: Thompson. 14 MS. THOMPSON: Aye. THE CLERK: Six "ayes," three "nays." 15 CHAIRMAN HALE: Six-three? 16 There being six "ayes," three "nays," the amend-17 ment is adopted. 18 Are there further amendments to Article IV? (No 19 20 response.) Are there further amendments to Article IV? (No 21 22 response.) Let's move on to Article V. Are there any amend-23 24 ments to Article V? 25

MR. HENDRICKS: 1 Question, Mr. Chairman. 2 CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Hendricks? 3 MR. HENDRICKS: In the second paragraph, "What other close relative was there, in a governmental 4 entity?" His father, D. C. Chappell, was he head of the 5 school board, is that what that paragraph refers to? 6 7 CHAIRMAN HALE: And Ramiro Carrillo-8 MR. HENDRICKS: Well, I know the Commissioner, but Zertuche is related to him, too? 9 10 I think they're nephews. MR. CHAVEZ: 11 MR. HENDRICKS: That answers my question. 12 Thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN HALE: Are there any amendments to 14 Article V? 15 (No response) We'll move on to Article VI. Are there any 16 amendments to Article VI? 17 (No response) 18 No amendments to Article VI? We'll move on 19 to Article VII. 20 MR. CHAVEZ: I have an amendment. 21 CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Chavez? 22 MR. CHAVEZ: I move to amend Article VII 23 by deleting Subsection 3-24 25 MR. DONALDSON: And 2?

3

4

5

8

7

10 11

12

14

time?

16

17 18

19

21

23

24

MR. CHAVEZ: I'll just go on 3 first. I'll just go on 3 myself, Mr. Chairman.

That's the cement, and I think Reynaldo Guerra explained that situation, that he sold the cement to the Judge and he showed the invoices I don't think there is any evidence to contradict that. For that reason, I move that that be deleted from the Article.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there any discussion on the amendment? Mr. Laney?

MR. LANEY: I've got a substitute I would like to add, add to that Section, make it 1, 3 and 5—delete Sections 1, 3 and 5.

MR KASTER: Why don't we do it one at a

CHAIRMAN HALE: Well, why don't we take them a paragraph at a time, and that way we won't get into a lot of substitutes here.

The Chair recognizes you for a motion and delete these others, Mr. Laney, if you want, at the proper time.

MR. LANEY: Do you want to recognize him for a substitute motion first?

CHAIRMAN HALE: All right.

MR. HENDRICKS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer a substitute motion, and strike Article VII in its entirety, and would like to be heard on my motion.

ì 2

3 4

5 6

8

9

7

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr Hendricks moves as a substitute, that Article VII in its entirety be deleted. The Chair recognized you, Mr. Hendricks, on the motion.

MR. HENDRICKS: Well, you can go right down the list and I feel like I'm the one that should do this because I was after that wall panelling and barbed wire probably as much as anybody, but I don't think anything has ever definitely been proved. There is some testimony, not enough, on the fuel. There is some testimony regarding goods owned by Duval County, but if you remember, Cleofas even himself, on his second testimony, backed up a little bit on that. I don't think we're on sound ground there.

Subparagraph 3, there is contradicting testimony regarding the cement. Also, the Judge has introduced into evidence some invoices on which he purchased cement. We never could find where the barbed wire went, and they panelled that city hall down there at Benavides with that panelling. And for that reason, I would move to strike the entire Article.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there any further dis-Ms. Thompson? cussion?

I don't remember Mr. Gonzalez MS. THOMPSON: backing up on the fuel. He actually admitted that he did fill the Judge's trucks up, and I don't remember him

taking any of that testimony back, or hedging, to a degree that would substantiate the removal of Number 1 under this article.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there further discussion?

Mr Chavez moves that Paragraph 3 of Article VII be deleted; Mr. Hendricks moves as a substitute, that all of Article VII, in its entirety, be deleted. The question recurs on the substitute motion by Mr. Hendricks.

All those in favor of the substitute will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no" as your names are called. The Clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Maloney.

MR. MALONEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Chavez.

MR. CHAVEZ: Aye.

THE CLERK: Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: No.

THE CLERK: Hendricks.

MR. HENDRICKS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Mr. Kaster.

MR. KASTER: No.

THE CLERK: Laney.

MR. LANEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Nabers.

24 25

19

20

21

22

23

25

MR. NABERS: No.

THE CLERK: Weddington.

MS. WEDDINGTON: No.

THE CLERK: Slack.

MR. SLACK: (Absent)

THE CLERK: Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: No.

THE CLERK: Four "ayes" and five "nays."

CHAIRMAN HALE: Being four "ayes and

five "nays" the Hendricks! substitute motion fails of adoption.

The question now recurs on the original motion by Mr. Chavez to delete Paragraph 3.

Mr. Nabers?

MR. NABERS: I guess I would have to wait to offer a substitute to that, would I not?

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is it dealing with another paragraph?

MR. NABERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Supposing we take these paragraphs one at a time?

MR. NABERS: What I would like to do, to save some time voting on 2, 3, 4, and 5, taking them out,

leaving 1.

CHAIRMAN HALE: All right. The Chair will recognize you for that motion.

MR. NABERS: I move that we strike 2, 3, 4 and 5 and leave Subparagraph 1.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Do you want to make any explanation, Mr Nabers?

MR. NABERS: No. I think everybody knows what's in their mind.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Kaster?

MR. KASTER: I tend to go along with Mr.

Nabers, but it bothers me on Number 4, the barbed wire
and fence posts. On our trip down to Benavides, we went
out to the ranch and saw a nice brand new fence with new
posts, new barbed wire stays that ran as far as I could
see, and there was no evidence—I think that evidence
could be developed that this was in fact part of the barbed
wire and fence posts that Mr Hendricks was asking about.
And I don't feel strongly about it, but I think there
would need to be more evidence developed to prove it, but
I think there is a reasonable doubt in my mind, at least
in regard to the fence. It was not along a road; it was
down the middle dividing two pastures, and there is an
element of doubt in my mind. But I don't feel strongly

21

22

23

24

25

about it. cussion? and 5.

CHAIRMAN

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there further dis-

Mr. Chavez moves to delete Paragraph 3; Mr.

Nabers offers a substitute to delete Paragraphs 2, 3, 4

and 5. The question recurs on the Naber's substitute.

All those in favor of the substitute motion by Mr. Nabers will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no," as your names are called.

The Clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Maloney.

MR. MALONEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Chavez.

MR. CHAVEZ: Aye.

THE CLERK: Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Hendricks.

MR. HENDRICKS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Kaster.

MR. KASTER: No.

THE CLERK: Laney.

