

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION
NUMBER 22

Interview with
Dave Allred
August 9, 1967

Place of Interview: Wichita Falls, Texas
Interviewer: Ronald Marcello
Terms of Use: Release upon my death.
Approved: Dave Allred
Date: Nov. 20, 1968

Oral History Collection
Representative Dave Allred

Interviewer: Dr. H. W. Kamp

Place of Interview: Wichita Falls, Texas

Date: August 9, 1967

Dr. Kamp: This is H. W. Kamp, Wichita Falls, Texas, August 9, 1967, and this is an interview with Mr. Dave Allred, member of the Texas House of Representatives. Mr. Allred:

Mr. Allred: Mr. Kamp, I think one good place to start might be to deal first with some of my pre-conceived notions of the legislature. Really about my only brush with the legislature in Texas prior to my election was back when Dad was in office in the late '30's and I was five or six years old. I did help to cover the Alabama House of Representatives and Senate a little bit when I worked for the Associated Press over there so I was slightly familiar with the legislative process. But as far as the Texas House, frankly its history has not been the best in the world. One man--a former mayor here--when I told him I was thinking about running, he said, "Well, you're following some rather undistinguished members that we've had from this county, and some of them have not made the best record." I don't think he knew when he spoke to me that one of my cousins served in the House about 15 years ago, and I'm sure he wasn't including him in that.

In any event, the Texas House until recently was very limited as far as office space. And for a while, the members had their secretaries with them right at the desk. Then later they moved the secretaries, as I understand it--I wasn't there, but I've heard some of the older members talk about it--they moved the secretaries into the little hall behind the House chamber, which now has telephone booths and things like this in it. It's sort of our equivalent of the cloak rooms of the national Congress. But many times the only way a member could get any privacy for dictation was to have the secretary come to his home. And particularly for a member who might leave his family at home, this could lead to some involvement with the secretaries aside from business. The legislature, particularly the House, has had this reputation a little bit in the past, and I was sort of expecting much the same thing to be carried on still by some of the members. I know convention behavior, let's say, as opposed to conventional. That is convention behavior is the type of conduct practiced by some people who are away from home. I saw it a lot in the Army Reserve training when guys would go off for their two weeks of summer camp.

And so in that respect, I expected much more partying, much more playing around than I actually found when I got there. And I think that this is due in part to the fact that the stories were probably exaggerated as stories of this type often are, and also to the fact that I frankly think the quality of the legislature is coming up. Another thing that I found was not true entirely was that freshmen are seen and not heard. I know in the national

Congress a freshman's maiden speech is a big thing. He makes a lot of it and labors over it and so forth; because I've worked for some men in Congress and kind of watched what went on there. But in the House you're encouraged even as a freshman to participate in the debates and you're not discouraged. Now when I was getting ready to go down there, I commented that I might be heard from once or twice during the five month session. My cousin, who served 15 years ago, said that's about twice more than they will want to hear from a freshman. And perhaps in his day that was true. But I found that freshmen, as long as they had something to say, were listened to with as much respect as any other member.

You have to make a decision when you go down to the legislature on what type of approach you're going to make. My personal opinion is that there's a great deal to be said for a first impression in something like this. If I had gone down to the legislature and either set out to (quote) "make a name for myself" or set out on a particular crusade, I have a feeling that some of the old heads, and there are men who have been down there for fifteen or twenty years, would have said, "This kid's getting too big for his britches and we need to push him down." And I think, particularly coming from a political background as I do, this would be more true of me than it would be for someone who had no political background. The reason for that is something I've run into all my life--the attitude of: "He thinks he's smart because his old man was governor." My personal feeling is that what my father did politically doesn't make me anything special one way or the other.

But people don't see it that way. I've drawn criticism and perhaps I'm a little extra careful because of it.

But in any event, I went down to Austin with the idea that I was going to try to be a reasonable, thoughtful-type member and try to do a job rather than go down there and try to make a name for myself politically. And I think once you make a name for yourself as a reasonable person, then people on both sides of the fence will respect you a lot more and you will be more effective. I worked with guys on bills who held political views diametrically opposed to mine. But as one guy commented: "You're a reasonable man. I can talk to you." So this was the type thing that I went down there for. I found that freshmen could get up, could ask questions, participate in the debates, could make speeches. I made a couple of speeches myself.

One thing you had to avoid was being on the microphone all the time. They have two "mikes" in the House. The author of a bill will be on the front mike, which is just below the Speaker's stand, and he explains the bill. Then members go to the back mike and ask questions. And the back mike has become known as the "snorting pole" because of the type questions that get asked on occasion. I know there was one representative who was given to asking what I felt were some rather rude and insulting questions. Maybe the questions needed to be asked but not in the phrasing and tone that he used. And I feel like this hurt the boy in the long run as far as working with other members because the truth of the matter is you can't be a prima donna down there. You've got to work with the

other members if you want to get your bills passed. This has good sides and bad sides. And I don't mean, "Go along to get along." But it's just like anything else. I'll get into this a little further. I made some notes on it. It's a consensus-type of government, and I think that's a good thing. You had to decide what type of approach you wanted to take. I found that most people, if they felt like you really honestly held a belief even if it was contrary to their ideas, would at least respect you for it. People generally want to know where you stand. You can run into some pitfalls there that I'll get to in a minute, but even if they disagree with you, if you let them know where you stand and they feel like it's an honestly held belief and not one that's held simply for political convenience, they will pretty well respect you for it.

I feel that I wasn't approached very much by the lobby for anything other than simply saying, "Let us tell you about our bill." And I feel like one reason was because they knew where I stood on a lot of things and they figured: "Well, we know where that guy is. Let's see if we can change some of the leaners one way or the other." I don't mean to indicate here a closed mind at all, because on some bills I started out thinking one way and ended up voting the other way after I heard the debate and tried to decide. But in any event, as I say, there was much less partying than I expected and there were many, many more long hours of work put in than I had expected. For example, take Joe Ratcliff from Dallas. I worked anywhere from 10:00 to 11:00 at night. And he was often still working when I left.

You get down there and if you like this sort of thing, it's not like a regular job. In my case, I enjoyed it. It was interesting. I had worked as a staff member for Senator Ralph Yarborough and Congressman Jack Brooks and Congressman Ray Roberts, all of Texas, and so I had seen it from that side of the fence. Also, of course, it's just like in the Army, in that every private wants to be a general and feels he can run the Army better than anybody else. I had my own theories and ideas of what I would do if I were a representative, and it was fun to try to put a lot of those into practice. I got to the office usually around 7:30 or 8:00 in the morning and stayed until 10:00 or 11:00 at night. And it did cut deeply into my family life which is unfortunate and I was grateful that I had an understanding wife. I did try on weekends to get away because family life is a very definite part of things. But I just found that I thoroughly enjoyed being a representative. Now if it had been for a longer time, certainly I would have had to take off more for the family. But I thought for those few months while I was trying to learn, trying to get organized, and this type of thing--that it would be all right to work these hours. But I found that when I finished, there were other guys who were staying even longer than I was, or at least as long. Joe Ratcliff is one--there were any number of others. Bill Bass, from Van Zandt County, Ben Wheeler, who was, I think, a very conscientious member, and Fred Head from Tyler--any number of them. These are guys I happen to know personally, and you notice the guys that you know, more than the others. But there were guys who stayed many many hours. And

then the committee sessions ran very late in the evening, notably the State Affairs Committee. Representative Dick Cory, of Victoria, was chairman of the State Affairs group and some of their hearings ran to two, three, and four o'clock in the morning. I was sort of glad I was not on State Affairs, although it is one of the more powerful committees down there.

Some of the hearings were "window dressing," letting people feel they'd had their say, when the members and those who followed politics closely knew the particular bill was most likely not going to get out of the committee because the speaker or the chairman opposed it or some similar reason. But sometimes a bill surprised us and moved, perhaps in a modified form. Or the hearings might be sort of ground work for reconsideration in a succeeding session. So the hearings were probably worthwhile in those respects.

And then of course, the Appropriations Committee had hearings, particularly at the start, where every department and agency came in and presented their needs, and so forth. I was a member of that committee and we were holding hearings morning, noon, and evening, particularly for the first few weeks, until we had heard everyone. And then later on there came the time when we had to get together--this time in the private dining room in Heatly's apartment house--to discuss the bill. Representative Bill Heatly, of Paducah, is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. In fact, I think he holds the record for the longest tenure of chairmanship of that committee thus far. And he got the whole committee together one evening, and we went through the bill page by page, and it's

about three or four inches thick, mimeographed on legal size paper. So there was a lot of ground to cover. We didn't go item by item but we went heading by heading, that would be the University of Houston...let's say, or the Liquor Control Board, or the State Board of Control--this type of thing, and any member could comment at any time. So there were a lot more hours put in and a lot of people went down there trying to do a good job.

One of my pet theories is that one of the reasons our political system has lasted as long as it has, and endured as well as it has, is the fact that men who are elected to office, regardless of their motivations often rise above personal gain and pettiness. My motivations were very mixed. I mean I had some personal ambition, I am sure mixed in with a sense of history--and I will cover that in a minute. And I am sure there were other guys who get into politics for a lot of different reasons: personal profit, personal ambition, wanting to be somebody. My opponent, for example, as much as anything, wanted to be somebody when he ran for legislature. Whatever their reasons, when people get into an office, the office quite often shapes them. The larger the office, I think, the more this is true. The presidency, for example, has brought out greatness that the men themselves who held the office probably didn't realize existed. And I think this is true, even in as small an office as the legislature, which is kind of way way down the ladder somewhere from the Presidency.

I mentioned my own personal motivations. I like to say that I am the fourth generation in public service. My mother's father's

father was a district attorney at Hamilton, Texas. And then her father, the late Claude Miller, who, was raised in Hamilton, went to Oklahoma. He was the delegate to the statehood convention in Oklahoma--was very active politically there. He was instrumental in helping get the capitol moved to Oklahoma City and having several new counties formed out of what was a very large county. He went to the first Democratic convention in Oklahoma, and stood up on a chair and shouted everyone else down and nominated his man for Congress and the man served for about twenty years. I am sorry I don't remember his name. Then Mr. Miller, my grandfather, moved to Wichita Falls, in 1919. He served on the city council here in Wichita Falls. Then, of course, there was Dad's career in public life. So I figure I am fourth generation in public service, and I deliberately choose the word "service."

And to me this means something in two ways. One way is that I think everybody ought to do public service where they can, and how they can...not necessarily political public service but volunteer work or something similar. And the other thing is, I am kind of an amateur historian and it means something to me to be a fourth generation in this along with the fact that if my son or daughter decide to go into politics they can be fifth-generation. I am not going to try to push them into that direction, but if they have a leaning and want to try it, well power to them. In addition I think that there is a certain amount of prestige that goes with the office, although you get your feeling of prestige pushed down pretty much, sometimes. I mean, most people don't know what office

you hold. They don't know whether you are in Congress or dog catcher. But they do know that you are some kind of an officeholder and when they need you they find out right quick who you are. I mean when they want you to vote a certain way or they need help getting their child into a state school or something like that. Then too, as I say, certainly there is some personal ambition. I would like to go on in politics if I can, but one of the things about politics is you not only have to be prepared and have some background and also have the knack of getting elected...a friend of mine said if you are going to be a statesman, you have to be elected first... you also have to have some of the breaks. That is, you have to have some place to run for. So I don't really know what I'll do in the future. I don't have any great campaign planned out--you know today the house, tomorrow the governorship--or anything like that. But I found that my best laid plans never work out anyway. So I am just going to play it by ear and see what happens. But whatever, there are a variety of things that motivate a person.

One of them, in my case at least, is the chance to help people. I discovered as a staff member in Congress how much help you can be to people. A lot of it is the sort of thing that people could do for themselves if they just knew where to go or who to see. But they don't, and many people tend to get flustered and confused when they are faced with the governmental framework. And certainly as our government grows, the framework is getting larger, and the forms are becoming more complicated and departments are piling upon departments. A phrase I use in a speech sometimes is that something

"grew as fast as the government department." In any event, the type of help that you can render is quite often of an advisory nature: simply telling someone where to go or calling some official's attention to a problem. For example, a man came to me the other day. He had sold a car and the man he had sold it to had sold it again, intending for it to be junked. Consequently, he had not registered the change of title. The man who bought it as an agent for the junk dealer, sold it instead to another person, and again didn't register the title change. So the title remained in this particular man's name. The man who finally ended up with the car had had several wrecks with it, and the Department of Public Safety was trying to take away the license of the man who had sold the car two years before.

He was writing and squabbling with them back and forth. When he came to me about it, I realized--having worked around government and so forth--that he might be squabbling with the wrong department. DPS deals with drivers license but the Department of Motor Vehicles, which is under the Highway Department, deals with car registration. So I called that day and talked to a man in the Highway Department. And I think I was helpful in getting this thing straightened out. Now I want to specify here: political influence has a bad connotation and quite often I think people tend to suspect the worst of the politician when usually it's not so. There are some, certainly, who have broken the rules and violated the laws. But most of the help that a man in politics is able to give is within the law. I'm not ruling out that sometimes people do go beyond the law and I think

it's a mistake when they do, but in my case I found that I can help people simply by knowing where to go and what to do.

Sometimes people get a little huffy when they want you to break the law and you won't do it and the implication is "Well, you would do it for anyone else, but you won't do it for me." And they go away huffy. That's one of the casualties of politics. You make enemies as well as friends. But I think one of the reasons I went into it was because there is a chance to do a lot of good and it makes me feel good. And I think a lot of people who are in politics have their own theories of government. I have my own ideas about how the state ought to be run, how the nation ought to be run. So do many others. A friend of mine, for example, was an Episcopal rector of a church in Sillsbee, Texas. His name is Davis Carter. And Congressman Brooks from the Beaumont area offered Davis a chance to be his administrative assistant. I talked to Davis after he had completed about ten years as Jack Brooks' assistant and had certainly had an influence on how the Congressman voted on legislation, an influence on bills that the Congressman introduced, and so forth. They were very close friends and Brooks was a very conscientious, hard-working Congressman. And Davis told me, "Well, I felt like I could stay on as rector of the church in Sillsbee, or I could go up and really have a say in what our nation was doing." He chose to go with Brooks even though the combination of religion and politics may seem a little unusual. I think it's not as unusual as people like to think, but it is a little unusual.

I had much the same feeling that here was a chance to put some of my ideas to work and perhaps to be able to influence the trend of government. Because our government is not a static thing--despite the fact many people try to make it so. I felt I had a chance to influence the trend of government toward what I felt was the best course for the state of Texas to take. Of course, one member of the House is not going to influence the state a whole lot, but you can do it to a certain extent and certainly you can do more than most private citizens. One of the strengths of our government, I think, is the fact that it is flexible and is able to change through court interpretations, through changes in laws, and so forth. I don't hold with the traditionalist view that our forefathers set up of government and by jing we ought to just stick right with exactly every jot and tittle of what they said. What they said is in the eye of the beholder anyway. It depends on his interpretation. Also, our forefathers certainly did not anticipate a world of atomic bombs, jet liners, and so forth. And I think the thing that has kept our government as good as it is, and it's the greatest government on the face of this earth, is the fact that it's been able to change within its framework.

