

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION
NUMBER
507

Interview with
SENATOR BETTY ANDUJAR
September 6, 1979

Place of Interview: Fort Worth, Texas

Interviewer: Ronald E. Marcello

Terms of Use: Open

Approved:

Senator Betty Andujar
(Signature)

Date:

Sept 29, 1980

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

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the Coordinator of the Oral History Collection or the University Archivist, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas 76203

Oral History Collection

Senator Betty Andujar

Interviewer: Ronald E. Marcello

Place of Interview: Fort Worth, Texas

Date: September 6, 1979

Dr. Marcello: This is Ron Marcello interviewing Senator Betty Andujar for the North Texas State University Oral History Collection. The interview is taking place on September 6, 1979, in Fort Worth, Texas. I'm interviewing Senator Andujar in order to get her reminiscences and experiences and impressions while she served in the Texas Senate during the 66th Legislative Session.

Senator Andujar, to begin this interview, and since this is the first time that you have participated in our project, would you give me a biographical sketch of yourself? In other words, let's start by mentioning when you were born, where you were born, your education-- things of that nature.

Senator Andujar: Well, I was born and raised in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, where my father was a Republican by inclination. He served as the district attorney of Dauphin County and ultimately became the judge of the Orphan's Court of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Marcello: Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and that particular area of

Pennsylvania is Republican country, is it not?

Andujar: Oh, Pennsylvania used to be Republican, period, and then later on it changed into a Democrat state. But that's possibly one reason why Republicanism was not hard for me to accept. It was a shock to me, when my husband and I moved into Texas in the late 1930's, to find that the word was socially unacceptable. We were regarded as being very eccentric because of it. So here in 1979, as Republicans look as if they might really be the wave of the future in this country, of course, I'm just delighted. In the election of Governor Clements here in Texas was a dream realized. I wasn't sure I'd even be alive when Texas ever elected a Republican governor.

Marcello: Well, back in the 1930's, when you and your husband moved to Texas, again, the number of Republicans in the state must have just been miniscule.

Andujar: Why, it was indeed. In fact, you couldn't find any Republicans until Eisenhower ran for president, and at that time, then, of course, many people came in, voted for Eisenhower, remained Republicans during the 1950's; and then when Kennedy was elected in 1960, they ran for cover and became Democrats again. But I never did change. I just remained a Republican from the 1950's on. Now, in Texas, you had to be a Democrat during the 1940's because there was no other party challenger. But after Eisenhower, I stayed within the party and worked

within it.

The reason that I remained a Republican is because I think they reflect my philosophy in life. I maintain that in the 1960's and 1970's in the United States, the Democrat Party at the national level has become the labor-socialist party. It does not stand for anything in particular. When you have diverse men, such as Ron Dellums from California and Drinan from Massachusetts, both of whom are far, far left, and who, in my opinion, should run as socialists--but they don't; they run as Democrats--and Harry Byrd, also as a Democrat, this party means nothing. Now, to me, Republicans stand for private ownership of property and the ability to keep the money that you earn and not have it taxed away from you in such amounts that you no longer are economically free. I believe in the free enterprise system. I believe if you do not have free politics and free economics, you're not going to have private ownership of property. I think that the philosophy of the Democrat Party was expressed thoroughly and effectively when they said, "Tax and tax; spend and spend; elect and elect." We have seen that since the regime of Franklin Roosevelt.

When people are puzzled here in 1979 as to what has produced inflation--why are they having a hard time meeting their payments--they've completely forgotten Franklin Roosevelt, and they have forgotten Lyndon Johnson, who wanted to have

a war and butter, too. They don't blame themselves for electing these people to office, but they have brought it upon themselves by the people they have elected to office. I claim that the Republican Party stands individually and differently for freedom--economic freedom as well as political freedom.

Marcello: How did you get involved in politics in an active sense? You mentioned that you had always been a Republican, but when did you begin working in Republican politics, and why did you decide to enter politics?

Andujar: Well, you may not recall, but after Roosevelt had been in office for years, and then when Truman succeeded him, I thought I was never going to live under another Republican the rest of my life. So when Eisenhower ran as a Republican, I jumped into that race, and I was asked to do very minor things, and after a while I was asked to do more major things. Politics is like religion or anything else--if you have somebody who will work for nothing, they're going to utilize you as best they can, and so that was how I really got started--I volunteered--and from then on, they just asked me to do more and more.

Then, of course, the great setback for the Republican Party was the defeat of Barry Goldwater in 1964. There were people who looked to Goldwater in that period of time as a return to the good ol' days of the 1950's, I guess. With

that defeat, they lost heart because when you had Kennedy and then the Johnson regime, which were obviously both very, very liberal, they were afraid that the more conservative philosophy was dead, and they quit. Well, I didn't quit. I stayed in the party and continued to work.

Marcello: So the Republican Party was rather demoralized after that national election in 1964, was it not?

Andujar: No question about it, and I was sick at heart. I'm a diehard . . . I guess I believe in things so much that, even though our own poll showed how poorly we were doing right here in Texas, I must have thought that there would be something to happen elsewhere that would help possibly elect Barry Goldwater. I imagine it was nearly ten years before I had to admit to myself that the American people were never going to elect any Republican in 1964 because, in my opinion, the country had been through this emotional uproar, and we were torn apart by the assassination. It was incredible, even to myself, a Republican, who didn't vote for or support Kennedy, the fact that this could happen, and, of course, happen in Dallas. The atmosphere that was generated over there--the hatred against conservatives--was just terrible. So I realized later that, having been through that traumatic experience, the American people didn't want any more great changes or shake-ups, and Lyndon Johnson was a cinch to be reelected, but, politically, I couldn't absorb that in 1964.

Marcello: How did you decide to seek public office? In other words, what was your motivation, and why did you decide to run for public office?

Andujar: I didn't seek it. It literally sought me. In 1970 my party wanted me to run for the House of Representatives, and I demurred. I said, "Well, why me? Why don't we get somebody else?" Well, the answer's very simple. No Republican had ever been elected, and no man was going to risk his political future or take the time to run on a ticket that had always been a loser. So, finally, they talked me into running.

I ran a creditable race, but that was where I bumped into, literally, the first time, this stone wall of the solid Democrat vote. You had to run county-wide at that time, and people out there in the hinterlands had never voted for a Republican. That was where I also learned to bow out in the black precincts where I would get twenty votes and my opponent would get a thousand. I learned right then and there that if you're going to run for office, it's most difficult when those boxes, which many of us feel, by experience and observation, are bought and paid for by the Democrats, that the votes are really thrown to the Democrats regardless. That is a terrific obstacle to overcome. You can't make up 900 votes in another precincts. You have got to pick them up very heavily. So, it was a shock, but I resigned myself to the fact that I had lost, and that was it.

Incidentally, I ran against a Democrat who knew nothing from nothing. He didn't know the issues; he didn't know the answers. It was proof to me that the solid Democrat vote was a habit and had nothing to do, literally, with the candidates themselves.

Marcello: To refresh my memory, who was your opponent in that election?

Andujar: Bill Hilliard. He was a man who'd just been talked into running, and he had not informed himself, really, on the issues. He knew it, and I knew it. We never attacked each other personally, and we remained friends. After he beat me, it didn't bother me. I was a friend of his, and when I finally got elected to the Legislature, he was still serving there, and we were friendly the whole way through.

Marcello: Okay, so when did you decide to have another go at it, so to speak?

Andujar: Well, in 1971, of course, after the 1970 census, then we had redistricting of the Senate districts. When they looked at the Senatorial District Twelve, the Republican Party realized it really was a Republican district. Now it had been hand-tailored for Representative Mike Moncrief, a young Democrat here who picked the precincts pretty much that he wanted, and he was going to run for the Senate. He was, I think, somewhat surprised when he ended up with a strong Republican candidate.

There again, the party had to talk me into running. I said, "Look, I've got beat once, so why should I go through that again?" But they showed me the statistics and said, "Look, these precincts carried for Eisenhower, for John Tower, and for Nixon." They said, "A good campaigner really ought to have a good shot at this." So I did and . . .