MR. LANEY: No.

THE CLERK: Nabers.

MR. NABERS: no.

1 THE CLERK: Weddington. 2 MS. WEDDINGTON: No. 3 THE CLERK: Thompson: MS. THOMPSON: 4 Ave. THE CLERK: Six "ayes" and three "nays." 5 CHAIRMAN HALE: Being six "ayes," three 6 "nays," the Naber's substitute is adopted. 7 The question now recurs on the Chavez amend-8 ment as substituted by the Nabers' substitute. All those 9 in favor of the adoption of the Chavez amendment as sub-10 stituted, let it be known by saying "aye"; opposed, "no." 11 (The motion, being put to a vote, was carried.) 12 13 CHAIRMAN HALE: The "ayes" have it, and the 14 amendment is adopted, as substituted. Counsel calls to the Chair's attention that in 15 view of that amendment that went on, where we're deleting 16 four of the five paragraphs, that we need to make a 17 corrective change in the preamble part of the Article, 18 19 where it says, "This conduct included, but was not limited to 20 one or more of the following:" 21 We would have to delete the words, 22 "One or more of," 23 so it would read, 24 "included, but not limited to the following:" 25

1 MR. JOHNSON: And strike the "one". 2 MR. MALONEY: And take the "one" off. 3 CHAIRMAN HALE: That's what I say. 4 Mr. Maloney moves, then, to delete the phrase, "one or more of" from lines 22 and 23, lines 22 on page 6 5 and line 1 on page 7. Does everyone understand the amend-6 7 ment? 8 MR. JOHNSON: And the numeral one. 9 CHAIRMAN HALE: Where is the numeral one? 10 Oh, on the paragraph, yes. The numeral one on line 2. 11 Does everyone understand the amendment by Mr. 12 Maloney to correct that language, deleting "one or more 13 of" and the figure 1. 14 All those in favor of the adoption of the Maloney 15 amendment, let it be known by saying "aye"; opposed "no." (The motion, being put to a vote, was carried.) 16 17 Are there further amendments to Article VII? 18 (No response) 19 We'll move on to Article VIII. Are there 20 amendments to Article VIII? 21 MR. DONALDSON: I'd like to ask Terry a 22 question. 23 CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Donaldson? 24 MR. DONALDSON: Terry, on VIII, do you 25 think there's any necessity for including in that Article

the fact that that benefitted him directly by virtue of the—of his ownership in Farm and Ranch Supply, or any other business entity?

MR. DOYLE: No. I think "charge and collect" is enough You do need probably to make that word in line 18 "governmental" instead of "government."

MR. DONALDSON: "Governmental"?

MR. DOYLE: Instead of "government entities;"

MR. DONALDSON: I so move, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Donaldson moves to amend Article VIII by substituting the word "governmental" for the word "government."

MR. DOYLE: It's just a typographical error. I think, Mr Chairman.

MR. DONALDSON: On line 18.

CHAIRMAN HALE: It would be on line 18, page 7.

MR. DOYLE: You might want to say "monies for rentals of equipment." That might make it a little bit more clear.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Let's get Mr. Donaldson's amendment first. Mr. Donaldson has moved to amend the Article to change the word "government" to the word "governmental" on line 18, page 7. Is there any discussion

on that motion?

(The motion, being put to a vote, was carried.)

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Maloney?

MR. MALONEY: Not in the nature of a motion, but if any member of the Committee can help me, I would certainly appreciate it. I do not recall any specific testimony that substantiated Article VIII, other than just some general inferences, or implications that were made.

MR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, I think probably most of it came from those records, didn't it, where there was leasing of equipment and such as this, that was never, according to Elizondo, had never been owned by the store.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there further discussion on Article VIII? Any amendments to Article VIII, further amendments?

(No response)

Article IX-

MR HENDRICKS: Did you want that "monies" in there. Terry?

MR. DOYLE: I think it would make it a little bit more clear. I don't think there is any question about what they received and collected.

"collect"?

MR. HENDRICKS: I would move to amend

Article VII and place the word after "entities," "monies,"

and then pick it up "for rentals."

CHAIRMAN HALE: Wouldn't it come after

MR. DOYLE: After "collect."

MR. HENDRICKS: That would be fine. And "collect monies from governmental entities for rentals of equipment that did not exist."

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Hendricks has moved to amend Article VIII by inserting the word "monies" following the word "collect" on line 18, page 7. Is there any discussion?

(No response)

(The motion, being put to a vote, was carried.)

CHAIRMAN HALE: The amendment is adopted.

Article IX. Mr Hendricks?

MR. HENDRICKS: Mr. Chairman, I move to strike Article IX and would like to be heard on my motion.

CHAIRMAN HALE: In its entirety?

MR. HENDRICKS: In its entirety.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Hendricks moves to strike Article IX in its entirety. The Chair recognizes you on the motion, Mr. Hendricks.

MR. HENDRICKS: Mr. Chairman, there is not

a doubt in my mind, or of that of any of the Committee, that our thoughts probably agree with Article IX, but I can only go by the evidence presented to the Committee and try to connect that, if it be connected, or is to be connected with Judge Carrillo regarding Arturo Zertuche. He was an employee of the Commissioner of Precinct 3, paid by the County. I find nothing that would convince me that we should vote an article of impeachment showing the connection of Judge Carrillo with this, even though vouchers may have been signed in the Judge's office. There is no testimony that ties Judge Carrillo himself with Arturo Zertuche, only the Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Kaster?

MR. KASTER: Mr. Chairman, I disagree. I think this Article was amply proved, not only by the warrants and the amount of monies that were paid to him, but I suppose you take your pick of two conflicting witnesses. You can either believe Mr. Saenz in that the Judge didn't know what was going on, even though it was done immediately outside his office over a great period of time, or you can believe the testimony of Mrs. Montemayor, who said that the Judge had to remind Mr. Saenz, through Mrs. Montemayor, several times to make sure that the warrants were turned in to the County for payment.

I think, also, that the conspiracy would be

dealing in that Mr. Zertuche is a cousin to Judge Carrillo, that his brother, under whose precinct the money was coming from, was also his brother, so I think there is ample evidence that a conspiracy was perpetrated in regard to paying Arturo Zertuche, particularly while he was away to school.

And on top of that, there was the close business affiliation with the Zertuche General Store, and I think there is ample evidence that they were very involved in the matter.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there further discussion?

MR. HENDRICKS: I'd like to reply to that.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Hendricks.

MR. HENDRICKS: I don't doubt anything Mr. Kaster says. What I'm saying is whether or not we've got the evidence to present an article of impeachment, whether we're going to sit up here and judge this on justiciable evidence that's been presented, or whether we're going to guess it on circumstantial evidence.