In the legislature, when I got down there, I found that there were definitely people or a group in charge, which I had sort of expected. In this case, as it usually is, about 90 per cent of the time, it was the Speaker and his group who were in charge. The Speaker is elected by the membership and Barnes is a very sharp, shrewd individual and ran the House pretty well. But in any event,

you had to decide, too, what stance you were going to take politically. In our particular case, and this session is really the only one that I have first hand knowledge of, the Speaker is a very close political ally of Governor John Connally. And consequently, it might be said that the Connally forces...the Establishment, if you will, or whatever you want to call it...were pretty much in the saddle in the House. This may not have been true in the Senate because you have the unusual thing here of Preston Smith having already said that he plans to run for governor regardless of who runs, whether it's Mr. Connally running for a fourth term or whether his opponent is Speaker Barnes or whoever it is.

I felt that if I went down there and started popping off too much, it would only antagonize and wouldn't accomplish a whole lot. Some of the members of the House, I felt, were more after Connally. They were more interested in the politics of the thing than in any merit the bill might have or anything else. I felt there were quite often cases where they would vote a certain way or take a certain stance or issue a certain statement with an eye toward how it would affect the statewide political picture. How could they get John Connally? Or, on the other side of the spectrum, how could they help John Connally? Or how could they help further Ben Barnes' political ambition?

I remember one time we were having a real close vote on something and they were having what they call a verification on the vote where each member has to be present in the chamber to verify

the way he voted. One of our members was gone and we were trying to find him. One of the Speaker's lieutenants said: "Let's not look too hard for him because we don't want to tie this up and make the Speaker vote. This is one he could get cut up on." I didn't find the member. I don't know whether the lieutenant found him and dumped him somewhere or what. But whatever the case, I felt that there were times when politics was the overriding consideration. I felt particularly that some of the arch-liberals were more interested in cutting the Governor than they were in accomplishing anything.

But these were only just a few people. We might compare this situation with these civil rights disorders now. Some of the people are getting pretty wild-eyed in their claims. Rap Brown, I think it was, said, "The Negro built this country and we're going to burn it." This is obviously not the case or a good approach and I think by their own excess such people weaken their case. One example might be the bill for state employees pay increase where it was proposed that it be done ahead of schedule. The governor opposed it and I think some of the people who pushed that proposal --not all certainly, because many of them were very definitely concerned about the state employees and justifiably so--were more interested in embarrassing Connally. The state employees are vastly underpaid. Some woman the other day was testifying in a court case that I heard. She was an employee at the state hospital. It seems to me her take-home pay was something like \$260, no \$160 a month or something like that. It was ridiculous. In this day and time,

a person doing the type work she did should not have been receiving that low an amount of money. But in any event, I felt that some of the people who were backing the pay advance proposal were doing so without much hope of success but with the feeling that it would put the Governor on the spot.

The other side of the coin was that the team, I thought, ran a very calloused operation in some cases, and I think this was more due to the lieutenants than to any of the "wheels." In one case Frank Lombardino of San Antonio had a bill that he had campaigned on. It was one of the principal parts of his campaign. The bill called for establishment of a four-year college at San Antonio. There was a bill up to give the governor a four-year term. I opposed the bill on the grounds that one:

I think that a two-year term keeps you closer to the people. If you get somebody in there who messes up, you can kick him out in two years. Secondly, unless the members of the House had four year terms and--I don't think that is wise--a governor with a four year term would be free on the off years to dabble in everybody else's election, and if he were a popular governor, he might well be able to eliminate a lot of these oppositions. I don't think this is particularly wise. This heads almost toward a dictatorship.

In any event one of the lieutenants of the team was chairman of the committee to which Lombardino's bill had been referred. And let me say right here in defense of my good friend, George Hinson, that it was not the Education Committee. Representative Hinson, from Mineola, headed the Education Committee--and I served

on it. He was a strong backer of education. And I think probably the guy--who was chairman of this other committee "backs" education --you know, just like everybody is for education. The question is: how you are going to do it. But this man told Frank, according to what Frank told me, "Frank, if you don't vote for this four-year amendment, your bill will never see the light of day."

Well, Frank had to make a decision then since this had been one of these big campaign issues. What was he going to do? He voted the way he thought was right. He voted against a four year term, which was his opinion of what was right. And his bill didn't see the light of day. Whether it would have otherwise is another question, because the Coordinating board, Texas Colleges and Universities, had also recommended against a University of San Antonio at this time. Not necessarily that the board opposed it, but the members of the board were recommending against everything until they could get organized and get their studies going and so forth. So, whether it would have gotten out in any event, I don't know. But I found that sometime the people who were the water carriers on the team--the lieutenants and corporals and things like that--in their zeal tended toward some excesses that I thought were unwise. When Senator Yarborough addressed a joint session, for example, some of the members were noticeably absent. A lot of them were members of the team of the establishment. As you know Governor Connally and Senator Yarborough have clashed politically and publicly on several occasions. Those who stayed away were mostly Connally people who in effect snubbed Yarborough.

Now I don't think Governor Connally or Speaker Barnes either one said, "Look, don't go hear that sorry so-and-so." These people, in their zeal, simply said, "I don't want to mess with that old so-and-so." Some of the people who addressed a special session were people I didn't necessarily agree with, but I felt that it was courtesy to listen. In any event I felt that a lot of the excesses for which the speaker or the governor might get blamed were actually due to actions of the lieutenants.

I did feel, too, that some of the people on the governor's staff were not giving a fair picture of what was going on. I think they were telling him what he wanted to hear or it might be that the Governor wasn't listening. Connally, I think, relied pretty much on his own instincts and on his own ideas and I don't know how much he accepted staff recommendations. But either way, I had the feeling that the Governor was out of touch with the legislature on several occasions on proposals he would make. And I think it showed a little bit, for example, in the fact that his tax proposals didn't get anywhere, and a number of proposals he made just didn't go.

The governor really does not have too much power over the legislature. The governor's power lies over the legislature primarily in the veto plus whatever influence he can exert on particular members, and this can be considerable. If the member has political ambitions and would like to be on a certain committee or commission or be named to some board or something like that, he might want the governor's favor. The governor has a lot of power on appointments. But in this particular case, he also had a good

deal of power in that Ben Barnes was his friend and ally. The speaker, of course, and the lieutenant governor in the Senate wield a great deal of power, more power than most people realize.

This power is exercised in a variety of ways. One is the fact that the speaker appoints the chairmen of the House committees. And they will be beholden to him for their jobs. He is not going to appoint people generally that he feels are not in line with his particular brand of thinking. And the result is that when the speaker wants a bill bottled up, it is bottled up. There are many many examples of this type of thing and I don't know that I need to go into any specifics. But the truth of the matter is that if the speaker quietly slipped the word to some committee chairman that he had rather a bill didn't get out of the committee it generally didn't get out. On the other side, I sponsored a bill that would allow the Texas Partners of the Alliance to buy surplus state property. The Partners of the Alliance is an organization started by my friend Jim Boren, who is from Wichita Falls. It combines government and private enterprise in trying to help underprivileged people in Central and South America. It is kind of a modification of the people-to-people program. Texas and Peru, for example, are partners. Business, private citizens and government join, with the Partners as coordinator, to help. The speaker has been very active in the Partners of the Alliance. He has backed it and consequently when I went before the committee, I made sure that the chairman and a great many of them understood that the speaker was interested in this bill. I don't think there were more

than three or four questions asked at the hearing and the bill just zipped right through. I introduced it very late in the session and it went right through. Of course it was a philanthropic type bill and didn't really hurt anyone. This certainly was in its favor, particularly in the Senate which was outside the speaker's sphere of influence. But the fact that it was the speaker's bill...that is not accurate because I introduced the bill and told the speaker about it in that order...but the fact that the speaker was interested in the bill greased its way through the legislative processes in the House and got it out in a hurry at a time when it could have been tied up behind a logjam regardless of merit.

So in that way the speaker is very powerful. He has power in another way, particularly if he is coming back and people are going to be depending on him for interim appointments, for committee appointments, and this type of thing. He wields a great deal of power there and people curry his favor. He can push or stall legislation as he wishes. In effect, he has a virtual veto power if he wants to exercise it, as I'm sure the lieutenant governor does in the Senate. In Ben's case, when it was known that Ben was going on politically, I think this helped too because a lot of people thought, "Well, I want a speaker that may help me on down the line." I am putting words in people's mouth but this is my estimate of some of the thinking that went on.

The committee chairmen themselves could be very powerful in their own little areas and certainly there were some areas that were more powerful than others. For example, Bill Heatly, the Chairman

of the Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the Revenue and Finance Committee or whatever it is called...and I believe that the chairman of that was Ben Atwell, of Dallas...are very powerful. This is true because they dealt with income and outgo of money. Heatly, for example, says, "I am good to my friends and a devil to my enemies." He plays it for power. He has done a lot of good, I don't mean to detract from him. I think he is really doing what he believes and he has done a lot of good in state employee pay raises, supporting of mental health, and this type of thing. But he is well aware of the power of the Appropriations Committee chairmanship and when he wants to push a bill he doesn't go around and threaten, he goes around and suggests that you might want to consider his viewpoint. And, as I say, he himself says he likes to take care of his friends and he can be a demon to his enemies.

Now in this last session of the legislature we adopted a rules change which gave us a sort of modified seniority. The strict seniority, as you know, works with the idea that whoever is the senior member of the majority party, as it is practiced in the U. S. Congress, becomes the committee chairman. This is not the way it runs in the Texas legislature. Prior to the adoption of this rule, the speaker could appoint anyone that he wanted, to any committee. Let's say, for example, when I went down there this time, nobody knew much about me; about my political belief, or anything else. I drew support from the conservative and the liberal camps. Some of the speaker's friends here suggested that I would be a good man for Appropriations and I was put on the Appropriations Committee.

A lot of that backing arose out of the fact that we wanted some things here locally. For example, we wanted an agriculture experiment station, which we are working on. I am going to a meeting tomorrow morning, trying to get one of these test tube-type experiment stations up here. We are organizing to make a presentation to the Texas A&M University system which will govern this particular selection.

But I drew some very good committee assignments. I was on Appropriations. I was on Education; with Midwestern University in my district this was important to me. I was on Mental Health and Mental Retardation. We have a state hospital here so this was important to me. Conservation and Reclamation is a very important committee in Texas, particularly in the area of water rights and we are very interested in water in north Texas where it is very short. And then there was School Districts, which is kind of a lesser committee. Undoubtly, Appropriations was the most powerful committee I served on. But these others I think in their own fields were very important and I think I had very good committee assignments, better than average for a freshman. I don't think Ben is the vindictive type. But if I did something that violently displeased him, he had the power to delegate me to the Underwater Basketweaving Committee if he wished. Under this modified seniority, a member would be allowed, if he were appointed to one particular committee and wanted to keep the assignment, he could. For example, I would certainly want to hang on to that Appropriations membership.

I really have the feeling that people respect you a little more if you don't jump every time they pull your string. If, as I say, you really honestly hold a conviction and stand up for it, I think they respect you more.

The speaker is a very busy man. There are a lot of people who are after his ear. I have discovered that once people begin to talk to somebody that they think is a "wheel" they tend to ramble. Ben appreciated brevity. He commented to me a couple of times about that. We'd be at places like a breakfast, or a dinner, and these would go on interminably. Everybody from the third vice-president in charge of pouring water glasses has to get up and make a five minute oration. All the while, you're sitting there fidgeting and you know visitors are stacking up in your office, and work is stacking up. You can't very well leave.

But I knew that Ben appreciated brevity. So when I had something to say to him, I went in, I said it, and I got out. I don't think in my whole career in the House so far I've spent more than about three minutes in the Speaker's office. And I think Ben really appreciated it more than if I'd gone in and bent his ear, and patted him on the back, and this type of thing because a back slapper is recognizable, I think.

But in any event, under this new seniority, you can retain membership as long as the rule is in effect. Now the "fly in the ointment" is that the House adopts a new set of rules each session and should some future speaker for one reason or another want to change this, he can do so with no problem because all he's got to

do is get the House to change its rules. And for the Speaker that shouldn't be too hard since he generally can influence the majority of the members or he would not have been elected speaker. But for the moment, I think this modified seniority rule is a good thing. I remember when I worked for members of Congress, people in Washington used to cuss the seniority system, and you do get some people in on occasion who are perhaps not the best choice for a particular committee assignment. But looking at the alternative, I begin to see more merit in the seniority system. And Joe Kilgore, who was Congressman from down at McAllen, quoted Sam Rayburn one time as saying, "Seniority...you don't like it when you get there, but the longer you're there the more you like it." But I could see more merit in the seniority system.

I don't know that there is any perfect system. I found that a great many people can complain and can tell you what's wrong with the world and what's wrong with government and whatever they happen to be in that they dislike. But when they're asked to come up with a constructive alternative, they aren't able to do so. I also think that many people who either didn't vote or who either voted for my opponent or were Republicans are the ones who are going to ask the most favors when you get in office. But, of course, it's hard to tell, unless the person openly supported your opponent, just exactly who they worked for, or who they voted for. And when you're in, of course, everybody you talk to voted for you. Even though you know that they probably voted for your opponent or you know that they're an avowed Republican, you kind of smile and thank them.

And, of course, under the Texas system Republicans can vote for you in that the Republican Party is still vastly a minority party in Texas. It's growing, but as of this time, many Republicans cross over and vote in the Democratic primary. Their reasoning is that they stand for conservatism. I dislike the terms conservative and liberal because they mean different things to different people. But the Republican Party is generally acknowledged as being the more conservative of the parties. They stand for conservative government, and they realize that if they vote for a Republican, they don't have a chance. They want to influence the Democratic Party as conservatively as possible, so they come over and vote in the Democratic primaries for conservative candidates. So in that respect they could vote for me on occasion, and I know some Republicans who are old friends of the family, did vote for me, I'm sure.

This county is a very close-knit county, and I think one of the things that helped me in my campaign was that both sides of my family came here in 1919. I was considered to be from an old family within the county. And consequently a great many people voted for me out of friendship for my family as much as political conviction, per se. My dad used to say, "You can know a man's a so-and-so, but you don't have to let him know it." This is my own interpretation of what he might have meant, but I might want a person to vote for me some time, and would feel there's no future in antagonizing him unnecessarily. I'm not averse to antagonizing someone if I have to. In fact my younger brother says that's one one reason why I'll never go anywhere in politics. If I don't like

someone, they know it. But my dad stood up for his principles, and people have commented to me, "I didn't agree with Jimmie, but by George I knew where he stood and I respected him." And I'm really proud of my father, and I'm trying to emulate him in many ways, although I realize that I'll never be the man he was. One way I try is in trying to stand up for what I believe. Another thing is in the area of finances. You can make a little money out of holding office, I guess, if you want to. But I'm very proud of the fact that my father came out of the Governor's Mansion \$16,000 in debt because he wouldn't take bribes and he paid it off himself.