Marcello: Now this would have been what year?

Andujar: 1972.

Marcello: 1972 was a good year to run, was it not?

Andujar: That's right. It turned out to be because it followed the Sharpstown bank scandal, where the Democrats were shown as utilizing the political process for personal gain in a very gross manner. I feel that Sharpstown really was my friend. Conversely, I was at the right place at the right time.

Marcello: I was also thinking of the national presidential election. This was the year when Nixon was running against McGovern, and McGovern didn't stand any chance at all against Nixon in '72.

Andujar: That's right. It was a Republican year, but a presidential race doesn't always help a race like a state senate race. People will vote for the president and then drop back. I thought that Sharpstown was helpful to me, and I must admit that the woman's movement was getting started, and women were more accepted as viable candidates.

I also feel that my work in the party helped me. I had

for years been trying to raise funds, trying to sell fifty-dollar tickets, hundred-dollar tickets, to Republican affairs to local businessmen who were more and more disenchanted with the Democrat Party. They knew that I was not just a housewife, that I had worked in the political arena and knew something, so I was able to raise money.

I think the fact I'm a doctor's wife was a great help to me because they knew me as a conservative. Doctors contributed. Everybody's friends contribute to him, but the fact that mine were doctors who were in a position not to contribute ten dollars or twenty-five dollars, but seventy-five or a hundred dollars, was very helpful to me. I think the fact that I'd been around so long and that they knew me and that my friends were in a position to contribute was a help, too.

Marcello: What kind of a district do you represent? If I were to ask you what is the pulse or feel or concerns of your district, how would you respond?

Andujar: I would say, generally, it's moderate-to-conservative. Within my district, I have a number of blacks and a few Mexican-Americans. I try to work with my black constituents in the legislation that they're interested in. I also serve them if they need help; I try to concern myself with their individual matters here in this office. I think that I'm a pretty good campaigner among them; I can meet with them, visit with them, and so on.

I have some black friends who have helped me through the years, too, so that my experience in 1970, where I was determined to work with the black people and not lose that bloc vote, I really think did help.

Then I think the businessmen saw me as a person who understood taxes and that you can tax a person out of business, that the tax burden can be so great that free enterprise cannot continue to expand and create jobs. Each time that I ran, I got greater and greater help from the community which is in business for themselves as opposed to the labor unions. Now my first year that I ran for the Senate in 1972 against Mike Moncrief as my opponent, I did run a different kind of race at that time.

Marcello: That was quite an upset, was it not, because Moncrief had name identification in that election, if nothing else.

Andujar: Oh, it was an unheard-of upset because he was a conservative Democrat. He had Establishment support--businessmen who supported Mike. Now the other technique that I've always used is: Don't make anybody mad. If people said to me, "Betty, I'm sorry, but we have to support Mike; we think he's a winner; we know his family," or something of that nature, I never said, "Well, you ought to know better; you ought to support a Republican." I always said, "I understand." Consequently, when I got elected, then those people were not mad, and I wasn't mad, and I was able to work with them.

But, in 1972, with McGovern running for president, I was able to go out to the University of Texas at Arlington and work with the students out there and say, "Look, you're supporting McGovern. Why in the world would you support a man like Mike Moncrief who is the apotheosis of the Establishment that you are against? If you have any political savvy at all, you should vote for me because I am the anti-Establishment candidate." That was the truth at that time.

I visited with labor unions, and they were most interested in keeping Mike Moncrief from being elected because they thought they'd never get rid of him. I made the outright offer to them. I said, "Try me. If you don't like me, then you can try to get rid of me in the next election." Sure enough, that's what they did. I tried to work with labor in . . . I'm not a person who's liberal enough for them, overall, and I did not know at that time that, if you try to work with these liberal groups, labor in particular, and teachers might be another group at the present time, trying to help them isn't enough. They want you body and soul. You can't just work with them on this issue and that issue on which you have common ground; they want a 100 percent labor representative. It was obvious that I would never be that. So after that first year, then they always have fought me since then, which I regret. I feel that essentially a good economy in the country is good for labor as well as

good for anybody else. But we have never been able to . . . I have never been able to understand labor unions who would rather put their boss out of business than not get the contract they want. They've done this in the news media and elsewhere. They will strike, and they've put newspapers in the East out of business, and they lost their jobs. This is the philosophy that I don't dig it at all.

Marcello: Awhile ago you mentioned that at the time you decided to run for office, the women's movement was coming into its own. How did you see your relationship to the women's movement then, and how has it evolved since your initial race?

Andujar: That's a very interesting question. I did make contact and was invited as a candidate to visit with some of the women's groups in Fort Worth who at that time were more active, really, than they are now. I could see immediately that they were far more liberal than I will ever be, but I believed them at that time when they said they wanted more women elected to office. I was busy getting myself elected and didn't pay very much attention to it. However, after I got in office, and when I ran for reelection, and since then, I do absolutely disagree with them when they say they want women elected to office because to the best of my knowledge they never have lifted a finger to help me, and I don't know that the women in that group ever voted for me.

I don't know. Personally, I don't go around asking people after the election, "Did you support me or didn't you?" because, first of all, they may not tell you the truth, but I have that feeling that they probably never even voted for me.

So I have taken exception to that slogan that they proclaim so widely. I said, "If you are honest, you would say, 'We want liberal women elected to office.'"

To tell you the truth, I had another experience that hadn't . . . it upset me then, but it hasn't had that much effect, but I will cite it to you as a historical note. I believe it was in, well, let's say, 1975, while the Legislature was in session, that the Dallas Association of University Women asked me to talk to them. Much against my inclination, I accepted the invitation because I really was surprised. It's a sacrifice for me, during a session, to go to another town, to take my time and make that trip and go over there and talk to that group, and they were not in my senatorial district. But out of respect to them, I accepted the invitation. They had not said anything to me about the subject that I would discuss, and I had assumed . . . most of the time I'm asked to talk about legislation that's under consideration at that time, and I was just going to tell them about the Legislature and so on. Well, about ten days later, I got a letter from a somewhat embarrassed

program chairman, I guess, saying that they were forced to withdraw the invitation because it had come to their attention that I didn't support their goals. Now, to me, this is amazing. University women are supposed to be educated, and I thought they were open-minded. Why they would shut me off of a program, it was incredible to me at the time. Of course, they knew that I was not only shocked but upset--not so much for myself, but I was embarrassed for them, that they would take such a step. Now I'm sure they found out that I didn't support the ERA.

In a way I think that my position has come to be the one that's been accepted publicly more than that far-out radical group which took over the ERA movement and made it so extreme that it was really unacceptable to some people. I think that the International Year of the Woman probably did more damage to the cause because, for the first time, it became pretty obvious that it had been captured by some very peculiar groups that were not in the mainstream.

Marcello: Let us talk about your position relative to the Equal Rights Amendment.

Andujar: All right.

Marcello: Again, what is your position, and why do you take such a position?

Andujar: Well, first of all, my experience proved to me that the wording of this constitutional amendment was so wide-open that nobody

knew what it really meant. It has always been promoted as a constitutional amendment to give women equal pay for equal work, but the wording of that constitutional amendment, which says that Congress shall enact the necessary legislation to enforce this constitutional amendment, taught me that nobody alive could tell you what Congress would do. But, more than that, and more importantly than that, the laws that we live under are not necessarily the statutes that are passed by Congress or by the Legislature. They are the interpretations of those statutes by the judiciary, and the judiciary is even more radical in some areas. Now by that I mean in geographical areas and philosophical areas, they are far apart from many, many legislators. They construe and twist the intention of the legislation to the point where we don't recognize the bill that we passed. I don't think it was ever the intention of anybody who drew up that constitutional amendment to say that you couldn't have a father-son banquet in an elementary school, but that actually did happen. It took President Ford himself to say, "This is ridiculous," and so these ideas do become ridiculous.

