

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION

Number 10

Interview with

Alonzo Jamison

July 26, 1967

Place of Interview: Denton, Texas

Interviewer: Dr. H. W. Kamp

Terms of Use: Open

Approved: Alonzo Jamison

Date: October 31, 1967

©

Copyright April 17, 1968
By the Board of Regents
North Texas State University

Oral History Collection

Alonzo Jamison

Interviewer: Dr. H. W. Kamp

July 26, 1967

Place of Interview: Denton, Texas

Dr. Kamp: This is a recording of Mr. Jamison's recollections and analysis of the 1967 session of the Texas State Legislature.

Mr. Jamison: In thinking what I could contribute to this study, I have thought in terms of reporting some observations about the session--about any significant trends that I noticed, any significant developments, and any noteworthy things that come to mind in regard to the session generally. And then I thought about making some detailed report on my own actions as a member in the legislature--these actions not necessarily revolving around the more important issues, but issues that were important to me and issues I chose to work on. So I'm going to make observations about the session in general and then I'm going to make observations about my personal role in the session. And the reason I'm going into this personal role is that because I did have a legislative program of my own, I found the session more interesting and more worth-while.

First I'll make some observations about the session that didn't directly involve my own program. I might say first that I think that for most members and for myself, it was a pleasant session, an agreeable session. Now it's true we had some controversial matters like daylight-saving time. We had the milk bill that developed controversy. We had the liquor-by-the-drink issue which involved a lot of correspondence and deciding what position to take in answering the correspondence. We had things of that type but we didn't develop bitter

partisanship in the House on any of these issues, and everybody maintained a sort of a sense of camaraderie and everybody had a good personal relationship--nobody got real mad at the Speaker and he seemed to be fair to everybody, and there was really an aura of good feeling in the House.

I think in the Senate it may have been a different situation. I'm not able to comment directly on that, of course, except from observation. I think there's some bitterness in the Senate. But in the House everybody liked everybody else. Representative Gladden, from Fort Worth, who returned to the House after having been out for two or three sessions, apparently had wanted to develop an opposition bloc to the Speaker and to the Governor, and worked rather assiduously at it and provided a good deal of leadership in trying to find soft spots in the program of the Governor and in the program of the Speaker on which to attack them. But he had little success in the House in developing such a bloc and seemingly failed to arouse much public interest. My observation was that it was pretty hard to find a popular position of opposition to policies that were being recommended by the Governor and by the Speaker--and this made it difficult to have an opposition bloc as such. We had a spirit of unanimity--there was probably too much of it during the session--we probably had not enough abrasiveness--we probably didn't have enough differences. We didn't have some characters in the House that we've had in the past--like Jim Cotten and Bill Hollowell and others who were constantly on the alert for opposition stands to take and were good "watchdogs" for the House. We missed that but I think we had the freedom to oppose if we had been of such a frame of

mind. We didn't have any strong discipline by the Speaker. We had a number of issues before the House where the Speaker's team was divided, even though he had expressed an interest or desire in a certain solution, some of his key people took an opposite position. In many instances where issues came on the floor the Speaker's team members did split up.

Now if it were a matter of real immediate concern of the Speaker, I don't think that happened. But he didn't attempt to dictate the solution on very many issues. In fact, I believe that that is one of the things I remember about the session--the fact that the Speaker did attempt to be a friend to everybody and did not exert a strong leadership of pros and cons of certain measures. In fact, he seemed perfectly willing, on a lot of these tricky issues, to just let the House decide. I attribute this to the fact that he does contemplate a statewide race--and he was not anxious to make any enemies. And on an issue like daylight-saving time, which could have been very well disposed of in committee without ever having a vote in the House, he insisted that the House vote on it. And on issues like the milk bill which could have been settled in committee, he wanted the House to decide it. Actually, the House, I think, never did vote on that bill, but it was his thought that that would be the way to resolve it. Well, you can't argue with this method of the House deciding these issues. But, in my experiences in the House, we have had Speakers who felt that if he could keep the House members from having to vote on a lot of controversial things, he was doing them a favor.

And one of the main roles of committees in the past has been to

take controversial issues and to keep them from ever coming to the floor of the House for a vote--thus presumably making it easier for members to run for re-election. As we say, we don't cut the members up on these issues. This time we didn't have that attitude, and neither did we have it in Jim Turman's speakership. Jim Turman, when he was Speaker, incurred a lot of criticism by the fact that he insisted that the committees weren't going to kill any legislation. This was a kind of reaction to the system that I have already described where committees were quite powerful and disposed of issues and buried bills and buried controversial things that never came to light and the members didn't have to vote on them. Jim Turman, as Speaker, said the House was going to decide these things. And he got a lot of criticism from conservatives for letting things out of committee. Speaker Barnes, who is a conservative, really out-did or equalled Turman on this. Because under Barnes there was hardly anything that had any steam behind it that didn't come out of committee and come before the House for a vote.

The Speaker's position was that he didn't want his committees and himself blamed for killing legislation that had any support much to it at all. Things came out of committee that a lot of us thought didn't have to come out--that showed that the committees didn't really work them out--they bucked them out to the House, they let the House decide. This supposedly takes the Speaker off the spot on these things. I'm not going to say that's bad, because I imagine if I had a Speaker that was sitting on bills that I thought the House ought to vote on, I'd criticize him for it. It's difficult to please everybody. But in a committee system, the committees have to perform a deliberative function--

that's the purpose of it. That means that they have to rewrite some legislation. They have to decide that some isn't worth passing. There has to be some that they can't recommend to the House. If the basis of committee decision is that, well, the House always ought to get to vote on it, then the committee hasn't fully met it's responsibilities. There are members that frequently take the position, "Well, I'll vote to get something out of committee, but I'll vote against it on the floor"--now that is not necessarily, in my mind, the basis on which the votes out of committee ought to come. If you're against something or if you're on a committee and you think a piece of legislation is bad, the thing to do is not to recommend it to the House. But that's getting off the subject.

I think most members felt they had a good deal of leeway to vote anyway they wanted to on most issues. The Speaker obviously would send word to his committees on major legislation, but he wasn't rough on those who disagreed with him. Members didn't get much interference from the Speaker; they didn't get much interference from the Governor. One of the marks of the session was, I think, that the Governor didn't throw his weight around this session--at least in the House--as much as we felt he had in previous sessions. He didn't seem to be quite as interested in the outcome of matters. He didn't do very much arm-twisting. If he did, it was privately with committee chairmen--not on any wide-spread scale. For instance, I don't think that the Governor really went to bat for the liquor-by-the-drink bill as much as he would have been expected to. He didn't make anybody uncomfortable for being opposed to it. If you're a political leader and you want to get some-

thing through, well, you twist some arms--you make it hard to be against these things.