Now, Arturo Zertuche headed up the Zertuche

General Store. That is his connection with Judge Carrillo.

He attended school at North Texas. He drew a county

paycheck from Precinct 3. I think when he took the Fifth

Amendment this morning it was well taken, and I so advised

him of it. If in mylegal mind, I thought we had evidence,

3

5

4

6 7

8

second?

10

12

13

15

16 17

18 19

20

22 23

24

25

I'd be the first one to vote it, but I just do not feel like the evidence is there on this particular instance. He didn't work for the Judge.

Now, Roberto worked in the Judge's office.

You've got a connection there. But on this one, there is no connection like that with the Judge.

MR. DONALDSON: Bob, will you yield a

MR. HENDRICKS: Yes, I'll yield.

MR. DONALDSON: I'm trying to think, in my own mind, the lady that testified yesterday, saying that the Judge had instructed Saenz to prepare these claims. Was Arturo's claims included among those?

MR. HENDRICKS: I believe it was. But that still does not show a conspiracy from the Judge, to me.

It may to you. I mean, I'm voting my conscience.

MR. DONALDSON: Yes. Well, I'm having some difficulty with it myself, and that's the only thing that I can think of in my mind that might conceivably tie Judge Carrillo to this by way of conspiracy.

MR. HENDRICKS: She did say he reminded here on Patricio Garza, Arturo and Roberto. But Roberto, to me, is the only one that worked in that Judge's office. The other guy worked on his ranch. This guy didn't.

That's my reasoning. I mean, you vote it up or

It's immaterial to me. But that's just my thoughts l 2 on the matter, and I wanted to let you know them. 3 CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there further discus-4 sion? 5 Mr. Hendricks offers an amendment to delete all of Article IX from the Resolution. All those in favor 6 of the motion will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote 7 8 'ao." The Clerk will call the roll. 9 THE CLERK: Maloney. 10 MR. MALONEY: no. H THE CLERK: Chavez. 12 MR. CHAVEZ: Aye. 13 THE CLERK: Donaldson. 14 MR. DONALDSON: Pass. 15 THE CLERK: Hendricks. 16 MR. HENDRICKS: Aye. 17 THE CLERK: Kaster. 18 MR. KASTER: No. 19 THE CLERK: Laney. 20 MR. LANEY: No. 21 THE CLERK: Nabers. 22 MR. NABERS: No. 23 THE CLERK: Weddington.

MS. WEDDINGTON: No.

24

25

THE CLERK: Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: No.

THE CLERK: Three "ayes" and six "nays."

CHAIRMAN HALE: There being three "ayes," six "ayes" the amendment fails of adoption.

Is there any further discussion on Article IX?

Article X. Is there any discussion or amendments on Article X?

MR. DONALDSON: Mr Chairman, I have.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: I've got an observation.

In looking at Article X, and IX, which as I read those, they're identical in wording, except they name two different individuals. Is that correct?

CHAIRMAN HALE: Well, I haven't read them word for word, and compared them, but they appear to do that, yes.

MR. DONALDSON: In view of the previous discussion on Article IX, it appears to me that it might be better to have one article and say that he conspired with

others to defraud Duval County by causing County funds
to be paid to individuals who are not entitled to receive
them, and then list, specifically, including but not limited to, Arturo Zertuche, Roberto Elizondo and the third
one. Who was the other one he prepared claims for?

CHAIRMAN HALE: Patricio Garza?

MR. CHAVEZ: I think I'd leave them separate. They're two separate transactions.

MR. DONALDSON: Well, if you all don't like it, that's fine.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there any discussion on Mr Donaldson's suggestion?

MR. DONALDSON: Terry, what do you think?

MR. DOYLE: Our thinking was that the payment of claims to Arturo Zertuche and Roberto Elizondo were—the monies they received were by virtue of claims, and not salary. And the Arturo situation was different, as is obvious by the previous motion, wherein three people thought it ought to be taken out, than Roberto's. Roberto, you have a direct connection with O. P. Carrillo who benefitted ultimately directly from, you know, Roberto going on the payroll as his court reporter, and you have the Judge benefitting directly from Arturo Zertuche in an entirely different context, by what appeared to be the use of Arturo's name and signature and perhaps other

I

 functions in his efforts to get money out of the county through the Zertuche Store arrangement.

And that was the reason we pled it separately, because they just didn't seem to fit well together. The evidence, to prove up what occurred with respect to Arturo is going to be drastically different than the evidence on Roberto. That's why it was done.

We also felt, as evidenced by the previous vote, that there might be some folks that felt like we had a womewhat weaker position on Arturo than we did on Roberto.

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN HALE: Mr. Maloney.

MR. MALONEY: In the format you have, where you have a different article on Arturo Zertuche, a different article on Roberto Elizondo, it appears to me that the proper thing, since in Article III we referred to Patricio Garza, "while employed and being paid by Duval County, worked on O. P. Carrillo's ranch," to maintain that he was actually not employed by the county, to get out from under Subsection 5 of Article III, then he certainly would come under it, the fact that he was not employed by the county, not entitled to any money, and it was fraud to pay him.

And if you have an article on Arturo and on Elizondo, you should have one on Garza.

and X?

CHAIRMAN HALE: Similar to Articles IX

MR. MALONEY: Right.

MR. DOYLE: Make it Number XI.

MR. MALONEY: Number XI, that would read the same, substituting his name.

MR. DONALDSON: I was thinking about that a minute ago. I think there is one distinction. Under Article II, or III, the one you're referring to, Patricio Garza, his services, paid for by the county, were being diverted to the personal use of 0. P. Carrillo; whereas in the case of Arturo Zertuche and Roberto Elizondo, you don't have that strong a connection as diversion of services. Don't you agree, Terry?

MR. MALONEY: What is the position? You take the position that you didn't divert his services from the county, because he never was a county employee?

MR. CHAVEZ: He was being paid for his labor and it was being diverted over to the Judge's—

MR. MALONEY: Or, was he under the same situation as Zertuche and Elizondo? He was not being employed by the county at all; he was just being paid some money by the county.

MR. CHAVEZ: Well, we've got more testimony that he might have been at some time working for the 2 3 4

county, because he testified to that, at least. So he must have been performing services. He acknowledged to having been on the payroll. So he was being paid for purposes of delivering services to the county. Now, those services were diverted somewhere else.

Now, on Roberto Elizondo, this was a separate deal. He was supposed to be working for the Judge, but one Judge apparently, according to the testimony, created the situation as an excuse to get him money.

MR. MALONEY. No. But remember Roberto Elizondo was receiving money at a different time, too, at a time when he was not a court reporter.

