

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION
NUMBER
440

Interview with
Representative David Allred
March 17, 1970

Place of Interview: Fort Worth, Texas
Interviewer: Ronald E. Marcello
Terms of Use: closed
until after my death
Approved: David Allred
(Signature)
Date: Oct. 25, 1978

COPYRIGHT (c) 1978 THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF NORTH TEXAS STATE
UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF DENTON

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

Oral History Collection

Representative David Allred

Interviewer: Dr. Ronald E. Marcello

Place of Interview: Fort Worth, Texas

Date: March 17, 1970

Dr. Marcello: This is Ron Marcello interviewing Representative David Allred for the North Texas State University Oral History Collection. I am interviewing Mr. Allred on the campus of Texas Christian University in Fort Worth, Texas, on March 17, 1970. I am interviewing Representative Allred in connection with the regular and special sessions of the 61st Texas State Legislature. Mr. Allred, one of the major issues of the first session of the Legislature concerned the one-year versus the two-year budget. What is your opinion of that particular controversy? Which did you favor?

Rep. Allred: I favored the two-year appropriation. In all honesty I have since had some second thoughts and questions, and I am more on the fence now than I was. But at that time I favored and voted for the two-year appropriation as opposed to the one-year. My reasons were primarily that I had seen what happened in the special session which Governor Connally called in

1968 in which the various state agencies came back and requested more money. They had said in '67, "We believe that we can get by on this amount for the biennium." In '68 they said, "We have another crack at the pot. Let's see if we can't pull a little more out of it." Now I may well be looking at this from the bias of having worked in Washington where budgeting and the budgetary process is kind of a game of one-upmanship. If you want ten you request twenty and let them cut you to twelve. I felt that I knew pretty well what was going on in the agency heads' minds--that here's a chance to get a little more for our agency. And, of course, you never can appropriate enough money to satisfy any agency head. Thus, it was for this reason primarily, plus the fact that I did not see the need for the additional session. It seemed to me that we were doing all right on the biennial basis. I did not see how, under the present system of handling the state finances, an annual as opposed to a biennial basis of planning would make that much difference. They know they have to plan for two years, they know roughly what the inflationary spiral will be and so forth. And under the system where you have a guy like Bill Heatly running the appropriations machinery,

I just didn't see that it would do that much good to go through the charade every year rather than every two years.

Marcello: You were obviously, then, on the opposite side of the fence from both Speaker Mutscher and Lieutenant Governor Barnes.

Allred: I spent most of the session on the opposite side of the fence. And this presented some unusual and unique problems that we might talk about sometime. But, in general, those were my reasons for opposing the one-year session.

Now, since that time, we've had some things come up that have called my attention to the fact that the legislature is not as infallible as I might have presumed. We can make some mistakes which need rectification sooner than a new biennial session. The most glaring of these, of course, is the common law marriage gambit that came up in the revision of the family code. And it's for this reason that I am now feeling more that it might be wise to have a brief session in the second year. Another example is reserve police in the State of Texas. Some of them, including those in my own hometown, have had to dissolve their reserve police organizations which were a great help to the local authorities in the saving of tax money and in providing additional men on police patrols and so forth.

Marcello: What exactly are these reserve police organizations?

Allred: A reserve police organization is a police auxiliary in one sense of the word. These departments vary. Some of them are set up under Civil Defense, others are set up under the police department or the Commissioner of Public Safety depending on the type of city government. But what it amounts to, is that these are men who are police "buffs," for lack of a better word. All day long they are working at some other job. But there is a certain amount of fascination to police work. I was on the police beat for awhile on a newspaper, and there is a certain amount of fascination in what the police do. Witness the number of police shows on television. Because you really see life in the raw, and you see a variety of situations and so forth. And so these men go out and ride with the regular officers. At an accident, let's say, they might direct traffic. They're an extra hand. They wear a badge and uniform. Even as a police reporter I was used on occasion to watch the back door while the officers went in the front and this type of thing, you know. Scared the life out of me one time. I had to hide behind a tree. We thought a guy might be coming out, perhaps shooting. It turned out to be an electric sign clicking. In any event these reservists are extra bodies for parade duty, for disaster

duty, plus the fact that with more policemen you can just cover more territory. For example, on the swing shift, the second shift which is, generally in most departments from 3:00 to 11:00 p.m., you might want to put two men to a car, and you don't have enough personnel in the police department to do it. You can put a regular officer and a reservist and that way have more cars on the road that are still two-man cars. Because in many cases where you have just one man to a car, when the dispatcher sends someone to anything other than a routine call, they have to send one or two backup cars. And this pulls a car off another beat.

Marcello: Right.

Allred: So the feeling is that those who favor police reserves, and I do in general, feel that the use of police reserves saves the city tax money in that they don't have to hire as many policemen. This is one bone of contention with the Texas Municipal Police Association.

Now there are some difficulties. The police reserve, for example, do not have arrest authority. I do not favor giving them the power of arrest. This is a pretty serious matter when you detain someone's freedom. And some of these reservists are, frankly, thrill-seekers. Most departments try to screen them out. They put them

through tests. They put them on a probationary period and so forth. But I still think that where you have a man who is coming out once in a while and is not a career man and not as seasoned as a regular officer, you stand a chance of him getting a little carried away. We have policemen, too, who throw their weight around. And you stand a chance that the reservist will also attempt to throw his weight around. Those who oppose the legalization of police reserves say that, first of all, if the city needs more policemen let them hire them. Secondly, many officers don't like to ride with a reservist because they feel that if there is any trouble they have to protect the reservist as well as themselves, and that if he gets in any trouble they are the ones who'll be held responsible. And, also, some of my friends in East Texas feel that many of the police reserves are the law and order types and as you know since George Wallace's entry on the American political scene, law and order has become, in many circles, synonymous with, "Let's keep the niggers in their place." Thus, the contention is made that in East Texas legalizing the police reserve is simply legalizing the Ku Klux Klan. So it's not at all an issue on which everyone agrees.

There's a question, too, of whether they can be armed. In some cities they carry weapons. In others

they carry a night stick, and that's all they're allowed. And it varies with the department. Civil service cities are the only place where they've had to disband them. The problem there is that under the law you have to pay at least \$40 a month, I think it is, and make the person a part-time peace officer which gives them full commission in that case, the power to arrest and so forth. And they haven't wanted to go this route. So we're attempting to pass a law that says that civil service cities may have police reserve organizations. I've found opinion among the policemen split. Some like them and some don't. And I think this would be true of any organization you had. Now I've forgotten what I was going to say.

Marcello: Are there any other reasons why you have come around to the position of perhaps favoring the one-year budget?

Allred: Oh, the point that I was trying to make on this was that because I'm the sponsor of the bill that would legalize the police reserves, I know that they feel that this is a vital issue. They have had to dissolve some of their departments. And if we had annual sessions it might come up in time to prevent disbandment. For example, they were after Preston Smith to include a police reserve law in any call of a special session. I've talked to the Governor's office, and I don't think he's going to call a special session for anything this

side of the second coming. But I've been fooled before. But, anyway, these people consider this to be vital. This was my point, and I got all involved in what the law was about. These people consider their particular cause to be vital.

There are those who oppose the way the common law marriage provisions came out since the attorney general has held that any girl fourteen and any boy sixteen can legally contract a common law marriage. And there are those who say we need to get the attorney general a good lawyer for this interpretation. I don't know what the deal is. I think his interpretation is probably correct but the law has been that way for years and wasn't questioned until now. And this sort of thing these people would feel is vital.

The mental health--mental retardation people would feel that their cause is vital. If you plan to have a brief session I have a feeling that before long it would become a full-blown second year session. Unless they raise the pay of the legislators, I don't see how many people who try to stay off the lobby kitty could afford it.

But the reasons for the two-year versus the one-year budget are a little more obscured in my mind now than they were, because I can see where we do need to go back and rectify some mistakes.

Now in this particular case, too, the two-year versus one-year budget became a political football. In addition to any arguments on its merit, it became a Ben Barnes versus Preston Smith thing with Gus Mutscher trailing along with Ben Barnes, which he generally tends to do.

Marcello: Well, Barnes allegedly favored the one-year budget because he argued that it would not create a need for new taxes. Is that your feeling now, also?

Allred: No. And I did not agree with him at the time. Barnes, of course, is the most complete politician we've seen on the Texas scene since Lyndon Johnson. But he lacks the finesse of Lyndon Johnson. I think '69 was very unkind to Ben Barnes, and deservedly so. Barnes, of course, was looking at the impact that a statement of no taxes would make on the public, because at that time Ben was wondering if he was going to run for governor or run for the Senate or what. This was before he found out that he wasn't as popular in everyone's eyes as he was in John Connally's. As someone said, Ben has a particular handicap in that when you are surrounded by people who are saying, "You're wonderful, you're great," and so forth, it's hard to keep from believing it. And this can really be a serious error. I think Connally's staff made the same error with Connally. They didn't

tell him what was going on. I have a feeling that a lot of Ben's staff tended to tell the boss what the boss wanted to know, although probably not to the extent that Connally's boys did. Ben doesn't have quite the arrogance that Connally does.

Marcello: While we're on this subject, you said, first of all, that the one-year versus the two-year tax proposal turned into a political football between Barnes and Preston Smith. Would you care to elaborate on this particular statement?

Allred: Yes, I had intended to. What I meant was that Barnes was looking at the possibility of running against Smith. It was to Barnes' advantage as he saw it--I don't think it was a wise decision--but as Barnes saw it, it was to his advantage to tear down Smith.

Marcello: Smith, on the other hand, knew that Barnes was eyeing the governorship.