I think some of the people interested in the liquor-by-the-drink bill felt the Governor decided he wouldn't make a big issue of it. The Governor did work quietly for a four-year term and the constitutional ammendment which will gradually appeal the state ad valorem tax. But I don't think his presence was felt too much on major issues. On constitutional revision, for instance, which was one of the main things he advocated, I didn't see much arm-twisting on his part. The Senate leadership wasn't for constitutional revision at all. The House and the Speaker were for it, but they came out with a proposal that was quite watered-down from what the Governor had recommended. He didn't seem to raise any fuss about it. It made a lot of people feel the Governor, perhaps, had decided he was serving his last term and he wasn't as interested.

One of the things about the session that made it memorable was the adoption of new rules. Throughout the session, a lot of us felt like we weren't familiar, really, with the rule situation; some of the procedure was new to us. Just to review the new rules, I'll point out some of the things that were in the new rules that did change our method of operation, somewhat, and I think had an effect on the session and will have an effect for years to come. As you know, one of the rule changes that the House adopted was that a conference committee would be limited only to reconciling the differences between Houses. It couldn't include new material. This rule was adopted in the House--

it was not adopted in the Senate and therefore, I do not think you could say that it got a real test. The House attempted to stay with it. And when the House and Senate did decide to include new material in their conference reports, they came to the House with a resolution asking the House's permission. I believe that this idea of limiting the conference committees to only the differences in the Houses can have some far-reaching effects as far as the appropriation bills are concerned. It made all of us who are interested in appropriations a little more interested in the appropriation process, from beginning to end. If on appropriations, the conferees are limited only to adjusting differences, you have to be sure there are some differences to adjust. When you go into conference under that kind of rule, you've got to have done a pretty good job with your bill in the first place. If you're limited to adjusting the differences, you can't go into the conference with a "barebonus" bill on appropriations (as has been the practice in the past) you've got to go in with a bill that says something and means something.

Another feature of the new rules was a new calendar system. Under the rules that existed for years, bills normally come on the calendar according to their number--a low number, of course, first. High numbered bills were never reached on the calendar. The only way a high numbered bill could ever come up was by a rule suspension or by being placed on the local uncontested calendar. So there was a clamor for low numbers. Now that is changed and bills are placed in the calendar in the order of which they come out of committee--rather than in the order of their number. This eliminated the clamor for low numbers.

I think it also meant that members felt that they didn't have to

push their bills early in the session. I have the feeling that they confused not having to have low numbers with the idea that they didn't have to get their bills out of committee early, because there was a good deal of legislative congestion at the end of the session. Members possibly thought that getting bills through early didn't make much difference anymore that the calendar was going to be set by the rules committee, and that somehow or another that meant that they had more leeway about getting legislative programs through.

Under the new rules, the bills actually are placed on the calendar by the rules committee, but their rule is, that they place them in order by which they come out of committee. Now it never was really made clear as to how much discretion the rules committee has about placing these bills on calendar--and that point was really never cleared up. The rules say that the rules committee will set the calendar. Actually they can set bills on several different calendars. One is the "major state calendar." Another is the "emergency calendar." Another is the "general state calendar." Whether a bill goes on this calendar or that depends on its nature and importance. And the rules committee decides which calendar each bill goes on, and decides in what order it'll go on the calendar. And they're supposed to put them on in the order which they come out of the committee--they say they do. But the question never seemed to be clear as to whether or not they could refuse a place on the calendar for a bill--until the last week of the session. Then the rules committee did demonstrate--at that time--that they believed that they could show some judgement and discretion in placing bills on the calendar. For instance, the horse racing bill came out of committee,

but was never given a place on the calendar. Or to be historically accurate, I might say that it was given such a place on the calendar that it wouldn't ever be reached. After the liquor-by-the-drink bill came out of committee, the Rules Committee deliberated a long time on what (laughter) place to put it on the calendar and it wound up never appearing on a calendar.

Now there was some criticism of the adoption of these new rules, because critics felt that this centralized too much power in the hands of the Rules Committee--to determine the calendar. And if the Rules Committee members, in future sessions, really decide that they're going to let their attitude toward a bill influence what calendar it goes on--and if they're against a bill, won't put it on a calendar--this is going to pose a problem that we haven't been too familiar with in the legislature. Yet, the Speaker, under the old rule, pretty well controlled the calendar, because except that under the old rule, if you got a low number, you were home free. The Speaker didn't have control over the low numbered bills except to keep them in committee. He had control over all the high numbered bills. Now, under the new rules, the Speaker and his Rules Committee, control all the bills--low numbered and high. I can see definite possibility of unpleasantness and dissatisfaction growing out of the new rule in future sessions.

There was something in the new rules for everybody--there's the reason they got adopted. And of course another reason they got adopted was the Speaker sent out word that he wanted them adopted. This was done before the committee assignments were made and so the Speaker did make a strong bid for the new rules. There was suspicion from the con-

servative elements in the House, to the new rules; there was suspicion from the liberal element to the new rules. But each side got something in the new rules that they had always wanted. When you combine that with the fact that a popular Speaker was saying that he wanted the new rules, and the committee assignments hadn't been made, when the vote was taken on the new rules--all this worked to get the new rules adopted. I think they were adopted unanimously. This is almost the same set of rules that were adopted during the Jim Turman Speakership, that were supposed to go into effect the next session. And when the next session did convene on the first day under Speaker Tunnell, the House decided not to go to the new rules, and to go back to the old rules.

Now, one of the things that's in the new rules that liberals seemed to like is the modified seniority system. This means that once a person has been appointed to a committee, he stays on that committee as long as he wants to stay--he can't be kicked off the next session. It will be interesting to see the effect of this in future sessions, as, of course, it didn't come into effect this session--except that the Speaker, by his appointments this session, did sort of set the mold for the committees, for a good while to come. A member now on a committee--if he wants to stay there--will stay there. The Speaker will still name the chairman and vice chairman of each committee but after that he's limited to filling vacancies--except for two committees--the Rules Committee and the House Administration Committee, which are completely under the control of the Speaker. The modified seniority rule will give members of committees an opportunity to stay on committees, if

they want to, even though a Speaker may come in whom they have not supported, or a Speaker comes in with a different philosophy or different point of view--unless the rules are changed (laughter). It gives him a chance to become an expert in that committee field, if he wants to.

