

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION  
NUMBER

Interview with  
Alonzo Jamison  
July 30, 1968

Place of Interview: Denton, Texas

Interviewer: H. W. Kamp

Terms of Use: Open (cont.)

Approved: Alonzo Jamison

Date: Feb 6, 1970

Oral History Collection

Alonzo Jamison

Place of Interview: Denton, Texas

Interviewer: H. W. Kamp

Date: July 30, 1968

Dr. Kamp: I'm H. W. Kamp, professor of government at North Texas State University. This is July 30, 1968. This is an interview with the Honorable Alonzo Jamison, member of the Texas House of Representatives in the Texas state legislature. This interview concerns primarily Mr. Jamison's reminiscences upon the recent special session of the Texas state legislature in the year 1968. Mr. Jamison:

Mr. Jamison: The timing of the special session, so as not to interfere with the primary election campaigns, was one of the first problems that seemed to appear with respect to the special session. Not only were many of the members of the legislature themselves involved in races for the primaries in May and June, but both the speaker and the lieutenant governor were involved in statewide races and the lieutenant governor was involved in a run-off race until the first of June which was the date for the run-off primary. I think the primaries must undoubtedly have been a factor that influenced the governor in the timing of the session because he did call the special session for really the first good day that he could call it after the second primary. He called it for June 4; the primary

had been run just the preceding Saturday on June 1. This was beginning to be a pretty late date for holding a special session for budget matters when one considers that the state's fiscal year ends on August 31, a date which was less than ninety days away from the opening of the special session. Assuming that the session would run at least thirty days, and according to many predictions would run sixty days, this left a very small margin of time between the time that the spending decisions would be made and the time that they would go into effect. And I am sure that this posed a problem for budget-makers, especially in institutions of higher learning, and probably in all the state agencies. As it turned out, we completed our work in thirty days, and so the agencies weren't as crowded as they could have been. Even at that, from the observations that I had of how anxious the colleges were to get their appropriation figures, they were having to wait; it was really too late. And this poses a question about when would be the best time to hold the annual budget session if and when the legislature decides to submit it to the people and if and when the people decide to adopt it.

The legislative aspect of the timing was this: given the late date of starting the special session and the closeness to the end of the fiscal year, if a real bitter fight had developed on taxes and on appropriations, it would have been impossible to pass an immediate-effect tax bill. You would have had to go to a ninety day tax bill; you could have had that present a problem.

And the element of timing presented itself as a political problem on the effective date of the tax bill. The tax bill that was passed was made effective for September 1. This means that on September 1 all over the state the sales tax is going to go up another 1 per cent--in the midst of the election campaigns. Many members who face Republican opposition this fall were and still are very unhappy about this September 1 effective date on the tax bill. There was a problem about passing the tax bill at all in the Senate; there was no problem in the House about passing the tax bill. If there had been more of a problem in the House, it's very likely that this factor about the effective date would have been a very decisive one which would have delayed the tax decision, or it would have delayed the effective date.

If in the future we go to the idea of annual sessions, we may want to change the dates of the primary elections so that they would be later in the year. I notice that most of the states that have annual sessions have their primaries in the summer or fall. There are only one or two states that have annual sessions that have May primaries. But I can see that that certainly seemed to be a problem this time--members hating to go to Austin for the special session in the midst of their primary campaigns and hating to give their opponents fodder in the newspapers on daily issues.

Another factor, I think, if we went to annual sessions based on the experience of this session would be that the budget-making process that we have been using in Texas would have to be hurried up. I believe this whole process now covers much more than a

year. This process is going to have to be compressed, timewise, if we go on an annual budget; and this means more personnel working as budget examiners, more personnel working in the budget office and in the governor's office. And the budget board examiners have told me that even though they didn't follow for this special session the normal budget-making procedures that normally are followed for a biennial bill they have been thrown three or four months behind schedule on their work for the budget for the 1969 session. And this presents a problem of planning.