MR. CHAVEZ: But he created the situation of helping him through school. He never really-

MR. MALONEY: You're saying if you're going to take Garza's testimony that he did work for the county, Elizondo testified that he did work for the county, too.

He did work in the Judge's office.

MS. WEDDINGTON: I think the difference is that we don't have the testimony on Elizondo and Roberto, that they actually did work for the Judge at the time they were getting the money. They were just getting the money free and clear, and then later they did some things for him. But at that time, he was paying them for other reasons, whereas Garza, I think, really was working.

1

5 6

8 9

7

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

It just happened he was doing the work on the Judge's ranch when he was being paid by the county. And that's the differentiation to me: what the people receiving the money were actually doing at the time they were receiving it.

MR. MALONEY: Well, is there testimony outside of Garza's own testimony that he actually worked ior the county?

MS. WEDDINGTON: Yes. Not that he worked for the county, but that he was doing work on the Judge's ranch. Ruben Chapa, Cleofas Gonzalez-several people testified that he was doing work on the ranch at the time that he was getting paid by the county, whereas there is no testimony that either Arturo or Roberto were working either for the county or the Judge at the time they were getting the money.

MR. CHAVEZ: He was benefitting by the services that these guys were rendering-as opposed to testimony. The Judge was benefitting from the services that Garza was performing. He wasn't benefitting personally by the services that Roberto Elizondo was rendering because if he was rendering service, he was rendering them in his capacity as a clerk for the Judge.

MR. MALONEY: I'm not suggesting that you I'm saying you need an additional article that delete V.

4 5

. 7

covers both situations.

MS. WEDDINGTON: We're saying the two situations are different; that Garza is covered by the kind of situation of Article II of the impeachment, whereas Roberto and Arturo are not within that situation, because we don't have the same evidence that they were rendering personal services to the Judge at the time that they were setting the money from the county.

MR. CHAVEZ: He was stealing those services

MS. WEDDINGTON: He was conspiring to see that they got money they didn't deserve. We don't have testimony that they were doing personal work for the Judge, or personal work on his ranch or something, at the time they were getting the money.

CHAIRMAN HALE: All right. Neither Article

IX nor Article X alleges that it was for his personal

benefit.

MS. WEDDINGTON: Yes, but the one where Garza is involved does.

MR. CHAVEZ: That's the distinction.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Well, what difference would it make in the context—I'm curious as to what difference it would make in the context of the allegations in the form of Article IX or X where you're just saying that he conspired to defraud the county by causing county

it.

funds to be paid to him when he wasn't entitled to receive them, regardless of who got the benefit.

MR. DONALDSON: Well, as I understand it, Maloney is suggesting that we put Garza under that category, too. Isn't that right, Bob?

MR. MALONEY: That's right. That's it's covered both ways.

MR. DONALDSON: I might agree with you if you don't delete it from Article III.

MR. MALONEY: No. I don't want to delete

MR. DONALDSON: Then you've got him both ways under Article IX and X, although I agree with Sarah and _____

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Chairman, I move to add an Article XI that would read,

While holding office as District Judge for the 229th Judicial District of Texas, O. P. Carrillo conspired with others to defraud Duval County by causing county funds to be paid to Patricio Garsa, who was not entitled to receive the funds."

CHAIRMAN HALE: All right. Mr. Maloney
has moved to add a new article, designated Article XI,—
all these numbers may change later. I've forgotten

now?

whether we deleted anything in its entirety now—which would read identical to Article X, except that the words "Patricio Garza" would be substituted for "Roberto Elizondo" in this Article XI.

Ms. Weddington?

MS. WEDDINGTON: Is Mr. Maloney then going to move that we have a separate identical paragraph on Cleofas Gonzalez, Pat Gonzalez, Francisco Ruiz, and Oscar Sanchez, and if not, what is the distinction between those people? Because none of those people were entitled to get the money they were receiving from the county.

MR. DONALDSON: They were working for the county. They were actually performing work for the county.

MS. WEDDINGTON: But—no. Well, maybe to a very small degree, but most of it was just for the Judge. That's why we're alleging they shouldn't have gotten the money, and it's an impeachable offense.

MR. DONALDSON: Who are you talking about

MS. WEDDINGTON: The other people that are covered in Article III.

MR. DONALDSON: Francisco Ruiz? Francisco, we're alleging that he just worked as a welder on O. P.'s property. He was a regular welder for the county.

MS. WEDDINGTON: Okay. What I'm saying is,

if he wants to have a new article on Patricio Garza, is he also going to have a new article on all those other people?

MR. DONALDSON: No. The distinction is this: is that in his opinion, Garza never worked for the county, period. He was always working on the ranch for Carrillo.

MR. MALONEY: That's correct.

MR. DONALDSON: Whereas Ruiz and those other individuals, we're talking about specific instances where we had testimony that although working for the county in regular employment, they went out to the Judge's ranch on isolated times and performed services for him.

MS. WEDDINGTON: I don't see that distinction, but I don't think we need to take up Committee time with it.

CHAIRMAN HALE: That is what the Committee is here for, Ms. Weddington, to take the time to discuss these matters.

Is there any further discussion on the Maloney motion?

Mr. Maloney moves that a new Article XI be added to the Articles of Impeachment, to read identical to Article X, except that it would apply to Patricio Garza, rather than to Roberto Elizondo. All those in favor of

the motion will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no" 1 2 as your names are called. The Clerk will call the roll. 3 THE CLERK: Maloney. 4 MR. MALONEY: Aye. 5 THE CLERK: Chavez. 6 MR. CHAVEZ: No. 7 THE CLERK: Donaldson. 8 MR. DONALDSON: Aye. 9 THE CLERK: Hendricks. 10 MR. HENDRICKS: Aye. 11 THE CLERK: Kaster. 12 MR. KASTER: No. 13 THE CLERK: Laney. 14 MR. LANEY: No. 15 THE CLERK: Nabers. 16 MR. NABERS: Aye. 17 THE CLERK: Weddington. 18 MS. WEDDINGTON: No. 19 THE CLERK: Thompson. 20 MS. THOMPSON: Aye. 21 THE CLERK: Five "ayes" and four "nays." 22 23 24

25

4 5

CHAIRMAN HALE: There being five "ayes" and four "nays" the Maloney amendment is adopted.

Are there further amendments, or discussion?

How about the concluding paragraphs of the Resolution? Is There any discussion or amendments posed to the concluding paragraph of the Resolution?

Mr. Johnson suggests that the Chair read it in tull. Well, we might read through it together then.