Now another thing that a lot of us had hoped that the legislature would eventually do was done in the new rules, and that is provide more printing of the bills. Under the new rules, when a bill is introduced, every member receives a copy. Used to be that the only time bills were printed was after they came out of committee. Our secretaries complained a lot about getting snowed under with a lot of printed material. But this, I think, is a good thing--it enables all of us to know better what is being introduced, and compare the committee version, if there is one, with the original bill.

So that under the new rules, when a bill comes to the floor of the House, each member has on his desk, if he'll organize himself, a copy of the bill as it came out of committee, plus a copy of the bill as introduced. If they're the same, why, he just has one copy. But he can see what the committee did to the bill that was introduced. Also, the bill coming out of committee is accompanied by a bill analysis, which is supposed to give a summary of what the bill actually does. And this has helped. Now another thing the rules are going to call for, I believe, that was not implemented this session, is that there's supposed to be a differentiation made in future sessions in printing of bills between what is new language in the bill and what is old language. New language will be underlined to indicate at a glance exactly what is being changed. And this'll be helpful. And in commit-

tees, now, under the new rules, a bill to be considered in committee has to be accompanied by a bill analysis. And this has been helpful. And I think as the committees develop staffs--and this is what's contemplated--incidentally, the new rules reduce the number of committees in the House, and make each committee, now, really a major committee. And the thought is, that the more important of these new committees will have probably permanent staffs, the year around--to assist the committees. The appropriations committee already has this, but the other committees have not had much staff help except just what they could get from the legislative council staff.

One of the things that's contemplated for these new committees is that a lot more of the committee work will be done in the interim than in the past. We'll have to see how this is going to work out. But this has been what the Speaker has said that he wants, instead of having so many special interim committees, that we've begun to have in recent years. His thought is that the regular standing committees will make a lot of the studies--hold a lot of hearings, that might normally be done by special committees. I expect, for instance, as a member of the Education Committee, that our committee will have some meetings in the interval. And this is completely new to Texas government, because the regular committees, in the past, have had no function at all in the interim--they have been assumed not to even exist. And now it's going to be considered that they are in existence.

This is going to be interesting and it indicates a growing feeling in Austin, that legislators are going to have to spend more time on state's business. The Governor, of course, has recommended annual

sessions--the new sessions limited to budgetary matters. I think that Speaker Barnes feels that the legislature needs to spend more time the year around on state business. And a lot of it can be done through interim work--if the regular standing committees would work during the interim, and have meetings during the interim, they could do a lot of ground work on bills and learn a lot about the problems--while they wouldn't be passing any bills during this time, they'd be learning about what needed to be passed--it would save a lot of time. If some of the bills that were introduced, for instance, at the beginning of this session, could have really been--if not introduced, at least considered back during the interim and sub-committees could have been working on those bills back during the interim, and whipping them up into shape so that they would have been in real good shape to work on--the work of the regular session would be really facilitated. And I hope that this is something that can be done.

Anyway, those are some of my general observations about the session. I think that the rules changes are significant--if nothing more than the fact that precedent has been laid for changing rules, in a major particular.

Now, I'm going to comment on some of my own work in the session. I found my work particularly satisfying because I did have some bills that I'd sort of dreamed up that I had the pleasure of seeing passed. And then I was on some good committees and had some sub-committee work to do that I took some pride in. Then, just as the Representative from Denton and Cooke counties, it just seemed to me that there were a larger number of issues than usual that affected my constituency--that kept me

busy. Examples of these things that came up--that just sort of gave the member from District 51 something to be working on was, for example, the proposed deaf school. We'd had an interim committee studying the problems of the deaf. And one of the recommendations of this committee during the interim had been that two new schools for the deaf be created in the state--one in north central Texas, and one on the gulf coast. And while they never did put it in the report, they did tell the newspapers that the place they thought the new school for the deaf in north Texas should be was Denton. This led to expectation, locally, that the school would be located here, and I spent a good deal of time trying to figure out how to get it in Denton. As it turned out no new deaf schools were created. But it was one of the things that was hanging fire all during the session. The legislature decided not to create any new schools for the deaf. So the question of actual location was never reached. I didn't have anything to show for the project except--just to spend some time on it.

Something that I spent a lot of time on that made the session interesting was the move in Dallas to try to get the state to take over the Graduate Research Center, now called the Southwest Center for Advanced Studies. There's a great move in Dallas, among Chamber of Commerce people, to get the state to take over that institution and make a Texas-style M. I. T. of it. Such an institution undoubtedly would impinge on the roles of our two colleges here. All this was something that was the subject of a lot of telephone conversations back and forth between me and our University President and others, and a lot of trying to see what Dallas interests were trying to do

and see to what the University of Texas was going to do and what we should be doing about it all, because Dallas wanted their "M. I. T." to be under auspices of the University of Texas. And I think that this is an example of the type of thing that happens when higher education and politics get mixed up together. The Graduate Research Center had been created as a private institution by wealthy Dallas people, who underwrote it. They did a lot of research work for the government and I guess for industry and got a lot of research grants that help support it. But they've come to the conclusion, evidently, that they need public support in order to have the type of institution that they want.

Dallas, apparently, has never felt that it has ever had its own state college or state university. They picture themselves as suffering in comparison with Houston, for instance, where they have the University of Houston. And suffering in comparison to West Texas, where they have Texas Tech to serve the area. Dallas leaves the impression that the North Texas area is deficient in higher educational facilities. And this is the thinking that has entered into their move to try to do something with this Graduate Research Center. And their desire, frankly stated, was to get it linked up with the University of Texas--and have it as a branch of the University of Texas, as a sort of a technical institute. And all during the legislative session, negotiations were going on between the backers of the Graduate Research Center and the University of Texas. Negotiations as to under what terms would the Center become a part of the University, and what control would the University have over the Center, what would be the relation-

ship between the two faculties, and how it would all be handled.