One other observation that one might make about the budget-making decision of the special session might be "Well, did we spend more money by having annual sessions or less money? Did the taxpayer get a break or did he not?" Now, frankly, I haven't got my figures straight enough right now to come to any conclusions on that, but I think it would make a good study, and I'm trying to put together some material to get some idea as to whether you can make a comparison between what we did and what might have happened if we'd have done it some other way. I don't know. A lot of the press have stated their impressions that they picked up, and that was that the idea of annual sessions seems less attractive as a result of this session. Maybe the idea of annual sessions for budget-making was set back by this experiment rather than being advanced. I don't know about that for sure.

But I will say that so far as this year's budget was concerned: first, I've already said that the budget preparation didn't go through the normal budget-making steps; and, second, there was a

kind of an attitude that "we're really going to follow the 1967 budget and just make as few changes as possible." I think there was an agreed-upon policy in the budget board that they wouldn't consider any new spending programs at all for the 1968 special session. College appropriations provided for increased enrollments, but not increases in salaries for teachers. I think actually that some of the presidents are being able to give increases, but the appropriations were not computed to allow increases. Special items were hard to get into the college budgets--very hard to get in, like major repairs and improvements. In the area of public school education, despite growing interest in the state in vocational education, the Committee was not willing to increase the appropriations so that there could be a full implementation of the state program already authorized in this area. Public welfare programs were treated very skimpily in the budget. So there was a "hold-the-line" attitude of, "Let's take what was in 1967 and, boy, let's not change much of that."

Yet there were a number of pork barrel items that did get in that looked like patronage items. The governor vetoed some of these. Sometimes, I think, members of the legislature are embarrassed by these things appearing in the appropriation bill, and our constituents wonder why it is that this happens, that the House and Senate don't correct this practice. But the fact of the business is that the rank-and-file membership in the House, at least, has really little effective control over the appropriations bill, except insofar as getting items put in it. You can get items;

you can be effective as a member in trying to get an item put in the appropriation bill, but you find that when you get that put in you feel less freedom to try to get some things taken out. So by private negotiation you take care of the needs of your district. You don't do it with amendments normally. When the House appropriations bill is about ready to come out of committee, the speaker usually makes a pretty solemn announcement to the effect that the Appropriations Committee is winding up its work and the bill is going to be printed right away and is going to be laid on the members' desks. And the members are cautioned that the bill's going to be laid out, that they ought to pick it up, take the necessary time to study it, and prepare the amendments that they want to offer.

But the fact of the business is that, except for the Republicans, there is very little serious effort made to amend the appropriation bill on the floor. Of the efforts that are made, few are successful. And part of the reason is that members of the House are generally conservatively inclined, and they are concerned about what the effect would be if your appropriation bill were written on the floor. There's been a feeling among the members that if some interest of theirs has not properly been taken care of in an appropriation bill that they have a better chance to get it taken care of by private negotiation with the appropriation conferees and with the speaker than they have to run with it on the floor. Members like myself who have institutions in the district that have to be taken care of in an appropriations bill hesitate to incur the enmity of the appropriation chairman by offering amendments

on the floor; and he does make it perfectly clear--and it's a pretty good technique perhaps--that if you vote for any amendment on the floor to the appropriation bill, that's practically an act of personal disloyalty toward him. This has the effect of stifling the offering of amendments on the floor. I have been placed in the position at times when I needed to get something done to the appropriation bill, but rather than run with an amendment on the floor, I tried to work quietly with the speaker and with the appropriations conferees to get my need taken care of in the conference committee report. It's interesting to note that of the amendments offered to the appropriation bill on the floor during this special session, only one amendment was adopted. This was an amendment to increase the appropriations for the Alabama Coushatta Indian tribe in East Texas. Though this amendment was added on the floor of the House, it did not appear in the conference committee report of the appropriation bill. The member from that district perhaps would have been more likely to get his money for the Indians if he had not run with a floor amendment.