So it was my experience as a senator, knowing that it wasn't what people thought that they were voting for or working for, it was what in my mind I thought they were going to get--that it was far, far different and that they themselves would be shocked by the interpretation.

Now I am for equal pay for equal work. I am for equal opportunity for equally qualified women. I am not for opportunity just because you're a female. I think you must compete equally. I am not for firing a man in order to make a place for a woman. I think that the reverse of ERA can cause just as much trouble as the implementation of it because industry is confronted with this whole problem now of what almost amounts to quotas.

I know for an absolute fact that a situation occurred right here in Tarrant County where a large corporation had an opening for an engineer. Their computer told them that this person should be a female and should be black, if they really wanted to get the best applicant they could. I looked at this man, and I said, "What did you do?" because I felt that to find a black female engineer would be almost impossible. He said it was impossible. He said they hired a black woman, and she sits at one desk, and the engineer sits at the other desk and does the work. This is not my idea of equal opportunity.

Now the ERA amendment, also, of course, in due course, was defeated because many of these ideas . . . I was not worried, myself, about going to war or sharing the same bathroom. That was the least of my worries. Circumstances make a lot of difference, and there are places in life, lots of places, where you share the same bathroom, and that

didn't bother me a bit. Even in my wildest dreams, I couldn't believe the Supreme Court would say you'd only have one bathroom in our schools. I couldn't believe that, although there's always that possibility.

In any case, it finally ran its course over seven years, and when they came in and then acted like weepy women and asked for an extension of that time, they lost all credibility with me whatsoever because they are asking for equal treatment in employment and elsewhere, but they would not accept equal treatment with their amendment. So they asked for an extension, which I considered foul. They also will let a state who has refused to pass the ERA amendment come in and pass it but won't let them rescind it. This to me was a perfectly clear illustration that these women are not going to play fair. Don't con me, on the basis of equality and doing right, into doing something that's obviously wrong. So they lost me.

Marcello: While we're on subjects of this nature, Senator Andujar, maybe we also ought to talk about your position relative to abortion and right-to-life. Would you care to discuss your views on that subject?

Andujar: Well, yes, I will. I'm a doctor's wife, and the whole concept of abortion has been most difficult for me because for most of our life abortion was illegal. You just could not perform an abortion except to save the life of the mother.

But then we had a complete change in our civilization, our social approach, in the 1960's when we began to realize that the Pill and the public knowledge of contraceptives had released over us a tidal wave of sexual activity to a degree and at an age that we had never before contemplated or dreamed of. When you begin to realize that young girls in junior high school are sexually active, that they are pregnant, that they are having babies, you are simply forced to take a good look at the situation.

Oddly enough, right about that time--this was long before I ran for office--I was asked to serve on the board of Planned Parenthood, which I did. Of course, this was a terrible eye-opener for me to learn what was really going on in the world. I wasn't aware of it. I went through sort of a crisis, and I finally decided that if I had to choose between these pregnancies and the Pill, then I would have to endorse the Pill, that it wasn't my fault that the girl was already active and that I didn't encourage her to do it. We had, of course, black women who were having babies and had never had the opportunity to control their families before. I finally had to decide that, under our civilization at this time, I would go for the Pill.

Well, then right away, following that, you get into the subject of abortion because there are the people who didn't get the Pill, who are emotionally upset, who are

not in a position to have a baby. And then the Supreme Court decision came along which permitted legal abortions. I think in many ways I'm begging the issue. I have to face--I have to admit--that after a certain period perhaps abortion is murder.

But let's just discuss a little some of these aspects. First of all, you take the country of Japan. Japan would not be able to support its population whatsoever if they didn't control it. They would have to do what they did before. They would have to become militarized and try to militarily take additional territory in order to have a place for their population to live and raise food. Of course, abortion is the great means of control in a civilization like Japan.

Philosophically, I also see modern medicine with all of its wonders doing some very peculiar things. I see--and I have complained to my husband who is a medical physician and a pathologist--that for too long modern medicine has made it hard to die. You and I both know people who were in their seventies who fell and broke their hips, and in the old days they would have died. That was their time to die. We don't let people die anymore. We put them in a hospital; we save their lives. Maybe they are not very well, and maybe they don't do well after that, but maybe they live ten years. So with our modern miracles that God has let us

understand, we are prolonging life, but for what purpose, I ask many, many times. We are keeping bodies alive in hospitals that have no minds. We are taking from God the decision of life and death at that end of life because we insist on these supportive measures. So we're interfering with the life cycle at that end.

Now what are we doing at the other end? Right here in Fort Worth we have a neo-natal unit which I have visited. I refuse to be pinned as somebody who is heartless. I think perhaps I am more sympathetic with human beings in some ways than others because I don't think sheer survival is what God intended. Even in the animal kingdom, when you have a dog who gives birth to too many puppies, some of those puppies die, but those who survive are usually well-fed and able to survive. But in human life we are not paying attention to that anymore. We are keeping babies alive who are born at two-and-a-half pounds and who have all kinds of genetic defects, and who, in time, will grow and reproduce more children with genetic defects. We are asking people who are just financially able to keep going today, whose taxes and standard of living are just able to keep going in our civilization, and we are taxing them to support people who are going to have medical treatment and public taxes to keep them alive all their lives. So at the beginning of life, we are also interfering with the

natural life cycle.

In a word, I am pro-abortion. I think that we have to have it at this time. I don't like it--I'm not happy with it--but I have decided that I have to accept it.

Marcello: How do you feel about using public funds for abortion?

Andujar: I'm satisfied with it because we use public funds for all kinds of people who have physical disabilities and whom we have kept alive. If we're going to keep those alive, why shouldn't we use taxes for abortion? So I accept that, too.

Marcello: Let us move on and talk about your experiences in the Texas Legislature. At the time that you went to the Texas Senate in 1972, was Barbara Jordan there at that time?

Andujar: No. Interestingly enough, that was the year that Barbara got elected to the Congress.

Marcello: So you were the only woman senator at that time.

Andujar: Yes, and the interesting thing is that Texas has had one woman senator since the 1920's--not all the time, but most of the time. But we have never had two women at the same time. I really wish that I could see that change take place before I leave, that we would have two women, maybe three women.

Marcello: What sort of a reception did you receive from the men in the Senate when you went to Austin to take up legislative business? Was there an adjustment on both sides to be

made, even though perhaps Barbara Jordan had paved the way, so to speak?

Andujar: No, I think the women had paved the way because they were accustomed to having a woman in the Senate. I think that did make it easier for me. They were more accustomed to it than I was in being alone with all the men. Of course, the difference with me was that I was a Republican.

Now in the Legislature, of course, we have a body dominated by lawyers. I'm very distressed about it. In the Senate today, and most of the time, two-thirds of the membership are lawyers. So you have a body whose rules and comportment reflect almost very clearly what you would have in a courtroom procedure. You'd have an adversary position in the committee hearings and in handling a bill on the floor. It is a little difficult to come into one of those bodies without the background and training as a lawyer. I don't think that this is right. I don't think it's desirable for any group. Whether it would be teachers, clerks out of stores, lawyers, or public relations people, there shouldn't be two-thirds of anybody in the Legislature. Now I do say that we have to have lawyers there, but the density is too much, and I think that some of our troubles stem from that.

But in any case, here I was, literally, somebody who had never been on a city council, even. Fortunately, I

belonged to organizations, and I knew something about parliamentary procedure. Even though we don't observe Robert's Rules of Order, we have our own rules. There's similarity.

I also had some friends there. See, Ike Harris was a Republican; Walter Mengden was a Republican; I was a third Republican. Senator Tom Creighton from Mineral Wells was a conservative that I had met, and we had mutual friends. Those men, as well as other conservatives in the Senate, when they learned that I was a conservative, I just became part of the conservatives that act somewhat together in the Legislature. So I was accepted.

I was very flattered at the end of that first session, when one of the real well-known characters in the Senate came up to me, and he said, "Well, Betty, I've served under several women in the Senate." He said, "I will say that I believe I like you better than any of them." He said, "You conducted yourself right. You kept your mouth shut and learned." That was what I knew I had to do. That was the way it worked out, and I was very relieved that I was accepted in that way, and there was neither political nor sex discrimination against me. I was treated like just another senator, but neither did I get preferential treatment--I was just one of them.