"In all of this, O. P. Carrillo has acted in a manner contrary to the trust reposed in him as District Judge and is guilty of gross violations of the Constitution and Statutes of this State, and of the duties of his office, and of the Code of Judicial Conduct. By such conduct he has rendered himself unfit to hold the office of Judge of the District Court for the 229th Judicial District of Texas, and he warranted trial and conviction, removal from office, and disqualification from holding any future office in this State, and the House of Representatives, saving to itself the liberty to exhibit additional Articles of Impeachment against O. P. Carrillo

at any future date, if it decides any are necessary, request that O. P. Carrillo be required to answer the Articles of Impeachment against him."

Is there any discussion on the concluding paragraph, or any amendment to the concluding paragraph?

(No response)

There is now pending then before the Committee, as amended, a complete substitute for House Simple Resolution No. 161. Is there any further discussion or any amendment to any part of it that any member of the Committee cares to offer at this time? Any amendment or any comments or discussion?

(No response)

Members of the Committee, that concludes the work of the Committee with respect to the proposed substitute for HSR 161, and I presume at this time we have reached the point where we will need to make some decisions.

The Chair has a few remarks that I would like to make at this time as a predicate to that.

This afternoon we are approaching the end of a long and difficult journey. I know that each of you has travelled this tortuous road with some reluctance and some misgivings, yet with courage to do what is right and conviction that our work will be received by our

ı

peers with confidence and good faith. We began this journey together on March 20, 1975. At that time the Chair outlined our challenge in these words.

"The proposition before us imposes upon this

Committee a heavy responsibility and a solemn duty.

For more than a century and a half— "

May the 20th, yes sir.

"For more than a century and a half Texas has been blessed with many great men serving in the judicial branch of our government. These men have maintained high standards of courage, honesty and integrity. We are all dedicated to the protection of the honor of the judicial branch of government.

To do this we must leave no stone unturned in our efforts to uncover any misconduct that would tarnish the reputation of the judiciary, and simultaneously we must strive to protect the innocent of any charges which are not well founded in fact.

I think each member of this Committee is
fully cognizant of the gravity of the charges
which we consider. I am confident that each of
you will approach the charges befure us with a
completely open mind, dedicated to the development

of facts and firm in the conviction that any decisions made by this Committee will be amply supported by the evidence which we now begin to hear."

 Since May the 20th, the Select Committee on Impeachment has held 21 meetings, and has spent a total of 90 nours, 30 minutes in Committee session. We have neard testimony from 32 witnesses, which required 69 hours, 30 minutes of public hearings. Members have studied a Statement of Facts which has already extended to twelve volumes, with more to come, from hearings yesterday and today. Approximately 166 documents have been introduced into evidence. Every person desiring to present evidence to the Committee has been afforded that opportunity, including Judge O. P. Carrillo.

The Chair has conducted all sessions of the Committee as fairly as possible under accepted rules of parliamentary procedure. I have exercised the power of the Chair to protect the rights of parties and witnesses, yet preserving the integrity of the Committee functions at all times. We have moved deliberately, yet with dispatch, in striving for the truth without doing violence to the sacred rights of due process. In that process, we have developed a record which will amply vindicate whatever action the Committee may take today.

Likewise, I know that each member of the Committee undertook our journey with a completely open mind. I know that you, too, have been fair and impartial in all of your work. You have listened to the testimony; you have studied the record; and you have arrived at your conclusions, based on the knowledge that history will be a harsh judge of our actions if we are not entirely proper in our procedures and totally justified in our decisions.

At our first meeting on May 20, the Chair further outlined our responsibilities under the as follows:

"The Supreme Court has defined the function of this Committee as judicial in character, rather than legislative. Our responsibility is neither that of prosecutor nor jury. Our sole function is to conduct an investigation to determine whether or not there are sufficient grounds to justify the presentment of charges, and if so, to adopt appropriate Articles of Impeachment and recommend such Articles for the consideration to the House of Representatives."

We have fulfilled that responsibility to the letter. We have not prosecuted; we have not judged. We have only searched for the truth, for it is the truth as we see it that must be the basis for any decisions which this Committee makes.

The Chair is proud of the members of this

Committee. None of you sought this assignment, yet none
of you have shirked the responsibility when duty called,
and each of you has dedicated his or her taients and
energies in a way that more than justified the confidence
of the Speaker in appointing you. By our labors together,
the House as an institution has been strengthened in its
public image.

We now come to the moment of truth. It is not an easy task to vote on matters of the gravity we consider, yet I am supremely confident that each of you will have the courage to vote your convictions, whatever they be, firm in the belief that right and justice will be achieved thereby.

Perhaps Winston Churchill said it best:

"It is not enough that we do our best.

Sometimes we have to do what's required."

What's required today is a decision on the matters committed to our consideration.

With those remarks, the Chair lays before the House—before the Committee, the Committee substitute for HSR 161, as amended. If there is no objection, the Chair will divide the question and take a separate vote on each of the Articles of Impeachment.

Is there any objection to that procedure?

2

3

6

5

8

9

11

12

14

15

16 17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

(No response)

The Chair hears none, and the question will be divided by Article.

The Chair lays before the Committee at this time Article I of the Articles of Impeachment, and the question recurs on the adoption of Article I. Is there any discussion?

(No response)

All those in favor of the adoption of Article I will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no" as your names are called. The Clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Maloney.

MR. MALONEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Chavez.

MR. CHAVEZ: Aye.

THE CLERK: Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Hendricks.

MR. HENDRICKS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Kaster.

MR. KASTER: Aye.

THE CLERK: Laney.

MR. LANEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Nabers:

MR. NABERS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Weddington.

MS. WEDDINGTON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Slack.

ı

٠í

MR. SLACK: (Absent)

THE CLERK: Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Nine "ayes."

CHAIRMAN HALE: Before the Chair announces the vote, there is one other thing that should be said. The Chair was in communication today with a member of this Committee, Mr. Richard Slack of Pecos, who is not here for this series of votes. Due to circumstances beyond his control, it was impossible for Mr. Slack to be here today, and it was his statement that the Chair express to the Committee his regrets at not being here at this significant meeting, to state his complete confidence in whatever decisions the balance of the Committee made, and to authorize the Chair, on the final adoption of the Resolution to cast his vote with the majority of the Committee. Not to cast his vote, but to indicate that that would have been the way he would have voted had he been here at this meeting.

Show the Chair voting "aye."

There being nine "ayes" and zero "nays" Article
I is adopted. Ten, I'm sorry—ten.