Of course, I think not only do the members feel that by trying to rewrite the appropriation bill on the floor, they might run up a tremendously extravagant bill, but I think they feel that the average member does not have enough knowledge--and I think this is certainly true--of all the aspects of state spending to make these decisions on the floor. I know that I wouldn't. It'd be very difficult for me to decide what to cut and what to increase. If I were presented with a whole series of amendments where my vote



was really going to be meaningful about whether they were put on or not, I just wouldn't have the knowledge, under present methods of operation.

I think that the special session, since there was so little other legislation, that the members on the whole had more time to study the appropriations bill, both on the second reading and at the conference committee report, than they have in the normal regular session. Part of the grumbling about the bill may be attributable to this. I heard a greater amount of grumbling over the bill and over items that were put in by the conferees than I have heard in any previous session. This grumbling came from all over the House, not just from the liberals who are usually the ones that are complaining about what the conservatives are doing. But even though there was a great deal of objection and discontent with the appropriation bill when it came out of conference committee, time and events were really against any effective opposition at that stage of the game.

Now what were the tax politics of the session? A strong working majority of the House, I think, can be called conservative or moderate conservative in their politics. Or at least they feel that their legislative districts expect them to be of that persuasion. I think that it's safe to say that the conservatives and the moderate conservatives came to the special session mentally prepared to get the additional tax money from sales taxes largely, and perhaps altogether. And probably few of these members were committed to pushing for any alternative measures. Now this is in the House.

In the Senate this apparently was not the case. Several of the senators, whose votes were needed for the sales tax, apparently felt very strongly that the sales tax increase if it were passed at all should have some additional taxes with it. A feeling of these people is that while the sales tax taxes business along with people, it doesn't tax business sufficiently, and there ought to be business taxes to balance off the sales tax. This was the main problem in the Senate. And the problem in the Senate in this regard reached the point where the Senate actually failed to engross a tax bill at one critical point. The business lobby grew very nervous about the developments in the Senate, and it seemed highly likely that the Senate might not be able to get a majority for any tax package. It's interesting to note that the governor's tax package which the House pretty promptly dropped never seemed to have much support in the Senate either. I don't recall that it was ever offered as a floor amendment during the days that various amendments were being offered. And when the Senate finally passed by the most narrow of margins the sales tax increase bill which had with it a modest increase in the corporate franchise tax, the business lobby was quite ready to have the House concur and thus get the measure enacted into law without a conference committee and without risking another vote in the Senate. The speaker, however, did not want to do this. He wanted the bill to go to conference, and it did. But before long it was reported that the conference wouldn't come out with any different bill, and so a rather unusual thing happened so far as taxation is concerned and that is that the legis-

lature passed this tax bill without it ever going to a conference committee. The concern of the lobby primarily was that they didn't want to give the Senate another chance to vote it down or to soup it up. Having the House concur in the amendments meant that the tax bill didn't have to go back to the Senate for any further consideration. The Senate has become a more liberal branch of the legislature compared with the House, and many of the lobbyists are freely predicting that the next Senate will be even more liberal than the present one. And it is the belief of many of them that this may be the last Senate for several years in which a sales tax increase can be passed without heavy taxes also being passed on business. Predictions about liberal Senates in the future may not hold up, but the lobby groups were very clear in supporting the idea of an increase in the state sales tax this session because of their conviction that it would be absolutely necessary next session to have it from their standpoint, and they might not have the votes next session to do it. They better do it now even if it raised more money than was immediately needed. It would provide a cushion for the tax needs for next time. I don't think the lobby particularly objected to the governor's tax package. The governor's tax package was that the city sales tax would be repealed and that the 1 per cent city sales tax then would be replaced by a 1 per cent state-wide tax which would be in all areas. The cities would be given rebates from the state to make up for their loss of sales tax revenue and that there'd a sufficient net gain to the state by this proposal that just a few other scattered taxes would

take care of the problem. I don't think the lobby objected to that particularly except that they felt it was not a long range solution, that the problem of passing a state sales tax would still remain next session, as I pointed out, and they thought they had more votes this time than they might have next time.