Marcello: Refresh my memory. Was there a Woman's Caucus at that time.

in the Legislature? I know we had a Black Caucus and so on and so forth. I didn't know if there was a Woman's Caucus, and, if so, what part did you play in that?

Andujar: That Woman's Caucus was a shock to me, too. Sarah Weddington was probably the leader of it, and I do respect Sarah Weddington tremendously. I think she's very smart; she had the advantage of being a lawyer. Kay Bailey at that time was a Republican lawyer in the House, and both of them were my friends. But when I saw the tremendous number of statutes that they wanted to change, I just didn't feel I could go. I never told them, "Now, look, I can't support all this stuff," but just as the bills came along, they got killed in committee and so on. For example, I don't mind having a man hold a door open for me to go through it; I don't mind a man taking me to lunch and picking up the tab; and I don't mind if we are women and don't have to lift as heavy a load in government agencies and elsewhere. If the men can lift eighty pounds and a woman only has to lift sixty, that was all right with me. The same thing was true within the prison system. Women formerly got about two years less on a felony sentence than a man. That was all right with me, too, because the concept, I think, that brought it about was that, generally speaking, a woman was used as an accessory in most crimes rather than the mastermind. I think to a great extent that that is still

true, not necessarily totally. But, of course, all of those preferential things for women have pretty much been wiped out by now. But I was not "gung-ho" to do away with every advantage that women had.

Marcello: That was quite a diverse group, as I look back upon them. On the one hand, there was yourself, and you mentioned Kay Bailey; and then on the other hand, there were such people as Sarah Weddington, Chris Miller, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Wilhelmina Delco . . .

Andujar: That's right.

Marcello: It was quite a diverse group.

Andujar: But oddly enough, of course, the Senate and the House work such different schedules that it's very difficult to deal with the same thing at the same time. It is even difficult to meet. Now the women in the House meet regularly at a given time, but it occurs at a time when it's most difficult for me to go. I would try to run over there to their meeting while I was supposed to be in another meeting, and I found myself very torn between the two, with the result that in the end I pretty much tended to my Senate responsibilities.

Now there are women that I don't agree with at all, but we get along personally very well. Of course, that is the secret to getting along in the Legislature, anyway. I could cite you Senator Lloyd Doggett now, from Austin, who seldom agrees with me or me with him, but we can always

discuss bills and get along. We're pleasant to each other. Occasionally, on very rare instances, we . . . in fact, I think it was Lloyd who came up to me one time and said, "Betty, there must be something wrong." I said, "Well, Lloyd, what is it?" He said, "Well, we're voting together on this bill." But occasionally, for instance, in the 66th Session, I did support some of his amendments to the state bar bill. I supported his desire to have public members on the board, and I supported his desire for them to deposit their funds in the state treasury, even though we didn't win that. So with the women, we maintain a good liaison, but it's very difficult for the House and the Senate to really work closely together, just as a caucus, really. I believed, truthfully, that as a caucus the House holds their caucuses, and I really think that the Senate more or less holds theirs.

Now in the Senate, the chief caucus is the study group. The Democrat Study Group, which is a liberal study group . . . I think they meet regularly. They work together well, and I just simply wish the conservatives would do just as well as the liberals. I fault the conservatives in the Senate for their loose organization and the fact that we don't dedicate ourselves in an organized manner.

Marcello: Why do you think it is that the conservatives do not have a study group similar to the liberal study group in the Senate?

Andujar: Possibly, it's a leftover from former days when the conservatives literally did control the Senate. I think that they are possibly overconfident that they think that they can kill something on the floor or handle it on the floor, and they have been surprised more than once to find out they could not do so. I think that they are possibly just a little bit lazier, too. They won't take the time.

I have tried from the first month that I ever hit the Senate to try to get some of these men to meet together. Now we're a little bit more successful in having a few of them get together and discuss methods or something and then just, what you would say, pass the word around. But I think we ought to be a little bit better, and we may be forced to.

Marcello: What particular committee assignments did you seek when you went to the Senate?

Andujar: Everybody wants to be on the Appropriations Committee because that's the heart of the whole operation. Bill Hobby would never put me on it. In fact, while I am personally fond of Bill Hobby, and I feel that he has made a pretty good lieutenant governor, he has been very political in his approach to committee assignments. Now he has problems that he has to consider that I don't have to consider, but I cite the example particularly of Senator Ike Harris, who

was in the Senate before Hobby was ever elected lieutenant governor. Under any consideration of seniority, Ike Harris should be a committee chairman, and the lieutenant governor has never done that. He has permitted much younger men in seniority to have assignments, and I'm mad about it. He knows I'm mad about it, and I'm just waiting for the day, which I hope will be in the 67th Session, when he has to give Republicans more recognition in his committee assignments.

Marcello: So to which particular committees did he assign you?

Andujar: I got on State Affairs, which would be my second choice. I serve under Senator Bill Moore, who's one of the well-known characters there, and I really value that assignment and would hate to lose it. As an extension of that, I'm a vice-chairman of the Subcommittee on Nominations. Oddly enough, all nominations float through that committee without very much trouble. We have had some pretty wild moments in that subcommittee, too. Then I'm on the Human Resources Committee and Intergovernmental Relations. Intergovernmental Relations deals with anything dealing with counties, cities, or other levels of government, and we have some troubles, some very sticky problems, that come up in that committee from time to time, but usually not as difficult as the other two.

Marcello: I was talking to Representative "Gib" Lewis last week, and

he is on a similar committee in the House, Evidently, that particular Committee on Intergovernmental Relations can get quite hectic and busy at times.

Andujar: Oh, yes, it does, particularly where small areas don't want to be taken over by organized cities and so on. Oh, down in Houston, they have some very real problems of being surrounded by Houston, but they don't want to be taken in by Houston. It gets very heated, locally. In fact, all of the work is very interesting.

My feeling, though, is simply that we have too much government. In fact, I think that when you look at the budgets of the federal government and so on, you realize that we've generated far too much, for example, just in grants. It's so hard to even to kill off anything that isn't doing any good anymore because they can get a grant, and as long as you can get a grant from the federal government, then they can pay this secretary and keep the office open. I object to this tremendously. I do not understand why taxpayers don't realize that it's their own money. It doesn't matter whether you take it out of your change pocket or out of the folding money, it's still your money. The whole philosophy of government has been, you know, "let's get it from some other level of government." The most bitter lesson that I've learned in my experience in Austin, and by observation, is that the only way to control

the growth of government is to cut off their supply of money.

All during the 1970's I've been very fortunate, and the men tell me that I have been, that I have never had to vote for new taxes because Texas has been affluent. We've had a good economic climate, and due to inflation, which raises the cost of everything so that you get more money from the sales tax rolling in, we've always had a couple billion dollars waiting for us. But, conversely, we have proceeded to spend every penny of it.

I think this is the thing that has given the impetus to the concept of initiative and referendum. People literally have lost control of their government, and I think it's finally dawned on them that, unless they want to be swallowed up completely, and taxed out of existence, they're going to have to regain control. That's why, in my opinion, Proposition 13 was successful out in California. When it came down to losing your home or cutting back on the taxes, they finally cut back on the taxes. In other words, they cut off the income for the State of California.

Marcello: Now when you went into the 66th Legislative Session, you had a Republican governor. Compare and contrast the Briscoe style with the Clements style. Was that a good way to put it?

Andujar: It's an excellent way to put it because a great deal of it.

is personality and style. I went down there under Governor Briscoe, and I do want to say that he and Janie are fine people. I have always thought they were fine, Christian people, and I had good personal relations with them. In general, I was really a more friendly senator and helped Governor Briscoe more than some of his own Democrats. So Briscoe and I had really no difficulty getting along at all because he was essentially a conservative governor. Again, the Legislature didn't pay any attention to him, either, because from time to time he would propose a capital fund to save some money, and they just paid no attention to him.