Allred: Yes, and Smith was going to try to oppose it where he could. And it became a test of wills, in effect. But it was more than this. Barnes, of course, was looking at the governorship or possibly at a senate race. This was before he became embroiled in the food tax and earned the nickname "Beantax Ben" and things of this nature. Neil Caldwell of Brazoria County pinned that on him in a beautiful satire. Caldwell wrote a beautifully

satirical one-act play. He and Carl Parker from Jefferson County are a couple of the wits in the House. And Neil is an especially sharp wit and is real good at satire. He does a lot of cartooning for the Texas Observer. And he wrote this play in which a number of characters who were recognizable . . . it was an inside sort of a thing. You have to have followed the session to understand the play. But you had such characters as Knott Mucher, the speaker, and Hot . . . well, it gets a little obscene there, I guess. But they had an obscene name for Bill Heatly that was very close to his name, and things of this nature. And one of the characters was Beantax Ben. The settings include the Deck Club which is a place in the Commodore Perry Hotel where people go for lunch. It's a rather exclusive place. Then at night it's kind of a night club, I think, and they dance. I've never been there at night. I don't know, but I think that's what it is. But the Deck Club is kind of the hang-out for some of the bon vivants of the legislature, including Ben "Jumbo" Atwell of Dallas. There were some who contended that "Jumbo" drew very few sober breaths during this session. Atwell is chairman of the Revenue and Taxation Committee and was one of Mutscher's conferees on the tax bill, as the committee chairman. But the scene in the play is

the Deck Club at which the conferees on the tax bill are gathered to discuss working out the differences between the two Houses. And the characters included "Jumbo" Atwell, and some of the other conferees, such as Representative Dick Cory of Victoria. I used to think a great deal of Dick. I've discovered since that his word cannot be relied upon, and in debate he doesn't mind stretching the truth a little bit, or at least saying something that gives one impression and then goes back and says, "Now what I really said. . . ." You know, the lawyer's hairsplitting. But, in any event, there are several characters of this type including Homer Leonard, who is about to retire, I think, but is still the chief lobbyist for the breweries. And the obvious reference is that Mutscher is pretty much in the control of the liquor interests, particularly the beer boys. Of course, Gus is a German boy and he's from Brenham where they drink beer like water and do not look on it as a sin which they would in my district, for example. I'm from the Bible belt. And my county voted overwhelmingly against liquor-by-the-drink. Mutscher's, I'm sure, favored it. Washington County and his district, I'm sure, favored it.

Marcello: What is the title of this satire anyway?

Allred: I've forgotten. The character is based on Carl Parker,

innocent young legislator, who is constantly being done wrong by the power establishment, because both Neil and Carl are liberals. The scene, anyway, includes Homer Leonard who is described as the Fairy Godfather. The House conferees are there awaiting the arrival of the Senate conferees. Ben comes in by himself. Beantax Ben comes in. And someone says, "Ben, you're looking dynamic and new today," I think is the line. And it's a take-off on Ben's slogan of a dynamic new leader for Texas which backfired on him in one extent. Somebody pulled out an old picture that had been taken of him at his desk sound asleep with his feet upon the desk. And they put underneath it, "A dynamic new leader for Texas." But in this particular case they say, "Ben, where are the conferees?" And Beantax Ben says, "I have their proxies here in my pocket. And I'll be the one that will negotiate in their behalf." The whole point of the thing was that Barnes was much more tied up with the extension of the sales tax to cover groceries than he would admit later on. And there are several scenes of this type. There are also some references to closed meetings. At one point Heatly complains to the speaker that some reporters have mistakenly gotten into the session and are cleverly disguised as spittoons around the sides of the chamber. And Mutscher says, "By golly, they're

just getting in our way," or something. And Heatly has what I think is a classic line, he says, "Yes, the press has been a thorn in the side of good government for years." And his obvious reference is that good government, as he sees it, is the way he wants to run things. But the press keeps exposing, because during the session, as you know, the press continually kept bringing out some activities of Mr. Heatly's which, while they were not illegal, were certainly questionable ethically. The fact that he owned a gravel pit and sold gravel to the state. The fact that he owned an office building and rented office space to the state. Now these are not illegal, but they are certainly questionable ethically, although I'm told that his office building is one of the nicer ones in the little town of Puducah. But this type of thing. And they have Fuzz Pigg who is the Sergeant at Arms Walter Schaefer. And Fuzz Pigg goes around and spits in each spittoon and those that object he summarily throws out of the chamber. And it goes along in this vein for a good while, and the House finally revolts against Speaker Knott Mucher's leadership. The Texas Observer, sometime during the summer, printed the text of this play. You might want to include this in your collection somewhere. But it's quite good. And

it hung the name Beantax Ben on Ben Barnes because, if you'll recall, after it became apparent that the extension of the sales tax to groceries was not popular, Ben came out with a statement that said, in effect, "Who me? I wasn't for it at all."

Marcello: Getting back to another statement that you made earlier.

Allred: Yes.

Marcello: You said that 1969 was not good to Ben Barnes and deservedly so.

Allred: It was most unkind to Ben Barnes. I, of course, am not a Ben Barnes fan. You have to take my remarks in this context, that I'm prejudiced. The first time I ever saw the man was at a State Democratic Executive Committee meeting in Amarillo in 1966. And the moment I looked at him the first impression I had was, "There is a man who would cut your throat and never look back if he thought you were in his way." And I've had no reason to change that impression since. Now I get along with Ben as you have to in politics.

One of the things that really grates on me about politics is the way people will smile and shake your hand and stab you in the back. But it has ever been thus since that early Ides of March, and I guess it always will be. Politics is the art of being likeable. And you sometimes have to form some uneasy alliances

in order to get something accomplished. Political alliances are very fluid and they move back and forth. The person who is your ally on one bill may be fighting you down to the wire on the next. I've quite often teamed with someone that I did not personally like in order to support a bill that I thought was a good bill.

And, as such, I have worked with Ben Barnes on occasion and don't go out of my way to antagonize the man. But at the same time he impresses me as a man who came to the legislature and saw where the power lay, moved to it, and said, "Here am I, send me." I think he sold himself completely. It's taken him on a meteoric ride. But it's the sort of a thing where you wonder how a boy can come off of a peanut farm in De Leon County--not to be demeaning a peanut farm, but you don't make a whole heck of a lot of money on a peanut farm--and--or it's not De Leon County, it's Comanche County, I think. De Leon is the county seat . . .

Marcello: Right.

Allred: But, anyway, how he can come from a peanut farm by De Leon, and in the short space of about five years I'm told that he now owns two or three Holiday Inn Motel franchises, a piece of a radio station, a lumber yard, several things of this nature. I don't know exactly what his business

interests are. The Texas Observer which I consider to be an excellent publication in many areas although they get a little far out for me sometime has published some on this. Like everybody else I think I'm a moderate and everyone else is a radical. The Texas Observer had a very good article on his business interests.

Marcello: I remember that one. I think he had some interest in a construction company, also, does he not?

Allred: The major point is that in a very few years Ben has prospered completely out of proportion to a man who is making \$4,800 a year, before taxes. I got tickled during the session. I was making a phone call. It was toward the end of the session. I was out in the little hallway which is our excuse for a lobby, really, or not a lobby, what do they call it off . . . off the chambers of the Senate? Oh, the little room where the senators and the representatives can . . . the cloakroom . . .

Marcello: The cloakroom.

Allred: Our excuse for a cloakroom is the hall back there with some phone booths in it and so forth. And, of course, it's not private at all because the speaker can look out of his office at any time and see who's back there. People wander by. But I was sitting there making a phone call, and I had my feet propped up and I had holes in the soles of both of my shoes. Another member came by and started chiding me about it. I said, "Well, I'm

very sorry but I just can't afford to get my shoes fixed right now." Particularly toward the end of the session you hit some pretty lean days there. They cut off your per diem and several things. And I just wasn't making that much money. My wife was pregnant, and she couldn't work, and it just got kind of interesting. Anyway, I was saying I just can't afford to have my shoes half-soled right now. He looked over at me and grinned and said, "What I say is that my wife is not as frugal as Martha Barnes." (chuckle) And I think that expresses it very well.

But the thing I noticed about 1969 in relation to Ben Barnes was that, first of all, Ben started 1969 at what I hope is his political zenith. He was the young man . . . the young colossus standing astride the great state of Texas. But during 1969 some of this eroded, partially through his own doing--a good deal of it through his own doing--and this is why I said deservedly so. Of course, I don't like the guy to begin with. And, as I say, you have to keep my bias in mind in considering my remarks. But, for one thing, he began to squabble with the governor during the session. His intention, I think, was to show Preston Smith to be a person of little resolution and a person who could not really exercise the office of governor, because at this time Ben was looking

at the possibility of running for governor or the United States Senate. It backfired on him to an extent. For one thing, Preston Smith showed himself to have more backbone than Ben figured--and than I figured.

I don't like Preston Smith either that much.

(chuckle) Personally, Smith is a very cold person. I've had the experience of going up to thank him for a letter he wrote to a blood drive when he was lieutenant governor. I ran into him out at Odessa at a West Texas Chamber of Commerce meeting and went over and said, "Mr. Smith, I just want to thank you for sending this letter." And he didn't even break stride. I came away with the feeling that I'd been brushed off. I've heard many people who say he's not a good public speaker, and they have the feeling when they talk to him personally that he's very cold and doesn't care at all for the individual.

Marcello: Supposedly he can be very vindictive at times, also. I've heard this said about him.

Allred: I've had no experience with this. I know that I have felt sometimes that he has let me down, but generally that means that he didn't do what I wanted him to do. And, of course, that's his right not to do what I want him to do. But he did exhibit more backbone than Barnes anticipated, I think.

Marcello: What particular issues?

Allred: On such issues as the one-year versus the two-year budget, for example, and on several things like this. Now, Smith also has the advantage of having some very shrewd advice, I think. I consider one of his shrewder political advisors to be Jerry Hall, his press secretary. I don't know enough about his staff to know whether he has others. I'm sure he does. But Jerry Hall is an old capitol correspondent who wrote for Newspapers, Inc., which had the newspapers at Austin and Waco, among others-- the Fentress Papers. And Jerry Hall. I consider to be a very savvy guy. There are such touches as when Preston was speaking for more technical and vocational education before a joint session. And he said at the end, "Now I have here with me, as my guest, Juan Pedro Gonzales," whoever it was, "and Juan Pedro has been able to do this. He started out with very little education and he's now better off because he took vocational education. And we have here, Sally Jones." And he had three or four of these living examples of the success of his program. Well, this was Jerry Hall's doing as near as I can tell. Jerry knew a good public relations gimmick. To this extent, Preston has had good advice and followed it. And I think he's come out of this thing smelling like a rose-- much more than he really should have, or could have.

I think he's got some problems that may crop up on him. I understand his son is involved in a banking interest. Sometimes this is not always wise, where you've got something where there's at least a suspicion of papa helping. His son and, I think, one of Preston's assistants, are reportedly involved in seeking a bank charter. It could smack of papa's influence. Whether papa tried to exercise it or whether they simply went in and said, "Remember Mickey Smith? He's the governor's boy." Now, I'm, of course, a little leery on some of that myself.