But many of the members of the legislature objected to the governor's program on the theory that if any part of his package failed, then the whole thing failed. And also many were concerned about going to what would be a new policy in the state of making direct rebates to cities from the state treasury. There was the concern that this could begin a policy that would become very expensive to the state in the future.

As to the struggle in the Senate, the Senate did struggle mightily with the tax bill. There were filibusters; there were long sessions. And the newspaper writers tended to sort of compare the Senate, which didn't seem to be able to make up its mind on anything, with the House, which had been unified and forthright on the tax question. One might as a postscript comment on the pressure of newspaper publicity and public opinion on the legislature in a tax battle of this kind. A number of senators apparently felt strongly enough about tax matters in principle that they were willing to risk passing no tax bill at all if they couldn't get their favorite policy. Now other senators, and certainly the preponderance of the House members, felt that failing to get any tax bill passed was worse than passing perhaps a bad one, from the political standpoint. That failure to get the job done in a thirty

day session was just as risky politically as passing any tax bill would be. In other words, they felt that to have the session fail and have to be called back for another one was bad politics, that almost any tax bill that could get a majority would be better than that. I don't know in the realms of public policy and of public opinion, whether that's true or not, but it has been true, I think, that legislators in the past who fought bitterly for some principle of taxation, and thus delayed tax decisions, found when they went home and talked to their constituents that they were rather more blamed for delaying than they were praised for sticking with any principle that they might have had about taxation.

Liquor reform legislation was the only other subject submitted by the governor. Originally, the leadership introduced two separate bills on liquor regulation. One was for mini-bottles and contained in addition to the mini-bottle provision some reform measures. The other bill was a pure reform measure and did not have anything to do with the mini-bottle system. At the committee stage these two bills were combined. A decision was made to push for one single bill which would have the mini-bottle in it and have a whole long list of reforms of the liquor control act. I think this is a question which on a review one would wonder whether it was a wise strategy--whether it would have been better to have gone with two separate proposals as originally started out. I don't frankly know the reasons why the two were combined, except that some thought the mini-bottle bill would pick up votes if general reform measures were lumped in with it. I suppose that was the basis.

There might also be a feeling that no reform is wanted unless the mini-bottle bill is in the package. Now as we know the liquor reform bill with the mini-bottle feature in it was passed by the House by a slight margin. But in the Senate it ran into trouble. At one stage the mini-bottle part was taken out of the bill in the Senate, and it still did not have the votes to pass. But there were not the votes to pass it with the mini-bottle part in, either. I don't think that the newspapers perhaps ever really were able to accurately portray how close we did come, however, to the passage of a mini-bottle bill. The Senate sponsor of the bill says that at least at one time in the Senate, he lacked just one vote of having a simple majority for the bill with the mini-bottle in it. He never could overcome this one vote deficiency. In fact, I imagine the deficiency grew a little larger as temperament . . . tempers and temperaments flared. We don't know what would have happened in conference. Here again there was a question of strategy. Some felt that if they could ever get it out of the Senate, it would be very risky to put that bill in conference committee for fear that they never could get another majority vote for it. But with a bill that technical, with that many provisions, it would've in my opinion been highly improbable that it would have been in such shape to become law unless it did go to a conference committee, just purely for technical editing.

"Well, why the mini-bottle approach?" I've been asked many times since I've been home. There was some talk about the problem of constitutionality with a straight-out liquor-by-the-drink bill.

I don't know how serious an impediment that is, but the question of constitutionality was stated on the floor of the House as the principal reason why the mini-bottle approach was used.