A bill was actually drawn up and dropped in the hopper which would provide for the transfer of the Graduate Research Center to the University of Texas, but action on it was not pushed. This was being watched here in Denton with some concern and with the feeling that if the negotiations with the University of Texas broke down, the civic leadership of Dallas perhaps would push for creation of a brand new school. Well, my worry, of course, was, "What should I--what can I, as a member of the legislature, be doing to make sure that some strong, rival institution won't develop within thirty miles of our own back doors?" I worked as much as possible with the Dallas delegation to find out what they were doing. Most of them were trying to find out what Erik Jouson was doing. What finally happened was, or at least the disposition of it--so far as the legislature was concerned was, that the people in Dallas and the University of Texas never could get together on a deal. The Dallas interests apparently did not attempt to get together with Denton interests on any kind of a deal. North Texas State University and T. W. U. had a plan which, at the proper time, they intended to offer for the coordination of the Graduate Research Center into a joint operation with the schools in the area. But the appropriate time for that plan to be presented, seemingly, never did come.

In the back of my mind, and in the back of the mind of those in Denton who were working with this, we felt that there might be a time when it would be appropriate to offer our solution to the problem. One of the things involved in timing was the relationship with the University of Texas. If the Denton institutions moved in too fast,

it might make the University of Texas a little more anxious to take the thing over. If the University of Texas and the Graduate Research Center had ever worked out a deal for the University of Texas to take over the Graduate Research Center, I am afraid the legislature would have endorsed it.

In the absence of making a deal with the University of Texas, some of us feared that the civic interests of Dallas might push for an independent four-year college for Dallas--trade out votes with West Texas, where Tech wanted a medical school--trade out with the University of Houston, which wanted various things. The large city delegations, now, are beginning to have enough power in the legislature, that if they ever get together on something and make enough trade-outs among themselves, they can get just about anything they set out after. Anyway, nothing happened legislatively on the Graduate Research Center, but it was a matter of concern all through the session--as to what they were about to do, or try to do.

Another matter that was of interest during the session to a member of the legislature from our area was judicial redistricting. The lawyers cry on my shoulder about how congested the district court docket is here in Denton county, so we try to do something about it. I introduced a bill to create an additional court for Denton county, feeling that such a bill probably could not pass, but would help me sell the idea that we needed relief through a redistricting bill. Actually the court situation did get to be a rather major issue in the legislature in the closing weeks, as to what about new courts, whether new courts should be created or not, and whether there would be state-wide judi-

cial redistricting. The legislature, after giving a good many indications that it would redistrict the state judicially, failed to do so. And then the House and Senate, both, began to pass bills creating new courts. But those of us who were afraid we weren't going to get our courts, were not willing to see anybody else get theirs. And in the by-play that took place between courts that were created in the House as compared to courts created in the Senate--nobody got any courts at all. And this is probably as it should be, if we ever are going to have state-wide judicial redistricting.

Now subcommittee work was interesting to me. Of course, we all serve on a large number of subcommittees and a lot of these only give passing attention to the bills that are before us, I'm sorry to say. Occasionally you'll be on a subcommittee where a bill is presented where you can do some real work. There was one challenge that we had that I thought was meaningful. As we all remember, last fall the people of Texas adopted a constitutional amendment which will allow the state to pay death benefits to law enforcement officers and firemen who are killed while in pursuit of their duties. Under this constitutional amendment, the state was enabled to pass a law setting up a system under which the families of deceased law enforcement officers and firemen could be compensated.

Well a bill, then, was introduced early in the session to implement this constitutional amendment. And it was heard in state affairs committee and it was obvious that the bill was incomplete--that it had been drawn up in haste and it raised some real questions as to what is good, sound public policy in this area--and exactly what kind of bene-

fits can you afford to pay--and how should they be apportioned between the children and the widow--and whether they should be lump sum benefits or monthly benefits--and how you would define the conditions of death under which the payment would be made. These were all things that had to be resolved--that were not resolved when the bill was introduced. And I was one of three who was on a subcommittee to work on this bill and it so happened that the other two were just as interested in it as I was and we spent a lot of time interviewing people, trying to find out how the thing would dovetail with Social Security benefits and with any other benefits that these surviving families might get. We considered what would be the proper state agency to administer it; we called on the Texas Research League to give us information about how these things are handled in other states, and spent so much time on it, that the firemen and policemen began to think that we were going to kill their bill.

But, we came out with, I think, a good piece of legislation which illustrates what I think is an important need in committee work--and that is to come out with a bill that has considered all the angles that are involved. We came out with a bill that passed the House and Senate unanimously.

On the juvenile delinquency committee, I think I did some constructive subcommittee work. There again, we were faced with a situation where an idea for a bill (and that's basically what a lot of bills are when they are introduced) is just an idea and this idea has to be checked and rechecked. And as you begin to hear opposition, you have to consider how you can remove the valid objections of the opposition,

and still come out with a good bill. The bill on juvenile delinquency that I worked on in a subcommittee was one that I was a co-signer of that I really didn't draw up. But, to explain it, I was on an interim committee on juvenile delinquency, that held hearings all over the state prior to the beginning of the legislative session.

And our committee made a report, following these hearings, in which we recommended certain pieces of legislation. And our committee staff drafted some ten or eleven different bills implementing these recommendations. And Representative Stewart, who was chairman of the committee, and I were co-sponsors of all those bills. The reason I say I didn't have much to do with drafting it is, that a lot of our recommendations were in the nature of ideas of needs. Our committee staff in Austin took these ideas that we had and these ideas that had been presented to us in our hearings, and attempted to draft legislation that would embody these ideas. So, even though we had had hearings for several months and we had thought about a lot of these things and had some pretty strong ideas, ourselves, as members of the interim committee, when it came down to actual bill-drafting on some of the bills, all we could do--or our staff could do--was to put down a generally desired idea. When the session convened, witnesses appeared on these bills, and then the bills went to subcommittee where we concentrated on trying to wash out the details and the objections.

Well, to give you an example, juvenile judges had kept telling our interim committee that they ought to have some way to get to the parents of juveniles in the juvenile court, that the county didn't have enough authority over the parents of offenders. And the feeling was expressed

that it would be good for the child and be good common sense, when a juvenile committed some act of property destruction, to make, as part of the disposition of the case, the parents pay for it. This is something that can be debated, but the judges said that they didn't have that authority now. Now, parents are responsible for the actions of their children under a number of conditions, but that is part of recovery under a civil suit, where the injured party sues the parent for compensation, and it is not part of the disposition of the juvenile offense. Now what the judges said was, that very few people who are hurt by a juvenile act would go to the trouble to sue the parents to get recovery.