Marcello: Getting back to Ben Barnes again, his marital difficulties aside, how do you think he would have fared in a contest, first of all, with Preston Smith?

Allred: I think he might well have beat Preston Smith. I don't think he could have beaten Ralph Yarborough, and I think he would've had a real rough contest with Preston.

I keep getting side-tracked here. Let me try to follow my line on Ben. He started 1969, as I say, as the young colossus astride the state. He became very critical of the governor. And I was amazed when I went to Army Reserve camp about the end of June, somewhere in there, shortly after the session, anyway, I was amazed at the amount of anti-Barnes feeling which I encountered. The thinking ran primarily in two particular criticisms.

One was, he's a young man who is getting too big for his britches. Ben's youth, in this case, worked against him, although, generally, youth is considered to be an asset in politics and if you're young you try to play up the fact that you're young and dynamic and a worker. And if you're older, you play on your experience. But the other criticism that I heard was that Barnes did not know who was governor of the state. And his criticism came across to the public, not the way I think he intended it--that Preston Smith was a doddering old no-good--but that Ben Barnes was a young, smart aleck who was trying to run the state without being elected by the people to do that. Many people have an exalted view of what the governor can accomplish. Actually, the governor is pretty powerless in Texas. His sole power lies in veto and appointments and persuasion. Then, too, Ben, I think, made a tactical mistake. And this is not an original thought. Someone else expressed it, but I think he's right. Ben had some polls run. First of all, Lyndon Johnson to the contrary, polls are not reliable. I say they are not reliable. They are to an extent. There's a lawyer in my home town who can pretty well predict an election to within a point or two. But, in general, professional

polls quite often reflect what the person who pays for the poll wants them to reflect. And, secondly, what Ben did was then take the results of these polls and announce the results himself. He said, "My polls show that I could beat either Smith or Yarborough." Well, this, in Ben's mind, was to show the public that Ben was invincible. Instead, the public reaction that I heard was, "Who does that young man think he is? What he is saying, in effect, is that he can be either senator or governor. And all he's got to do is crook his finger. And we'll just show him a thing or two." And it came off very poorly. Someone said what he should have done was have the results announced by one of his cronies, of whom he has a hundred. He could have had Ralph Wayne do it. Ralph Wayne is owned by Ben Barnes. He's the Representative from Plainview and he's cast his fortune with Ben and he's his right-hand man in effect. Ben could have had Ralph Wayne announce the results of the poll and say, "Look what a great guy Ben is." And then Ben could have stood by and shuffled his feet and smiled boyishly and said, "Shucks, I'm just trying to do a good job." And it would not have had the same effect as Ben himself announcing that he could beat anybody in the state. A great many people were offended by this and said, "We'll just show that young fellow." Again it's

a variation of his getting too big for his britches. Then I think the squabble over particularly the extension of the sales tax to groceries hurt him because, whatever he said, that would not have passed the Senate without Ben Barnes pushing and twisting arms very hard. In addition, I think we were all hurt by the special session. Bill Heatly says that you can look all over the Capitol grounds and you will not find one monument to an author of a tax bill. What he is saying is that taxes are never a popular issue. And anyone who had anything to do with the special session in which the tax bill was voted was hurt. Senator Charles Wilson from over at Lufkin got a phone call from a little old lady who was just berating him for the proposal to tax groceries. And he said, "Lady, I opposed that bill. I fought against it. I got up on the floor and filibustered and spoke against it." And she said, "That's all right. You were there." And I think that the public is not interested enough to try to find out who opposed it or who favored it. Their primary interest is they just didn't like the bill. This year of 1970 is a political year in which it is not necessarily an asset to be an incumbent because the public is mad. People feel they're being misled, and they don't know exactly where to turn or at whom to be mad. But they want to

strike out somewhere and the handiest target is the politician. It's not solely the politician's fault, although I think he has contributed his share as have the economists, the businessman, and the public itself. But, in any event, this also hurt Ben. And then there were several little squabbles in which Ben had to take sides that have hurt him with various groups. And, in general, I think Ben came out of 1969 a rather battered and wounded colossus. I don't think, however, that his wounds were serious enough to be anywhere near fatal.

Marcello: Also it has been said, assuming that he did defeat Yarborough, he would have probably been going to the Senate at a disadvantage in that he would have been a Southerner who had defeated one of the few liberal Southern Senators in the Senate and, as such, would perhaps not have had a whole lot of influence or very much voice in Democratic circles.

Allred: No, I don't agree with that theory because politicians are, above all, realists. A friend of mine says that if you want to be a statesman you've got to get elected first. And there would be people who, I'm sure, would mourn the passage of Ralph Yarborough from the Senate scene. But they would also say to themselves, "Well, I'm sorry to see old Ralph go, but I've got to work with this boy." And Ben's personality is such that he

would fast become a wheeler dealer in the Senate, I think, and would make his mark. Whether I would agree with the mark he made is questionable, but he would have made a mark just as Lyndon Johnson did. Lyndon, you know, came in and rose very quickly. I think Ben would have done the same thing. I do not think that they would have held it against him that he had defeated Yarborough because politicians realize that that's the name of the game. In every election there's got to be a loser, and if you're the loser, that's just tough. Now when the individual himself is the loser he finds it hard to reconcile sometimes. You know it's always painful to be turned out by the voters. And we all face this possibility in any given election. But the people with whom he would be working, I think, would say, "Now, let's see what this young boy can do," more than say, "I don't like him because he defeated Ralph Yarborough." Knowing the nature of the political beast, I don't agree with the idea that he would have suffered that much from it. Now labor certainly would have been highly "shook" to have a guy like Ben Barnes and a guy like John Tower, because Barnes has flirted with labor, but I still believe his basic orientation is toward the John Connally, more conservative wing. This is probably

one reason I don't like him. Our philosophies would disagree to an extent.

But I personally find him to be . . . oh, you go into his office, for example, and he really hasn't got time for you and this sort of thing, which is a small irritation, but still the average person gets the feeling he's considered unimportant. You know, when you go to see your legislator you want him to pay you some attention. I think Ben generally gives this impression to people that he's really too busy to talk with them.

I remember working for Lyndon Johnson in the 1948 senatorial campaign and I was just a young, idealistic kid. I was a teenager, I guess, or maybe not that old. I've been in political campaigns since I was about seven or eight, somewhere around in there. But the great man came to town and had a rally out in Hermann Park in Houston, and I went out to meet him. I had been going down voluntarily every day. You know, when the political bug bites and you're working in a campaign you really get wrapped up in it. At least I do. And I think most people do. And when it came my turn to shake the great man's hand, he grabbed my hand and jerked me across in front of him with barely a word. Well, now, from the standpoint of being able to shake a lot of hands this was good because he was keeping that line moving,

and you have to do this because if you don't then one guy will stand up there and monopolize and monopolize, and the other people say, "Oh, to hell with it. I'm not going to stay this long. I'll just leave and not worry about it." But it was very offensive to me. I think if I ever get in that position, and I don't know that I will, I would try to have a couple of staff members there and when somebody said, "Now, Dave, I need to tell you something," I'd say, "Look, I've got a bunch of people here and I can't talk to you right now. I don't mean to slough you off, but here's my special assistant here. Would you mind explaining your problem to him?" And if you've got three or four of them around, they can take the talkers off your hands and get you rid of them more diplomatically.

Marcello: Sure.

Allred: But I wasn't a voter and he didn't know me from Adam. I think probably for a long time he had no idea who I was. And, then, too, I'm personally antagonistic toward Lyndon because I think he forgot us Allreds. But that's something else I'll get into in a minute.

But, in any event, Ben is much the same way. Ben is generally too busy to really talk to you, and many people find this offensive. Ben came to Wichita Falls early this year to address a Board of Commerce and

Industry rally. It was just a day or so after his divorce had been announced. And, of course, Martha's filing for a divorce, I think, hurt him politically. He got up and made a rather routine mediocre speech in which basically all he said was that the 1970's are going to be full of challenges and we have to make the right choices. It was cliché-ridden. It did not really deal with any basic issues. And at one point he said toward the end of his speech . . . in fact I think in his climax he said, "We need to make the right choices so that your children and mine can grow up in a better state," or something. And I thought, "Great heavens, Ben, a day or two after your divorce has been announced--or your suit for divorce--I would have found a different way to express this." And then he had to get right back to Austin. He didn't have time to stick around. And he had to hurry out. And the whole impression of the thing was very bad. I heard many, many criticisms of Ben from people who were basically of his persuasion. They would be conservative Democrats to Republicans. I equate the two fairly closely, although the conservative Democrat may be a little more liberal than Republicans other than the Javits wing of the Republican Party. But, in general, Ben's impression was very bad.

There were several derisive nicknames for Ben going around. My favorite was "The Burning Bush." If you'll recall, God spake to Moses through the burning bush. And I think the general impression was that Ben considered when Ben talked, God talked. (chuckle) And . . . not literally that he had any delusions or anything except a delusion of grandeur, but I think he's much taken with his own importance which is partially due to being surrounded by people who are constantly saying what a fine fellow he is.

Lyndon Johnson was much the same way. I can remember visiting at the L.B.J. Ranch with my father while Lyndon was in the Senate. Johnson spent most of his time on the telephone talking here, there, and yonder. Mrs. Johnson was the person to whom fell the chores of hospitality. I'm sure this is a pattern that they had worked out long ago. We spent the night there at the ranch, and the only thing Lyndon really did with us outside of greeting us when we arrived was to take us out and show us his cattle and the standard tour. We drove around for perhaps half an hour and he showed us this, that, and the other. I had the feeling that he was saying, "See what I've got." And the more I see of him the more I think that's probably it. You know, "See what I have risen from a small farm boy to

become, or to acquire, at least." But he had very little time for us beyond that, where it was Mrs. Johnson who saw to it that we were comfortable and saw to it that the girls took me for a ride in the electric golf cart that they had. This is when electric golf carts were a novelty--at least to me they were. And we rode out toward the mailbox along the little road that goes out to the highway. It was probably Lynda Bird who took me. In later years Lynda scarcely knew anyone. I've felt that Lynda's a lot like her father. There's a great deal of arrogance there. It may not be arrogance, it may be that she has had this public life thrust on her when she really doesn't want it, and it's a reaction against it. Luci, on the other hand, is irrepressible. When I was a Washington correspondent for the Houston Post and was covering Johnson among others, I was always afraid Luci was going to get him in trouble because she said the first thing that popped into her head. Luci's a little like her father in that she does think politically. She's a lot like her mother in that she's very gracious. I consider Lady Bird Johnson one of the more gracious people I know. But, in my particular case, I have felt that Lyndon Johnson forgot an old debt. My father supported him in his first race for Congress and helped him get started. The story

in the family, and I think it's accurate . . .