I think also, though, that the governor and the tourist industry, and incidentally the tourist industry is the basic special interest group supporting this legislation, felt that a miniature-bottle bill would be easier to pass than a straight-out liquor bill. And to some extent their feeling on this has been vindicated because during the regular session the liquor-by-the-drink bill never did come to a vote in the House. It did come to a vote this time as the miniature-bottle bill, and it did pass by a majority in the House, and it lacked, as I say, only one vote of having a majority in the Senate. I think the governor and the tourist industry felt that the bill would be easier to pass because they felt a miniature-bottle bill would not be as offensive to the organized drys as a straight-out liquor-by-the-drink bill. And I think possibly they were able to get the support of elements in the liquor industry itself easier for a miniature-bottle bill than perhaps for a straight-out liquor-by-the-drink. I don't have anything really tangible . . . I don't know enough about the operations of the liquor industry to know why the liquor industry might prefer a miniature-bottle bill over a liquor-by-the-drink bill. I don't know if a deal was made between the governor and the liquor industry or not on this bill, but the liquor industry was not helping very much in the regular session to pass liquor-by-the-drink, and it was helping somewhat in the special session. So evidently some kind

of understanding had been reached about getting some support and help from those interests to help pass the bill. And whether the mini-bottle approach was a part of the deal, I don't know.

But it is true that evidently the drys weren't as strongly opposed to the mini-bottle approach as they had been to liquor-by-the-drink. At least from the way they acted in the special session, they did not mount near the campaign of opposition to the mini-bottle bill that we had seen them mount against liquor-by-the-drink. When the hearings were held in the committees, they didn't try to pack the galleries. In fact, they hardly brought anybody to Austin at all. Their testimony was almost admittedly token opposition. During the regular session when we had the liquor-by-the-drink legislation pending, I received over 300 letters, cards, and telegrams from my district against liquor-by-the-drink. During the special session I may have had as many as three or four communications against the miniature-bottle bill. So the drys were less militant against the miniature-bottle bill, but the other side of the coin was that many wets were certainly not very enthusiastic about the reform. Hardly anyone down in Austin--and I think this is certainly true out over the state--hardly anyone except the restaurant and hotel people supported the bill with any enthusiasm. The support of the liquor industry was there, but I wouldn't call it zestful support. I'm not sure that any legislative votes were gained by this maneuver, but it may be true that the legislators who wanted to vote for liquor-by-the-drink could vote for it a little more easily as a miniature-bottle bill simply because they



weren't getting as many letters and the opposition was not as intense. Perhaps that was an asset to getting it passed.

Those who kept saying, "We don't want the miniature bottles. We want liquor-by-the-drink. That's what the referendum was about, and that's what we ought to have" were assured that if we could get the mini-bottles, that that would be a foot in the door for liquor-by-the-drink later on, that liquor-by-the-drink would be harder to pass now, that the mini-bottle approach could be passed now, and that within two, three, or four years there would be a greater hope for liquor by the drink.

Of course, we had the spectacle of seeing some of the legislature's most accomplished drinkers voting and working against liquor-by-the-drink and miniature-bottle bills. They didn't seem to be embarrassed by this. They felt that they were representing their districts and not their own personal taste. The supporters of liquor-by-the-drink, including the governor, apparently had their knives out pretty strongly against the private club system as it presently operates in dry territories. They stated numerous times that one of the reasons why we can't get liquor-by-the-drink in Texas is that too many people have already got liquor-by-the-drink through their private clubs and so are not interested in the issue. And the governor was supported by several as having stated privately that if the dries killed the miniature-bottle bill, he was sure going to dry up the state as an accommodation to them. He would dry up the private clubs in the dry areas, at least, and he could very well do this. If he insisted on it and, assuming

that he had enough control over the Liquor Control Board so that it began at his instigation a very tough policy on enforcing the present law on private clubs in dry areas, he could make good this threat to some extent. For the present state law on private clubs --and this is something that many private club members don't know-- is that any private club in a dry area has to operate on a locker system, and a pool system in a dry area is strictly illegal. Yet, probably few of the private clubs in this state in the dry areas are following the locker system. **They are using** the pool system as a practical matter. Even the most law abiding and prestigious of them all, the country clubs, are operating for all practical purposes in violation of the law. If the Liquor Control Board ever decided to clamp down and enforce the law, there would be some radical changes in the operation of the country clubs and other private clubs in dry areas.