Yet, they thought that it would be in some instances helpful to rehabilitation for the child or the parent to pay for some of the damage. So, we introduced a bill which would make the parents responsible for the damages caused by juvenile delinquents and give the juvenile judge the power to make the parents pay for these damages as a part of the disposition of the case. We were getting into an area where there could be a lot of controversy--a lot of discussion. I was chairman of the subcommittee that worked on this bill and for a while it looked as if we were going to just have to throw up our hands and give up on the whole idea. But, finally we came up with what, I think, was an equitable solution to the problem, which I won't go into here. But, it was a matter of trying something out, and then finding the holes in it, and going back to see what you could do to eliminate those problems.

As it turned out, after we did all that work, the Governor vetoed that bill, but supposedly it was not on any substantive matter in the

bill, although I have not seen a copy of his proclamation. But according to the paper, he vetoed it because we introduced some matter in the bill that we hadn't indicated in the caption and that is something that I feel embarrassed about, but it's a very good lesson to learn--that is that in all these subcommittee labors, when you're revising these bills and trying to find some element of compromise and you're trying to take care of some kind of objections--we've got to be good enough craftsmen to remember that under the constitution of Texas, the caption has got to indicate everything that is in the bill. We got so carried away with getting a bill that we could pass that we forgot the very mundane responsibility we had to change the caption to conform to the body of the bill. I learned a hard lesson that way.

I got interested, before the session started, in the teacher shortage. I don't know exactly what the genesis of it was, but I was thinking in terms of people entering the labor market at some period subsequent to graduation from college. I was thinking of people--say that have achieved the age of thirty or forty, and maybe in the case of widows needing to return to work, or a person going into some line of work and being dissatisfied and wanting to change. Suppose you're thirty-five, and you're a woman, and you're a widow--and you need to go to work. You've got a good education, you've got a good mind. Now, what I observed to be happening was, that this person could get a job with the federal government fairly easily, get a job with the state government fairly easily, get a job with industry fairly easily. If in a particular industry this person didn't have a skill, she could take a job and the employer could train her in the job. The federal government almost has a similar program. But, certainly industry has a pro-

gram of taking people and giving them training.

But if this person decides that she would like to teach, well she might get a job but it's going to be on the most tentative conditions. What she's got to do is go back to college and take some more work, probably a whole lot of work. To me, this represents an important deterrent to persons in their thirties and forties going into teaching, as opposed to going into any other line of work of comparable salary. So I thought, "Well, why couldn't a person with a good education go into a public school system, and learn to be a good teacher in the public school system just as they go to work for an industry and learn on the job." That was probably not a very sound idea, but I thought enough of it to try to draft some legislation which would set up the machinery under which a person with a good education who desired to be a teacher could have on-the-job training as a teacher--became a teacher and be trained while she was teaching.

I found, as I learned more about the certification of teachers, that this was more of a far-out idea than I had contemplated. But my objective was to put entry into public school teaching on a comparable basis with other lines of work that this person could go into. And frankly, I had the idea that we might get some real good people in teaching that way. Just because they hadn't decided to take education courses and become qualified as teachers as undergraduates, didn't indicate to me that they would necessarily not be good teachers--in fact, I thought that the reverse might be true. I wrote Dr. Edgar (the State Commissioner of Education) about this idea and asked for his comments and suggestions. I also, in talking with school people about this

thing, I was referred to some magazine articles about teacher certification in general from a nation-wide standpoint, and found that throughout the country there is a trend to liberalize teacher certification requirements.

Even more important than that is a trend for states to have requirements more nearly uniform or fix it where it's easier to cross state lines, in teacher certification. There's a definite trend to try to eliminate state line barriers for teacher certification--a definite trend to try to eliminate something that would make it difficult for a person certified in Indiana to come to teach in Texas--the idea being to make it reciprocal and as easy as possible. So I got interested in anything that we had in Texas that might be a bar to interstate movement of certified teachers, and I found out that our statutory requirement for government courses, was such a bar--in the view of some. So I considered a bill on that. But, at any rate, Dr. Edgar suggested that I meet with the state board for teacher examiners, which was to meet in Austin just a day or so before the legislature was to convene. I was invited to come down and sit in on this board and tell them about the ideas that I'd had and get their reactions. This was a very interesting thing. I spent one Sunday afternoon with the board.

Now, under our teacher certification law, our law in Texas is quite general as to teacher certification requirements. What we do is to impose on the State Board of Education, really, the duty of making the requirements for teacher certification. And then we state

that the Board shall seek the advice of the State Commissioner on Education and also the advice of the State Board of Teacher Examiners. The state board of examiners is appointed by the State Board of Education, I believe. This is a group of teachers, school administrators, and college people who serve in an advisory capacity to the State Board of Education on certification matters. So, really, I imagine that most of the rules of the State Board of Education have their origin in this board of teacher examiners. Dr. Edgar advised me that this matter of certification requirements for mature persons who want to enter teaching, had already been before the board of teacher examiners--had been offered by a principal of one of the elementary schools in Austin who complained about what he was having to do to get his teachers certified. And since this was a subject that had been before the board, perhaps it would be valuable to have a meeting together, so I met with the board that afternoon, but I didn't get much encouragement from the board to do anything different from what was being done.

So I sat down sometime early in the session--one weekend--and drafted me a bill which would have asked the State Board of Education to develop a program under which persons with certain educational background could be offered teaching positions in the public schools with the understanding that in the school system where they were teaching they would get on-the-job training, which would make up any deficiencies that they might have so far as certification was concerned. Well, anyway, this bill, when introduced, created quite a stir

among college education faculties who felt that it was a slap at them. And it didn't draw much enthusiasm from the public school people who didn't particularly want to get into the teacher-training business. But as a result of the introduction of this bill, I had an opportunity to sit down with college people in this field, and I think perhaps faced with this sort of threat, they volunteered some suggestions for accelerating teacher training programs at colleges--which I was very grateful for.

And on the basis of those ideas, I discarded the original bill altogether, and wrote me a new bill which which gave up altogether the idea of having on-the-job training in the public school system--but which directed the Board of Education to work with the colleges of education, to develop special programs that would be directed particularly to the needs of mature persons who wanted to become qualified to teach, giving them a concentrated program which they could take and complete within a reasonable time. Now, this doesn't sound like anything great. But, one of the problems that persons have had who have wanted to become certified to teach after they've left college is that when they go to a college to find out what they have to take, they're usually given a long list of courses--not only education courses, but subject matter courses which don't take into consideration any job experience that they may have had, for instance, or any reading that they may have accomplished since they left school, or anything of that kind. I know of instances where such lists of

required courses have been absolutely ridiculous, were applied to the particular background and achievement of the person seeking certification.