Marcello: This would have been back about 1938?

Allred: Yes. You see, Dad at that time was governor. Johnson was running for the Congressional District, which included Travis County. Dad was the fair-haired boy at the time. He had come in as a reform candidate following Ma Ferguson. He was sharing a lot of the New Deal popularity of F.D.R. And his backing, I think, meant something in the race. The family story is, and I think it's accurate, that Johnson came to the Governor's Mansion, put his arm around Dad's shoulder and cried and said, "Jimmie, if it hadn't been for you I couldn't have made it." Now this was Lyndon Johnson about 1938.

Lyndon Johnson of 1958, when we visited him, or roughly '57 or '58--twenty years later--was an entirely different breed of cat. Powerful, to an extent arrogant. I think the presidency mellowed him some. He was much less arrogant as president than he was as majority leader. As majority leader he was ruling the United States under a do-nothing president like Eisenhower, and he knew it. But I felt that he owed my father a little more courtesy than he paid him.

I know that at one time my Dad stopped by somewhere where Lyndon was to give him some political advice or to tell him something that he thought was politically

important, that Lyndon ought to know. And Lyndon brushed him off. And to my way of thinking this is not the way you treat someone who helped you get started. Now Lyndon didn't owe us eternal devotion. But he did at least owe us courtesy which he did not pay us.

And then Dad went on the federal bench. He was appointed a U.S. District Judge. And at that point I think in his mind, Lyndon Johnson wrote off the Allred family which I would, of course, resent. The old adage is that the sons of great men seldom equal their father's accomplishments. And I think this may well be true in my own family. I don't think any of us will ever equal my father's accomplishments. But I think Johnson just pretty well wrote us off because we were considered to be pretty much light-weights. Most of the people who knew us as teenagers, knew that we were not the bright, intense, young teenagers that you meet today. We enjoyed life a little more, I think.

Then, all of a sudden, I got out of Columbia University in 1961 and came to Washington as the junior of two men in the Washington Bureau of the Houston Post, one of the biggest papers in Texas. Lyndon was politician enough to recognize his political base as being Texas. And all of a sudden we were big buddies

again. Now this isn't entirely true because of an incident during the Johnson-Kennedy race while I was in Columbia University in New York. As a student I was with an NBC News team and we went to the Waldorf Towers to interview then Vice President Nixon, who was calling on General Douglas MacArthur. He came out and held a little press conference in the hall of the Waldorf Towers where General MacArthur was living at the time. And then, as the saying goes, we had vice presidents running out of our ears because here came the Democratic nominee for vice president, the majority leader. And he comes bustling in with his entourage including the Secret Service. I believe the Secret Service was there. But, anyway, there were some men who gave me the impression of security men. They may have been New York City detectives or they may simply have been aides who were kind of clearing the way for him. But his entourage got on the elevator. And I saw two people that I knew, Lyndon and Liz Carpenter. And we walked up to the elevator, and Lyndon recognized me. One of the few times that I think he really did. Generally, when I met Lyndon I stuck out my hand and gave him my name so he could say, "Of course." Because politicians . . . you know, it's impossible to remember

all the names you have to remember. But in this particular case--this would be in the campaign of '61, or campaign of '60 it would be, the fall of '60-- Lyndon recognized me. An aide started to block me from getting on the elevator. And Lyndon said, "No, I know him. Let him on." When we got up to his suite in the Waldorf Towers, the other reporters were absolutely amazed that this man knew me. And they said, "Hey, see if he'll talk to us." So I went over to Liz and I said, "The press would like an interview with Senator Johnson if it's possible." And she said, "Certainly," and we worked it out. I felt like the hero of the day actually. But, in that respect, Lyndon did recognize me.

But I can remember when he became vice president and moved into The Elms, which I believe was Pearl Mesta's old home in Washington. I was told later that it was impossible to heat; that it's heating bills were tremendous, and that it was terribly costly to live there. But it was a beautiful place. We were invited out along with other members of the Texas press to some of the parties there. And it's pretty heady stuff to be going to the vice president's house for a party, you know. I noticed a couple of things about Lyndon. One was that wherever he went, he had his little entourage

that followed him, generally Homer Thornberry and Les Carpenter. Homer was the Congressman from Travis County at that time from Lyndon's old district and was a very close friend of Lyndon's. Les was a Washington correspondent, and his wife was Lady Bird's press secretary. In the parties Lyndon would always speak in a very low tone as he did in the Senate when he presided. And the effect of this was that everyone else would stop and listen to Lyndon. It was deliberately calculated, I think. Anyway, Lyndon got me off down a hall leading to the ladies' room, I think, in The Elms, or to the restrooms in general. It was not a very well-lighted hall. But here on the wall was a picture of my father, F.D.R., and Congressman Johnson taken in, I believe, 1938 or '39 when F.D.R. visited Texas. My father, of course, was a New Deal governor. He was fairly close to F.D.R. In fact, a family story which may or may not be accurate, I don't know, is that when my father ran for the Senate in 1942, he was told by F.D.R., "Jimmie, get yourself elected to the Senate and we'll see what will happen from there," with the implication that there might be a selection for a vice presidential nomination because F.D.R. would need a Westerner. There was the feeling that had Dad won the race in '42, he might have been in Harry Truman's shoes.

Now this is something the family would like to believe and I don't know whether it's accurate or not. But in any event he was fairly close to F.D.R. He introduced Lyndon to F.D.R. in this famous picture which, when Lyndon became president, was run in Life and some of the different publications. It showed the three of them standing there. And Lyndon got me aside and put his arm around my shoulder and told me what great friends he and my father were and so forth. And the whole time I was thinking of how he acted when we visited the ranch and how my father was very hurt later on when he went by to try to help Lyndon and to tell him some political information he thought he ought to have. And Lyndon was arrogant and wouldn't even listen. And the whole time I was thinking, "You sorry so-and-so." (Chuckle) And it just grated on me. I didn't mean to get into all this past history, but I think Barnes is much the same way and has much the same effect on the common man, that he is too busy, really, to be with them. And the year of '69 and the early part of '70 have not been kind to Ben Barnes. I don't think it's enough to cripple his career, but certainly he is bleeding from a multitude of wounds, and it's going to take him a while to regain the position which he held at the beginning of '69. If he'll just make a few more mistakes

like this it may well be that he will cut himself out.
It's happened to many bright, young men before.

The thing that started this was the discussion of the one-year and two-year budgets, and you were asking me why it became a political football. Ben was pushing for the one-year budget for a variety of reasons. One was that it would not require a tax bill in the year in which he might be running for office, other than for re-election. I think he got some good advice to run for re-election and finally decided to do it, although it must have been a pretty painful decision for him. And, also, that just in general it became a bone of contention . . . the merits of the thing aside, it became a one of contention between Ben and Preston. And, in effect, it was who's going to be running this state, because Ben had many things going for him that Preston doesn't. As lieutenant governor he could control bills much easier than Preston could because he could tell his committee chairmen, "I want that bill deep-frozen," or, "I want that bill passed." And it would probably happen unless it was a terribly important bill. For example, right now with all the furor that there is about pollution and ecology and so forth, even Ben Barnes would have difficulty in completely suppressing an anti-pollution bill. But most bills don't attract this much attention. There are in any given session only a few

glamour bills, liquor-by-the drink, for example. A few like this that attract the public's attention. Ben talked a lot better game on pollution than he acted out. And one thing that he would do would be to put out half a bill and then say, "Look what we've done." You know, "We've passed you a pollution bill, here," when the bill was actually virtually toothless because it was not funded. But, for the most part, Ben could go to a committee chairman and say, "I want this bill put in deep-freeze," as could the speaker in the House side, and unless it was a highly popular bill he could generally get away with it. So in this respect he had more power than the governor did, and there was a real chance that he could have taken over if he'd played his cards a little better. But he didn't. 'Twas even thus," I think, with this type of personality. However, I still think he will be a power on the Texas scene for some time.

Marcello: Getting back to revenue activity once again, what was your reaction to the proposed revenue measures which Preston Smith introduced into the last session of the legislature? I'm speaking primarily of the sources of income for the state that he proposed.

Allred: In all honesty there have been so many I don't recall what the governor's specific proposals were. It probably makes me something of a dummy.

Marcello: Well, one in particular I was thinking of was the so-called Cavness Plan which couldn't get any sponsor in the House, isn't that correct?

Allred: Well, I don't know about that now because among the members of the House is Representative Don Cavness of Travis County, who is the son of the Cavness who recently retired from, I think, the state Comptroller's office. Anyway, he was one of the state fiscal officials. And I think the Cavness Plan was advanced by Representative Don Cavness, hence it's name. Now it may have been his father, but I believe it was the member of the House. And if it lacked a sponsor it was in the Senate. I honestly don't remember.

Marcello: Maybe this is what I'm referring to then. I think one of the things Smith also proposed among his revenue . . .

Allred: Wait a minute, what was the Cavness Plan, first, the two . . .

Marcello: This was the one to divert oil money from the permanent school fund.

Allred: Yes, some . . . that's what I was thinking of. From the funds that were earmarked for schools and which Cavness contended were simply piling up and that some of them could have been diverted. And the opposition view was that once you start something like that, and it becomes an easily accessible fund source, the first thing you know the school kids are stripped. My position on the

Cavness Plan was . . . as you know it never came to a vote. This was a decision within the attorney general's office . . .

Marcello: Right.

Allred: . . . and the courts, I think, probably got a little involved.

Marcello: Right.

Allred: My position on that was wait and see. I was neither pro or con with the exception that I would have some question knowing the general tendency of seeking revenue from the point of least resistance. I had some question as to whether or not it would be feasible from that respect. You know, no politician likes to take an unpopular stand, and once they found that here was a source of revenue they would, I think, have bled it dry rather quickly. It's always easy to find ways to spend money.

Marcello: Now another one of his proposals called for new taxes on the chemical industry, I believe it was.

Allred: Yes.

Marcello: Many people said that this was politically motivated because apparently the chemical industry didn't give Preston Smith the support that he had wanted or thought that he had deserved in the election.