My cousin and I were commenting the other night about one thing that is sometimes done where a legislator may have someone else introduce a bill dealing with a certain area. Let's say it's a bill affecting left-handed widget makers. The bill would be something that would be very detrimental to their interests. Then you go around and organize the left-handed widget makers into an association and have them all pay \$100 dues or something. Then you get the bill killed, and you're a hero. The bill is killed, and you made a little money. Now this can be done. There was one member in particular who had the reputation of introducing anybody's bill if they paid him enough. Whether the reputation was justified, I don't know, but I did hear this about this particular guy. I think the comments were more speculative than real knowledge. And I know that many of his bills were defeated by vast majorities. I remember one time I had just come back onto the floor. You get called off when constituents come to see you or for some similar reason. I came

onto the floor and one of his bills was up. And I commented to a guy near me, "What's the action? What's the bill?" And he said, "I don't really know what the bill does, but I know who's sponsoring it, and I'm voting against it on that basis."

Getting into the area of influence, the lobby around the Texas Legislature is extremely powerful, but it's not through the area of bribes. I wasn't offered a single bribe per se, and I don't know of anybody else who was. Of course, this is not something a person would advertise. But membership in the House is like belonging to a club. Even members who hold varying views on the floor will get together for coffee or a beer or something afterwards, and they respect each other. A story is attributed to Representative John Field of Dallas. I don't know how true it really is, but he is supposed to have commented to another member, who was of a different view, "Now, as a member of the House, you merit my respect and I will give you my respect as a member of the House, but don't come around here with a bunch of this jazz." He was talking about the member's conduct. So members do kind of consider themselves a club. And they talk about things that come up just as anybody talks shop.

One of the big ways the lobby is powerful is in the area of campaign contributions, not only in members races, but in the speaker's race. The race for speaker can be a terribly expensive and a real, mean race. My estimate is that you would have to have some financial backing to make much of a race for speaker. If you're not independently wealthy, the lobby is the most readily available source. And certainly they would want to back a winning speaker

candidate because of the fact that a person remembers who his friends are and gives them at least a sympathetic hearing. Anything else would depend on the person.

I remember in one particular case, one lobby that was backing a bill I opposed. The lobbyist called me and invited me and my family, and I had to turn him down on that. I really had something else to do but I wasn't particularly interested in going out with the guy. I was already familiar with the bill. I had heard his arguments, both in the office and in the presentation before committees and so forth, and I didn't want to sit through them again. I don't know if he would necessarily have tried to argue. A lot of the time it's, "Let's just get to know each other better." Lobbyists are paid advocates. They are paid to represent a particular view. But many of them are experts in their field. They have been in it a long time. As long as you keep in mind the mental reservation that it is biased in behalf of their client, they can quite often be a good source of information. I don't condemn lobbyists. But I turned down two or three invitations to different things this guy was throwing and one of my friends finally told me, "Well, I am not for his bill either, but I am going to go to one of his parties just so I don't antagonize him too heavily because he has the reputation of financing candidates against you." I have found that the tradition in Texas is that generally once you are elected, you can be re-elected as you want. This has been a trend throught the South and is one reason why you find so many southerners, under the seniority system, have committee chairmanships in Congress.

But even though I might not be afraid for my seat, the mere fact that I have an opponent means that I have to get out and campaign. This is a personal inconvenience and an expense. What I am saying is that, for example, I don't really anticipate an opponent next time because it is traditional that you at least get a second term, if not more. Also I don't think that I've made anyone particularly mad at me even though I have taken some pretty strong stands. I don't think I have really highly alienated anybody to where they would want to put somebody in against me. But if I have any opponent at all, I am going to have to campaign because otherwise I look like I was sitting back smugly and saying, "Well I am not even worried." You have to get out and make a few appearances, have some cards printed up, run a few TV spots, and shake hands. The amount of campaigning depends on your estimate of your opponent's strength. But even a token candidate can cost you money and trouble.

Actually public service generally costs people rather than making them money. For example, during the session you have your expenses of maintaining your home in your home district and your home in Austin. You have travel back and forth. The state of Texas pays for one round trip. If you go down to Austin and forget about your district for five months and don't show up, there's likely to be somebody in the next election. That somebody has been making the Knights of Columbus picnics and such events and shaking hands. Forget your district and he is going to be in that seat instead of you. So the result is that it costs money in the long run that

most legislators do not have unless they are independently wealthy. Sometimes it gives you an excuse to go and collect some more campaign funds and stash them away for future campaigns.

But anyway I was sort of given the word that I ought to go to some party that this lobbyist threw, just so that he wouldn't feel that I was so antagonistic that he would need to field an opponent against me.

The lobby I think quite often donates to both sides in a campaign so that they will be known as a friend regardless of who wins. The truth of the matter is, I don't think the fact that someone contributed to my campaign is going to make me vote against my convictions. But certainly anyone who contributed to a campaign, is going to be listened to and their views considered. This, I think, is what the lobby is aiming at as much as anything else. Few commitments are asked in the campaign donation stage, as far as I know. That is, I don't think anybody came around and said, "Now I am going to give this to your campaign, and I want you to be sure that you vote for X bill." But in all honesty, it is probably implied. In other words, if you are talking to an oil lobbyist, you know he is interested in keeping taxes off the oil industry.

Now, the lobby does throw some parties and they also may buy your dinner on occasion. The nicety is that they are called "sponsors," as in "Do you have a sponsor for this dinner?" That means, "Is there a lobbyist here who is going to pick up the check?" But again I don't feel that a lobbyist buying my dinner obligates

me to anything. I have never gone out and hunted up a sponsor for dinner or anything like that, but lobbyists have bought me lunches. They will come and say, if you are going to lunch, how about going with me? And I will go to lunch with them and listen to their arguments and I don't feel that the fact that that man pays for my lunch obligates me to him to vote his way or anything.

The lobbyists work a lot through friendship, through the fact that if you like a guy, you are going to...perhaps unconsciously, be a little more disposed toward his point of view. They do argue their point as an advocate of a particular cause. And there is a lot of pressure through their membership. For example, when you are talking to a man from...let me pick one...Texas State Teachers Association, TSTA...you know it is a vast organization. Texas Restaurant Association is another one. The Texas Restaurant Association, I have been told, is the largest trade association in the state. Well, certainly when you talk to someone from TSTA or the Texas Restaurant Association, you are aware of the people who are members of their association. They don't come in and say, "I represent five thousand people throughout Texas," or twenty-five thousand people or whatever it happens to be. But you know their membership is there.

Really more people are informed of more legislative activities through organization membership than through any other one source of information, I think.

This can be helpful and hurtful to representatives. Most people don't know what goes on in their state legislature except

where it specifically touches their business or life and then the organization generally lets them know. Some associations have adopted a listing at the end of the session. They will pick out certain issues and say members voted right or wrong according to the association's views. The AFL-CIO does this, and I am including them under the broad heading of trade associations. The Texas Manufacturers Association does this, I think. They give various ratings on how you voted according to their particular likes. In addition, they let their people know how a member voted on a particular issue. For one thing, in the house, the bill comes up three times--first, second, and third readings. The first reading is simply to refer it to committee. But by the second reading they have an idea how you are going to vote. If you are voting against their views, not only is that lobbyist going to come to see you but he is going to be checking with the folks back home. And let's say it's a bill that affects second-hand stores. If there is a Second-Hand Stores Association, you are going to start hearing from second-hand store folks in your district. And a politician is well aware that he needs about a hundred friends to offset one enemy. Because your friends don't really push you as much as your enemies are out trying to fight you at election time.

The inclination is that you want to please people if you can, and the lobbyist is aware of this. He will get on long distance telephone, or write, or send telegrams back home and say, "This boy has gone contrary to our views so see what you can do with him." One thing that irritated me is the fact that since I work for the

newspaper here and Mr. Rhea Howard, the publisher, is politically oriented, people would go to him. He is very interested in politics. He is the Democratic Committeeman from this district. Many people who wanted to get to me would go to Mr. Howard, figuring that he would influence me.

Actually Mr. Howard, if he called me at all, would call and say that somebody was in here and talked about this and I want to make you aware of the problem, or something like that. He never tried to say, "Hey listen, kid, you vote this way or it's your job." If he was really interested in something he would let me know about it. But it was an advisory-type thing and not a threat. But I really resented the fact that people felt they could twist my arm through my boss. I had already made up my mind that if my boss said vote or be fired, I would be fired and go find another job. Particularly when I have a wife and two kids, this is a real decision to make. But I had decided this is the way it was going to be.

The lobbyist will have people call you from your home district or they will come down to see you. Austin is a lot closer than Washington, and you got a lot of people in every few days from home, pushing one bill or another.

I was campaigning one day and some guy said, "Are you running against Maurice Doke?"

"No, he is not seeking re-election. He has moved to Austin, and has gone in business down there." This man was a service station operator and Maurice apparently had voted for a particular

bill to remove signs in front of service stations. So this man was mad at him because of that one thing. And it wouldn't have made any difference in the world if Maurice had voted on every other bill exactly the way this man would have voted, had he been pushing the button Maurice was still six kinds of a so-and-so in this man's book because he had voted against one bill this man was particularly interested in. And my estimate of people, at least of this early stage of my life, is that they clutch one or two issues to heart and if you agree with them on those issues you can do pretty well what you want to on anything else and you are still fine with them. If you don't agree with them on those points, although you might agree with them on every other point, you're still no good in their book. It is through trade associations, quite often, that people learn how you vote on a given issue.

In the House you come to recognize that certain members are spokesman of certain groups. There was one member, for example, who was recognized as the spokesman for the Texas League of Municipalities. And when he spoke, I marked in my mind that he had a biased viewpoint. I don't mean that he was being kept--if I can use the word--by the League of Municipalities. But I think he really simply was deeply interested in city government. He is a very honorable guy, as far as I know. Of course we have found in the Billy Sol Estes case that you can't always judge a man by appearances and certainly you don't run any kind of a Dun and Bradstreet report or moral check--a background **investigation as** the FBI would call it...on everybody that you meet. But I think

this guy really believed the way he was advocating.

So through friendship and thorough guys who think their way within the House and in the Senate, lobbyists are able to influence legislation. They can help you or hurt you, but really it's more of a help type of thing. If a lobbyist likes you or if a particular group likes you, they'll run your picture in their membership publication and mention you favorably. And a lot of these are beautiful jobs...The Dry Cleaners Association, the Public Employees Association...several like this have beautiful magazines that they put out. Almost all of them put out a publication of one sort or another. In citing these particular organizations I don't mean necessarily that they do this type of thing because I don't know that they do. But they do put out good publications. Any mention helps. A lot of people don't realize how much a politician depends on publicity. It's helpful to get your name in front of the people so they recognize it when they see it on the ballot. Because a lot of people voting on an office don't know who they're voting for. They vote for a name they know.

Probably the strongest draw at the ballot box is a good hot sheriff's race. People will know who they're going to vote for for sheriff. They know who they're going to vote for in a lot of other offices, unless there's a real hot race. And despite the fact that a candidate gets out and hustles around and so forth, most people never heard of him. But if you can get your name in front of the people and if they can at least know your name, it means a lot in votes, just as being first on the ballot means a lot. Many people

will leave the first name and scratch all the others. I don't know why, but it's a proven fact they they do. And the fact that you're first on the ballot is good for several hundred votes in a county like this.

But to go back to my point...I'm rambling here...you live on publicity, and the fact that they run your picture or mention you in their membership newsletter helps you. For example, I introduced a couple of bills dealing with parking lots trying to help merchants who had problems with people congregating on parking lots, and kids causing trouble and so forth. And some of the merchants' organizations mentioned this in their reports to their members. And while they didn't do it necessarily to push my career, it was helpful to me politically when I got a mention in the Texas Restaurant Association publication, for example, as the sponsor of bills that would help restaurants.

The parking lot problem is very real and I didn't put in the bills to help specifically anybody except just try to help merchants in general and keep business in a healthy state. But the fact that I was mentioned in the TRA publication would help help me both with my restauranters here and if I ever wanted to run statewide. So this is a source where they can help people.

Also the lobby is behind a lot of these appreciation dinners. If you carry a bill or a series of bills that helps a particular group, they may throw you an appreciation dinner. It may be disguised as a "The people in support of Joe Shrunck" or whatever. But it's the Underwater Basket Weavers Association or somebody,

who actually does the organizing. I've seen several of these. Some of them are better run than others. Some of them are pretty obviously a boost. Others look like a real ground swell from the community, which some really are. Any time they throw an appreciation dinner for you and you get your picture in your paper and the governor and everybody comes down, which I've seen happen, and people say nice things about you, it helps politically. And I don't know that the governor's necessarily cooperating with the lobby, he just happens to like the member and wants to give him a pat on the back. But the fact that the dinner was thrown gives the governor an excuse to pat you on the back if you're a friend of his.

And all this together builds up your image in the eyes of your constituents. So people who do something that the lobby likes, the lobby can pay off in this way. What I'm trying to do really is explain ways in which the lobby can influence legislation. One comment, and I think it's a very true comment, is, "The people don't have a lobbyist." All the special interest groups have lobbyists, but the good, hard-working, solid citizen, Texan, American doesn't have a lobbyist, and it's to his detriment quite often. I don't know exactly how they could get a lobbyist. I wish I could figure out some way. The only thing the people have to depend on is the representatives and senators thinking of their welfare, and I think most of them really try to do this.

But what you run into sometimes is when people discuss the merits of a bill, they'll say, "Let's talk about the politics of this thing." Politics and merits do not always go hand in hand.

and on some bills, a man will get up and say:

"This is a compromise bill. We've talked to all the different associations involved." Let's say it's going to touch two or three different businesses. And the different business associations' lobbyists get together and they talk with the bill's sponsor and they say, "All right, if this provision is in there, we won't oppose this bill. We don't particularly like it perhaps, but we won't oppose it." And the sponsor gets up and says, "All right, this bill has been agreed upon by the representatives of the various industries that will be affected." Well, this is all well and good, and it might be the type of bill that would help all the industries affected. But would it help the people?

Also, the lobby can help you push a bill. If you have a bill that a lobbyist is interested in, he can talk to his friends and try to get them to support your bill. And he can get quicker action sometimes or get a stalled bill moving.

Going back to discuss a little more about "The people." A great hue and cry is made on behalf of the people. I think everybody tends to interpret his own ideas as to what would be best for the people. And I guess really there's no way around that. I'm leery of a guy who comes in, as many do, and says, "Now this is my opinion, and there's lots of other folks who think the same way I do." The person may really believe this. He may have talked to other people about. But most people are not informed, and if anybody has a strong view, a lot of people are going to agree with him simply because he's going to be espousing his view. Often the way he's going to do it is say,

"Now don't you think so?" And the guy, either because he doesn't want to argue, or doesn't care, or doesn't know, will agree with him. So when people come in, they may really believe a lot of other people think the way they do, and maybe a lot of people do. But at least in my case it gives me a certain amount of reservation when somebody uses that particular phrase. And it's quite often used.