Now, when this situation is called to the attention of people who are working in it, we have a situation that is similar to what we have in the Legislature when a goof is made. We say, in the House, that it was done in the Senate. And the Senate says that the House did it. Well, when you begin to point your finger at some of these embarrassing situations in teacher education, you'll find that your education departments in the colleges will say, "Well, the state board is the one who is responsible for this." And when you're talking to the state board and the State Commissioner of Education, they say, "Well, it's the college departments of education that are making this requirement." I guess this is natural. There is a division of responsibility there and a certain amount of leeway that leaves doubt in one's mind. I believe that in the legislature, I know more about teacher certification than any member of the House or Senate, and I'm still at a loss to understand exactly where the power of the board stops, and the discretion of the college activities begins. I think it's still an uncertain area--maybe it should be uncertain, but it has given rise to a lack of uniformity in certification requirements. A woman would write to East Texas State, for instance, and be told that she needed so many hours for teacher certification. She might write Sam Houston State and be told a totally different number of hours.

Anyway, I started trying to write out a bill which would be a directive to the education agency and to the colleges--that when someone came wanting to teach, who had a good academic record, and who had a Bachelor's degree, and who perhaps had work experience related to teaching, that they should be treated differently than an undergraduate who was attempting to qualify himself to teach. And that was the whole thing that I was trying to get over. Here's somebody coming to teach who may have had a lot of experience with church educational work. Well, under the rules and regulations of the Texas educational agency, no consideration whatsoever is given to this. It's as though you didn't have it. They can't give any recognition to it. This principal in Austin, who had appeared before the board earlier asking for some kind of special consideration for his teachers, seemed to me to be a person who was thinking along the same lines that I was and I contacted him. And it turned out later on he was immeasurable help because he was a principal who was working with the problem directly, while I was an outsider trying to see how it worked.

His name was M. K. Hage. He is principal of an elementary school in Austin and it's in an area where there are the level of income and achievement generally is high. A lot of University people live out there, faculty people. He found that--he found as he became acquainted with the people in his area--any number of the wives of University professors who had excellent--wonderful--educations, who were interested in children, who would like to teach. They didn't have

teacher's certificates, but they were well educated. Well, he began hiring some of these women to teach in his elementary school. And those of them that were turning out to be good teachers--of course, he was anxious to help them get certified. And when he sent them out to the University of Texas, even though they were teaching in his school, and even though they were doing what he thought was a superior job without taking any courses, these women would be told by the University of Texas that they would have to have so many hours of this, that, and the other, that the women would say it was impossible. "I can't go to school that many summers and retain my sanity--to get these requirements." So then Mr. Hage would go out and negotiate with the faculty at the University of Texas and in a few instances, get the requirements reduced.

This pinpointed a situation which education people are reluctant to admit. And that is that there are many people--well I don't say many--there are people who would make excellent teachers, who are deterred from going into teaching because of present requirements. And so, I was trying to work out a--to give the education departments and the state board some kind of directive--not that I felt that I could spell out what the requirements ought to be for a teaching certificate--but that they ought to be able to give credit for work experience.

Mr. Hage had a teacher that had done more work on specific dyslexia than anybody in this country. Now, specific dyslexia as I understand

it, is an ailment, or maladjustment of some kind that appears in some people where they have the utmost difficulty in reading. This is something that is just gradually beginning to come out--apparently research shows that some problem readers are problem readers because of specific dyslexia.

This woman had pioneered in this study and she had always taught in private schools. And her husband moved to Austin as a member of the faculty of the University of Texas, and this man--Mr. Hage--jumped with joy at the thought that he could get into his school system, a woman who had worked in this area of specific dyslexia. But she had no teacher's certificate; she hadn't ever had to have one, because she'd taught in private schools. When she went to the University of Texas to find out--and she was the authority, she knew more about teaching reading to specific dyslexia people than anybody in the country--when she went to the University of Texas to find out what she needed to take to become certified to teach reading in the elementary schools of Austin, she was given a ridiculously long list of courses that she had to take just as though she had been a University of Texas undergraduate co-ed. In other words, there was no consideration given, whatsoever, to the fact that she had been teaching for years and years and years. Now this isn't because the people at the University of Texas are particularly stupid, but it's because they are given a set of guidelines for the certification of teachers, and if she doesn't meet that set of guidelines--well they're scared to death to

certify her because they're afraid somebody's going to come down from the State Department of Education and gig them for not following the requirements. So they want her to take the same courses that an undergraduate would take who was learning to be an elementary teacher.

So anyway, that was my main project in the field of teacher education, and we finally got a bill passed which is general in nature but which does direct the State Board of Education to develop a program to recruit into teaching and to train for teaching, persons who have bachelor degrees, who have had some work experience related to teaching, who are not qualified to teach under existing rules and regulations. And it directs them to develop programs that will meet their particular needs and will do it quickly as possible and get them ready to teach and give them a reasonable course of study that they can complete in a reasonable time and that's about all the bill does. I had to keep watering it down to ever get it passed because, ah--one of the reasons I was fearful about getting it passed is because we are dealing in the legislature with so many technical fields that the members do not inform themselves in, and they are influenced by what people tell them a bill does. And if they begin to hear some opposition, why then they--it's easier not to do anything. The safest thing, politically, on a bill which changes teacher certification is not to vote for it if you're getting any kind of yelps from anybody. So I had to do everything possible to memorize opposition within the teaching profession, while still accomplishing as much of my objective as possible. There might be a

general feeling among public school teachers already certified, that I might be opening the gates to a lot of people to come into teaching that hadn't done all the work that they had done. And I was particularly concerned about possible opposition of the Texas State Teachers Association, who might not oppose what I was trying to do but might be fearful of what amendment would be offered if certification ever came up in the floor of the House. There's certainly a feeling among some legislators that there ought not to be any particular certification requirements at all. In other words, if you've got a college degree, you ought to be able to teach and particularly, the education courses ought not to be required. The TSTA is very cognizant of this attitude and very sensitive about my legislation having to do with certification.

I had a member of the education committee, who is the principal of a school in El Paso, who thought my bill was just fine--until he got one letter from one education prof. at Texas Western, and then he cooled off immediately about the bill. Instead of really reading the bill, and then being strong and saying, "Well, the man at Texas Western doesn't really understand this bill," he got very nervous and wishy-washy about it. Constituents, a lot of times, don't realize how much power they have. I've seen this happen in numbers of instances and it was real close to home on my little bill about teacher certification--where for one member of the legislature to get one letter against it made him really question it. Well, perhaps he should question. But on a bill like this, if too many members got too

many letters against it, I had a dead letter. So my problem was to try, in this area just like it is in any other area, to accomplish my major objective and still water it down enough to get a bill passed.