1 The question recurs on the adoption of Article II. 2 Is there any discussion? 3 MR. DONALDSON: As amended. 4 CHAIRMAN HALE: All of these are as amended 5 as we have previously amended them. Article II as amended. 6 All those in favor of the adoption of Article II, 7 as amended, will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no" 8 as your names are called. The Clerk will call the roll. 9 THE CLERK: Maloney. 10 MR. MALONEY: Aye. 11 THE CLERK: Chavez. 12 MR. CHAVEZ: Aye. 13 THE CLERK: Donaldson. 14 MR. DONALDSON: Aye. 15 THE CLERK: Hendricks. 16 MR. HENDRICKS: Aye. 17 THE CLERK: Kaster. 18 MR. KASTER: Aye. 19 THE CLERK: Laney. 20 MR. LANEY: Aye. 21 THE CLERK: Nabers. 22 MR, NABERS: Aye. 23 THE CLERK: Weddington.

THE CLERK: Slack.

MS. WEDDINGTON: Aye.

24

25

1 MR. SLACK: (Absent) 2 THE CLERK: Thompson. 3 MS. THOMPSON: Aye. - į THE CLERK: Nine "aves." CHAIRMAN HALE: Show the Chair voting "aye." 5 There being ten "ayes" and no "nays," Article 6 7 II is adopted. 8 The question recurs on the adoption of Article III, as amended. Is there any discussion on Article III. 9 10 The question recurs on the adoption of Article All those in favor of its adoption will vote "aye"; 11 those opposed will vote "no" as your names are called. 12 13 The Clerk will call the roll. 14 THE CLERK: Maloney, 15 MR. MALONEY: Aye. THE CLERK: Chavez. 16 MR. CHAVEZ: Aye. 17 18 THE CLERK: Donaldson. 19 MR. DONALDSON: Aye. 20 THE CLERK: Hendricks. 21 MR. HENDRICKS: Aye. 22 THE CLERK: Kaster. 23 MR. KASTER: Aye. 24 THE CLERK: Laney. 25

Aye.

MR. LANEY:

THE CLERK: Nabers. 1 2 MR. NABERS: Aye. 3 THE CLERK: Weddington. . MS. WEDDINGTON: Aye. 5 THE CLERK: Thompson. MS. THOMPSON: 6 Aye. 7 CHAIRMAN HALE: Show the Chair voting "aye." There being ten "ayes" and no "nays," Article 8 9 III is adopted. The question recurs on the adoption of Article 10 11 Is there any discussion? IV. 12 (No response) 13 All those in favor of the adoption of Article IV will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no" as your 14 15 names are called. The Clerk will call the roll. THE CLERK: Maloney. 16 MR. MALONEY: 17 18 THE CLERK: Chavez. 19 MR. CHAVEZ: Ave. THE CLERK: Donaldson. 20 21 MR. DONALDSON: Aye. THE CLERK: Hendricks. 22 23 MR. HENDRICKS: Aye. 24 THE CLERK: Kaster. 25 MR. KASTER: Aye.

25

THE CLERK: Laney.

MR. LANEY: Ayo.

THE CLERK: Nabers.

MR. NABERS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Weddington.

MS. WEDDINGTON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Show the Chair voting "aye."

There being ten "ayes" and no "nays," Article
IV is adopted.

The question recurs on the adoption of Article V. 1s there any discussion.

(No response)

All those in favor of the adoption of Article V will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no" as your names are called. The Clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Maloney.

MR. MALONEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Chavez.

MR. CHAVEZ: Aye.

THE CLERK: Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Hendricks.

MR. HENDRICKS: Aye.

ı THE CLERK: Kaster. 2 MR. KASTER: Aye. 3 THE CLERK: Laney. 4 MR. LANEY: Aye. 5 THE CLERK: Nabera 6 MR. NABERS: Aye. 7 THE CLERK: Weddington. 8 MS. WEDDINGTON: Aye. 9 THE CLERK: Thompson. 10 MS. THOMPSON: Aye. 11 CHAIRMAN HALE: Show the Chair voting "aye." 12 There being ten "ayes" and no "nays," Article V 13 is adopted. 14 The question recurs on the adoption of Article Is there any discussion on Article VI? 15 16 (No response) 17 All those in favor of the adoption of Article VI will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no" as your 18 19 names are called. The Clerk will call the roll. 20 THE CLERK: Maloney. 21 MR. MALONEY: Aye. 22 THE CLERK: Chavez. 23 MR CHAVEZ: Aye. 24 THE CLERK: Donaldson. 25 MR. DONALDSON: Aye.

Į THE CLERK: Hendricks. MR. HENDRICKS: Ave. ł THE CLERK: Kaster. MR. KASTER: Aye. 5 THE CLERK: Laney. 6 MR. LANEY: Aye. 7 THE CLERK: Nabers. 8 NABERS: Aye. MR 9 THE CLERK: Weddington. 10 MS. WEDDINGTON: Aye. 11 THE CLERK: Thompson. 12 MS. THOMPSON: Aye. 13 THE CLERK: Nine. 14 CHAIRMAN HALE: Show the Chair voting "aye." 15 There being ten "ayes" and no "nays," Article 16 VI is adopted. 17 The question recurs on the adoption of Article 18 VII. as amended. Is there any discussion? 19 (No response) 20 All these articles are being adopted as amended, if there were any amendments, whether the Chair neglects 21 to say that or not, let the record speak clearly on that. 22 Is there any discussion on Article VII? 23 All those in favor of the adoption of Article 24 VII will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no" as your 25

names are called. The Clerk will call the roll. 1 2 THE CLERK: Meloney. 3 MR. MALONEY: No. THE CLERK: Chavez. 5 MR. CHAVEZ: No. 6 THE CLERK: Donaldson. 7 MR, DONALDSON: Aye. 8 THE CLERK: Hendricks. 9 MR. HENDRICKS: No. 10 THE CLERK: Kaster. 11 MR. KASTER: Aye. 12 THE CLERK: Laney. 13 MR. LANEY: No. 14 THE CLERK: Nabers. 15 MR. NABERS: Aye. 16 THE CLERK: Weddington. 17 MS. WEDDINGTON: Aye. 18 THE CLERK: Thompson. 19 MS. THOMPSON: Aye. THE CLERK: Five "ayes" and four "nos". 20 CHAIRMAN HALE: There being five "ayes" 21 22 and "four "nays," Article VII is adopted. The question recurs on the adoption of Article 23 VIII, as amended. Is there any discussion on Article 24 25 VIII?

All those in favor of the adoption of Article
VIII will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no" as
your names are called. The Clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Maloney.

MR. MALONEY: Present.

THE CLERK: Chavez.

MR. CHAVEZ: No.

THE CLERK: Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Hendricks.

MR. HENDRICKS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Kaster.

MR. KASTER: Aye.