Allred: I don't know anything about that part of it. I felt it

was discriminatory in that it singled out one particular industry. And yet you have in the taxes on oil, for example. The oil has supported Texas economy for a long time. And, of course, much of the chemical industry is petro-chemical, and would, therefore, have been a double taxation. This was another one where I never really, in all honesty, formed a complete opinion because I didn't have to. And quite often, at least in my case, I was still weighing the merits of something when I went in to push the voting button.

Marcello: What is your position with regard to the social welfare legislation that was passed during the 61st Legislature? For example, were you for or against raising the state minimum wage and why?

Allred: I was for raising the state minimum wage with one exception. I voted consistently against all the crippling amendments on the minimum wage bill. There was one amendment that would exempt certain people who would be your small businessmen, in effect, under a certain amount of gross and this type of thing for which I voted. My feeling then was that this was probably the wisest vote because the national law has an exemption, and this was how I justified my feeling that probably an exemption was necessary for the small guy who was

struggling along. Since that time I've thought some more about it, and I think if I had it to do today I would vote against that exemption because when you consider the amount of the minimum wage, if someone is paid just the minimum wage, he's barely above poverty level. I think I would be even stronger in support of the minimum wage now than I was then. I do have some reservations about the government telling a person what he's going to do in his private business. But government is already in other sections of business.

And what you run into are things like my preacher mentioned from the pulpit. And my preacher is no liberal at all. He and I, I think, would disagree on a lot of things. He's very careful. He screens his politics, though. He mentioned that there was one department store in Wichita Falls which was still paying its porter \$40 a week. And in my estimation this is criminal. A friend of mine who's a lawyer who tries personal injury suits quite a bit was telling me about a little Mexican woman who came in to see him who was employed by a restaurant in Wichita Falls. And she was given something like three days off a year, Easter, the Fourth of July, and Christmas, let's say, or something, and this was about it. She was paid a pittance; and so long as this type of exploitation exists, as it

certainly does in the Rio Grande Valley with the Latin Americans as it does in many areas with the Negro, we need laws to protect people. People who are black could have Ph.D.'s and they still, in many areas, could not rise above a certain salary. Now this is becoming less and less true. But as long as this sort of thing exists, it was my feeling that the government was certainly within its rights to tell the employers that they were going to have to pay their employees enough to at least keep them from starving, you know. The phrase "genteel poverty," wasn't invented by a poor man. I read somewhere that a survey in Harlem showed that most of the people on welfare were jobholders and taxpayers. But despite the fact that they held a job-- and I would interpose that it was probably forty hours a week or probably more--they still could not raise themselves above the poverty level. And it was for these reasons that I supported the minimum wage bill. As I say I did vote for the one exclusion, and I don't think I would now, because my feeling is that while you might put a lot of folks out of business, perhaps, that some of these businesses are so marginal they would go under anyway.

Marcello: Were you in favor of the improvements which were made with regard to workmen's compensation?

Allred: Very definitely. Yes I supported this.

Marcello: Would you care to comment on this?

Allred: I think that workmen's compensation in the state of Texas is shameful. The amount paid used to be \$35 a week. I think it's up a little bit now. And I think this law will help it some more. But the amount paid to a person who is injured is ridiculous because the man's expenses are more, not less, at this time. The employers have held this down, I think. They say they're trying to run a business. And there is something to this too. I mean you can kill the goose that lays the golden egg if you make your legislation so discriminatory that it makes it difficult for a man to be in business. But by the same token, in this case I think that the law is sadly lacking. There are some other bad practices, I'm told, for which there can be no remedial legislation because it's extremely difficult to prove offenses. In the construction industry a carpenter, let's say, who is injured on the job and files for workmen's comp and then tries to get another job, may well find himself black-listed. I had one carpenter who contended he was fired from a job where he had been a foreman because his employer found out that he had previously filed for workmen's comp and he was on the blacklist. Now this is something that's extremely difficult to prove. Even under oath the

average employer might well deny the existence of the blacklist, and yet I'm virtually certain there probably is one. This would be the sort of protective measure that people in this industry would take, and generally your general contractors are going to be rough individuals. And they're gonna play rough. But, generally, I just did not feel that workmen's comp was sufficient. I don't feel it is now.

Marcello: Were you generally satisfied with the achievements which the Legislature accomplished in the field of education during the past . . .

Allred: Before we leave this let's go into the welfare bill for a minute if we can. As you know they raised the ceiling on welfare. And, obviously, it's not going to be enough, particularly under the new program where they've picked up more people. And now we see the state reaching for welfare money again. Welfare is not a popular issue because there are so many misconceptions about it helped along by right wing publications such as the Reader's Digest and right wing commentators such as Paul Harvey, and the program Three-Star Extra, and this type of thing. There are many people who feel that all welfare goes to lazy bums, primarily Negroid, who lie up all day and have children and live off the fat of the land. And, of

course, surveys show this is not the case at all.

In Texas our welfare is for aid to dependent children, permanently and totally disabled, blind, and old folks--old age assistance. Those are the sole welfare categories within the state of Texas. A presidential commission of a couple of years ago studied the situation and found that there were less than 5 per cent malingerers within the welfare system, as I recall. I'm working by memory now, but somewhere in that neighborhood. Welfare, though, is not a popular thing. The reason that the decision was made to put a ceiling on it was that it was felt, and I think accurately so, that they could not sell an open-ended welfare program to a public that is antagonistic, particularly right now where the public itself is faced with tight money and inflation, and people are much more money conscious. Now a few years ago they would have come closer to selling something like this than they would now. The reason I brought this up is because I've been asked by people, "Why did you put a ceiling on?" And this was the reason. I talked to Johnny Traeger from Seguin, who sponsored the bill, which surprised me because John is basically a conservative. But in welfare he has taken what I consider to be a very liberal point of view. His reasoning was, basically that he didn't

think he could sell an open-ended program. And I agree with him. I don't think he could.

Now you were talking about education then. I was the co-sponsor of the teacher pay bill. This will strap the state with some debts for some time to come. But it's my feeling that we need this in order to retain quality education in Texas. You will see some changes coming, such as school consolidation, which is one of the big issues of the Governor's Committee on Public School Education Report. It recommended consolidation, among other things. Many of the recommendations were quite good, but I had the feeling that what they were doing was saying here's what you need to go first class. You know, like I can go in and say, "Now if you want a really good hi-fi system, for example, then you need this, this, and this." Or, "If you want a really good stereo you need this component and this component." Perhaps the best example is, "If you really want to ride in style you need a Cadillac." However, a Ford will get you there. And I had the feeling that the Governor's Committee Report was the Cadillac of the educational recommendations, that had we completely fulfilled these that we would have been riding in a Cadillac when a Ford would do. This does not mean that I'm against educational excellence, obviously,

but I felt that many of their recommendations were for the top part. Now I think there were some real mistakes made in the presentation of this thing, from a public relations standpoint.

Ellis Ivey was the staff director on the governor's committee. I attended a West Texas Chamber of Commerce meeting in Fort Worth at which he was the speaker. And he knew that he was talking to an antagonistic audience because particularly in West Texas you find a lot of these little old tiny schools. He may have felt that since he was talking to an antagonistic audience, "What the heck. I'll go ahead and shoot the works." But he got up and antagonized his audience at the start. I've forgotten exactly what he said, but he made some statements that didn't need to be made. And he presented his programs in a rather dogmatic way when he could have said, "Now, this is what we believe and here's why," in a little more diplomatic fashion. Quite often the way you state something to a person will affect his reaction to it. As I say, Ivey may have felt that because he was facing an antagonistic audience that he could afford to go ahead full tilt since he didn't have many friends there anyway.

The Governor's Committee Report was highly controversial. There were a number of other provisions, some of which,

I think, were quite good--for example help for the teacher in the way of a teacher's aide, and some school districts have adopted this. Teachers' aides could take over a lot of the administrative responsibilities which currently weigh down a teacher. Also they might relieve a teacher from extra-curricular activities unless she's paid for them, or he's paid for them. Teachers, particularly at the high school level, are expected to direct play practices and sponsor clubs and do similar extra-curricular activities. The public is all for the dedicated teacher taking his time and doing these things. And many dedicated teachers do it. But it quite often conflicts if a teacher has to moonlight, for example--that is have a second job in order to support his family. Or it just takes away from the teacher's time. The public, of course, sees the teacher getting off at 3:30 in the afternoons and thinks, "That lucky dog." They don't see the hours spent preparing for class, grading tests, correcting papers, and this type of thing.

But of the recommendations of the governor's committee, the one which got the greatest fanfare and greatest notice and caused the most stir was the one for consolidation of schools. Now I did not agree with the

figure that they selected as the size for consolidation. I can see where many small schools do need to be consolidated, because my wife, for example, was from a little school in Toano, Virginia where there were twelve in her graduating class. And she was valedictorian. But she said that she feels that her education was severely limited because it was such a small school. And then this was consolidated with the school in Williamsburg, Virginia, and her sister went to the consolidated James Blair High School in Williamsburg and received a much better education. And my wife, who is a teacher, has often commented--or was a teacher until the children came--she has often commented that she felt that her high school education was limited because of the school's size. And in a school of that size I can see that there is some consolidation necessary.

Now, in all honesty, I did not make this a public position because it's one thing to be brave and it's another to commit suicide. And many people in my district--particularly in your smaller towns--were opposed. Wichita Falls could have cared less, for the most part. Despite the efforts of the school superintendent there who rabidly favored the report, Dr. Don Waldrip, the people in Wichita Falls were apathetic.

Don is one who has his viewpoints and doesn't mind expressing them. He very much favored small school consolidation and attempted to stir up the P.T.A. But I only remember one communication from a P.T.A. in Wichita Falls concerning the governor's committee report. And it was worded in such a way that I couldn't tell whether they were really for it or not. On the other hand, the cities of Electra, Iowa Park, and Burkburnett, all were very fearful of consolidation.

And my disagreement was with the arbitrary number which the governor's committee chose as the cutting-off point. They had to choose something, and I'm sure that it would have been attacked in any event. But I felt that they set it too high, that they were talking about too large a school. For example, as I understood it, it could easily have cut out the Iowa Park School System. And I consider this to be a quality education system even though it is not too large. Now, certainly, if you were in a larger school system you could offer a variety of courses; for example you might be able to offer an elective in French, let's say, or an elective in Russian and the Slavic languages or something like this. Some of your brighter students would go for these. But I think a school system the size of Iowa Park is able

to present a pretty balanced program.