Incidentally, one of the groups that became quite interested in the mini-bottle legislation were the country clubs and other private clubs. First, the interest of the private clubs was alerted by the fact that the bills proposed at the beginning of the special session had some quite restrictive features in them concerning private club operation. Then as the private club managers and others began to study the legislation and view the legislative situation, they saw some hope that while the liquor laws were being revamped that perhaps there could be some improvements made in the law that would make it easier for the private clubs to operate. I found myself interested in this more than in the mini-bottle

part, and I had a very pleasant, interesting experience of working with some private club managers in an attempt to rewrite some of the private club features of the present liquor control act. We not only got the crippling language out of proposed bills that affected private clubs, but we actually were able to get written into the mini-bottle bill some language that had the effect of legalizing what the actual practices are in the private clubs in dry areas. As a result of getting this language--we got it written in on two floor amendments on the floor of the House--the private club people became very anxious to see the mini-bottle bill passed because though they could care less about the mini-bottle part, they were pleased that an opportunity for getting a more liberalized club law. But, of course, when the mini-bottle went down the drain in the Senate, the provisions in it that the private club people were pressing for also went down the drain.

Well, in many ways I think it was regrettable that the legislature passed up an opportunity to do a little legislating in the private club area because I think the clubs fill a real need, and it's very bad government and very bad law for us to have a law in Texas on private clubs that has such a wide variance with the actual practices in these clubs. Just as a matter of being honest and not being hypocritical, we need to see the private club laws rewritten so as to conform with current practices in the more responsible private clubs. And I regret that this part, like the miniature-bottle part, failed to pass.

The question has been raised as to how much effect reapportionment is having in the legislative process of Texas since the reapportionment giving the urban residents of the state the number of members that they are entitled to. Now my first reaction is that this has not made any great noticeable impact at the present time, but I want to make perfectly clear that there may be things going on in a trend basis that will develop significantly in the future. We're just beginning to have more members from the bigger cities here. We're just beginning the era of reapportionment based on population, and it may be too early to say that it is not going to be effective. I guess I'll have to amend my statement just a minute and say that I believe it has made a significant change in the Senate. When I say it hasn't made much change, I'm thinking in terms of the House, and I think a House member's apt to think in terms of the House and in terms of what he sees in the House. I don't think there's any question but what it's had a dramatic effect in the Senate. And, of course, the reason that it has is because the Senate was so much more malapportioned than the House was. Now the House was malapportioned, but the large cities still had a great deal of representation. We were not in the situation in the House in Texas which apparently they were in many states where the large cities had practically no representation. The apportionment of the Texas House was not as badly out of kilter as it must have been in numbers of other states.

The fact is that all over the state of Texas we had cities of large size getting their full representation all along. I believe

it was only when a county got over 300,000 that the discrimination set in, so that cities under that figure were getting their full representation all along. But in the Senate the provision was that no matter how many people a county had, it only had one senator and that did represent a great discrimination.

The Senate is not going to be the bastion of conservatism that it has been. That doesn't mean that large cities are all electing liberals, but it does mean that liberals are going to be elected sometimes, while in the rural senatorial districts that doesn't happen very often. The Senate has made a big change. That's the big change.

We'll see if the time comes in the House when a big city member is elected speaker. That'll represent a significant change. We have had a speaker from a big city on rare occasions, but I think it's been most rare. We had Emmett Morse as speaker from Harris County in 1939, we had W. O. Reed as speaker from Dallas sometime during World War II, but all the other speakers have come from the outlying areas of the state. Lubbock, a medium-sized city, had a speaker, but Jimmy Turman came from Gober, and Ben Barnes comes from De Leon, and Gus Mutscher comes from Brenham. But I think the city delegations are thinking that their time is going to come to have a big city man as speaker.

I detect on the part of the speaker and the lieutenant governor and the governor himself a more of an awareness of urban problems. But I don't know if that's so much from reapportionment as it is from the fact that their votes come from those districts.