The other interesting thing was that the liberals in the House and Senate gave the Democrat Governor Briscoe a good deal of trouble. I understand from other people that a new governor always has that period to go through where they test each other out, and there is tension between the legislative branch and the executive branch, particularly in Texas where our governor is not a strong governor. Our constitution doesn't give him the power to be the executive that we really do need in these days, in my opinion. I would support the executive amendments to our state constitution. When that constitution failed, I did support the increased powers for the governor.

But Governor Briscoe's first session was a disaster. I think it's generally agreed now that he probably was not

in good health at that time because he disappeared for long periods of time. Not only could the press not find him, but neither could the people who knew him and really wanted to make contact with him, and needed to make contact with him. I know that Governor Hobby and Speaker Clayton would need to speak to the governor, and sometimes a week or ten days would go by when they couldn't even find him. So this was very bad for that first session of the Legislature.

Marcello: Some people attribute a great deal of power to Mrs. Briscoe. What are your views toward that assertion?

Andujar: I have no personal knowledge of it. But I think that apparently, from what everybody observed and said, it was true. You may recall that for years Mrs. Briscoe wouldn't leave the governor's side. She wouldn't get ten feet away from him. Now I feel that some of this possibly was a health problem, but additionally it was interest and learning on her part, and I believe that she must have had a good deal of input and a great deal of influence in his administration the whole way through. Of course, the joke was that Dolph would rather be back on the ranch, but Janie loved Austin, and I think there was some truth in that. I think Janie was a more natural-born politician than Briscoe himself because he was always ducking out there. He didn't care much for the press. I think he was afraid of being misquoted or something, and they had a hard time finding him, setting up sessions

for interviews and so on.

So there is a great deal of difference in style because Clements is a man who is an extrovert.

Marcello: Let me back up a minute. In your wildest dreams, did you really expect the election of a Republican governor?

Andujar: No, I didn't expect it, but I will say that as that campaign wore on, that I got to feeling it was possible. Not even maybe probable, but possible. A couple of things were involved there that I think are very interesting, and I do think that Clements is grateful to and has shown his gratitude to Briscoe and the Briscoe supporters who moved over and support Bill Clements.

This was a clear choice between a conservative and a liberal. John Hill, the then attorney general, had spent the taxpayers' money, which is not new, and used all of his efforts as a consumerist and a liberal, building his springboard to the governorship. I think that the most surprised man in the world on election night was John Hill. But he was seen by people, not only around the state, but I think many people in the bureaucracy itself . . . I think John Hill would be surprised at the people who were afraid of him as a governor because he'd been pretty tough to work with as the attorney general. They knew that he would . . . they felt . . . now this is just my opinion, and I don't mean to say that I'm speaking for the bureaucracy, but I

think there was a feeling that there would be a great sweep of change and that many people who'd worked in the bureaucracy would be moved out and a liberal group would move in. I think that this is demonstrated by the absolute fact that on the day after election, there were people in John Hill's entourage who had made payments on or arrangements to buy homes to live in in Austin, and they had to hurry around and get themselves out of those commitments. I think that for once we had a clear choice between a real liberal and a conservative and that the people of Texas chose.

Now the other thing that I personally tried to help them with . . . I would say it was during September and, well, more into October, and I would have people come to me who probably had never voted for any Republican except a president in their lives, and they'd say, "Betty, do you think that Clements has a chance to win?" I said, "Listen, he not only has a chance, but quit talking that way. Don't raise a question that he can lose. You go back to your golf course or your church circle or your club or whatever it is, and you say, 'Look, we are supporting Bill Clements; we just cannot go for John Hill. And for the first time in our lives we're going to support a Republican candidate.'" I said, "You'd be surprised at the ripple effect." I said, "Say it out loud, and say it firmly." I said, "Some of

those people around the table are going to be people who've been considering this but were scared to mention it.

I also feel that Clements' own approach . . . I don't know whether you remember, but he kept saying, "We're going to win this thing. We're going to win." That is not only optimism; that's a real good campaign tool. I feel that that ploy or that confidence contributed to it, too.

He also had the money to do things that no other Republican candidate had ever been able to do.

Marcello: He spent a lot of money, and he had to spend a lot of money.

Andujar: That's right. It was the only possible way to win. My goodness, Democrats spend multi-millions of dollars running for office. What's wrong with a Republican doing the same thing?

Marcello: He also needed the name identification, and only through advertising, television spots, and so on did he get that name identification, and that costs money.

Andujar: It's tremendous. But before I get into that, let me add one other thing. His money enabled him to do something that I don't think the Republicans had ever done before. He deliberately set out to organize the rural counties. The Republicans would win in the metropolitan areas but always lose out in the counties. I think that the Briscoe people probably helped in that respect very greatly, and

they did try to go out and organize and meet with the people in every county in Texas. I have felt that that was an excellent thing for them to do, and it must have paid off, too.

Now you mentioned the media and the cost of running, and I'd kind of like to mention something in that respect as well. I take sort of a dim view of the hypocrisy of the media because on their editorial pages, oh, they wring their hands about how much it costs to run, and they belabor the point all the time. Yet they are the biggest contributors in many ways to the cost of running because right here in Fort Worth, the Star-Telegram charges a political candidate the highest possible rate to advertise in their paper, and we have to pay cash in advance. So in that case, where they're getting the last cent out of us as advertisers, why should their editors sit in there and "boo-hoo" about the cost of running for office? The same thing . . . I don't know the rates on television. I don't know what their political rates are, but I do know for a fact that that is true in this newspaper here, and I think it is in general. So there's a lot of hypocritical conversation that goes on in regard to politics.

Marcello: Also, of course, 1978 to some extent was the "year of the outsider," so to speak. To some extent, I guess we can say that Carter's victory was due to the fact that some people

considered him an outsider, not really a part of the Northeast, the Washington syndrome, and so on and so forth. I was thinking that perhaps this could have also been of some help to Governor Clements in that he was not associated in any way with Austin or any of the incumbents.

Andujar: It's quite possible that that is so. I do think the fact that John Hill's liberalism was well-known helped Clements and that businessmen in particular were afraid of it. Hill was the architect of what we called the consumer package of bills.

Now this is where liberals almost always beat conservatives, or Republicans, because they always get a good title. Now people don't look beneath the title to see what is involved. As it turned out, those consumer packages . . . and I was on the State Affairs Committee when John Hill came to testify before us on the deceptive trade practice act and the product liability, and at that time he was questioned about treble damages and what would happen to certain businesses. He said, "No honest business has anything to worry about. We are not going out after those men. We're going out after the ones who are deliberately deceiving the public and taking them for a ride."

Well, there again, John Hill didn't know what interpretation was going to be put on his own bill because the

treble damages that we intended were to be for people who were convicted of consciously deceiving the public or consciously foisting on the public a product that didn't function the way they said it did.

Well, the courts didn't interpret it that way. The courts interpreted it that if you got any kind of a judgment against you whatever, you were liable for treble damages. It was working a terrible hardship on business. I have letters from businessmen who said, "Look, I can't stay in business if this continues."

Of course, this brings up another concept that I think is very important. Again, we return to the trial lawyers who passed that bill. They themselves are the direct beneficiaries of it. They are the ones who sue. One of the main ones who supported that bill and wept over the changes that we made in the 66th Session, himself, has filed over eighty suits.

Of course, any lawyer who thinks that the claimant, plaintiff, really ought to get perhaps a quarter of a million dollars is going to file a \$2 million lawsuit. Now the juries that we have today, they are so out of touch with where money comes from. We have juries, I think, that think that Washington "just has money." They don't know where the money comes from. They think there are rich insurance companies that just have boodles

of money, and so instead of giving the plaintiff the quarter-million that he may really honestly need, they will award him possibly the \$2 million. So we have fantastic, unrealistic, inflationary awards being made of which the trial lawyers get at least one-third for themselves. So the trial lawyers probably represent the most significant group who are personally benefiting from the legislation that they pass and protect.