Now one thing that may have a real bearing on this was the legislation sponsored by Representative George Henson and in which I joined him. I don't know whether I was officially a co-sponsor, but I backed it. It dealt primarily with vocational schools. But I think the principle which it espouses can be expanded to cover other areas. In Wichita Falls, right now we have under construction a vocational-technical high school. All right, now, a district such as Burkburnett, which is fifteen miles from Wichita Falls, or Iowa Park which is ten miles from Wichita Falls, Henrietta which is twenty miles, Archer City which is about 15 miles, districts of this size cannot afford to construct their own individual vocational-technical high schools. There has been in the past a reluctance on the part of school officials to allow their students from these smaller satellite cities to come into the larger cities to take courses even though the student would benefit. And it's a financial reluctance because schools are hard-pressed for funds. And should the students leave and come into the city, this would place in jeopardy his A.D.A. By that I mean the school system is supported out of our minimum foundation program on the basis of the average daily attendance or A.D.A. Some of the school men feel this is not wise, that average daily attendance drops

way low during a flu epidemic or during a snow storm. And, yet, they have to continue to maintain the school plant and pay the staff and so forth. And they feel A.D.A. is not the best way. But that is the system on which it is based. Henson's bill said, in effect, that if you are a satellite school system and you have students leave your system and go to the larger city for a part of a day that you still retain the A.D.A., which would then take away the financial sting, and I think would make cities of this type more willing to let their students go. I think that this same principle once it's established in vocational-technical education which is one of the glamour children right now can be expanded. People realize that not everyone is going to college and going to be a PhD. and a nuclear scientist and that there is a need for vocational-technical education. And this cooperative school idea may well be the answer to the consolidation question along with the matter of sheer economics. The figures show that more and more school districts--small districts--are consolidating of their own free will each year. What the governor's committee was attempting to do was accelerate this.

People simply bowed their necks in the smaller towns. And you had a great deal of sentimentality, of, you know, "We don't want to lose our schools." Many, many little

localities felt, and I think with some accuracy, that if the school was removed the town would die. You know, in Texas we have what we call communities. You have cities, you have towns, and then you have communities like the Valley View community in my district. Small town people feel, and I think with some accuracy, that if the school is removed that it will kill the little communities. The school is not only a place for education, it's also a social center. The youngsters go there for their dances. They hold box suppers there, you know. This is a function, I think, the churches can take over, but the people don't see it this way, and there might be some problems. Let's say the Baptist Church is the largest church in town which it is in many areas, are the kids going to go there to dance? Obviously not. So there is some question. But it was part of the apprehension on the part of the small cities, small towns, and communities that if their schools were taken out it would kill life as they knew it. But finances are forcing a great many consolidations.

Also there was a Little Red Schoolhouse Association. This was formed by some of the large landowners, primarily I think Charles Schreiner from Kerrville of the Schreiner Ranch out there. Charlie Schreiner is a great Texas Ranger buff and owns half of West Texas, I'm told, so he

has large land holdings. And he and some others of that ilk formed the Little Red Schoolhouse Association in which they tearfully pleaded for the life of the little red schoolhouse. And my reaction was one of absolute disgust because what they were actually tearfully pleading for was the retention of the lower tax rates on the vast holdings of land that they had. Admittedly if there were consolidated districts and the tax structure were rearranged, it certainly would cost them more. There you just have to look at who has the ability to pay. I would submit that the amount of taxes that would go up on Charlie Schreiner would not hurt him that much. But then my definition of what would hurt Charlie Schreiner and his definition would vary. But those were, I think, the primary educational questions. There was some question, of course, about student sit-ins, student riots, narcotics and such in larger systems.

Marcello: That was going to be another one of my questions. What exactly is your opinion of the situation on the college campuses in Texas? By situation I'm referring to the student unrest, of course.

Allred: I think the student unrest has at its base a very laudable purpose. What the students are, in effect, saying is, "You told us in civics class that majority rules, but look what happened to the delegation from New York to

the Democratic Convention. It did not at all reflect the strength of Senator McCarthy's forces in New York in the primary." I'm obviously not referring to Joe McCarthy here, I can't think of what his first name is . . . what . . . what's the present McCarthy's name?

Marcello: Eugene.

Allred: Eugene McCarthy. Look at Eugene McCarthy's strength in New York, and the delegation was more Tammany controlled. The students were saying, I think, "You told us this and it's not like that. Now live up to your word." Of course, I have a religious orientation, so I'm going to see a certain amount of religion. But I think part of it is the students are saying, "Let's really live up to the things that could make America great."

Now where I differ with the students is that first of all it's much easier to criticize than it is to come up with a viable, workable program. The best example I can think of on this is the people who were for unilateral disarmament or for some of the proposals for a rapport on Vietnam. And they said, "We need to have more meaningful negotiations with the North Vietnamese." Well this is a beautiful phrase, but I would submit that our experience in Paris has shown that more meaningful

negotiations are a two-way street and that we are not having meaningful negotiations in Paris not because we are not willing to enter into them, but because the North Vietnamese are not. And here you run into semantics, define "meaningful." And, of course, it is the standard Communist tactic to look on the bargaining table as an extension of the battlefield and only to negotiate when there is nothing else to do. I think if we keep up our military operations in Vietnam that we will see a change in the Communist attitude because they've getting the socks beat off them. I'm not present on the battlefield. All I know is what I read. But I think, for example, the Communist action in Laos which is, according to Evans and Novack whom I consider to be the best political columnists today, partially aimed at taking pressure off of the Vietnamese forces in Vietnam, the North Vietnamese forces in Vietnam, but it's also aimed at preventing an interdiction of the . . .

Marcello: Ho Chi Minh Trail.

Allred: . . . Ho Chi Minh Trail, either by physically moving forces back or, more, by having us sue for peace by saying, "All right, we'll give up the bombing." Well, this to me shows that the bombings are hurting them militarily along with our operations in the field which

have recently uncovered large caches of supplies, weapons, hospitals abandoned in great haste and many medical supplies left behind. This can only hurt an army in the field. And a lot of it is based on our Chu Hoi program which is where Viet Cong are encouraged to defect as are NVA, North Vietnamese Army people. And then in many cases when they have defected they go back and show U.S. forces where these camouflaged caches are. It's not that the Marines are so good at scouting them out or the Army is so good. It's quite often that they're led there by defectors. But whatever, we are hurting the North Vietnamese. And if we continue to do this I think we'll see a change in the Communist attitude in the Paris peace talks. For example, they've been waiting, I think, to see what the Vietnamization Program of the present administration would do. And as we did in Korea where we built an army from practically nothing, we've had to do the same in South Vietnam. It's my understanding that they're finding that Vietnamization is not what they had anticipated. In the early days of the war the South Vietnamese security was shot. The Viet Cong knew before the South Vietnamese did it what they were going to do. The South Vietnamese were not trained. They didn't have good diet. They didn't have good equipment. They didn't know how to use what equipment they had.

But this has changed now just as it did in South Korea. In South Korea we saw the South Korean Army pushed back to the Pusan perimeter. And then the U.S. stepped in and fought their way out. And, yet, in Vietnam one of the most feared units was the Tiger Division from South Korea. I talked to a man who was a company commander in South Korea. His unit was ROK, Republic of Korea, troops and he said that his men would fight like demons to take a hill. When they reached the top of the hill even though they knew the North Koreans would counter attack and that the militarily advisable strategy was to dig in so they'd have some shelter from which to repel the counter attack, they would sit down and pant because their diet was such that they could only go at great physical activity pace for a certain amount of time and then they gave out. And even adrenalin couldn't get them moving. But we changed this. And we're doing this in Vietnam. We're also building up the economy, as we are in Northern Thailand where we're attempting civil affairs programs to build devotion or allegiance to the government. And these things are paying off, but slowly. But at the moment I think we're seeing what the Communist's definition of "more meaningful negotiations" is. I would not consider this to be a viable criticism.

In addition, I think that many of today's young people are too much taken with confrontation as a way of settling problems. And instead it is a way of hardening polarization. When you go out and act like Father Groppi, for example, I consider such acts to be doing more harm than good really. The demonstrations in the streets at one time were needed because they dramatized a very pressing problem. They were, for the most part, peaceful. Martin Luther King's ideas were based largely on the successful strategy of Mahatma Gandhi in India. But from that have grown such things as the S.D.S. and the Weathermen and the Black Panthers. And this is, to an extent, an example of what I'm trying to say. When you have a confrontation like this, it hardens the viewpoints of the people and makes them want to get off in little camps and throw rocks at each other or, now, shoot at each other. I mean the caches of weapons which the Minutemen and the Black Panthers and other radical groups of both sides are storing are a frightening thing. Here you have a large force which is under no compulsion of law at all, except the law as they see it. To a Black Panther it's a self-defense thing. He considers himself to be in hostile territory-- in Whitey's territory. And while I can follow his

reasoning, I don't agree with it. But then, of course, I'm a Whitey. But more than this I think it also makes it extremely difficult for the person who would reach out and seek a rapport. For the person in the middle there are a lot of those rocks are going to be hitting him. And both sides are going to be toughening.

My wife was talking to a Negro lady who said that at one time her community had encouraged her and some others of the black community to reach out to the white community, to attempt to establish a rapport. And they were never fully accepted. This I blame on the white community. They were never fully accepted in the white community and now they're not fully accepted in the black community either.

And they're in a limbo in the middle. One of the things that frightens me is the polarization to radical viewpoints which I see now, and which I think is largely helped along by some of these student demonstrations which are irresponsibly conceived and very poorly executed. The student leaders have quite often found that what started out to be something high and idealistic got out of hand rather rapidly. Then, of course, there is the backlash as well. And I'll get to it in a minute. Spiro Agnew is the spokesman of the backlash at the moment.

But my primary feeling is that the basic thing the students are saying is good. Such things as the Moritorium. I did not agree with the Moritorium, but I thought it was good in that it was a way of expressing an opinion, and it is the citizen's right to express his opinions in a democracy and to seek redress of his grievances. If he feels that the government is not on the right tack, he can attempt to bring it to the right tack, so long as he does it peaceably and within the established channels. There is built into our government a way of change which you do not find in a totalitarian government, witness the Soviet Union or Czechoslovakia. I read the other day that the purges recently in Czechoslovakia ended in something like 108 executions and 10,000 political prisoners. Now this is a real police state. The students use the phrase "police state" rather loosely without really knowing what it means. The Gestapo is probably the best example of a police state where they could come and get you and put you in the oven. This is a police state. In the United States police are restricted--some feel unjustly so. I don't agree with that either. I think it is simply making them be more professional. That's a generalization and a simplification, but I don't want to get into that issue. That's not a state issue exactly and it's not . . .

well, I may get into it more in a minute in connection with the violence. But, in general, I think the students have the right idea.