Another thing that I have discovered is that most people are poorly informed on the issues. I've had the experience quite often in discussing something casually with people that they'll make some statement and I'll disagree with them. Often they swing right around and agree with me. They'll do a 180 degree about face from the view they had just expressed. And I never try to point it out to them unless we're in a real hot argument and I'm mad. But the truth of the matter is a lot of people don't really hold much of a conviction. This is due to a variety of things.

As a newspaper man, I enjoy trying to explain things to people. One of the things that I enjoy in newspapering is taking a complex issue and explaining it so people can understand it. And like public service, in newspaper work you feel like you're doing some good. You are keeping the people informed. But if you stop and think about who the people are, you realize they are the guys who work in the offices and the garages and all this sort of thing. That is, they've got their own business to take care of. They have family responsibilities. When they come

home, the wife wants them to mow the yard or the kids want to play, or something like this. And the average person's time for gathering of information is limited. The result is that they are not informed and so cannot form intelligent opinions on the wide variety of issues that face us. You really can't blame them in a way. I think the advent of television news plus the fact that newspapers have come to shorter, more concise stories, are helping people be better informed. Then too our educational system is a little less of an ivory tower thing. It is turning more to presenting views and lessons in relation to the world around us. And I think all of these things are helping.

But television and radio, from a newsman's point of view are not very satisfactory, or from a politician's point of view for that matter because they only skim the cream off the news. They don't dwell very long on any one thing.

As I say, many people know that you're an official, but they don't really know what office you hold. A lot of people think I'm in Congress. They come up to me or my wife and say, "Well, how's Washington?"

And you don't want to really alienate them or hurt their feelings. So, generally, since I've lived and worked in Washington, my own ploy on this is to say, "Well, I haven't been there in a good while. I really like the place though. But here lately you know I've been working down in Austin." And this gives them an out of saying something like, "Oh, I thought you had been up there recently."

Also, when I meet a famous person, even though they might know me, I extend my hand and give my name. For example, Lyndon Johnson has known my father. But there's no particular reason why he ought to know me. By sticking out my hand and giving my name, I give the famous person then a chance to say, "Of course," as though they had known me all along. Actually, they may not have known me. But a lot of people don't think of this, or a lot of people take it for granted that you know them. So you become very adept at not using names.

One boy that I know was discussing methods of campaigning. There's a very definite science to campaigning, and part of our shop talk is discussing different methods. This boy has a very beautiful wife...probably one of the prettiest of the legislative wives, and she would be a real asset to him in campaigning. She is an asset when she appears on the stage with him because personal appearance is a very definite help. John Kennedy's shock of hair and his good looking wife didn't hurt him a bit. This boy's district is predominantly rural, composed of small towns and so forth rather than cities. He said that when he went into a town, he parked his wife in the nearest cafe or she visited a friend in town or something like that. The reason was that he had been away from his home district for a while going to school, and he didn't know a lot of the people. And if his wife's with him, he's got to introduce her. But if he's by himself, he can say, "Well, how are you doing, fellow?" or, "How's it going, man?" That way he wouldn't really have to use

the person's name.

This can lead to some comical situations on occasion. For example, there are a couple of people right now that have asked me to find out things for them, and I don't remember their names to call them up and tell them about what I've found. So I've got to just keep watching for them on the street and hope I run into them. (Chuckle) But for the most part, people don't realize this. There are some people who enjoy baiting a politician, "You don't know me, do you?" But I found there are not as many of these people as I expected. Most people are innately courteous, and they mean real well.

There are a few people who like to go away after they've insulted you and say, "Well, I told that so-and-so." But I found it's much fewer than I expected really.

Very few people know your voting record, which is good and bad. It's good because a lot of the time they might not agree with you, and so might not support you at the next election. But if people just know you socially or know you from having you speak to them on the street and things like this, they may vote for you where they might not really agree with your voting record.

On the other hand, it's not so good sometimes in that people may have a false image of you one way or the other. And they may feel that they're a liberal and you're a conservative or they may feel they're a conservative and you're a liberal because they mean different things to different people. I've had John

Birchers tell me, "I think I'm a moderate, politically." But I don't consider the John Birch Society to be a moderate organization in my spectrum of things. However, the Bircher thinks of himself as a moderate. None of us like to think of ourselves as extremists. Most people think of themselves as a moderate, and "liberal" and "conservative" mean different things to different people.

Another difficulty with politics is that you make enemies really without trying. For example, any time you have to vote on an issue, there are going to be people on both sides of the fence. And those who are on the side that you vote for are going to be pleased and those on the other side are going to be unhappy. A friend who is a former member of Congress commented one time that there are a lot of good careers wrecked in the legislature. When I went into this race, I was thinking he was referring primarily to the fact that guys stand up and pop off when they shouldn't--that is, some politically unwise comment. But a lot of it is that you're making a record on every vote that you make. And if I vote heavily liberal--I'm using the terms I don't like--but if I vote heavily in favor of bills that are espoused by labor, the Texas Manufacturers Association will be mad. If I want to run for a state-wide office someday, TMA would then say: "Uh huh, see how this so-and-so voted? We don't want him." Conversely if I vote heavily for those bills espoused by the Manufacturers Association, labor is going to be down on me. And the fact is that every time you push that vote button, you're making an

enemy...making a number of enemies probably. These enemies may not be so much in the House, as in the future.

From a political standpoint, you're safer in the House than you are in the Senate. There are 150 members in the House; there are 31 members of the Senate. In the House, your district is smaller and your vote doesn't mean as much and so you don't antagonize as many people. Part of the antagonism is the personal contact thing where you've got to tell somebody you aren't going to vote for their point of view. I have seen very few people who take that gracefully. Some do, but not many. Another difficulty in politics is that people figure you know them when they meet you once. During the last campaign, I would go by the courthouse several times a day and work the license plate line, handing out cards while people stood in line to buy their license plates. And how many people would I meet in a day in a given campaign? A great many. Let's say I would get up early in the morning and meet the postmen coming to work and then during the day work the license plate line and up and down the streets, in front of the post office, along Eighth Street, and up in the office building, and then catch a luncheon meeting and the dinner meeting, or work the lines at the cafeterias, and this type of thing. And, in the evenings, I might hit a couple of bowling alleys--during one particular week of my campaign I made every bowling alley in town every night so I would try to catch everybody in all the bowling leagues.

You meet all these people and they meet you once and they

expect you to remember them. You cannot physically do it. Calvin Ashley, the county judge here, I think has the best retort when you stick out your hand and meet somebody and he says he has met you before. Ashley says, "Well gee, I am sorry, I just meet so many people that I try to remember all of them but I make a mistake once in a while." And then people are pretty generally understanding about it. My favorite story on myself concerns when I was working the dance at the Labor Temple one night. I had gone out early and worked a city teachers' meeting as the people came and then went on over to the Labor Temple dance and I was passing out cards and this kid and his wife sitting at a table and I said, "Y'all look familiar. We have met before, haven't we?" They said, "We're in your Sunday School class." And all you can say, "Oh." You get wrong names on people every once in a while and people get their feelings hurt. But if they'd think about it, generally this means that when you meet a person once, you don't really remember his face because he's one of maybe a hundred people you meet. Later, you pass them on the street and perhaps you are thinking about something or don't recognize them. I have had people get their feelings hurt because they felt I snubbed them. Really, I didn't intend to snub them at all.

You lose a lot of privacy in public life. You can't get mad at people because you are liable to alienate some votes. You begin to weigh, "Which will do me more good (chuckle)--giving vent to my temper or going on and accepting the discourtesy?"

We have state official license plates on our cars. And this may help when you pull into a parking lot sometime. Perhaps you're going to a picnic or meeting or something like that and you are supposed to be on the speakers platform and you are running late, which you continually are because you have so many people after you on different things. The policeman or guard may see the plate and let you park in the reserved section. I don't mean that my being a state representative necessarily means I always have that much to do. But when you try to be a state representative and be in business and several other things, it keeps you busy. I hold down a job as a newspaper reporter, my cousin and I are putting in an automatic car wash, I am in the Army Reserve, and I am on the board of my church, and one thing or another. A lot of these things keep after you. And it helps when you pull in a parking lot and a policeman sees that SO plate and he will direct you to a parking place in the reserved section up next to the speakers stand instead of way out in the bull pasture somewhere. But by the same token you are very...at least my wife and I are...very aware of that SO plate on the car as far as our driving. You become much more careful in your driving habits. People think, by the way, that we get those plates free. Actually, we have to pay for them.

Another thing, going back to the comment that a lot of good careers are wrecked in the legislature, you come to points where you really feel strongly about an issue and the pressure is all the other way. You feel you ought to vote against a bill but the lobby and many others are pushing for it. You decide you are going

to make a real stand on principle and I have seen it done. Fred Head, of Tyler, is one that comes to mind and there were many, many of them of them. I remember talking to Fred about a particular vote and he said, "Well, now there are a lot of people in this particular group...I have forgotten which group was pushing the bill...back home who are going to be very mad if I vote against this bill, but doggone it, it just isn't right and I am going to vote against this bill."

So a legislator makes a great stand on principle. The truth of the matter is that the people back home seldom know about it or appreciate it. This is quite often the case when you make a stand like this: the folks back home don't know about it or care and you still alienate the association or whoever was pushing the bill. My feeling on it is that you have to live with yourself and you have to sleep at night. Also, it makes it a lot easier to defend your position on a bill if you voted your conscience. I don't think anybody down there votes on any major bill without thinking, "How can I defend myself to my opponent?" It is part of deciding which side has the most merit and it is also that you know you have got to placate the opponents as much as you can since you voted against them. But you do it because you care and because you feel like that it is right and it probably does your own mental health some good even if it doesn't do your political health much good. Some of us too, in musing about this, ended up forming the Texas Association of Windmill Tilters referring back to Don Quixote's days. We awarded memberships to people who "went down in flames"

in defense of the peoples' rights and privileges.

There's another thing that I personally resent but I get a lot of it. I don't know whether people really mean it or not--I don't think they do mean it because--having been overweight most of my life I know that a lot of people say things about overweight people without meaning to be hurtful, but they are. And in the area of politics it's much the same way. I get a little tired of the jokes that imply incompetence or dishonesty in politics. You know, the guy who, in a large crowd, says, "Well, so you're in politics--lie a little for me." It is funny and all of that but it kind of hurts a little bit too because I think the vast majority of people in public life are honest and hard working and trying to do a job. Certainly there are some crumbs, but I think the vast majority is the other way. Unfortunately, that is not the image the public has.

One difficulty, and this goes back to people being poorly informed, is that most issues are very complex. There are many things that bear on the issue but the public wants a simple answer and they want a simple issue. They try to boil everything down to simplicity except something which particularly involves them. Then they begin to say, "Well there is a lot to this you don't understand all that there is to this." But on the average issue that doesn't touch their lives in a concrete way, people want simple solutions and simple comments and they can't always get them. This is one reason why the politician is reluctant to make public statements. You know the politician's image is fence-straddling, and being for God, Country, and Motherhood and firmly against the common cold,

and tigers downtown, and that sort of thing. My outlook on this now is a little bit different from the time when I was a newspaper reporter and covering government. I covered Congress and the state legislature. A newsman tries to get comments because he is looking for something that will make a story. One type of story concerns what a politician thinks on a particular bill.

But the thing about it is that someone will introduce a bill, and I will initially say, "No, that is not a good bill." What I am referring to may be one particular section of that bill. Circumstances may well turn around so that in committee this section is amended and that makes it a good bill. So I turn around and vote for the bill. Or it may be that at one particular point I didn't know something about the bill. None of us know everything. I have had occasions where I started out being opposed to a bill and then I have had the pros and cons explained to me by the advocates and opponents. And I have decided I didn't know these facts--and based on these facts this is a better bill than I thought and I will vote for it. And yet I am on record as having opposed it. An opponent can really tear you up with something like that if he wants to. They did it to Barry Goldwater, for example, on the national scene. He said one thing one time and he said another thing another time. The truth of the matter is that things change. Bills can be changed. This is one reason why a politician is reluctant to make a stand. Another reason is that you don't really accomplish a whole lot politically in most cases by taking a stand in the newspapers. In ninety per cent of the

cases, all you do is alienate people. I feel like the place for me to make enemies is when I push that voting button. This is my responsibility. I asked for it when I ran for office. But I'm not helping by making wild-eyed statements around here, there, and yonder. The public in general won't care and many of the people who do care are going to be alienated. So I can understand a little more about the politicians' reticence now.

Another thing is, many people will not write you letters. But they will jump you about a vote when you get home or they will wait until you get home and come to you with your problems. It takes longer to get things done because they talk interminably. Most problems can be explained in three to five minutes but you may have to spend ten or fifteen minutes or longer with each person and this adds up. Just a whole lot of people won't write you letters. When you come back, they will criticize you on your vote but they didn't bother to write you and tell you about it even though they knew the particular bill was up.

Also you go to different things and you go for publicity. There are a lot of things that I go to--meetings, dinners, this type of thing--that I wouldn't go to if I wasn't in politics. There are two sides to this. One is publicity--getting my name exposure--the other is that I feel that I ought to know as much about my constituency as I can and about the different factors and it has been very educational.

I have learned a great deal, for example, trying to help get an irrigation project over in the Pond Creek area, which is in the

western part of my county. I took a tour where they were showing the members of this particular board around the county and what they were trying to do. And I learned a great deal about irrigation, about beef cattle production, about the growth of Coastal Bermuda Grass. This is educational and it will help me to vote more intelligently on farm bills and things like that in the future. But you go to a lot of these things and aside from what little hand-shaking you are able to do, you don't get a lot out of it from a political standpoint because people don't introduce you. They don't remember that you live on publicity. Many people vote for the name they know.

Another difficulty is when people come to you and they want to propose a particular law. They have an idea that they think will be great. But most of the time they haven't thought it through too thoroughly and don't realize that there are many other facets. I am in the Civil Affairs or Military Government branch in the Army Reserve. They point out to us that when you go into a community in Vietnam, let's say, to try to help the people you may see that they need: that their water is bad, and they need to upgrade their livestock and all this sort of thing. But you can't change one facet of life without affecting other facets. If you try to upgrade their diet by introducing pork, it may turn out that they're Moslems and don't eat pork. This is much the same thing. People don't realize the many facets that a law might touch, in addition to the target area at which they are aiming. But how do you tell a guy that his great ideas are all wet? You have to just say,

"Well, that sure is worth further studying, thanks a lot." But sometimes they don't really understand.

Concerning the role of the press, I would like to comment a little more on that. As I say, reporters want you to commit yourself on a bill that will most likely be changed by the time it gets to final passage. But, I still think it is a good thing. I think the press is a good watchdog in many cases although, unfortunately, I notice that both at Washington level and at Austin there are a great many people who are "hot-rock reporters" on a daily paper. But when they get to be a Washington or Austin correspondent, they quit being a reporter and they want to be "a mover and a shaker." They want to influence thinking. They think of themselves as pundits and write big, long articles describing trends in thought and that type of thing. And I've found, particularly at Austin, some of the reporters let their personal bias get in their way...either their personal or political bias.