I don't know how many purely small town versus large city issues we have. Rural electrification might be one, and I think that it would be true that the rural electric co-ops wouldn't expect to pass any controversial bills in the Texas Legislature as it is now constituted, whereas as late as 1961 they thought they had a reasonable chance. I think that the urban influence is sufficient in the legislature now that the farm to market road program could be reduced any time the city boys get together and decide they want to change it. I think they can change it. I think what's happening in higher education right now--higher education politics--is indicative, perhaps, or is a reflection of reapportionment. Now I don't know exactly what the motivation is for the Board of Regents of the University of Texas to be interested in establishing branches in all the large cities of the state, unless it is a feeling that under reapportionment and under the growth of cities that the big cities are going to get higher education facilities politically one way or another. And if they're going to get them, perhaps the University of Texas feels as a matter of self-defense that the institutions in these larger cities ought to be tied into the University of Texas as a matter of self-preservation. I've been told that Austin interests at the University of Texas are concerned about the fact that Travis County only has five or six representatives in the legislature, but Harris County has twenty.

Of course, the idea of this special session was primarily the governor's. And one might have thought that he would have been a little bit more in evidence during this special session.

Some of the newspaper reporters have said that during the thirty-day period, he was in Austin only less than a week if all the days were added together. I don't know whether that's true or not, but we didn't see much of the governor. He presented the tax program, and then apparently adopted the attitude that he had discharged his responsibilities and that if the legislature preferred something else it was perfectly all right with him. He'd done what the constitution required him to do. And I didn't see any evidence that he was twisting anybody's arms in favor of his tax bill. In fact, I think that the speaker probably got an okay from him privately to go ahead with the bill that was gone ahead with. I'm told that in the Senate, even though he might've been in San Antonio or some place else when he made the telephone calls, that he did telephone a number of senators trying to get their support for the miniature-bottle bill, but his presence was not felt so far as I could feel it very much, and I regretted it, partly from the appropriation standpoint. I think that the progress that higher education has made in Texas in the last few years financially has been attributable almost 100 per cent to the leadership of Governor Conally. If my remarks seem a little critical about the time that he spent in Austin on the special session, I want to certainly offer the comment that one of the ways in which his influence was missed in the special session, I think, was on the appropriations bill. I think that since he's a lame duck that the appropriations conferees felt a little bit more independent of what he might think, and I think that this was bad for higher education. He

did not propose an extravagant budget for higher education, but he has stood and pushed for more money for the colleges and universities, than any other recent governor. But his influence undoubtedly is waning as a lame duck. I don't think there's any question about that.

I think he's held in high personal regard by most of the members of the legislature, but he just hasn't ever been a governor that cared much about catering to the fancies of the legislature. Members of a legislature feel their importance somewhat, and none of them are so proud that they don't like to get invited to the mansion now and then, and they'd all like to be able to feel that they could get in to see the governor when they wanted to. They have been able to do this with previous governors, but Governor Connally has not maintained this open door policy. Rank-and-file House members came to feel that the governor was too busy to see them, that the governor was not interested in them as individuals and personalities. Even senators! This is really something when a senator or a senator's wife will complain that they never get invited to the mansion, and they can't ever get in to see the governor. This is something that is characteristic of the way Governor Connally operated. He's delivered on what he's tried to do, and perhaps he's saved himself the trouble of visiting (chuckle) with a lot of dull people. (Chuckle) Perhaps he ought to be commended for it. But the simple fact is that the legislature has not had the access to the governor's office or the governor's person that it was accustomed to under Governor Daniel and



Governor Shivers. And I suppose the reason is that Daniel and Shivers both came up through the legislative branch. I think it's probably very much of an asset to a lobbyist to have been in the legislature, (he's not going to get the same education any other place) and I think with respect to the governor, if he's come up through the legislative ranks, he has a little different feeling about working with the legislature. With all his knowledge about the legislature, however, Governor Daniel had a lot of problems with the legislature. It wasn't because he didn't have some warmth toward the members and couldn't cater to them. It was just that he and the leadership in the legislature fell out on some major issues. Governor Connally, on the other hand, very skillfully worked through legislative leadership, at least in the House.