Marcello: What you're saying, in effect, then, is that you supported the modifications in that Consumer Protection Act of 1973 that was presented by Senator Meier in the last session of the Legislature.

Andujar: Absolutely, because I think liability is for real cases to try to make the plaintiff whole, in other words, to actually repair his damages, not for him to get rich and not for his lawyer to get rich. But we see more and more of this nowadays. Of course, that's another topic of discussion.

Marcello: We originally were talking about the Briscoe and Clements style. Let's talk about the Clements style, and let me ask this question. You mentioned awhile ago, and it is a fact, that the governor of Texas doesn't have a great deal of power as compared to the Legislature. This must have just bugged somebody like Clements.

Andujar: (Chuckle) I think it did, and we tried to help him with some of those things. I voted, when Governor Briscoe was there,

to give him some more powers of execution of the budget and so on. But I think we didn't finish on the style, so, of course, the style of Clements was entirely different. Here is a man who is an extrovert, who obviously enjoys his job, who is quite available to the press, and who speaks in what you would call "plain language." He doesn't barricade himself behind a bunch of long, formal, pseudo-statesman-like statements and so on.

I remember one that kind of tickled me. It had to do with some appointment in which, if the governor didn't take care of the problem, Justice Joe Greenhill would have to be confronted with the decision. I remember that Governor Clements said, "Well, Judge Greenhill didn't want that hot potato on his plate." It's this kind of off-the-cuff remark, I think, that makes people feel that this is a real man and not just some "politician" hiding behind those great phrases that they always use.

This is not to say that the public agrees with everything that he does, but I think they feel comfortable with him, and they feel that they can identify with him.

Marcello: Did he have to be educated politically to some extent in terms of receiving advice from people such as yourself and Senator Harris and Representative Agnich, in other words, some of the Republicans who had been in the Legislature for some time?

Andujar: Absolutely. There's no question about it. Anymore than I could go in and run his company, Sedco, he had to have all kinds of advice, and a great effort was made, even before the inauguration, for him to meet with the leadership in the House and the Senate and get to know what you'd refer to as the "wheels" and so on. By the time he was sworn in, it was pretty well-accepted that some very well-known conservative leaders would at least work with him. They were not deliberately going to give him a hard time. I think that that's the way it turned out to be.

Marcello: There were times when he did make some off-the-cuff statements that he did have to back off or back down somewhat.

Andujar: Right.

Marcello: I refer to the situation concerning the raising of the interest rates, and then also he had to do a little bit of backtracking with regard to the appropriations bill.

Andujar: More recently, in regard to the damage done by the oil spill, too. This is the thing about him, though, that makes him human. I didn't agree with his statement in regard to the interest rate, and I was shocked that he took that position. There was no question about it, that the housing industry in Texas was going to come to a complete standstill if we didn't raise it. Incidentally, I feel that they didn't . . . it wasn't my idea, but I did say, from day one down there, "We don't have to raise the ceiling

to 12 percent. Why don't we give it a float so that it floats with the money market?" In the end, that's what they really did do. I think that in regard to raising the interest ceiling on mortgages, the problem was that Clements, as a first Republican governor, didn't want to be seen as going into office the first session and instantly raising interest rates. I think that it was this concept possibly. I never did discuss it with him because it healed itself before too long.

Marcello: Well, it is kind of one of those situations where you can't win. On the one hand, it can't be very popular to advocate raising interest rates; but on the other hand, if the interest rates aren't raised, like you pointed out awhile ago, housing starts would come to almost a standstill because money would be leaving the state.

Andujar: First of all, I kept asking myself, "What are we doing setting interest rates in the state constitution or by law, anyway?" That's not our business; we shouldn't be doing it. But secondly, here we come again to the public, which literally doesn't understand the economy or how it works. We have a group that's going to rise and scream and reelect themselves by running against higher interest rates, whereas, in fact, by doing so, they're driving business out of Texas, reducing the number of jobs available--particularly on the housing issue.

One realtor told me of a case where a man wanted to buy a \$150,000 house, and he could pay \$75,000 cash, but he had to get a loan for the rest of it, and there was no money available at 10 percent. He would have to pay more than 10 percent, which he was willing and able to pay. Why should I, as a legislator, sit in Austin and tell somebody in Mineral Wells that they can't have their new home that they've planned for fifteen years because I'm not going to raise the interest rates? That's up to the man in Mineral Wells to decide. If he finds that, instead of having a patio and a swimming pool, that he's going to have to pay a higher interest rate, but he still wants the house and he'll do without the pool and the patio, that's for him to decide, not for Betty Andujar to decide.

Marcello: So do you say, then, that the setting of interest rates should be something done by the local bank?

Andujar: By the market, because competition will always keep money as cheap as possible. The biggest enemy of cheap money is the federal government itself. Its inflationary spiral and its manipulation of the currency supply and so on is reprehensible and intrusive, and they know it and they love it.

Marcello: Let's talk about the appropriations bill because we've more or less touched that subject briefly. On the subject of appropriations, there were some difficulties between the

governor and the Senate. For example, the Senate, as usual, adopted the recommendations of the Legislative Budget Board, which called for spending of about a billion dollars more than the governor felt necessary. What position did you take in this particular matter between the Senate and the governor?

Andujar: I've always supported the governor in his concept that we don't need to spend as much money as we're spending. There is fat in the budget. My goodness, you could go out to almost any educational institution and shrink up their budget quite a bit. They don't want to do it. I'm not even talking about cutting salaries, but I'm talking about more effective use of their money. On college campuses they like monuments; they want buildings. They would rather have two new buildings than one good program that's going to . . . well, I shouldn't say they would prefer, but they want both. They love bricks and mortar, as you say.

There're lots of these things that we don't have to have right now, and we have overbuilt some campuses. Every senator in the state wanted a university in his senatorial district to the point where people are disgusted if they can't get just what they want within an hour's driving distance in regard to education. It is not possible to bring total high-class education to everybody on their home grounds. We have entirely too many branches of schools,

of the universities, and we have too many medical schools in the state, but everybody wants his.

In regard to the bureaucracy, I don't think there's any question that there're loads and loads of places where five people are doing the work of four people. I like his approach of not firing anybody, but to say, "Look, we just won't replace this position." Believe me, that office will function. The people there can just work a little more and talk less.

The whole feeling or the texture of government is set to a great extent by those at the top. I admire Governor Bill Hobby. I think that he is a man of integrity and honesty and isn't trying to manipulate anything for his personal gain, and I think that if you don't permit abuse of the public payroll or the public funds, people are going to do better the whole way down the line. In fact, it occurred in the Senate. We had to fire the Senate printer because he was stealing paper and things like that. I admired them when they didn't cover that up. They fired the guy.

It's the same way with Clements. He cut back his own staff, and with attrition nobody's going to lose a job, but we're going to reduce the number of employees. I agreed with him on that totally.

We have had cut-backs in some agencies, and no agency likes it because they like everything they can get. There

are loads of typewriters and desks and all kinds of supplies that they could use last year's model instead of getting the new model. It just hasn't been stylish to try to really "do" with what you can. I think that when people in Texas are as hard up as they are . . . we have senior citizens, people who are not making quite enough money to live on, so why should we gouge it out of them for the Legislature to live in luxury, or the bureaucracy? I just don't believe in it.

Marcello: One of the differences between the Senate appropriations bill with the governor was when it concerned pay raises for the public schoolteachers. What was your position on this particular matter?

Andujar: I supported the report of the Education Committee headed by Senator Oscar Mauzy, with whom I seldom agree. We don't vote the same way at all. But I will give credit to Mauzy in that respect. He stuck with what was possible, which was 5.5 percent. Now the teachers wouldn't admit that they had gotten quite a lot . . . I don't mean "wouldn't admit it," but it was never very much emphasized that they had gotten quite a bump the previous biennium.