There's one guy I can think of in particular who is kind of a sour-dispositioned individual, and the fact that he doesn't like somebody personally, I think, influences the stories he writes. There are some others who think along a particular political line, and I'm certain that that influences their writings. And then in some cases, unfortunately, the publisher's politics influences the reporter's stories. They know what the publisher wants to read.

But this is not always true, and there are some very good, very conscientious reporters in Austin. One man that I'm particularly familiar with because I worked with him in the Washington Bureau

of the Houston Post is Felton West, who is now the Austin bureau chief for the Houston Post. Felton is an accurate, fair, complete, unbiased reporter, and a very good one. And there are some others along this same line. I just happened to have worked with Felton, and he comes to mind. But there are some down there, unfortunately, who write poor stories either because of political or personal bias or because they just don't understand the problem. One of the problems on many papers is that the reporters aren't informed on politics or the workings of government. Hence many of their stories are inaccurate or miss the point. The press needs to be informed on these things in order to write accurately and coherently about them.

Of course the press necessarily has to condense because space is limited or, in broadcast journalism, time is limited. And quite often what they consider important and what you consider important are two different things. I think one reason the press and politics don't get along is that politicians feel like the press is trying to nail them to the wall. Also they feel that when they say something, the press misinterprets it. And unfortunately, sometimes this is true because newspapers do not pay high salaries and sometimes they don't attract competent people. A friend of mine once commented that newspapering is one of the professions that people go into and many of the best of them leave. And that's true. They go into public relations or some other better-paying field. It's like teaching. Unless you're really dedicated with a missionary spirit, you leave. And even sometimes then you have to leave if

you've got a lot of kids, or a mother who gets sick as one guy did, and he had to pay her hospital bills. He couldn't afford to stay with a newspaper. And the result is, quite often, that you get reporters who are sub-quality, who have poor judgment, who don't write good, accurate stories.

Another difficulty is question and answer shows on radio and television where people can call in and ask questions or comment. Often they don't have the facts and you kind of get in a harangue and argument with them sometimes on the phone. And it's just like my father once commented, "Nobody really wins in that kind of a fight because it makes you look bad even if you come out well." You have to learn to keep your temper, and very politely disagree with people. I did get tickled at one thing dealing with the press. We were considering the Open Meetings Bill, which says that state agencies cannot hold meetings and exclude the press. And they were introducing some amendments to allow certain things. Ralph Wayne from Plainview got up and proposed an amendment to allow staff meetings within the departments to be closed to the press. I hadn't known that the amendment was coming. This is one of the difficulties. You get the bills in advance, but you don't get the amendments in advance because some of them are written right on the spur of the moment. Anyway, I didn't know the amendment was coming. I wasn't exactly sure that this proposed amendment was a good idea, but when I got up on the mike to question Ralph about it, I couldn't think of exactly what I wanted to say. And I finally had to say, "Thank you, Mr. Wayne," and shut up and sat down. I don't think Ralph was

trying to slip anything by anybody. His thought on the thing was that sometimes you have to get together and discuss policy and this type of thing, and that the press might, "Get in the way," as he saw it. In retrospect, now that I've had a long time to think about it, I feel like most of those meetings the press wouldn't be interested in anyway, but that they should be allowed to attend if they wished. But when I started to sit down after I'd questioned Ralph as much as I could several of the boys along the press table started saying, "Hey, that's not a good thing." And I could see their point because a multitude of evils could be covered by "staff meetings". So I said: "All right, I'll introduce an amendment. Let's figure out what we want to say." And they all looked at me with a blank stare, and they started saying, "Well, this, this, and this." But none of the points really did what we were trying to accomplish. They were trying to limit who could be there, or who couldn't be there and this type of thing. So finally I had to go off by myself and write an amendment that said that no matters of public policy or public business could be discussed in these staff meetings. And this amendment was passed, and I feel like it will remove a lot of the chances for chicanery that might have been present had an administrator at some future date been unscrupulous and wanted to use them. But it gave me sort of a kick, and I went back over and told the boys at the press table, "Now the next time you're inclined to criticize a member for not being able to think fast in an emergency, friend, just remember what you contributed when you had to think fast." And in that respect, I

sort of got a chuckle out of it.

As I say some people discuss the merits of the bill and then they say, "Let's talk about the politics of the situation." A friend of mine once commented that if you want to be a statesman, you've got to get elected. I'd like to comment a little more...we brought it up before...about religion in lawmaking. Under our system we like to say that church and state are separated, and certainly as a matter of government they are in that the church does not govern per se as it does in some other countries, perhaps, or at least have much more of a say in the government. But I do not believe that religion is absent from the processes of government nor should it be. For example, each week in the House, and I guess in the Senate, there was a prayer group. The attendance was kind of small, but this is due to a variety of things including breakfast meetings and all types of things. Representatives met one morning a week for prayer and religious discussion.

Dr. George Davis, who is pastor of the National City Christian Church in Washington, the church which President Johnson attends on occasion and where I was formerly a member of the Board of Deacons when I worked in Washington, once commented, and I think he's very right, that the church influences the people who make up our government. While the church itself does not dabble in government, church people do. And I think rightly so. Much of our policies, both as a state and as a nation have a background in religious belief. For example the humanitarian aspects of things such as foreign aid. The fact that we are in competition with

Russia in the field of helping people, rather than in the field of killing people, is an accomplishment. I've just finished a two week school in civil affairs in the Army which is aimed at teaching military government officers to help people with public health, public safety, public utilities, this type of thing. I like it because it's something that enables you to be of service to people. But a part of it is the fact that our religion does show up in our government through the humanitarian and the moral stands that we take.

A bill that was before the Texas Legislature called for a referendum on horse race gambling, pari-mutuel betting in Texas. The proposal was that the people be allowed to vote on whether or not they favor pari-mutuel betting in Texas. Now this has been a question for years and years. And I'm quite proud of the fact that my father led the fight in 1937 that outlawed horse race gambling. He called a special session and led the fight that brought about the outlawing of pari-mutuel gambling in Texas in 13 days after the session was opened. I opposed the bill for the referendum. We just had a referendum just two, three, or four years ago, and the people voted it down then and I didn't feel we needed to go to the expense and trouble and so forth of doing it again. And I opposed pari-mutuel betting. I made some speeches in the House to that effect, and plan to make other comments as the time nears for the vote on the referendum. The referendum will have no formal standing. In other words it does not require the legislature to do anything. But certainly if horse race gambling is approved, the

legislature is likely to vote for it, and if it's voted down, the legislature is likely not to vote for it.

In researching some of this, I read one of my father's quotes which said that while the state cannot legislate morals, it certainly does not have any obligation to place temptations in the way of people. It should, instead, remove these temptations when possible.

I felt much the same way in regard to liquor by the drink because I feel it will increase consumption. This is one of a number of reasons why I opposed liquor by the drink, and it wasn't brought up in this last session. The advocates of the bill were primarily those from large cities. We found predominantly that the large city people favored it and the rural area boys opposed it. The advocates took polls almost constantly. Every week or so they ran another poll to see how the sentiment stood. When they saw they couldn't get it passed, they didn't bring it up. But I think religion does have a very definite place in law-making and I think it is exercising that much more than people realize through the consciences and the hearts and minds of the people in the legislature most of whom are church members, I think, and many of them active in their churches.

Another strong impression I have from the legislature is that where before I didn't really have much opinion one way or the other, I very definitely favor a bi-cameral legislature now. The reason for this is I discovered it is possible to sneak something through or bulldoze something through one house. And if you have two houses plus the gubernatorial veto, you have a much better chance

to thoroughly consider legislation and a lot fewer bad bills get passed.

I think that in setting up our national government, the men who formed this system that we have of checks and balances showed great wisdom in making it as hard as it is to pass a law. We hear a lot of talk of how we ought to streamline Congress and we ought to do this, that, and the other to speed things up. We live in an age of speed. A computer that can reel off thousands of characters in seconds, or can at least examine thousands of characters in seconds and reel off the proper information in split seconds. Here again you run into difficulties and conflicts, particularly let's say the powers of the Presidency opposed to the powers of the legislative branch. In a time of nuclear missiles, the President needs to be able to act quickly to counter any threats or aggressive actions. The old practice of declaring war through the Congress has almost gone by the board. But on a state legislative basis, where we don't deal with things such as a declaration of war, or where the life and safety of our people don't hang on us doing something within the next thirty seconds, the people profit by debate and consideration. And certainly this is also true of domestic issues within the National Congress. This is something that is going to have to be worked out and will probably just evolve eventually.

But I think the system that has been worked out for consideration of bills is very good. They are referred to committees and subcommittees and they have to make their way through, and it is

hard. It is not streamlined. But it keeps bad bills from being passed in a fervor. For example, when I covered the Alabama legislature, I saw hasty action. The legislature was white, elected predominantly by the white voters and they rushed all over each other to get to their desks to vote for any segregation bill. And certainly in a situation like the riots occurring now, I am sure there would be some really vindictive legislation introduced in a segregationist legislature in some of these southern states. It helps to be able to take a longer look at these things and let them calm down. And another thing is once you get something through one side of the Legislature, it can be stopped in the other house. I found that quite often people don't take you seriously on a bill and they will come to you later and say, "Doggone y'all passed that bill and I didn't think it had a chance; I wasn't even worried about it." But still, if they do oppose the bill and have valid reason for their opposition, they can go to the Senate and say, "Hey, fellows, let's kill this bill." Then, of course, you also have another shot at it if the Senate only amends it, because it must come back to the House. Particularly toward the closing days of the session, an amendment is as good as killing a bill because you will never get it back through the log jam to get the amendments passed, or it is extremely difficult to do so.

Along that same line I have come to understand more the reason for formality. I had thought it was simply tradition. For example, in the United States Senate, they refer to each

other as "the able and distinguished senator from Idaho" or something like that instead of using first names or epithets. And in Austin, in the Texas House of Representatives, we refer to each other on the microphones as Mr. so-and-so. You might have been out having coffee with the guy before and be on a first name or nickname basis, but when you got on the floor it became, "May I ask the gentleman this question?" or "Mr. Jones, have you thought about this point?" At first it seemed to me that this was simply a holdover from a more formal age. But it has a very definite purpose. I have seen tempers get very riled. When you really strongly believe something, not everyone is capable of controlling his temper. We all have a point beyond which we lose our temper. Requiring this formality makes for more seasoned, more deliberate, more thoughtful debate, and less of personalities and name-calling.

A criticism I have of the legislature is that there is not enough time to study all the bills that come up. Now they have done something about it this time and for the first time this session they began to require the committee clerks to brief a bill. In other words, you introduce a bill and when it is referred to a committee, the clerk of that committee would brief the bill. They placed before each committee member a copy of the bill and a copy of the summary. The only difficulty is the summary, sometimes deliberately can leave out points.

Now the bill itself cannot be written like a summary because the lawyers--and bills are predominantly written by lawyers--need

to try to cover all the loopholes, and all the possibilities. Therefore, you need the great lengthy whereases, therefore, and whatever's type of presentation. But the gist of what the bill will do can be boiled down and it is very helpful to be able to read two or three paragraphs on a summary sheet rather than a four or five page bill. And this has been a help.

On the floor many members bring with them files containing the bills that they know are coming up that day, although this can get pretty thick toward the end of the session. The session is in definite stages. In the first part of it, bills are being introduced and referred to committees and the committees do most of the work. You spend most of your time in committees and the sessions on the floor are maybe an hour or so a day, or less. People who gauge legislative accomplishment by the length of time the body is in session criticize you for spending so little time. They say, "Well, the legislature met for an hour on Thursday and adjourned until Tuesday." The truth of the matter is you're working your head off in committees and trying to get your own bills drawn up and so forth.

Texas has a system that has been very helpful called the Legislative Council. It's headed by Robert Johnson, a former member of the House from Dallas, and a very, very astute lawyer. He also serves as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives and as such advises the Speaker on rules and helps him with his decisions on parliamentary procedure and so forth. I have no legal training. My training is in journalism. If I want a bill

drawn I can go to the Legislative Council and it has lawyers who can do it in the proper form. One of the big problems is the problem of having the bill printed with its amendments. This is done by the Enrolling and Engrossing Room. A very capable lady named Orea Guffin heads this department. It's a very vital part of the process. (Engrossing means including the amendments.) They have some limitations which also work to our disadvantage. But it is not because they don't try. They really work.

A member can go to the Legislative Council and have a bill drafted. He can have it drafted and redrafted until it suits him. Generally you sit down with the lawyer assigned to your particular bill and you say, "Now let's change this, this, and this," rather than saying, "I don't like it, go back and redraft it." But this would be a matter of personality and as a matter of dealing with the individual. Once the bill is drawn, it is typed in final form. When they type it, they also cut a perforated paper tape, as I understand the process, and this helps a great deal in the Enrolling and Engrossing Room later on. They just pass the tape up to the Enrolling and Engrossing Room and it helps them in having the bill typed there.

One difficulty is that the Enrolling and Engrossing process takes some time. This is simply because the Enrolling and Engrossing Room doesn't have the man power to get things out any sooner. For example, when a bill passes second reading, it is very, very difficult to get a copy of that bill before third

reading. I am speaking here where third reading occurs on another day, usually the next day. On many of the bills, the speaker says, "Mr. so-and-so moves to suspend all necessary rules in order that the House might take up and consider on third reading House Bill 1004 or whatever its number. If the House suspends its own rules to take the bill up the same day, then you know what bill you are talking about--what its provisions are. Quite often, and this becomes a matter of strategy, you want to sit off and take a look at what amendments have been added. I am thinking particularly of a bill that was introduced proposing the creation of a Certified Shorthand Reporter. The way the bill was drawn, I opposed it because I felt that it created a monopoly for a certain type of court reporter. It said that before anyone not only could be a court reporter, but also could even take a deposition, they had to be a Certified Shorthand Reporter. The bill, as drawn, excluded even stenographs and other machines used in court reporting. I got up and put on an amendment that said this did not circumvent the present law that allows justices of the peace and others to take depositions and Renal Rosson, the member from Snyder, got up and put an amendment on it that said, "If both parties agree, anyone can take a deposition." Thus, if both parties agree, one of the lawyers' secretaries could take a deposition. In the matter of a deposition, you're worried about accuracy. You are not worried about how fast someone can take the words down. Whereas, in court proceedings, you're after someone who can take conversation or

testimony accurately and quickly.

When they passed this bill to third reading, it was passed over my opposition but it did pass. The governor later vetoed it. When it passed the third reading, I wanted to try to see what amendments were on it so I would know where we stood and if we still wanted to oppose it or whether we had a good bill finally. You can change a bill from bad to good with amendments. And it's extremely difficult from the point of view of having to assimilate the amendments into the text of the bill itself. When you draw up a proposed amendment, whether it's drawn up carefully in advance or hurriedly on the floor, you have to have three copies of it. So I began keeping a legal-sized pad and two sheets of legal carbon paper in my desk solely for that purpose, and most of the other members did the same. And you could say, "Amend House Bill 1004, part 3, section A," or whatever it happened to be, but if you weren't quite sure, you could simply say, "Amend appropriate section and paragraph," or something like that to make it read thus and such. So the Enrolling and Engrossing people have then got to go in and read the bill and figure out where that amendment is supposed to go. These amendments often are written out in long hand, and not everybody's long hand is easily decipherable. So the Enrolling and Engrossing Room must assimilate the amendments into the bill and then get a copy of it out in a neatly typed form.