THE CLERK: Laney.

MR. LANEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Nabers.

MR. NABERS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Weddington.

MS. WEDDINGTON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Seven "ayes," one "nay," and

one "present."

CHAIRMAN HALE: And one "present." There being seven "ayes," one "nay," one "present and not voting,"

22

23

24

25

Article VIII is adopted.

The question recurs on the adoption of Article

IX. Is there any discussion on Article IX?

(No response)

All those in favor of the adoption of Article IX will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no" as your names are called. The Clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Maloney.

MR. MALONEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Chavez.

MR. CHAVEZ: No.

THE CLERK: Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Hendricks.

MR. HENDRICKS: No.

THE CLERK: Kaster.

MR. KASTER: Aye.

THE CLERK: Laney.

MR. LANEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Nabers.

MR. NABERS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Weddington.

MS. WEDDINGTON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Seven "ayes" and two "nays." 1 CHAIRMAN HALE: There being seven "ayes," 2 two "nays," Article IX is adopted. 3 The question recurs on the adoption of Article 4 Is there any discussion on Article X? 5 Χ. All those in favor of the adoption of Article X 6 will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "nay" as your 7 names are called. 8 9 THE CLERK: Maloney. 10 MR. MALONEY: Aye. 1 I THE CLERK: Chavez. 12 MR. CHAVEZ: Aye. 13 THE CLERK: Donaldson. 14 MR. DONALDSON: Aye. 15 THE CLERK: Hendricks. MR. HENDRICKS: Aye. 16 17 THE CLERK: Kaster. KASTER: Aye. 18 MR 19 THE CLERK: Laney. 20 MR. LANEY: Aye. 21 THE CLERK: Nabers. 22 MR. NABERS: Aye. 23 THE CLERK: Weddington. 24 MS. WEDDINGTON: Aye. 25 THE CLERK: Thompson.

24

25

MS. THOMPSON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Nine.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Show the Chair voting "aye."

There being ten "ayes" and no "nays," Article X is adopted.

The question recurs on the adoption of Article XI. Is there any discussion?

All those in favor of the adoption of Article
XI will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "nay" as your
names are called. The Clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Maloney.

MR. MALONEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Chavez.

MR. CHAVEZ: No.

THE CLERK: Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Aye

THE CLERK: Hendricks.

MR HENDRICKS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Kaster.

MR. KASTER: No.

THE CLERK: Laney.

MR. LANEY: No.

THE CLERK: Nabers.

MR. NABERS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Weddington.

ı MS. WEDDINGTON: No. 3 THE CLERK: Thompson. 3 MS. THOMPSON: Aye. THE CLERK: Five "ayes" and four "nays." 4 5 CHAIRMAN HALE: There being five "ayes" and four "nays," Article XI is adopted. 6 7 The question will now recur on the adoption of 8 the Committee substitute for House Simple Resolution No. 9 161 as amended. Is there any discussion on the adoption 10 of the complete substitute for the Simple Resolution? 11 (No response) 12 The question then recurs on the adoption of the 13 Committee substitute for HSR 161. All those in favor 14 of the adoption of the Committee substitute will vote "aye"; 15 those opposed will vote "no" as your names are called. The Clerk will call the roll. 16 17 Maloney. THE CLERK: 18 MR. MALONEY: Aye. 19 THE CLERK: Chavez. 20 MR. CHAVEZ: Aye. 21 THE CLERK: Donaldson. 22 MR. DONALDSON: Aye. 23 THE CLERK: Hendricks. 24 MR. HENDRICKS: Aye. 25 THE CLERK: Kaster.

24

25

MR. KASTER: Aye.

THE CLERK: Laney.

MR. LANEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Nabers.

MR. NABERS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Weddington.

MS. WEDDINGTON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Nine.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Show the Chair voting "aye."

There being ten "ayes" and no "nays," the Committee substitute is adopted.

The question now recurs on reporting HSR 161 to the House as substituted.

MR. CHAVEZ: I so move.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Is there any discussion?

All those in favor of reporting House Simple Resolution 161 to the House as substituted, with a recommendation that it do pass, I suppose would be the recommendation, that it do be adopted, that the Articles of Impeachment contained therein do be adopted, all those in favor of the motion will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no" as your names are called. The Clerk will call the roll.

I THE CLERK: Maloney. 2 MR. MALONEY: Aye. 3 THE CLERK: Chavez. 4 MR. CHAVEZ: Aye. 5 THE CLERK: Donaldson. 6 MR. DONALDSON: Aye. 7 THE CLERK: Hendricks. 8 MR. HENDRICKS: Aye. 9 THE CLERK: Kaster. 10 MR. KASTER: Aye. 11 THE CLERK: Laney. 12 MR. LANEY: Aye. 13 THE CLERK: Nabers. 14 MR. NABERS: Aye. 15 THE CLERK: Weddington. 16 MS. WEDDINGTON: Aye. 17 THE CLERK: Thompson. 18 MS. THOMPSON: Aye. 19 THE CLERK: Nine. CHAIRMAN HALE: Show the Chair voting "aye." 20 21 There being ten "ayes" and no "nays," House Simple Resolution No. 161 is reported to the House with a 22 recommendation that it be adopted as Articles of Impeach-23 24 ment. Let the record reflect, pursuant to the previous 25

statement the Chair made, that Mr. Slack, as a member of this Committee, had he been present, would have voted "aye" on the adoption of the Committee substitute, and would have voted "aye" on the reporting of HSR 161.

Now, members of the Committee, let the Chair take a deep breath for a moment and thank all of you for all of your work on this Committee, in addition to what's been said before. I think you have all done youmen's service in a very thankless task, and each member of the Committee is to be commended.

We do still have other work to be done. As you are all aware, we must prepare some type of narrative report, or order to give the membership of the House the benefit of the weeks of labors that this Committee has been through, to give them the benefit of at least summaries of the evidence supporting the Resolution.

Mr. Kaster?

MR. KASTER: Mr. Chairman, prior to—if you are getting ready to adjourn us—I would like to say, on behalf of the Committee, that I appreciate the judicious manner and the fair manner in which you have conducted these hearings. I feel that I have been afforded the opportunity to ask any question that I might, and I particularly appreciate your ability to place into the record pertinent material that a person without legal

 training, I would never have thought of, and I think the record will be one that will withstand the test of history, primarily because of the manner in which you, as the Chair, has handled this Committee. I personally wish to thank you for the manner in which you have conducted these hearings.

CHAIRMAN HALE: The Chair thanks you for your kind remarks.

I'll get that in writing for my next campaign.

