

great wealth could run for public office. Therefore, in the interest of good government, persons should be encouraged, rather than discouraged, in the making of campaign contributions. However, the time of and the motive for making campaign contributions should be carefully scrutinized. Corporations are prohibited by law in Oklahoma from making campaign contributions. There is no competent evidence that the contributions by attorneys who represent utility companies as well as other clients were made at the direction of said utility companies and said campaign contribution cannot be traced to funds advanced by the utility companies, except insofar as said funds were fees collected by said attorneys together with other fees from other clients. The evidence also shows that contributions by attorneys who represent utility companies were made to candidates who were running for office in the city, county, state and federal government, and that said contributions were made to candidates in both political parties in the State of Oklahoma. The evidence also shows that in certain instances, contributions were made to opposing candidates running for the same office, by a single law firm. The evidence also shows that in certain instances, the same law firm supported some candidates of each party.

12. The grounds for impeachment set out in the Constitution and the Statutes of the State of Oklahoma are listed as "willful neglect of duty, corruption in office, habitual drunkenness, incompetency or any offense involving moral turpitude committed while in office." There is no competent evidence presented to the Committee which would justify it in the recommending of impeachment proceedings.

13. Morris Head, who is presently an employee of the Corporation Commission, collected travel expenses from the State of Oklahoma at a time when he is shown by the evidence to have been performing services for the Urban Renewal Authority in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as an appraiser. The Committee finds that there is strong evidence that Mr. Head made false travel claims and collected expenses from the State of Oklahoma for said travel and that he failed to spend an equivalent time on the job for which he was hired and paid.

14. There is a sharp conflict of testimony among several of the witnesses who testified before the Committee and the testimony of some witnesses is contradicted by documentary evidence. It is the finding of the Committee that there is strong indication in the evidence that false testimony under oath was given by James G. Welch, Clyde H. Hale, Jr., Morris Head and Marguerite Estep. The sharp conflict in the testimony and the convenient lapses of memory of some other witnesses under oath, such as is found in the testimony of Ferrill Rogers, gives rise to the question as to whether some of said witnesses may have given false testimony.

15. There is a code of high ethical conduct for attorneys engaged in the practice of law in the State of Oklahoma, which code of ethical conduct is set forth by the Oklahoma Bar Association and adopted by the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma. There is a strong indication in the evidence that James G. Welch, Clyde H. Hale, Jr., William L. Anderson and Ferrill Rogers may have violated the canons of legal ethics required of practicing attorneys in the State of Oklahoma.

16. The Rules of Procedure in the Corporation Commission for proceedings before said commission or any sub-division of the commission are vague and indefinite and there appears to be unnecessary delay in some proceedings in the Corporation Commission. The rules and regulations of the Corporation Commission are not sufficiently codified or updated.

17. The motor carriers of the State of Oklahoma are not furnishing adequate service to the people of the state in the delivery of goods transported by motor carriers. This lack of adequate service is particularly true in the smaller communities of our state and is aggravated by the transfer of permits by those carriers making the long hauls to those making the short hauls. This problem is now under study by the Roads and Highways Committee of the Legislative Council.

18. It is required under the present law that the Corporation Commission submit an annual report to the Governor of the State of Oklahoma. The evidence shows that the last report submitted to the Governor by the said Corporation Commission was for the year of 1964. It is also required by law that with said reports, the Corporation Commission should have any recommended legislation, and it appears that recommended legislation has been omitted from reports of the Corporation Commission filed with the Governor.

19. By practice and by reason of a limited and inadequate staff, the Corporation Commission can not initiate investigations of rates and operations of utility companies in the State of Oklahoma. Limited review of rates depends upon a complaint duly filed in the Corporation Commission, under present procedure. It appears to the Committee that the present law and procedure is inadequate