And it has to be neatly typed to prevent inaccuracies from coming in, because a sloppy job done by the Enrolling and Engrossing

Room could create chaos on the floor. If they got an amendment in the wrong place or amended the wrong section, it would cause problems. So they not only have to type these bills up, but also they all have to then be proofread. So from a physical labor point of view, it's a difficult thing to get a copy of a bill with the amendments on it quickly. I think this is a detriment to the legislature. The only thing I can see that would help it would be to give Mrs. Guffin more personnel so that she would be able to do this, but it would call for a vast army of people in there. And you run into how much money is available and the taxpayers scream about the costs of their government.

I mentioned that whether a bill is passed one day or postponed might be strategy. There's a sort of a steam roller effect in passing a bill. If you've got the House in a good mood, and if they're voting for your bill, you want to go right on through and suspend the rules and get the whole thing out of the way because the mood of the House changes. I remember I tried to pass a bill about 6:00 on a Saturday evening, late in the session when everybody was tired and we'd been under a lot of pressure. They just about slapped my bill down. I got it through to third reading, but I wasn't about to try to suspend the rules because I knew I couldn't do it. It requires a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules. It's important for a freshman or any member to know the rules because the rules can be used to your advantage and to the detriment of your opponent, particularly if he does not know the rules. In any event, people would get up and they say with the calm voice of reason, "All right,

boys, now we've passed this one through to third reading. They're going to try to suspend the rules here, but we've amended this one a lot. There's been a lot of discussion. I think we all need to take a cool, dispassionate look at this, and we can pass it over until tomorrow, and then vote on it tomorrow." Well, the truth of the matter is that certain bills only come up on certain days, and it may be as much as a week before that bill may come up again. And also you've lost your steam roller effect. So this "let's wait and see what the amendments look like" can become a tactical ploy in an attempt to defeat the bill. If an opponent can get the bill put over, it gives him and his forces time to work on the members and try to present their viewpoints and win people to their side. In that way it becomes a tactical point.

Toward the end of the session, the House is passing bills right and left...bam, bam, bam...one right after the other. It would be a physical impossibility to even read the summary sheets on all of them, along with the other duties that you have. Most members are pushing bills of their own as well. There just isn't enough time. The session, I think, is too short. But, towards the end, particularly if this steam roller effect is rolling, and the House is passing bills one after another, where sometimes a member will just get up and kind of mumble. This can backfire on you if you get up and say something very general about it. Someone who opposes it will stand up and say, "I'm sure it's a very good bill, but would the gentleman explain it more." When somebody gets up and starts fighting with you, the membership sits up and pays a little

more attention.

The scene on the floor of the House is a lot different from what the average person expects it to be. Seldom do the members sit in their seats and listen quietly to the debate. Most of the time you're up wandering around. Also there are pages and sergeants-at-arms moving around. The telephone company provides operators who answer the telephone and come get you when you have a call. All these people are milling around plus the fact that the members themselves get up and mill from desk to desk. And I frankly wouldn't have it any other way because it helps during a debate for me to be able to go over to someone whose judgment I respect and say, "What do you think about this bill?" And he may very well have some views and present some points that I haven't thought about. It helps. But the public doesn't realize this. All they see is a bunch of people milling around. And you develop sort of a second ear. You're listening to what's going on even though you're also listening to the person with whom you're conversing. A lot of what goes on is form and routine which must be observed, but you don't have to sit there and listen implicitly to every word.

But I think the average person who comes in to sit in the galleries and watch, expects the decorum of the United States Senate. There, if you want to talk to somebody more than a word or two, you go into the cloak room. Well, this deprives you of being able to know what's going on on the floor. Members in the Texas House just kind of mill at large. But at the same time you know what's going on because you can hear. I've seen guys talking

and suddenly they'll say, "Just a minute," and they'll jump up and ask the speaker a question or cast a vote or something. So you do keep up with what's going on. But people who come in to see the House wonder about all the milling around. They feel you're not really paying attention to the people's business.

Now the House has calendars for bills, particularly since they changed the rules to put in a Rules Committee. There are local and uncontested bills which are included on various calendars. A consent calendar, for example, is one where, if a certain number of members object to your bill, it's knocked off of that calendar and put on another one. It's to your advantage to have a bill on the local, uncontested calendar or what they now call a consent calendar, because these are generally passed almost automatically. I think the Senate calls them local, uncontested bills because everybody knows that they're just going through the form of passing these bills. A lot of them are local bills, and it's a tradition in the House that you don't mess with somebody else's local bill. It affects his area and the courtesy is that you don't mess with it. It's more than courtesy because if you mess with somebody's local bill, that person is liable to go around and have one of your pet bills killed. Also, it's considered better to let each locality handle its own. The theory behind this is that a member from that locality is not going to do something that will be detrimental to his locality because he knows he's got to go back to those same people for re-election.

But what you run into sometimes, particularly during generally routine business, is people who get up and mumble. You're wandering

around and you haven't really been keeping up too well and you don't know exactly what all this bill does. So you may vote without enough information.

In the Texas Legislature, they vote through an electric system. Each member presses a button at his desk for voting yes, no, or present. And the "present," of course, is used if you have a conflict of interests or something like that. And also there's a button to call a page, and a button in case you push the wrong button and want to change your vote before the Speaker raps his gavel. The electric voting machine is operated from a booth just above the speaker's stand, and the man who operates it has a little window where he can look out and watch the House and hear the Speaker. And the Speaker will say, "All right, the question is on so and so, and so those in favor vote aye, those opposed vote no." And you press your button and it's registered on two big boards at the front of the chamber. If you vote yes, a green light shows beside your name on these boards. If you vote no, it's a red light. If you vote present, it's a white light. So in slang, you talk about a green board or a red board. Or you might say, "We passed it without a red light." The man who runs the machine does not close off the vote count and order the total until the Speaker raps his gavel. At that point, he operates a little switch and you can no longer vote from your desk. You can no longer push your button. It's locked in place, and the machine automatically totals what votes are registered. Then a paper copy of this is sent by a pneumatic tube down to the foot of the Speaker's desk where the

clerk gets it. Also some vote by getting the Speaker's attention, and then holding up one finger for aye, or two fingers for no, or, I would presume, three fingers for present, although I've never seen anyone ever do that. You're voting aye or no mostly. And the Speaker will order the clerk, "Show Mr. so and so voting aye. (Or no, as the case may be.)" The clerk then takes the tabulations from the electric machine and adds in these three or four or five, generally, who have voted from the floor, and then he totals it up and hands it to the Speaker. And the Speaker announces the vote: "There being 75 ayes and 23 no's, the motion is accordingly passed," or whatever it happens to be.

When people are up trying to get a bill passed, they sometimes ...they know members are voting aye, aye, aye, right down the line, they'll get up and kind of mumble a little bit. And it becomes sort of a joke among the members. "That was pretty good mumbling for a freshman, kid." And at one point along toward the end of the session, I even proposed, privately, that we form an Olympic Mumbling Team. There was one man from the Rio Grande Valley who was particularly good at it, Maurice Pipkin, and I was going to make him coach. But the suggestion never really caught on.

There is, by the way, a very definite place for humor in the session. A lot of things come up that are funny. But a lot of it is hard to explain because it's inside jokes. For example, there was a bill proposed that called for the state to inspect feed lots. A feed lot is a place where a bunch of cattle are brought together and, rather than being put out on the range, they're kept in close

quarters and fed to fatten them up. One section of the bill drew a great deal of fire. This was the section that would have said that if a feed lot had met the state minimum requirements, it was not subject to suit by someone who might claim it was a nuisance. A feed lot, unless it's properly maintained, can smell bad and can pollute water. So this bill was shot down by a very, very large vote. I forget exactly, but let's say that out of 150 members, there were only eight or ten who voted for it. Maybe it was closer than that, but not much. And it was the first major bill to be shot down by such a large vote. The rest of the session there were jokes about the feed lot. And when someone's bill was a bad bill, you'd hear cries across the floor, "Send it to the feed lot," and this type of thing. I had a bill voted down at one point, and one of the members looked up at me and grinned and said, "Go get your bale of hay, they just sent that bill to the feed lot."

And then different comments come up. One of the people who was good at alleviating tension with humor was a man named Neil Caldwell from Brazoria County. Neil was a very accomplished pianist and a great artist. He was very, very good, particularly with portraits. In fact, he's the man who designed the picture that decorates the head of our certificate for the Texas Association of Windmill Tilters. And in addition, he's a good lawyer. I think he's a very able and a very conscientious, hard-working legislator. I was sorry to hear him say he doesn't plan to run for re-election.

One thing that stands out in my mind is when Randy Matson, of Texas A & M, who had just set a world's record with the shot put,

visited the House of Representatives. The speaker had him on the platform up front, presenting him with a resolution honoring his achievement. Matson was a tremendous giant of a man with wide broad shoulders and large arms. What you'd expect to find on an Olympic shot putter. Caldwell was rather short and very slight, although he was a good athlete in track. Caldwell came up to the snorting pole and got the speaker's attention, was recognized, and said, "Mr. Speaker, you know that Aggie joke I was going to tell you? Well, forget it." This type of humor may seem a little out of place in a deliberative body, but it helps to ease the tension. And Caldwell had a great sense of humor along with many others.

For the same reason, he was a very effective debater. There were two men who particularly had a reputation in debate. One was Neil Caldwell of Brazoria County. The other was Representative Dick Cory from Victoria, Texas. And either one of them, if they got up to question your bill and really wanted to debate you about it, could leave you "bleeding all over the floor" as the saying goes. Their questions would be very sharp, to the point, and could quite often completely tear up your beautifully made case for your bill. Fortunately, I never had to go up against either one of them, but I've seen them really take on some people and do a very adept job of opposing the bill.

Turning to other subjects, I feel the session is not long enough, but you run into a problem with a proposal for annual sessions. Congress has met this problem and it may be that the House of Representatives can too. I don't have enough experience

to know. But what you run into is that on election years, as they find in Congress, the members are in a hurry to adjourn so they can get home and politic. As I say, you've got to get elected to be a statesman.

In a legislative session, you do a lot of good. You make a lot of people happy. This past session we passed a teacher's pay raise. We passed a pay raise for state employees. And things like this make a lot of people happy but legislative bodies also have to pass some tax bills. We didn't have to do this in the last session because of the way the governor manipulated things. But you can make a few people unhappy as well. And I would think that election year-psychology might well be that you don't want to make anybody unhappy you don't have to. And this could present some problems in the idea of annual sessions.

Looking at it from an appropriation standpoint, however, it seems annual sessions would be a much better thing. Professor Edwards here in town is a former government professor at Midwestern University and is now the chairman of the Wichita County Democratic Executive Committee. He points out a legislature is something like a board of directors for a company. When you are trying to appropriate money for something that may be needed twenty-four or twenty-eight months ahead it is a little difficult in your planning; I think probably annual sessions would help from the planning standpoint. But you run into other difficulties, such as politics. The particular situation that came up concerning taxation in this session dealt with the governor's proposal. The governor has an

advantage in that when he speaks to the legislature and it is covered by television, radio, and newspapers. Legislators are not allowed to question the governor. He simply gets up and makes his speech. He can present his programs in such a way that they all sound wonderful. I didn't agree with everything that Governor Connally proposed. I was not one of those who went out of my way to cut him just to be cutting him but I did disagree with him on occasion. It would have been helpful to have been able to discuss with him some of his reasoning behind his programs. But you sort of get a chance to discuss this with him in that you are able to discuss it with his "team" in the legislature. The "team" is the group that agrees with the governor.

But whatever is the case, Connally's tax proposals were met with crashing opposition. The result was that toward the end of the session he got up and said, in effect, "All right fellows, I will call a special session dealing with taxes later. We have enough surplus funds to cover us the rest of this year." Well this is all very fine and good except that it puts us into a special session during an election year; a session dealing solely with taxes. So if anyone wants to run against any member, all he has to do is talk about the taxes. There is a wry little joke, as an aside, in which a politician finds someone who is voting against him and says: "Well why are you voting against me? After all, I got your town a dam last year and year before that I got it a new post office and year before that a new federal building and so forth." And the guy says, "Well I know, but what have you done for me lately?"

The reason this is a wry joke is that whatever is freshest in the voters mind, that is what he is going to remember. It gives a ready made platform for an opponent to be able to stand up and say, "Well what did this guy do for you? He raised your taxes, that is what he did." No one likes to pay taxes and most people don't realize that Texas has one of the lowest tax figures of any state.

I have lived in a number of states and all of them I think were higher in their taxation than Texas. It is always a dilemma you run into: the people demanding more services but being very reluctant about paying more taxes. It is like the war between the sexes. It will never be solved. The current rumor is that the session will be held next June which is after the primaries and hopefully far enough ahead of the general election to where things will simmer down. But there is already talk about the Republican Party fielding opponents in most legislative races solely on this issue or at least predominantly on this issue.

Another difficulty in serving in the legislature is that it can be financially costly. The legislators draw \$4,800 a year. This certainly does not cover all your expenses while you are in session. But it does help the rest of the year when you are at home and you don't have the additional expense of having to live in Austin. It does help to have that check coming in each month. We are paid four hundred dollars a month for both years and there is a proposal up now to increase the amount of pay to \$8,400. I have mixed emotions on it because really being a legislator is, at

least in my case, a part-time job. And I think that in most cases that is true. Now in California and some of the other states they have gone to a full-time job. The argument here is that if you pay a man eighty-four hundred dollars a year that is enough for him to live on and he can then become a full-time legislator and perhaps that is true. But I think that many of them will still retain private businesses. It will, however, be an increasing compensation and in that respect it will attract probably a better quality of individual. A great many people who want to run for office can't do so because they lack the money and I don't mean necessarily political contributions, although that is definitely a factor. I was talking to a man who was considering running for lieutenant governor, which would be a state-wide race. If you are going to run state-wide, you have to start well in advance. He wanted to start, let's say this September, for a primary next May. But the question becomes, "What will his family live on?" We just recently had a case of Senator Dodd of Connecticut being censured by the United States Senate for using campaign contributions for personal expenses. The other side of the dilemma is that a man who wants to run for office may be headed off not by any lack of ability or anything else except a lack of personal funds. I am not defending Tom Dodd, I am just making this observation.