But I disagree with some of their methods of presenting their viewpoints. For one thing they still have a rather immature way of presenting their viewpoint. They still have a rather immature viewpoint of: "if things don't go exactly my way, then I'm going to pick up my marbles and go home. If things don't go exactly my way I'm going to force my will on you." It's the Spanish Inquisition mentality of: "I'm going to save you whether you want to be saved or not. And if you disagree with my viewpoints, I'm the one who says who's saved and who isn't." And for these reasons I would disagree with the student unrest.

But I think that it is based on some very real grievances, as is the racial unrest. Negroes are discriminated against. Latin Americans are discriminated against in our society. And by unrest, by raising a little hell here and there, they have accomplished a great deal more than their ancestors did in years of peaceful co-existence. You know, as the saying goes, "If you want to get the mule's attention, you hit him in the head with a two-by-four." So to this extent I think the demonstrations themselves helped to dramatize

a great need.

But from this has come those who are the haters, to whom George Wallace is appealing. And, surprisingly, I think President Nixon is. Now this is a Democratic viewpoint and is therefore going to be biased. But I think Nixon is attempting this appeal, primarily through Spiro Agnew. I cannot believe that Spiro Agnew is given the free hand to make the statements he has without at least some clearance and some condoning by the White House. Among other things Nixon has never disassociated himself with Agnew's viewpoint. Agnew is a spokesman for the backlash that I see coming.

We are a society in transition. And we know that in a period of transition it appears to people that the values that they were taught as children--I'm talking now about my parents' generation primarily--the values that they were taught as children are being questioned. And I think questioned justifiably in some cases, not in all cases. Change for change's sake is not a virtue. But neither is simply saying, "My father did it this way; therefore I will do it this way." There's got to be a middle ground. But when you have a society in transition many people tend to become rather dogmatic and to cling unreasonably to the old ways simply because they are the old familiar ways. When

the person looks about him and he sees narcotics and mini-skirts and sexual freedom and these things that he's been taught are bad, he is shaken. I would agree with him that they are bad. Those are probably poor examples for that reason, because I do not hold that some of the sexual freedoms are as beneficial to mankind as the teenagers seem to feel they are and certainly narcotics are proven to be destructive to the body. But he sees about him also the free thinking, the questioning that goes on, and he thinks, "Boy, if I'd said that when I was that age, my old man would have blistered me." And he would have. But the thing about it is that he may then turn to embrace all that is old simply because it's old. And he doesn't want it to be questioned. He becomes extremely dogmatic. He doesn't want any of this to be questioned, which the student is doing. And t'was ever thus. It's simply been accelerated recently.

And the student has come to realize more that he can be a political power. I think today's college student is really a much better citizen than the college students of my generation or of my parents' generation. There is less of the goldfish swallowing and the phone booth packing, you know, how many students can get in a phone booth. Now in my generation there was some of

this. Mostly it was, "I've got to go out and face that hard old world, and I want to get the best business background I can." But these students now are saying there's more to it than making a lot of money. And this is what, after all, Christianity says, that the people who have sought monetary success have found when they've achieved it that it's really rather hollow. I think that really it's a very moralistic thing that these students are doing. My question would be, as far as their methods of doing it, because, certainly, no one can condone the destruction of files and in the office of the college president, breaking out windows as you see, actions of the Weathermen and so forth . . . The Minutemen are still lying doggo. But you know, I noticed some amazing similarities about both sides. As a newspaperman I've had a little dealing with both sides. The Minutemen, the John Birchers, the extreme to the right see anything with which they do not agree as a Communist plot. I've discovered now that the new left sees anything with which they don't agree as a plot by the C.I.A. or the F.B.I.

Marcello: Representing the establishment.

Allred: Well, the establishment uses these arms, the C.I.A. and the F.B.I., the pigs, if you will, the fuzz, the cops, and the far left feels it's a plot against them. And

it seems to me that when you reach these fringes you find paranoia on both sides. I'm afraid that what's happening is that we're polarizing toward the extremes and away from the center, which to me is senseless. Because this is the only world we've got, and we've either got to live in harmony with our fellow man or we're going to kill each other. And, obviously, it's much easier and much better to live in harmony with our fellow man.

So I voted for the bills in the legislature that would strengthen the rights of the administration to put down violence, to put down the students who would arbitrarily take over a building and deny other students the use of that building. I believe it was Mr. Justice Oliver Wendall Holmes who said, "Your right to swing your fist stops at the end of my nose." A person has certain rights, but we've seen the emphasis so heavily on rights that the responsibilities that accompany these rights have been overlooked. I think these young radicals are only a small minority of the entire student body. I think most students today are probably much more serious, much more sincere than even my generation. And I don't look on myself as being that far removed from this generation even though I'm thirty-five right now. Want me to creak a little in my joints for you?

The responsibility is lacking, and for this reason I voted for bills that would give the college security officers more power to put down this type of thing, because I think we're drifting toward anarchy. Rights are all well and good until they begin to infringe on the rights of someone else. And this is what I think many college students overlook.

It was for this same reason that I opposed giving the vote to eighteen year olds, and still do. I'm of Congressman Sellers' persuasion that people at this age are easily led. They're swayed by demagogues. They tend to see things in blacks and whites when my experience has taught me that most things are actually shades of gray. I just feel that they would not be responsible voters at eighteen. I don't hold with the viewpoint that if a person is old enough to go off and fight and be killed in a war that he's old enough to vote for or against those who would make these policies that are going to send him off.

For example, I'm not an extreme hawk, let's say I'm a peregrine falcon on Vietnam. I'm not an extreme hawk, but neither am I a dove, because I think our involvement in Vietnam is necessary to our national security. We made a mistake in the way that we got involved and in the Kennedy years we said we would go to

any lengths--what was his quote? "We'll go anywhere, do anything, that's necessary to preserve peace." We were appointing ourselves the world's policemen when we weren't prepared to back it up. Vietnam is the bread basket of Southeast Asia--Vietnam, Laos, and that area. If we lose this, we lose Southeast Asia, including the Thais, who have been our staunchest allies in Southeast Asia. And I don't think that we can afford to do this, because then our alliances around the world would be in question, including South America, where we are fighting right now a battle with Communism through our civil affairs activities and through our going in and trying to help these people raise their standard of living above the level which breeds discontent. You know there's a certain level at which a peasant says to himself, "What have I got tollose?" But if he's raised above this level then he looks twice at the person who comes in, as the Communists do, promising the moos. Even though they don't deliver, this is not apparent at the time. And for these reasons I think these things are necessary in support of our national security.

And yet, it's an obscure sort of thing, and it's extremely difficult for some people to see. I think that when you live in the United States it is your duty

to take on some of the responsibilities of citizenship, and this includes military service. This includes voting. This includes, if you will, stopping at a stop sign even when there's no policeman there, and not throwing litter on the highway, if you want to go to the extreme. But it does definitely include military service. Military service is not something that you do if you want to. In my opinion it is something you owe to your country. And for this reason I feel the way I do on these things. And I did not vote to allow eighteen year olds to vote.

Marcello: Moving on to another subject on the regular session, there were several proposals to establish additional four-year colleges at various locations throughout the state. One of these which people in my area have been particularly interested, is the establishment of a four-year college at Dallas. In other words, the University of Texas at Dallas.

Allred: The SCAS fight.

Marcello: What was your position on that?

Allred: As I think you know, I violently opposed it. I favored the formation of some of these colleges. However, I was caught flat-footed on one. For some time, Ace Pickens-- I forget what his real name is, and Ace may be his real name--but anyway, Ace Pickens from Odessa, had sought

the formation of a Permian Basin College. And this legislature voted it. Really they sort of framed up on poor ole Ace, in the House. When his bill came up, Midland-Odessa had a great many representatives of their Chambers of Commerce in the gallery. Here was Ace's chance to shine before his constituents. And Ralph Wayne of Plainview and a couple others who were pretty good friends of Ace, came around and framed up with the rest of the members. We knew the bill was going to pass. There was very little opposition to it. But it was agreed that everyone would press the "No" button, first. Now, as you know, in the House of Representatives there's a large board on either side of the speaker's stand on which the members' votes are registered. And a "No" vote is registered by a red light, a "Yes" vote by a green light, and a "Present but not voting" by a white light. So here's Ace getting up and really making an elegant plea, speaking as much I think to the gallery as he was to the House. And then the speaker calls for the vote. If it's a record vote, the clerk will ring the bell. The bell starts ringing and it's a red board, all the way across. And then just before the speaker bangs his gavel, which is the signal to turn it off, everybody shifts. I don't think there was a vote against it. But it was enough to give poor

Ace heart failure. I didn't mean to get sidetracked, I just happened to think of it. You know, there's a certain amount of humor that goes on in these things. You've got to, to save your sanity.

But what they did at the last minute was shift guns on me, or shift a little bit--not enough to where I felt I couldn't support it, although now I think I would think twice about it. At the last minute it became the University of Texas, Permian Basin. Well, now what I am afraid is that something else is happening here and someone else has mentioned this and I think he's right. The new school created at San Antonio was the University of Texas at San Antonio, sponsored by my friend Frank Lombardino, who has the next office to mine in the Capitol. The school which was SCAS became the University of Texas at Dallas. Well, now, already you have the University of Texas at El Paso, the University of Texas at Arlington, the M.D. Anderson Hospital at Houston, and some of the other things in the Texas Medical Center which are branches of the University of Texas, the University of Texas at Austin. With the addition of these others, you have a University of Texas facility in virtually every major population center in the state. You have at the head of the University of Texas system a man I personally

dislike, Frank Erwin. But more than that whoever he is, he is an appointed man. Even if he was a person that would vote the way I would on everything, he's an appointed man. And, yet, when the head of the University of Texas system comes into the legislature he has the automatic attention and a great deal of influence with the representatives from the major population centers. And under the Warren Court's "one man, one vote" ruling we're getting more and more of these representatives in the major population centers, which is as it should be. I agree with the court's ruling. I think that ruling is much more significant than the school segregation ruling which is the more famous one by the Warren Court. But what you have, in effect, is what I'm told you have in California where the head of the state university system is a great political power. And at the last minute they ran this amendment in on Ace Pickens' bill. And it caught me flatfooted. I didn't react fast enough to get up and oppose it. And really I think I would have been voted down had I opposed it. This may be a defense mechanism on my part but I think the bill was so popular that it would have been passed anyway. But I foresee that this could cause the state some real trouble--this large a university system headed by an appointee of the governor.