I am resuming this session, now, after a break for lunch and I'm not sure at just what point I left the microphone. I know I was discussing my legislative program having to do with teacher certification. And since I may have been rambling while ago, let me get a new start on it. First, let me--my primary bill on teacher certification was House Bill 664, and the reason I want to discuss it and some of the others is to illustrate part of the process involved in working up a bill... and passing it. This bill, like most other bills, started out as an idea. In some respects, it was different from the average bill introduced because I think most bills that are introduced in the legislature come from some kind of organized group or from some attorney who's in the specialty of drafting bills, like water bills or hospital bills or something like that. My bill came from my own brain, my own idea, and was not the product of any research or organization by any organized group, and to that extent, it's not perhaps a typical bill in the legislative process.

My interest in teacher certification was my own interest, prompted by my own observation of the situation and the original idea for it was my own. It started out with an idea that it ought to be easier for mature people with good educations to enter into teaching. And as I stated before, my first thought was that we should duplicate as much as possible the

situation that you find confronting a person who is seeking employment in private industry or in government--and that is that they are taken on the job and given training on the job. My first idea was to devise a means by which a person with a good education who desired to teach could enter upon a teaching job and take his training at the same time that he was beginning his initial teaching, through the public school system.

So I drew up a bill which provided that the Texas Education Agency would set up a system under which a person (with certain educational requirements) beginning public school teaching could get his certification requirements off, mainly, through on-the-job training in the local school district. I drafted this bill and sent it to the Texas Education Agency for their review and for their suggestions and they did give it their review with the comment that while they were not endorsing the bill, they would be glad to appraise it and comment on its workability and so on. They made a few suggestions for changes from a standpoint of workability and I incorporated their suggestions in the draft which I introduced.

Now, then, as I stated earlier, as word began to get out about this bill, people involved in training and certification of teachers in the colleges began to raise considerable objection and pointed out that this represented a shift from the traditional practice in Texas of having certification done by the colleges and the training done in the colleges. And, finally, I met here in Denton with a group of men who were teachers of education at North Texas State and for a couple of hours during the

afternoon, we discussed what I was trying to do with the bill. They suggested that the colleges were the proper places to do this training of teachers--not the public school system--and they felt that if they were given the leeway by the Texas Education Agency, they as college people could facilitate the training of teachers who were of a mature level. And I understood that they indicated that this type of training could be given to most people during a summer school session, that it could be concentrated, that courses could be combined, and that a crash program of teacher training could be offered by the colleges if they had the leeway from the Texas Education Agency to do so.

So, after this conference, I went back to Austin and began to write another bill. I came up with a bill which I introduced as Bill 664, and it directed the Texas Education Agency to develop programs which would attract into teaching and teacher training programs certain qualified persons not originally trained for teaching. It provided that these persons would be given accelerated training programs at the colleges in Texas approved for teacher education. Accelerated programs would be developed and would be offered during the summer session, so that the person desiring to teach could enroll in this crash training program at the beginning of the summer and at the end of the summer, he would have gotten off all the requirements necessary for teacher certification. And that is the way that House Bill 664 was introduced.

Now, after its introduction, of course, I continued to have correspondence from people and points of view expressed. We had hearings in the Education Committee at which persons discussed the bill. And it

went to a subcommittee composed of five representatives who are members of the Education Committee. This subcommittee did not move very rapidly with the bill, although there seemed not to be any major objections, from witnesses at the committee hearings except to the fact that the training would be limited to one summer. They felt that practice teaching couldn't be accomplished in that period and there would be some needs that could not be met. And as a concession toward getting a bill that could be supported and could be passed, I eliminated that limitation and finally we persuaded the subcommittee to report a bill out that continued the directive that I had in the original bill to the Texas Educational Agency to develop a program of training to qualify teachers who were mature and who had a good college education, already. And try to have a program that they could embark on and complete within a reasonable time and I provided a wrinkle that Mr. M. K. Hage suggested and that is that the suggested and that is that the determination of the training program to be pursued by any individual candidate for certification would be made by a three-member evaluation committee located at each institution of higher learning which was engaged in the training and certification of teachers. This three-member evaluation team to be made up of two members from some department or school outside the school or department of education. And this is the bill that finally passed the House and Senate and was approved by the governor.

Now, I also introduced and passed House Bill 229 which was directed toward the statutory requirement that a person who becomes certified

to teach in Texas must have completed a course in the Texas and American constitutions. House Bill 229 provides that in meeting these requirements, a person who has received his training in another state may meet these requirements by taking an examination administered by the Texas Education Agency, rather than having to enroll in a college course in these subjects. This bill proved not to be controversial.

I also enjoyed working on a bill which was drawn up at the University of Texas and which was handed to me for introduction and handling in the legislature--House Bill 935--which had the effect of eliminating the statutory Texas government requirement for degrees above the Bachelor's Degree. This is something that didn't have a wide interest to people, but it was applauded by people engaged in graduate education in Texas. We had to make some amendments to this bill as it went through the legislative process but we preserved our purpose.

Now, another interest that I had in the legislature this session besides the bills dealing with education was constitutional revision. I felt that the governor's proposal for constitutional revision--that is for revision of the whole constitution by a citizens' convention--was very likely not going to receive the support of the legislature. In that suspicion...it turns out I was correct. But back before the session began, of course, it was difficult to know for sure what the reaction would be. I felt that the problem of constitutional revision in Texas could have been being met through the years, if the legislature had paid more attention to the amending process. If our constitutional amendments...if...let me say this, that we could have made some

progress toward constitutional revision by the piecemeal method through the amendment process if sufficient attention and thought had been given to this. And so I had the idea that a bill should be drafted which would give the constitutional amendments committees in the House and Senate an advisory committee of outstanding people over the state, who could work with the constitutional amendments committees in trying to originate revisionary-type constitutional amendments that could be submitted to the people one at a time, and if they were adopted, over a period of years they would in effect accomplish revision.

As it turned out, the Governor's proposal, pretty well, had the support of the Speaker and something that was close to what the Governor wanted was passed out by the House. It was not passed by the Senate. My proposal for setting up this constitutional amendments advisory committee was by-passed in favor of a thorough-going revision of the constitution by a commission to be appointed by the governor and others. Possibly as a result of my interest in revision and my particular proposal I was appointed by the Speaker the other day to serve on the constitutional revision commission that is being set up.