I would like to turn for a second to the subject of Negroes in the legislature. This session of the legislature for the first time since Reconstruction days had three Negro members, Representative Curtis Graves of Houston, Representative Joe Lockridge of

Dallas, and Senator Barbara Jordan, a woman and if I am not mistaken, a lawyer, from Houston. There were three Negroes in this session and they were entirely different types of people. For example, I feel that Curtis Graves seriously impaired his ability to do his cause any good by the way that he conducted himself. On the other hand, Joe Lockridge conducted himself much more decorously but he also had his problems. He was being accused by some of the Negroes of having made his peace with "whitey" and being an "Uncle Tom." Curtis Graves, for example, made very little secret of the fact that he considered Lockridge to be an "Uncle Tom." I am not so familiar with Barbara Jordan's conduct in the Senate. It is my understanding that she won the respect of the members of the Senate which might have been a difficult feat considering she is (1) a Negro, and (2) a woman. But in any event I don't want to comment on her conduct aside from the fact that I had heard that she had won their respect because I don't really know. I wasn't around to see how she conducted herself. My general impression is that she did a very good job.

I would like to comment on the differences between Graves and Lockridge. I quite often agreed with Graves on points, because I favored civil rights legislation and equality of opportunity and so forth. But I felt that Curtis had sort of a chip on his shoulder and also that he saw every issue in terms of race. His sole conversation was wrapped up in black and white. The first time I met him I asked him what he did for a living and he said: "I am in public relations. In the trade they say I handle the black

market." Actually Curtis has a very deep feeling about civil rights. His partner in the public relations business was a young Latin American from Houston, Lauro Cruz, also a member of the House. Curtis and Lauro sponsored a minimum wage bill for example. Now Texas not long ago turned down a 50 cent an hour minimum wage, but I think this was prior to the passage of the federal government's minimum wage law. I know that it was prior to the passage of the sweeping coverage of the minimum wage which the federal government has now enacted. But Curtis and Lauro proposed a dollar and a quarter minimum wage covering down to farms that employed five or more employees I think. This also, I think, covered laundry workers and restaurant workers and some others. It was never given a chance and never saw the light of day. I think it was bottled up in the Rules Committee or maybe in a committee before that. This was despite the fact that you had the Huelga, the strike, going on in the Rio Grande Valley and despite the fact that there had been the march on the state capital. Also, there was for a good part of the session, a vigil kept on the front steps of the state capitol by at least one member of an organization backing the minimum wage. You would see a person, usually a Latin American, out there on the steps of the capitol. On one of the hand railings, they lashed each day with string, a little wooden block from which protruded a Texas flag and a Christian flag, as I recall, or an American flag and a Christian flag, but anyway a couple of little flags. The man would stand there and when people asked him a question he would explain that he was in a vigil in support of the minimum wage.

But to return to Curtis and Joe Lockridge everytime I talked to Curtis his conversation dealt with the Negro and the white. He was very conscious of it and I think very deeply moved in support of the civil rights movement. But I disagreed with some of the ways that Curtis interpreted things. In particular there was a bill up that dealt with the makeup of a school board in Tarrant County. In many school board elections, the people in power have a tendency to perpetuate themselves. If they are elected at large, you generally have most of the people elected from the better part of town. The school board is a non-paying job and...in fact it is a good way to make a lot of enemies. Everybody has a different opinion on how the schools ought to be run and they get pretty carried away with their opinions sometimes. The people from the better economic areas can more afford to serve. Also, even if someone from one of the lower economic areas runs, he doesn't have the campaign funds generally that somebody from the better area does.

Waggoner Carr used to tell a story about a man who said, "You know I'm a poor boy, but I feel like a poor boy can still be elected in Texas politics." His friend said, "Buddy unless you have enough money to get on television and tell the people you're poor, they'll never know it." And I think this is very true in many ways. The person who can afford television time, and billboards, and newspaper ads has a much better chance of being elected. I think Curtis had a very definite point. I question not his point but the way he went about it. Curtis favored electing school board

members from districts or wards. The same could hold true for the city council. We were both serving on the School Districts Committee, headed by Representative Tom Bass of Houston. One ploy that is used to perpetuate the group in power on a school board is: if they know someone is going to resign or not going to run again, they will arrange for that person to resign a few months ahead of time and have someone else appointed in his place. They make sure that that someone is friendly to the current administration. Then that appointee can run as an incumbent when the election comes up. It's a political fact that it is much harder to defeat an incumbent than it is if both candidates are running for an open seat.

But in any event this particular question came up concerning the way the school district elections would be held in Tarrant County. Curtis wanted to amend it. But it was a local bill. Curtis was told by some of the local members, "Leave it alone Buddy--you don't mess with somebody else's local bill." But he insisted. I suggested to him that he instead introduce a bill of statewide application providing that in all cities in the state the candidates for school boards and city councils would have to run from districts or something along that line. But Curtis said that he had been told by some of his advisors to amend this bill. He had talked to several men, such as college professors who taught in the Negro colleges and such. He had been told by them (by one man especially, I think he said) that they felt this bill should be defeated. Curtis was named to a three-man subcommittee on the bill. The other two members of the subcommittee didn't want to mess with the local bill.

I think the sponsor was Tommy Shannon, and I don't know whether Tommy would have been vindictive about it or not. But he could have turned around and gotten bills killed that were pets of these subcommittee members. It only took something like five votes to kill a local bill and almost any member could round up four friends to vote a bill down. And if you couldn't get a local bill passed to help your district, an opponent could use it against you. (A local bill is one that pertained to one locality.) As I say, the general rule was you just didn't mess with somebody else's local bill. Curtis, I felt, should have taken a little different approach.

Also, there was a good deal of antagonism because he dealt so much on the one theme. He said he told racial jokes in order to set people at ease. My feeling was it only served to accentuate the subject. And in general, I felt he took what could have been a reservoir of good will and turned it pretty much against himself because of the fact that he was absolutely uncompromising. Now compromise has come to have a bad connotation in many people's minds, but the truth of the matter is when you're dealing with 181 people as you are in the legislature, the name of the game is compromise. The only way you can get anything accomplished is what the others will allow you to accomplish. It may not be exactly what you want, but it's the best that you can get through.

Curtis' theory, as he expressed it to me, was though that it helped him politically every time "Whitey" slapped him down. Also, Governor Connally was not particularly popular in his district, according to him, and he felt if he fussed at the governor and

cussed the governor, this would help the Graves image. Looking at it from a political standpoint, he felt that the more "Whitey" slapped him down, the more he was helped. And in his district that might be true. But I felt that, like the people who went out of their way to cut the governor for no particular reason, Curtis was cutting his own effectiveness in the process. I felt that if he wanted to be strictly a spokesman for the Negro, which he apparently did, he could have been much more effective if he had been a little bit more moderate in his actions. But I can imagine that a great deal of resentment could be built up by a Negro due to the undeserved slurs any Negro receives. And I know it's very difficult for a man to grow up under the stigma of prejudice which he's undoubtedly had to face all his life. But Curtis was so much in contrast to Joe Lockridge.

Now, of course, Joe was from a different situation, too. Curtis was from a predominantly Negro district in Houston. As someone told me in trying to get me to support the bill proposing liquor by the drink, which I opposed, "Now we understand that the first law of nature is you've got to get re-elected, and everybody knows his own district, but we wanted to see if you felt that you could support our bill." And I told them I couldn't, not only from a political standpoint, but also from personal belief as well. Anyway, Curtis was from a particular district. In Dallas the present custom is to elect at large from Congressional districts. Dallas County, I think, has three Congressional districts in it now. A candidate runs at large within a Congressional district.

So Joe would be seeking votes from a mixed community, and perhaps from a predominantly white community. In addition, you have something in Dallas that you don't have so much of in Houston and that is an establishment that pretty well controls. I forget the name of it, but there's supposed to be a committee of influential citizens in Dallas who sort of run things.

And it was said Joe was selected to run for the legislature with the idea that the committee wanted to work more Negroes into public life. The feeling was that if you're going to have a Negro candidate and ask white people, particularly white people who may well be prejudiced, to vote for him, then you want to get a good man. So Joe Lockridge, who was a young lawyer in Dallas was sort of handpicked as a man who could win the respect of both whites and Negroes. And I felt that Joe did a very good job. As someone said: "Joe was like Senator Edward Brooke of Massachusetts. He was trying to be a representative of all the people and not simply one racial group."

Lockridge became the first Negro to get a bill passed through the Texas House since Reconstruction. He and Representative W. S. (Bill) Heatly from Paducah sponsored a bill dealing with the sale of chicken by the piece. Texas law for some reason had held that a chicken had to be sold by the pound. The bill that Lockridge and Heatly passed jointly provided that chicken could be sold by the piece. This was being done in many restaurants and drive-ins already. A customer could order a box of chicken and get any number of pieces in it. This bill made it legal. This was the

first bill which had a Negro as an author that had been passed in the Texas Legislature since Reconstruction. When it was finally passed, the House gave a very warm and genuine round of applause to Joe Lockridge.

But the other side of this thing is that there were only two Negroes and the rest of the House was white. Curtis Graves, for example, made no secret of the fact that he considered Joe Lockridge to be an "Uncle Tom." That is, a Negro who kowtows to the whites, to the detriment sometimes of other Negroes. I was told by some of the boys from Dallas that Joe was drawing some fire within the Negro community in Dallas for the same reason. The more militant elements in the Negro community felt that he had made peace with "Whitey"; was an accommodationist. I do know that Joe was in poor health the latter part of the session. I believe it was high blood pressure, and it may well have been brought on by this pressure between working to get things done in the House and the push from his own race by people who have their own ideas of how to accomplish their goals. And many of those who are pushing are very impatient. I talked to Joe. He was a very intelligent man, and he did not emphasize racial subjects. But I think that when he felt that it was in the interest of civil rights, he voted for a proposal.

Another example will sort of point up another portion of Curtis Graves' personality. He introduced a bill that would provide that the legislature would order that school textbooks include more information on the contributions of the minorities. Representative

Reed Quilliam and some others argued that this was already being done. Admittedly in the past, the role of minorities had been largely overlooked, but the current trend in textbooks was to do this. It was argued that if we approved of this bill that Curtis Graves had proposed, we would have the legislature dictating what would be taught in the schools. And this opened a very dangerous precedent because as soon as we did that, the John Birch Society and others of various political and religious persuasions, and quite often of extreme persuasions, would be in and say, "We want our views taught." To cite an example, some might say, "We want all references to that evil, one world issue United Nations removed from the textbooks." Of course the United Nations, whether people approve of it or not, is a very definite part of our life today, and students should, in my opinion, learn about it. But there are those who feel that it is a weapon of evil and a weapon of Communism and that it should be left out of our textbooks.

Similarly, there's been a controversy for many years--remembering the Scopes trial, for example--dealing with the teaching of evolution in the schools. It was feared this bill would open the doors for certain religious groups to come in and demand that the teaching of evolution be banned from the classroom and from the textbooks. I don't believe Reed Quilliam is anti-Negro, but he and others feared setting this precedent would open the doors. The committee eventually voted not to report this bill out because most of the members felt that it would be the legislative branch dictating what could be taught in the schools and that this might set this

dangerous precedent. Curtis, on the other hand, maintained that Negroes had been slighted in the textbooks.

Joe Lockridge was elected the Rookie of the Year, that is the outstanding freshman member of the House. And I think he deserved the award in many ways. I feel sure that the fact that he was a Negro and the way he had conducted himself as a Negro had something to do with his election, but he was also a very conscientious and hard-working member. It's just a shame they couldn't have given more than one such award. I felt that some others deserved it too: my office mate, for example, Bob Thomas from Waco. Bob was a victim of polio when he was 15, and he was confined to a wheel chair and only had the use of about three fingers on each hand, and had to be lifted into and out of his chair. But he was a very effective, hard-working member, sponsored some bills, and was instrumental in the defeat and the revision of some other bills. He was a very hard-working fellow, and I felt he would have been a good nomination for Rookie of the Year. I did feel that there was one thing that left a bad taste in some people's mouths. They put the Rookie of the Year Ballots out on the desks of the old members before the members came in, and one member went around and collected a whole bunch of these ballots and wrote in his favorite. And this struck me as rather a poor example of statesmanship or fair play. Joe Lockridge, who was elected, was not this other member's choice. Now how much that helped him in the Negro community--an award coming from "Whitey"--I don't know. But he did, I felt, try his best to be a good representative of all the people

in his district. And perhaps Curtis was representing the people in his district since he came from a predominantly Negro district. But I felt Curtis hurt his chances of being effective by the attitudes that he took.

Commenting just a moment further on compromise, someone once commented that legislation or law-making is the art of the possible.

I mentioned that I didn't know too much about what went on in the Senate. We were pretty much wrapped up in the House. Members of the House do have access to the floor of the Senate, and members of the Senate have access to the floor of the House. When either body is in session, they have people on the doors that keep out the idle curious and people like that. But each House extends to the other house the courtesy of admission to the floor. So if you need to talk to your senator, you can go over and talk to him. If you're sponsoring a bill and you get it out of the House, you still have to get it through the Senate. You need the help of someone over there.

One little side light on that is that the House of Representatives is rather jealous of the Senate being called the upper house. Actually they're equal houses, and the House prefers that the Senate be called "the other house." The other side of the coin is that most senators are looking over their shoulders. Politicians are constantly watching to see who might run against them. And I think many senators feel that, quite often with just cause, members of the House may run against them sometime. This can sometimes lead to friction. If you want to get a bill passed in the Senate, you

sometimes have to go to somebody besides your own senator, because of this or because he opposes the bill. This was not the case with my senator, Jack Hightower of Vernon. I felt that I could go to Jack with anything that I needed, and ask him to sponsor any of my bills over there. And if he didn't want to sponsor them, he'd tell me and I'd go somewhere else. But if he did, he'd do his best to get them passed. But I had also told Jack that I wasn't particularly interested in running against him for the Senate because, as I say, you can make a lot more enemies in a lot shorter time in the Senate. This may have affected his attitude, although I really think that if he thought my bills were good, he'd have gone ahead and run with them anyway. He's just a good man, although I sometimes disagreed with him.

I mentioned that the House mills around a lot while in session. There are times when the House does sit still and listen, for example during a particularly hot debate or during a personal privilege speech. If a member feels that he has been wronged, the rules of the House prescribe certain areas in which a member can make a speech of personal privilege. The most notable example I can think of is Lauro Cruz making a speech of personal privilege on a press release that was issued in his name and which he did not put out. It was later found that it was an employee of another legislator who had put out the press release. He said he was trying to stir up some interest in the minimum wage. Eventually the employee wrote a letter which was read to the entire House requesting forgiveness. And he did lose his job, I think. What

he had done was put out a press release under Lauro Cruz's name and drop it in the box in the press room. Somebody came to Lauro for more comment, and he'd never seen it before. So he got up and made a speech of personal privilege denouncing the press release.

When a member makes a speech of personal privilege, the other members give him the courtesy of sitting there and listening to what he has to say. Also, it's quite interesting because it's generally a protest about something when a member speaks on personal privilege.