Now here's a problem, of course, with public schoolteachers and any group, labor unions or whatever, in dealing with inflation, and that is that everybody is running as fast as he can to catch up with inflation, and hardly anybody's

trying to control inflation. We'll never get anywhere as long as we do that. Every round of raises beyond increased productivity is simply inflationary. The teachers, since they are affiliated with the National Education Association, are pure and simply a militant union. I don't mean all teachers, but I mean their legislative representatives are taught and must go ahead and make these demands.

Now the teachers' legislative demands are very unpopular with many people. First of all, they will never discuss the concept that they are part-time workers. Teachers are the only people that I know of that want to base their salary on a full-time year when they are only working three-quarters of the year. They also are now demanding a national level of income which has nothing to do with the cost of living in the place in which they live. You can't tell me that a person living in New York City who has to pay 8 percent sales tax, who has to pay a state income tax, who has to pay the inflation rate in New York City, has the same problems that a person in Mineral Wells has, but the teachers want the same salary. I just simply do not agree with it. I think that the place where you work has something to do with what your salary is, and the standard example is the difference between Fort Worth and Dallas. There's a great difference in salaries in corporate areas

because there's a difference in the standard of living. The teachers will not admit it, and won't discuss it.

I am willing to work with the teachers on their problems in regard to parents. I sense they have militant parents they have to deal with. I think that the State Board of Education and the local boards of education are scared to death to exercise sufficient disciplinary powers because students now have rights to go to court and sue, and they're doing it. I deplore it. I think it's been, in most respects, probably bad for the schools. I think parents have abdicated their responsibilities many times, and this is in the high-income area as well as the lower area. I think the fact of two parents working has made a lot of difference in the schools because the mother isn't at home to reinforce what that teacher says. I think the more teachers are militant, the less sympathy they get from the families. This is a tragedy for education. Additionally, when they get fringe benefits, they don't want to discuss the benefits; they just want to discuss the salary.

Then you have the competition between our state employees and our schoolteachers. Everytime one group gets a benefit, the other group wants the same. Whereas the state employees work a full year, just like most people do, and the teachers do not, still they want the same benefits. The teachers want to have, I believe, one day off a month--I

believe that's it--for personal affairs. I think that that's entirely too much because they also get a vacation time at Christmas and other times that most employees do not get. I have forgotten the figure, but everytime you close down the state for a holiday, it costs millions of dollars. But in addition to all the other time they get off, the teachers want this day a month off. Why should they have a day a month off? Why shouldn't they hire a substitute just the way everybody else has to do? Their demands are endless. If we paid them \$50,000 a year, NEA would be back demanding more. You may as well face it. Since they have become so militant and so political, it's very difficult to cope with.

You take Senator Tom Creighton from Mineral Wells, who just now announced that he's not seeking reelection. There's one of the most arch-conservatives in the entire Senate who has . . . you either respect him highly or hate his guts, depending on your viewpoint, but he has been a very outstanding committee chairman in the Senate. The teachers targetted him the last time to try to get rid of him because he didn't give them everything they wanted.

Of course, this is part of our problem, and the political process has been so distorted because we no longer have people voting for the general good and trying to get a representative of the general good. They're trying to vote

for somebody who's going to increase their salary, and the heck with everybody else. We are deeply involved in the whole concept of robbing Peter to pay Paul, and Peter's getting darn tired of being robbed.

Marcello: I think today it's also called special interest politics, is it not?

Andujar: Well, that's the general name for it, but that name has now gotten to be such a cliché that I'm not sure people even digest . . . of course, my special interest is your pressure group. It just depends on your viewpoint.

Fortunately, we have a "balance of terror" because, whatever your viewpoint is, you have a balance between the different viewpoints, and that is why politics is the art of compromise. The compromise with the teachers was that they took the 5.1 percent increase, but they got two more step increases. My position's very clear in regard to an organized militant group of that kind--you'll never satisfy them even if you gave them the whole treasury.

Marcello: From my own research, it seems like you really couldn't separate the appropriations bill, the school finance bill, and the tax relief bill in that 66th Session.

Andujar: You really couldn't because it all involved whatever the money available was. A \$21 billion budget, that's how much we had. It's just like mother baking a pie. If somebody gets a larger slice, somebody gets a smaller slice. There's

just no way around it. They were not going to pass any new tax bill to cover that. This is what is involved in every session, is who gets how much. That's what it's all about.

Marcello: Well, by constitutional mandate, you had to provide some measure of tax relief in this 66th Session, did you not?

Andujar: Yes, in regard to the ad valorem taxes. Of course, there, again, is an example where I differ from a lot of the other people in the Legislature. The tax relief bill that we came out with gives senior citizens and handicapped people an additional \$10,000 of ad valorem tax relief. I do not believe in class legislation of that nature. I'm very willing to give the senior citizens on a limited income, who are having a hard time, tax relief of that nature. And I was willing . . . didn't even feel that they had to bring in their income tax report to show us that they were needy or anything, that I thought they should apply for it. I thought that all they had to do was write in and tell the tax assessor that they wanted a senior citizen's exemption. Let them see that they got it; they know they had it. Instead of that, we have an overall, on a basis of age, exemption where you have people of great wealth who now will automatically get that exemption, and I don't believe in that sort of legislation. But it's done all the time.

Marcello: How did you feel about taxing agricultural and timber and

ranch land on the basis of its productive value rather than its market value?

Andujar: I think that was a necessity, and I always did support it because we were literally . . . there again, in their efforts to try to make the land speculators look like ogres and devils, they were literally about to tax the honest-to-goodness rancher off of his ranch, and he had to have some protection. So what we did was to come up with this concept that if he did at some time sell his ranch for a tremendous amount of money, then he would owe some back taxes on it. This was the way we tried to equalize that.

I know I had people come . . . another issue in regard to ranching and so on is this idea that people have to sell their ranches to speculators. I just looked at a couple of them and said, "What do you mean, you have to sell it? You don't have to sell at all. Stay on your land and continue to cultivate it." So this idea of trying to make the land speculators look like they were causing all the trouble just left me cold. There's nothing yet that says you have to sell your property and make a big profit. On timber . . . of course, we're totally dependent on timber for many, many things, and, again, you can tax that business out of existence, and it takes thirty years to grow a tree. You've got to constantly harvest what is mature and replant. So you have to give them some consideration, too.

Marcello: Of course, I guess the heart of that tax relief bill involved, I guess, what we would call a kick-back to the local school districts.

Andujar: It's exactly what it is. Sure it is.

Marcello: I think it was about \$430 million that would have to be shifted to the local school districts.

Andujar: Set aside, that is correct, because they had no advance warning that we were going to remove from the tax rolls all that money that the senior citizens would claim for exemption, and so we had to help them out on it.

Marcello: What will that mean to the future of education? In a sense, I guess what I'm referring to is having the state provide this money to the local school districts rather than having the local school districts raise it themselves.

Andujar: I'm opposed to increasing the amount of money that the state gives to the local districts because that becomes a centralized operation then, and then the local school district just becomes a minor appendage, you know, to pass out the money. I firmly and strongly believe in local control of the schools. This is not to say that they always please me with what they do, but, still in all, I'm always for local operation, and I wish that we could get back more local control even over the federal funds and so on that we discussed.

You go through changes of concept as to what you should

do, by the city council or by the school board, and I think we're having a somewhat slight return to a little more "back to basics." You know, these educationists get off on some pretty wild things. We tore down the walls in a lot of schoolrooms and have these big, open areas. There are always children who can learn under given circumstances or almost any circumstances, but there are others who cannot. That casual situation is not good for some children, but, yet, we have to go ahead, and everybody has to adopt the new math, even though it isn't very applicable to ordinary life. It was designed primarily for people going into higher mathematics, but they forced it down clear into the elementary schools. Even the men who invented new math say it was never intended to be taught in the public schools.

Marcello: Another issue that came up before the 66th Legislature involved property tax reform, and what I'm referring to, of course, is the Peveto Bill or the "Son of Peveto Bill" or the "Grandson of Peveto Bill" or whatever you wish to call it.

Andujar: That's right.

Marcello: It failed to pass the Senate three times, and it passed this time. What are your feelings toward the Peveto Bill?