Another subject in which I was interested all session, but didn't do anything about until toward the end of the session, is preservation of the present governor's mansion as a home for Texas governors, rather than see it fall into decay or see it abandoned, as many have suggested, in favor of a brand new mansion for the governor. I was at a little bit of a loss as to how to proceed to

accomplish this and didn't get to work on it until the latter part of the session. At that time, some people representing history and heritage groups in the state, indicated to me that they would favor exactly what I had in mind and that was that the mansion should be retained-- the present mansion should be retained as a home for Texas governors; it should not be replaced by a brand new mansion if the present mansion is at all adapted to major repair and major renovation. With the encouragement of some people in this field, then, I introduced a resolution calling for a joint committee to be created by the House and Senate to study every aspect of the structure of the present governor's mansion, and on the basis of the study, to make recommendations to the next legislature as to whether or not the mansion can be preserved as the home for Texas governors, and if it can be, what needs to be done in order to make the mansion meet the needs of the first families that occupy it.

I was also interested during the session in trying to eliminate the practice of salary supplementation that has developed in the state, particularly in the field of higher education. I introduced a bill which would have prohibited any appointive officer of the state, whose salary was a low item in the appropriation bill, from drawing any salary from private sources or drawing any salary that was not specified in the appropriation bill. I had some encouragement that some favorable attention would be paid to this bill by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, but he never did give me a hearing on the bill, so he must not have been very sympathetic.

So far as technique concerning the legislative process goes, I might go back just a minute to the resolution I referred to a while ago about the preservation of the governor's mansion. The suspicion that I had was that the quote, power structure, unquote in Austin politics, had already made up its mind about the mansion. I had a strong feeling that the governor and certainly the state Building Commission had already decided that the mansion ought to be replaced. I felt that I was bucking a trend but I made some discreet inquiries and found that there was at least one fairly well-placed individual in the state government who felt that the present mansion ought to be retained and who was opposed to any headlong rush into construction of a new mansion and that person was the Lieutenant Governor.

And so before I went very far with my draft for the mansion resolution, I discussed the matter with the Lieutenant Governor, found that he was sympathetic to the creation of a study committee and he made some suggestions for what should be in the resolution. I'd already tentatively located a sponsor in the Senate for the resolution--Senator Hardeman, who has been identified with a love for history and tradition in this state. I discussed the matter with him and found him quite interested in working with me on the Senate side. So I drafted a proposed resolution creating a study committee and gave it to Senator Hardeman and he reviewed it. He had a member of the Legislative Budget Board staff with whom he worked closely review it for suggestions, particularly with a reference to how such

a study would be financed, especially in view of the fact that such a committee would probably have to employ some architectural assistance. We finally solved the problem about where the study committee would be payable out of the contingent expense funds of the Senate and the House. Then Senator Hardeman, in an inspired moment and knowing how politics works through his long years of experience, said, "I suggest that we make the Lieutenant Governor chairman of the committee and make the Speaker the vice-chairman of the committee and that way you'll be sure and get your money--get whatever amount of money and also took care of the problem of who would be chairman and vice chairman. Our resolution then was introduced in the House to provide that the Lieutenant Governor would be the chairman and that he would appoint two Senators to serve with him, that the Speaker of the House would be the vice chairman and he would appoint two House members to serve with him and the six man committee would make a study of the governor's mansion with the view to recommending a long range program and policy for the state of Texas with reference to whether the present mansion ought to be kept and used or whether it ought to be replaced by a brand new mansion.

I'm going to return now to the first part of this recording, and that is just general observations about the legislative session. And I want to comment on the rivalry that existed this session between the Speaker of the House and the Lieutenant Governor...comment on that rivalry just a little bit. This was something that was very noticeable during the session, especially in the earlier stages of

the session when the Speaker was very anxious to get some new rules adopted and the Lieutenant Governor indicated he was quite well pleased with the old rules so far as the joint rules of the House and Senate are concerned.

There was a play in the Senate to get an immediate pay raise for state employees. I assume that this play was instigated by the Lieutenant Governor. The Speaker and the Governor felt that they could not go along with an immediate salary increase for state employees, that they preferred to wait and handle it in the regular manner through the new appropriation bill for the new year. This brought a lot of publicity in the newspapers about the rivalry between the Lieutenant Governor and the Speaker and I don't think that there is any question but what during the session there was this rivalry and that each was interested in out-manuevring the other. And I think that we could have had a very difficult situation develop but apparently the thing that saved the situation and kept the session from bogging down into complete inaction because of this rivalry, was the fact that there were definite limits to the rivalry. I think that both Preston Smith and Ben Barnes and their advisors had the good judgement not to press too far. They managed to recognize that if the rivalry got too far along on issues that were too critical, that everyone would suffer. So, I believe that restraint in this rivalry was what saved the situation and I don't see any noticeably bad effects as a result of the rivalry, so far as the legislative product is concerned.

Both the Lieutenant Governor and the Speaker managed to at least

publicly keep their good humor; they managed to communicate with one another; they managed to speak to each other. Their advisors on either side were able to stay in communication and rivalry did not deepen, apparently, into real personal difficulties and did not really hamper lines of communication. Lines of communication remained open, the House and Senate leaders were able to exchange views and work together on a number of matters, even though the rivalry was present and even though it did threaten at times to really become serious. At least, these are my observations...I was perhaps not close enough to either man to know how deeply serious it became. There was one point when the Speaker and the Governor made a very bold play to try to take the appropriation process completely out of the hands of the Lieutenant Governor. This was covered pretty well in the newspapers. The play was that the House would pass an appropriation bill that would come over to the Senate and that enough Senators could be led to rebel against Preston Smith so that a majority of the Senate would vote to accept the House appropriation bill without throwing it into conference. There apparently was a time when the governor and the Speaker felt that as a practical matter they could get enough Senators to vote to do that--it was considered a definite possibility. As we know, that was not the outcome. The Speaker and Governor failed in this effort. They could not influence a majority of the Senators, finally, to go against the Lieutenant Governor; and the appropriations bill, as it has in every session that I know anything about, did go to a conference committee. But it's interesting to note that there was even the

thought on the part of the Governor and the Speaker that enough Senators could be influenced against the Lieutenant Governor in such a major challenge to his leadership.