Also there are certain members who are respected for their judgment. Other people aren't listened to when they get on the mike. When some people get up, you know what they're going to say anyway. Your attitude is always, "Is that guy up again?" But some other people when they get up, people listen. A good example might be Neal Caldwell of Brazoria County or Dick Cory of Victoria. There are, I guess, eight or ten, perhaps, who are known to have good, solid judgment and who don't get up very often. And when they get up to ask a question, you sit there and listen because you know it's going to be an important question and one that you may want to consider yourself. So there are certain people that when they stand up, the House kind of quiets down.

There was in the Legislature, a Legislative Wives Club. It met once or twice a month for a luncheon and tea and style show or something like that. There were a couple of difficulties encountered in this. One was that many of the lobbyists' wives were also members of this organization. I would say that probably the majority of

the lobbyists once served in the legislature themselves. Homer Leonard, who represents the Brewers' Institute, the beer lobby, is a former speaker. But I know some of the wives felt that they couldn't really let their hair down and talk frankly because the lobbyists' wives were there and could certainly be counted on to bring back to their husbands any little tidbits of information that might be useful. In a situation like the legislature, information is power. Anyone who possesses information about how someone might vote or something like that, has a negotiable item or at least a useful item; perhaps not negotiable, but at least useful. By negotiable I meant that it's part of a lobbyist's stock in trade to know how people are going to vote and to know people's likes and dislikes in order that he can best present his case in a favorable light to a particular person.

My wife and Mrs. Patsy Bass, the wife of Representative Bill Bass of Ben Wheeler, suggested to the Wives Club that they do some service projects and perhaps take some tours of some things like the state capitol and the old French Legation and so forth in Austin. And this was not met with universal approval so I think what's going to happen next session is that those wives who are interested will do this and those wives who feel that they don't want to become any further involved, that their social life is already too heavily burdened, will not do it. My wife had also suggested that the legislative wives have a mock session some morning and let the wives go through the actual processes of introducing and considering a bill so that they can understand a

little more about what their husbands were doing. Wives, I felt, were a very definite help. They were somebody to come home and talk things over with and were an asset in legislative life.

Another thing I discovered in running a campaign is that there are a great many people who like to be campaign strategists and sit around and give you advice. But when it comes to who's going to address envelopes to send out campaign literature and who's going to go out and pound the pavements in the hot sun and hand out your cards and who's going to help you put up your signs and all, there are very, very few people who are willing to do these vital jobs. Most folks want to be strategists and not workers.

A criticism that I have of our system in Texas is that you're pushed either into the liberal or conservative camp. People always want to know, "Is he a lib, or is he a conservative?" And my feeling is that I'm a moderate. Of course, as I said earlier, everybody considers himself a moderate. But I find myself liberal on some issues and conservative on others. For example, my rating with the AFL-CIO was just published here the other day. I had eight right votes, seven wrong votes, and one absence in their estimate of the issues, which I think sort of puts me in the middle somewhere. The AFL-CIO generally espouses a liberal viewpoint. Many people try to force you into one camp or the other.

I can also see why the average legislator doesn't serve more than two or three terms. The same issues come up over and over again. You defeat an issue and you think, "Well, by george, we're through with that issue." But the sponsors say, "Well, we lost that round,

but we're coming back, boys, next time." Some examples might be that the State of Texas has argued the pros and cons of pari-mutuel betting and liquor by the drink for years and years and years, and the same proposals keep getting defeated and keep coming up. The sponsors of these proposals say that the tone of the state has changed, and perhaps it has. For example, my own personal opinion, even though I oppose liquor by the drink, is that I'm fearful it will pass within the next few years.

Another interesting sidelight I've discovered since I got in the public life--and it's true also with my wife as the wife of a representative--people don't know exactly how to treat you. And people that you meet socially can be very friendly until they find out that you're a member of the House, and then they kind of stand off as though they don't want to seem to be currying favor, or as though they don't know quite how to take you. Some people assume that if you're in politics, you're dirty or dishonest. And also, you have a lot of fascinating experiences but it's like taking a trip to Europe or somewhere. You come home all laden down with fascinating experiences, and you start telling about them and people say, "Well, who does he think he is trying to show off?" And a lot of these things you can't talk about really except within the legislative family because you don't want to seem to be putting on airs, for the lack of a better term. For example, we had Dean Rusk and Ambassador Ed Clark and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey all address our joint session. President Johnson's daughter and her husband, Mr. and Mrs. Pat Nugent, attended several of these

including the one at which Vice-President Humphrey spoke. And Humphrey looked over at Pat Nugent--this was shortly before the birth of their first child--and said, "Pat, before long you're going to find out what it feels like to be number two." But you come home and you start telling these things, and people thing, "Good grief, that guy's trying to show off." This may be projection, but that's the way it's appeared to both my wife and to me.

As I say, you don't have enough time to get your business done, but people talking to you ramble and ramble. You'd very much appreciate it if they would just state their business and leave.

Another question that comes up is "How do you represent your people?" It's been a question for many, many years, really since the birth of representative government. Do you represent what your people want as you see it? Or do you use your own common sense? I think in most cases, you use a combination of the two. In the case of liquor by the drink, for example, I got maybe five hundred letters in opposition and four or five in favor, let's say, a hundred to one or perhaps not quite that high, in opposition to liquor by the drink. This might well be a clear consensus or at least a good indication of how my district felt on that particular matter. But generally people who oppose something are more motivated to write in about it, than those who favor it. So, mail is seldom really an accurate reading of your district. Neither are petitions. People will sign almost any kind of a petition. So how do you really know what your entire district wants? My district has nearly 130,000 people in it. There are two of us who serve at

large representing this county. There are certain issues that you believe your district feels strongly about, and there are others where you just use your common sense.

Speaking of letters, some of the write-in campaigns are good and some of them aren't. One of the worst was conducted by the optometrists. There was a question of whether large chains such as Texas State Optical would be required to separate the process of making glasses and process of eye examination. The independent optometrist contended that if a person went to the big companies, he might not even see an optometrist. He might be serviced by a technician. And they contended that certainly he had no guarantee that the same doctor would look at your eyes if he came more than once. So they were trying to have the functions separated. If an optometrist's name is displayed in connection with a shop, that optometrist would have to do business in that shop. Then, of course, there was the controversy between the optometrist and the ophthalmologist, who is an M.D., which is tied up in this. But either way, some large optical companies had cards printed up and had people sign them. And I could just imagine the people coming in and, as part of their processing in, they were asked to sign a card. I didn't really put much stock in these cards because I didn't feel like the people who signed them, for the most part, really had given much thought to the thing or were familiar with the issues involved.

However, the Texas State Teachers Association had a very good write-in campaign, and they and some others had been very good

about having their people write you later and say thank you. It's amazing how many people ask you for a favor and never bother to say thank you. It's a little thing, but it does mean something. You also get a lot of letters from people who oppose different things. You get letters from nuts, both inside and outside of the state hospital, and from convicts and ex-convicts and such. I try to help if I can but some requests are unreasonable. Maybe I'm a little extra touchy on this, in that my life was once threatened when my father refused to pardon a murderer from the electric chair, and an anonymous letter told him someone would kill his children. The Texas Rangers had to take us out of town for a while. But I worry sometimes about a request for help that I don't feel I can grant. I got one the other day from a woman that the doctors told me was crazy. I got another one from a convict who wanted to get out because he had a hurt knee. I checked on the thing and the guy had been treated for it once and had taken the cast off himself. Also he was a chronic alcoholic. And I didn't feel like he ought to get out. He could get medical treatment within the pen where he had been sentenced by a court of law. But what do you do? You know if you write the guy back and say, "No," is he going to get mad at you and, when he gets out, figure he can hurt you most by hurting your family or something? How about the nut who is free? And it's a difficult thing.

In answering letters, you sometimes get so many it's difficult to answer them. But here recently there have been some new innovations that help. Within the last few years, they have automatic typewriters

--Robo-typers, Royaltypers--things like this, where you can work out a form letter, but the person still gets an individually typed letter rather than a mimeographed letter. In the United States Senate, I know, they even have machines that are capable of signing a senator's signature. If you write him on a very popular issue, or a very hot issue, it's very likely that you'll get a reply that appears to be typewritten and personally signed, which the senator himself neither saw nor touched. His staff handled the whole thing.

As I say, your family life does suffer. Your time is taken up with other things. I estimate that I eat only about three to five meals a week at home during the session. The rest of them were the League of Women Voters breakfast or lunch with the lobbyists or some dinner somewhere. A little sidelight, and probably because I'm overweight, I noticed it more than most: but I had several people comment that everybody puts on weight during the session because you go to all these places and most of them are steak and potatoes and this type of thing and it really stacks the weight on you.

There are some pleasant experiences and some funny ones. About 29 years ago, my dad was made an honorary member of the Alabama-Coushatta Indian tribe over in East Texas. He was, as I understand it, the first chief executive of Texas since Sam Houston to visit them. And I happened to be with him. So when I was about five years old, I was made an honorary member of the tribe. It just so happened that in the Appropriations Committee hearing this year, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe made a request for some additional

money to build tourist attractions on their reservation between Livingston and Woodville in East Texas. They had had Brown and Root Construction Company, their engineers, run a survey and suggest some possible tourist attractions such as damming up a stream and making a lake and putting in a camp ground and an Indian village and so forth. Some of this, the Indians have already done. But they wanted some money to do the rest of it. They told the Appropriations Committee that if they were given this money, they felt that it would make them self-sufficient and they would not have to come back to the state for additional appropriations.

Later the committee had a meeting in the apartment house of Representative Bill Heatly, committee chairman. He rented a little dining room and we all had dinner and talked the bill over. We came to the part about the Indians and I was trying to get more money for them. Representative John Hanna is the representative from that district, but he wasn't on the Appropriations Committee. But I felt these people had a valid reason. Of course, what you run into here is that almost everybody has good, valid reasons. There's only so much money to go around, however. It's like a personal budget. Anyway, we bantered back and forth. The argument against more money was that they were friendly Indians and wouldn't revolt if they didn't get all the money they'd requested, and I kept saying, "White man speak with forked tongue," and things like that. But eventually, and partially, I think, through my efforts along with the efforts of Speaker Barnes and some others, they did get a great deal more money than was in the original bill. And I

feel it'll help them to become self-sufficient. Conditions on the reservation are not good. They need more income sources. As a side-light, I just ran into the son of the chief who is a regular Army sergeant at Fort Gordon, Georgia. I happened to notice his name "Sillistine" on his fatigues, and asked him about it. He's the son of Cooper Sillistine, the present chief.

One other point that I'd like to comment on is the matter of vetoing. I had one bill that was vetoed. I had had a lawyer draw it up in the Legislative Council, and then we'd had some revisions drawn up by a constitutional lawyer in one of the law firms there in Austin. One of the lobby groups that favored the bill had retained this lawyer to help me get it drafted. There were several lawyers who dealt with this particular bill, including the chairman of the Judiciary subcommittee that considered it. He was Bill Braecklein, a lawyer from Dallas. The chairman of the full committee that considered it was Renal Rawson, a lawyer from Snyder. It went through all this, and then the Governor vetoed it.

I happened to be talking to somebody who mentioned that the boy who had briefed it for the governor's veto was a young kid just out of law school. And this strikes me as a little bit unfair. I don't really know exactly how it could be remedied except I think it would be helpful if the governor, when he plans to veto a bill, could call the author and say, "Look, I'm going to veto your bill, and here's why." He could at least hear what the author has to say about the bill. In my case, I was not consulted at all. This seems to be the way they operate quite often. This is one reason

why I sometimes say Governor Connally is a little out of touch with the legislature. Another example: during the push for four-year terms for the governor and others, one particular representative changed his vote. He first voted against it and, under pressure, changed his vote and voted for it. A day or so later the governor came out and publicly blasted one of his pet projects. Some members wonder why they should do a guy a favor if he is going to turn around and cut their throats.

The Rules Committee is an additional power given to the Speaker. The Rules Committee decides which bill shall come to the floor and what order it will have on the calendar. I had the experience of having the Speaker order that one of my bills be placed above another bill on the calendar because many opposed the other bill. It was getting toward the end of the session. (He didn't want my bill held up while we debated the other bill.) The Speaker wanted to get my particular bill passed, in this case, primarily because I had bird-dogged him enough and stayed after him until he, I think, wanted to get me off his back. But, whatever the case, he was able to say, "Put his bill ahead of the other one on the calendar." The Rules Committee does a lot of this and really it is kind of a buffer for the Speaker in that the Rules Committee can be blamed for it and also it does help to keep out bills that the Speaker's team doesn't particularly want to pass. There are some bills that are proposed that a person can really get cut up if he votes for them. And the Rules Committee cuts these things out to be sure that the Speaker or somebody doesn't

get cut up on it. There was a proposal made at this time for constitutional revision. It's a proposal that has been made any number of times but Governor Connally has espoused it this time and I believe that it is the first time that a governor has publicly called for constitutional revision. It has long been a drive of the League of Women Voters. There are about three different schools of thought on this. The constitution was written long ago and it has been amended and amended and amended until it has become lengthy and unwieldy. Also it is my opinion that there are some things which are required to be set by constitutional actions which could better be set by legislative action. The constitution, for example, sets certain rates at which investments in certain funds can be made. The legislature might better be able to decide these things. It takes a lot longer to get a constitutional amendment through than it does to get a bill through the legislature. However, those who oppose constitutional revision maintain that despite the fact that the constitution was written a long time ago, the amendments have kept it up to date and that it is, in effect, a constitution of 1967.

They also say that the constitution has settled many points which could become open and bleeding issues again if constitutional revision comes up. Then, too, the question arises of who would name the delegates to a constitutional convention. Who would name the people who would write the new constitution? If it is the Speaker, or the Governor, or Lieutenant Governor, or people like that, some would consider that these men all come from the same

camp in the current administration although Preston Smith has said he will run against John Connally for Governor. They're basically from what is considered to be the more conservative at least the moderate to conservative wing of the party and it's felt that their viewpoint might prevail in the constitution. Those who don't agree with that viewpoint would oppose this. If, on the other hand, you elect people you get the best politicians. But are they necessarily the best in constitutional law, which is a very highly specialized field? Also, if they're elected, couldn't the special interests provide the campaign funds for the ones they wanted to get elected? If so, in effect, the special interests could be rewriting the constitution to suit themselves.

Representative Travis Peeler of Corpus Christi has made a proposal that calls for revision of the constitution section-by-section. I remember the last ballot we had. There were sixteen amendments proposed and the people were completely confused. I made a number of speeches trying to explain what these various amendments did but the people were confused and didn't understand a great many of them. Also, some of them were worded rather deceptively, notable number seven, I think it was, which dealt with the poll tax and what the people were actually voting for was not simply whether or not the poll tax would be abolished, but whether we would have an annual or permanent system of voter registration in the state. The AFL-CIO has challenged this in the courts. I don't know I think the AFL-CIO was initially upheld and it is on appeal but anyway it is still in the courts. And people who oppose

a complete revision at one time argue that if the people couldn't understand sixteen amendments, they could not understand an entire constitution. Peeler's proposal was for a section-by-section amendment, with the people voting on one section before the next section is amended. The idea was that more people would be able to keep up with what's going on and with the various issues involved. Constitutional revision was referred to a study group.