Andujar: I have never supported the Peveto Bill because there again you have centralization at the state level of something that's really a local level concern. I understand what brought

it about was the court decision that all of the income of the state should be available to educate all the children of the state. There was a disparity between the different levels. In Fort Worth a house of \$50,000 was producing far more income than a \$50,000 house out in West Texas, but that didn't bother me one bit. I think that people deal with their local appraisers, their local tax assessors, and that is their business. It's only the business of the state, in my opinion, to see that each child is guaranteed a basic education. I'm not even for the same education. I support local enrichment because I think that's just life. You're never going to have everything equal everywhere. If areas want to enrich their teachers' salaries and try to get better teachers, as long as every child in the state has been basically guaranteed an adequate teacher. This has been my approach, and I have never changed it.

Marcello: How did you feel about that aspect of the Peveto Bill that called for a single county-wide tax assessing unit?

Andujar: We could have had that by voluntary cooperation any time we wanted it, but since they didn't voluntarily do it let's see, the school board piggy-backs the county tax assessor, I believe, and I really felt that it might have been better to have a pilot program somewhere and see how Dallas or some other entity did it. If it became desirable, then other people would adopt the same approach.

I simply don't like the centralization. They will take all the appraisers and assessors to Austin. They will be trained so that the appraisal will be uniform throughout the state, which is fine, and I don't oppose it. From there on out, of course, all the entities within the county will have to get together, and each one will have a fraction of a vote on how certain things shall be done, and I can see it becoming very sticky.

The local homeowner is going to be lost in the shuffle. That's going to be tough. Personally, my husband and I never succeeded in having the appraisal or assessment of our house lowered by the appeal board here in Fort Worth, but we always felt we could go down there and appear before them. Now it's going to be nearly impossible, and you . . . mainly just large landowners or corporate entities will probably be able to appeal down to Austin. So I felt that it was just removing a very local operation, and it will end up being controlled down in Austin rather than in individual counties.

Marcello: How was it that the Peveto Bill managed to pass the Senate this time, whereas it had failed three previous times? Do you have any views on this?

Andujar: I should have, but I don't have the details. They did change it. It went through several metamorphoses, and they did make some alterations.

Marcello: As I recall, one of the things that helped, I believe, was a provision that gave the local taxpayer the opportunity to appeal tax increases over a certain percent or something along that line.

Andujar: Or have a referendum on it. It was the tax referendum in which they could then hold the entity to a tax increase of a given amount. I think that that little amount of initiative really helped to sell it.

I particularly object to the concept, which will evolve, in my opinion, when they set up this board to train the appraisers. Ultimately, the executive director of that board is . . . even though he's only the hired executive director, and you have representatives on the Appraisal Board, anybody that knows anything knows that these executive directors ultimately become the power as long as they play along with the majority of their board. That executive director is going to be the appraiser for the entire state. He's going to have tremendous power. That was one of the main things that I objected to.

Marcello: Let's move on to another subject, and this is something that occurred near the end of the session, Senator Andujar. What are your thoughts concerning the so-called "Killer Bees?"

Andujar: Oh, mercy, we don't have time for that (chuckle)! Well, of course, they used a parliamentary procedure which, I think, is reprehensible. They didn't stay on the floor and filibuster,

which is permissible. They used up the taxpayers' time and money at a very crucial time, at the end of the session, where literally it did interfere with the business of the session. There's no question about it. It is also a demonstration that a minority can ruin the work of the majority. So I took a very dim view of it.

I have stated since then that the only nice thing about the whole operation was that while they were gone, we were convinced, those of us who remained, that they were off on somebody's ranch living it up high, you know, barbecues, drinks, and all that stuff; and when we found out that they were all rammed in together in a small room, I nearly died laughing because there are a few of those men that can't stand each other, and I don't know how they literally came out of that thing.

But the thing that I particularly resented--and I think Governor Hobby knows this--was that those of us who stuck with him, we stayed there and we tried to keep up a dignified appearance of the Senate ready and waiting to go back into the regular, routine business; but when they came back, he made no effort to chastise a single one of them. This set them up as heroes, which the press had already made them, as much due to the fact of their title. I told Hobby later, "If you had referred to them as 'Senate Scabs,' they would have been back on page thirty-two." But that

"Killer Bees" title was a killer.

It just sold like gangbusters, and the press loved it and enjoyed it. Additionally, the press is generally liberal, and those were liberal senators, and they just loved it. It's a sort of an incestuous relationship, actually.

But I think it was a tragedy for the Senate. I think that it really diminished the lieutenant governor's standing and, really, his control of the Senate.

Marcello: It was a tragedy in what way, so far as the Senate was concerned?

Andujar: In that it interfered with the total work of the entire Legislature. Nothing could operate while they were gone. They simply stood there and thumbed their nose at the 66th Legislature and the taxpayer who was paying for it. They didn't have the guts to stand in there and fight and filibuster and take the losses that they thought they were going to have. So it was a chicken, juvenile, childish thing to do. But they did it, and I'm just simply hoping that some of them get punished by the electorate for it.

Marcello: How did you feel about the split primary, which ostensibly was the reason for the walk-out of the "Killer Bees?"

Andujar: Well, "ostensible" is a good word because there were some of the men who became convinced that they were more worried about product liability than they were about the split

primary, but I came to the conclusion that as a Republican that it didn't matter to me either way, although I did, as national committeewoman, support the party position of the same-day primary. But I thought the separate date had a good deal going for it, particularly if we had been able to get the regional primary concept implemented with the other states. I thought it was a very interesting concept, and, of course, Governor Hobby devoted almost his entire energies to try and pass that bill in order to save a bunch of his conservative legislators because the Democrat conservatives are the ones who are in trouble next year with the same-day primary. People are going to come in the Republican primary and vote for our presidential nominees, leaving the conservative Democrats over there exposed to the possibility of being beat by liberal Democrats. Next year we'll probably see the final transition of power in the Texas Democrat Party from the conservatives to the total liberal wing.

Marcello: If that in fact does become the case, do you see more conservative Democrats switching parties, such as Senator Braecklein recently did?

Andujar: Absolutely. In fact, some of them should've switched in the past, except that, of course, they didn't know that they could be elected. If we elect some recent Democrats as Republicans, and they vote as Republicans . . . I think there

are many, many conservative Democrats who stuck in the party thinking that under Briscoe they could hang onto it, and I think they're totally disgusted now because John Hill is, in fact, the head of the Democrat Party at this time, in my personal opinion. I don't think Hobby has emerged, and neither has Mark White. Bob Bullock, I don't think, is acceptable to the average Democrat voter as the leader of his party, and I think that John Hill's kind of picked up the pieces.

Marcello: Now there is some talk that Governor Clements might call a special session of the Legislature, basically to settle the issue of initiative and referendum. As a state legislator, what is your feeling toward initiative and referendum?

Andujar: I have supported initiative and referendum because I think we brought it on ourselves. I think that any bunch of people who sat in Austin all during the 1970's and didn't save a nickel have really brought it on themselves because people want that ability primarily to control the rise in taxes. I do support it.

Marcello: Well, Senator Andujar, that exhausts my list of questions. Is there anything else relative to the 66th Session that you think we need to discuss and get as part of the record?

Andujar: Oh, I think I probably have emphasized it enough, but I think that the public probably does not realize the role of the trial lawyers in controlling legislation. They're

a small group. The public doesn't identify them, but they put hundreds of thousands of dollars into political races trying to elect another trial lawyer.

They are in control with the people that they can control around them. They can kill changes in our so-called consumer protection act. It is the greatest conflict of interest in the legislative process that I know of--to go down there and pass bills where you get rich quick at the expense of the other consumers or the public. This is one thing that I emphasize.

The other thing that I think is so terrible is that a people who believe in representative government don't understand the economic system and where the money comes from that they demand for their various programs.

Marcello: Senator Andujar, I want to thank you very much for having participated. You've said a lot of very interesting and important things, and I especially appreciated your being so candid. I'm sure that scholars will find your comments most valuable when they're available for research.