In order that we can work on the report, as the Committee members are well aware, there has been some informal discussion about the next meeting of the Committee. What the Chair would like to suggest at this time is that those of you who would care to do so—I see no reason for the Committee to meet tomorrow or Friday. It's going to be necessary that the staff have a little time to prepare these summaries that we want to include in the narrative report, and some of the background material on impeachment and other matters that we think will be helpful to the members of the House to have it in summary form in a written report.

Since there is going to be some little time required in order to get all of that material together, it occurs to the Chair that probably, perhaps Tuesday of next week, or Wednesday of next week might be the

-4

5

8

7

11

10

14

13

16

18

. 20 21

22

23

25 -

best suitable time for the Committee to reconvene for that purpose. Obviously we will be hearing no more testimony; that is not the purpose. The purpose of the meeting will be to work on the draft of the narrative report and to put it in a form where all of the members of the Committee find it acceptable.

MR. KASTER: Mr. Chairman, I hope that it will be Tuesday, because I think we need to complete this work as quickly as possible to let the rest of the House have the opportunity of reading this report prior to the convening of the House, which will probably be August the 4th, now that we have completed our labors on the impeachment charges.

of the Chair, and would any member of the Committee or any member of the staff take issue with me if they think what I'm about to say is not entirely correct? It is the understanding of the Chair that with the filing of HSR 161 with the Chief Clerk, which will probably be done tomorrow—we will get it typed up in the morning, the Chair will sign the Committee report on it, and file it with the Chief Clerk probably tomorrow. If that is done, that event is the contingency provided for in—what was our other resolution?

MR. JOHNSON: 167.

. 17

CHAIRMAN HALE: —221. Under the provisions of HSR 221, the resolution provides that the report containing the recommendations with respect to impeachment be filed with the Chief Clerk, and that if the impeachment is recommended by a majority report, then the House of Representatives shall be reconvened at ten a.m. on the third Monday following the date that the Committee report is filed with the Chief Clerk.

It's the interpretation of the Chair that the filing of the Committee report on HSR 161 is the contingency which will trigger automatically the recall provisions of HSR 221. So, if that interpretation is correct, and the Chair signs and files the Committee report on HSR 161 tomorrow, that would mean that the House would be automatically reconvened on Monday, August the 4th at ten o'clock a.m.

Is there anyone on the Committee or on the staff who has a differing interpretation on that chain of events? Are we all agreed that that's what the resolution provides?

I say that because I think that it is the Committee report on HSR 161 which is the event and contingency which will trigger the automatic recall, not the narrative report, which is nothing more than an appendix, so to speak, to the formal Committee report, the formal Committee

· 17

report being HSR 161, which is the only thing committed to the jurisdiction of this Committee.

So the Chair would state to you that barring any unforeseen contingency, of which I'm not aware of any at this time, the Committee report on HSR 161 will be signed by the Chair and filed with the Chief Clerk tomorrow, in which event then I think you can anticipate that the House will reconvene on Monday, August 4th at ten a.m.

Now, that leaves unresolved the work on the narrative report. Mr. Kaster, you suggest Tuesday?

MR. KASTER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN HALE: —as being an acceptable date. Is there anyone, before we take a formal motion on it, is there anyone that has any differing ideas?

MS. WEDDINGTON: As I indicated earlier,
I have a trial set for that day, but I can try in between
trial to be here.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Well, it's the hope of the Chair that we can get some rough draft material to you from the staff between now and next Tuesday, so that hopefully, although that, too, is a pretty tight time schedule, but hopefully we can get you some material you can be reviewing in advance of the meeting.

MR. CHAVEZ: What time?

CHAIRMAN HALE: Next Tuesday, about ten

2

3

4 5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

noon.

13

14 15

16

17 18

19 ₋ 20

21

22

24 25 o'clock in the morning? Next Tuesday? Or would you prefer to have it a little later?

MR. NABERS: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN HALE: Those of you that want to drive in that morning. Those of you that have a full day scheduled Monday might want to come in Tuesday morning, we could—

MR. CHAVEZ: One or one-thirty.

CHAIRMAN HALE: —supposing we—one or one-thirty Monday afternoon?

MR HENDRICKS: Yes, sir. Tuesday after-

CHAIRMAN HALE: Tuesday afternoon.

Before the Chair takes a motion on that, is there any further business that we need to transact here today? Mr. Doyle, do you know of anything further?

Mr. Johnson, is there anything further that we need to do here today?

(No response)

In view of certain other matters of which I think all members of the Committee have been advised, the Chair would like to take the motion in the form for next Tuesday, for say 1:30, or on call of the Chair, whichever is earlier, in the event something should transpire which might occasion a more hasty recall of the

Committee. If there is no objection to that proceedings.

Is there anything further to come before the Committee?

(No response)

Let the Chair also state, which I overlooked in my little formal statement a moment ago, on behalf of the Committee, the Chair wants to express our sincere appreciation, Mr. Johnson, to you and the staff of the Counsel, the staff members that you've had working with us, they have done extremely able work in helping the Committee on this.

We've had an outstanding court reporter and we are greatful to you for your work and your punctuality and your attendance here here in getting the reports to us very timely.

COURT REPORTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HALE: For all of those who came and testified, of course, we're endebted to all of them for the testimony which they gave.

And to the press, I can certainly say that this has been the best covered Committee in the news media on which I have ever had the privilege of serving, and on behalf of the Committee, let the Chair thank each of you, of the press and the news media, radio, television and the newspapers, for doing an outstanding job in reporting

3

5

7 8

9

11

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23

25

to the people of Texas on the work of this Committee.

It is the type of work in which there should be publicity on it, because it's the type of work on which the people of Texas are entitled to be kept informed, and you are the vehicle by which we can achieve that, and the only vehicle by which we can keep open those lines of communication.

And to you, Laura, thank you for your outstanding work as Clerk of our Committee. You've done a very fine job.

Is there anything further to come before the Committee?

(No response)

Mr. Maloney moves that the Committee stand in recess until one-thirty o'clock on Tuesday, July 22, 1975, or on the call of the Chair, whichever is the earlier date. Is there any objection?

(No response)

The Chair hears none and the Committee stands recessed pursuant to that motion.

(Whereupon, at 4:45 p.m., the Committee was recessed.)

CERTIFICATE

1 2

COUNTY

THE STATE OF TEXAS

OF

TRAVIS

I, Walter H. Hickman, a Notary Public in and for Travis County, Texas, do certify that on the 16th day of July, 1975, the foregoing proceedings before the HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPEACHMENT were reported by me and that the foregoing pages constitute a full, true and accurate transcription of my Stenograph notes.

GIVEN under my hand and seal of office this 28th day of July, 1975.

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