In general, I supported the formation of the schools

around the state. I think more education is one of the keys to a better future. If we're going to live together we're going to have to learn how to do it. And I think, generally, education tends to do this, along with helping more people prepare for better jobs. As we become more technologically oriented there are fewer jobs of the ditch-digging variety. And everybody needs some sort of training.

But then we came to the University of Texas at Dallas. Now what you had, to begin with, was SCAS, the Southwest Center for Advanced Studies. This was started by a group of Dallas businessmen, including, I'm told, Mayor Eric Jonsson and some others. The intention was, I think, to create a highly technical institute there. They foresaw federal largess falling like snow, that they would get a great many contracts, that this would be of great benefit to the area because it would bring a lot of money in and would create a lot of jobs and so forth. It didn't. It bombed, in effect. SCAS had some contracts, and they've got a good public relations outfit. I still get a paper from them telling all the great things they're doing. And I'm sure they are doing some worthwhile things. The question became whether we needed an expenditure for a major university and whether we needed one in that particular area, where you already

have T.C.U. and S.M.U. and University of Texas at
Arlington and North Texas State, a couple of Baptist
schools . . .

Marcello: East Texas State isn't that far away.

Allred: . . . East Texas State in Commerce, the junior college
at Weatherford, this type of thing. I think you're
going to see that Weatherford school grow. I base that
partly on the fact of its location and partly on the
fact that I know its president, J.C. Nichols, and I
know he's a go-getter. He and I went to high school
together. And he's a real go-getter. But, anyway, my
feeling was that--as I expressed it in my speeches in
the House--the Dallas-Fort Worth area was already wall-
to-wall university. And we did not need another one.
If we needed to expend the money for education, we
needed to expend it somewhere else than in this immediate
area.

I contended that it would hurt the schools that
were already there, principally the private schools
which must charge higher tuition, and it could also
hurt my little school at Wichita Falls, Midwestern
University by drawing students. Midwestern started out
as a junior college supported by the school district. It
grew into a private four-year college and was failing.
It became part of the state system and is beginning to

grow and beginning to acquire a certain amount of excellence. A few years ago--ten years ago--it was a tax-free high school. You went to Midwestern if you couldn't go anywhere else due to money or grades. But if someone has a chance to go to the University of Texas system schools, I felt that this would pull away from Midwestern. I was really not completely concerned about Midwestern in all honesty. I used that as a subterfuge, in one way, because I opposed the school in general. And you have guys who come over and say, "What in the heck are you opposing this for?" In effect, "What difference does it make to you?" And if you start saying, "I don't think it's good for the state." They say, "Malarky. Don't give me that jazz." People tend to question your motives sometimes. Anyway, my feeling was that, generally, it just was not good for the state.

And once I got into the thing I got mad, too, and that makes a difference, because the wheels were well greased. The backers had done their job well. Jack Blanton, who was the sponsor, and I had been pretty good friends. And I think Jack took a lot of it personally. And I'm sorry if he did, but that's the breaks of the game. As they say in the Indiana Plan, which is a form of discussion group, "I can reject your ideas without rejecting you as a person." But not everyone holds that

viewpoint. And Jack, I think, was getting pretty peeved at me by the end of the thing because I was probably a thorn in his side by opposing it. And I was getting pretty good press on it (chuckle) as a matter of fact, which he didn't appreciate. But my feeling was that this was taking over, first of all, an institution that was failing. And it was simply taking a white elephant off the backs of some Dallas millionaires who owned it, and creating another school in an area where we didn't need a new school. And look at it from the standpoint of T.C.U., for which I have some feelings since I went there as an undergraduate and I'm currently enrolled in the seminary at T.C.U.,-- Brite Divinity School--and S.M.U. which is my little brother's alma mater. They are great institutions of higher learning. They are privately supported institutions. To go to T.C.U., I forget what it is right now. It's what, \$60 an hour or something? It costs as much for one hour of instruction at T.C.U. as the entire tuition would be or let's say for two hours of instruction. I forget. What is tuition in a state school now? Fifty bucks? A hundred bucks?

Marcello: Something like that. I'm not sure what it is.

Allred: Anyway, a state supported university has a much lower tuition rate. If you're a student in Dallas and you

have a choice between S.M.U. and the University of Texas at Dallas, many students are going to choose UT-Dallas. And this cannot help but hurt the private schools, plus the fact that you already had so many state schools--East Texas, North Texas, University of Texas at Arlington--all within spittin' distance. And the last thing we needed was another school. But, as you know, I was overwhelmed. And the bill did pass. The school was created.

This is one reason why I felt Preston Smith didn't really play square with me. But as I say, I have a biased viewpoint because I was a participant. I went in and talked to Jerry Hall and said, "I don't think this is a good thing." And Jerry privately encouraged me and said, "The governor doesn't like it. And I think he might veto . . ." You know, when I got outgunned . . . when I got outvoted in the House, then I appealed to the governor in a publicized letter to veto and listed about twelve . . . I forget, twelve or fifteen reasons why I felt he should veto. And the impression that I was given by the governor's staff was that he would probably veto. I talked to the governor briefly and he was rather noncommittal in his dissent. And it could be that I misinterpreted the staff member's statements. The impression I was given by the governor's staff,

principally by Jerry Hall and Larry Teaver was that the governor was very likely to veto the bill. And, instead, the governor sent it back and said, "I can't accept it as it is now. But if you will reconsider it and change it, then I will accept it." Well, this is highly irregular for a governor, not irregular, but it's unusual. And, of course, they had the votes to do it and that's what they did. And the University of Texas at Dallas is now set up as an upper level school at the moment, but it won't be long before it's a four-year school I think. The feeling was that the junior colleges would take care of the first two years and then students could transfer to UT-Dallas for the last two years. But I don't buy that theory, and I think before long it will be a four-year school. It was for these reasons that I opposed it and I feel that, really, I was sort of led down the path by Preston Smith, or by his staff, let's say.

Marcello: In closing out the general session of the legislature, are there any bills that you haven't mentioned that you yourself sponsored that you would like to talk about?

Allred: I would like to throw in a couple of other things first. There's a couple of things that I think should be considered in addition to this. One was another provision of the tax bill on whether or not liquor and

beer would be put under the sales tax.

Marcello: Now did this come up during the regular session or during the special . . .

Allred: No, this is during the special session.

Marcello: This is the special session, right. For the special session.

Allred: Yes, I'm getting ahead of you here. I'm sorry. But, in general, what I'm aiming at is a discussion of the leadership or lack of same exhibited by the present Speaker, Gus Mutscher of Brenham. I ended up quite often on the other side of the fence from Gus. And so again, my comments are going to be biased. But I felt that Mutscher exhibited very poor leadership. And one of the things that I really felt he stubbed his toe on was the way he handled his opposition to the proposed extension of the sales tax to liquor and beer.

Marcello: Okay, let's go on to the special session then at this point and just . . .

Allred: Could I just go on and comment first on Mutscher himself and on the speaker's race which was involved? And I got a little involved in this.

Marcello: Okay.

Allred: Mutscher was an entirely different type of guy from Ben Barnes. Barnes had the Barnes' team in the House headed by Ralph Wayne from Plainview and Randy Pendleton from Andrews. Randy is now the state's lobbyist in Washington.

Wayne has not physically lived in Plainview for a number of years but still claims it as home. In fact, he's unopposed this time for re-election from that district. And, of course, in Texas residency is a rather nebulous thing depending on intention and several things so it really hasn't become a question in his case. But, in any event, when Barnes wanted something done the team let you know about it. There are various ways that a speaker can accept votes. One is from a member's desk when the button is pushed. Another, though, is if you're away from your desk you get the speaker's attention, "Mr. Speaker." When he looks your way you hold up some fingers to indicate how you want to vote. If you hold up one finger you're voting aye, if you hold up two fingers you're voting no, and, presumably, three fingers would be present but not voting. I've never seen that used however. But the way Barnes would do it was to give a clue to the team as to which way he wanted them to vote. He would go through the rigamarole of, "This is a record vote. The clerk will ring the bell." And the little spiel that the speaker has to go through each time. "Those in favor will vote aye, those opposed will vote no. This is a record vote. The clerk will ring the bell," and so forth. Then he would say, "Show Mr. Pendleton voting aye. Show Mr. Wayne voting aye." And

this was the clue to the team that this is the way to do to get right with God, in effect. And Mutscher did not have this at all. Mutscher's team was a much more low key, low pressure sort of a thing. It was primarily rural with the exception of Tommy Shannon of Fort Worth who was an old school chum. Tommy is the Ralph Wayne of the Mutscher administration. He is Gus's righthand man. And Gus, too, became a little more suspicious after he became speaker. For one thing, Gus's mind is not as quick as Ben's. Gus is a much slower. . . . If he were to be described I guess it would be as a typical square-headed German. But this I don't think really holds because I've known some square-headed Germans that were mighty fast thinkers. But in Gus's case his mental processes just did not operate very fast. And I think he primarily owes his speakership to the backing of the liquor lobby which owns him lock, stock, & barrel.

Marcello: Homer Leonard in particular.

Allred: Homer Leonard in particular. Yes, he and Homer Leonard are big buddies. I think (chuckle) one of the truest things said, they have a speaker's day every year which the lobby uses to give him gifts and this kind of thing. And Homer Leonard was one of the speakers. And he got up and said, "I'm in better shape than you guys that are in the legislature now." Leonard is a former speaker.

Marcello: Yes.

Allred: He said, "I'm in better shape than you guys that are in the legislature now." He said, "On everything that I did, the statute of limitations has run." And I thought (chuckle), "Now there is one of the truer statements." (Chuckle) It's made in jest, but it's true. As someone commented. . . There seems to be a tendency, which was especially accentuated in Gus, but there's a tendency of all speakers that once they get behind that gavel, to get paranoid. They think everybody's out to get them. And Gus tended to look on any disagreement with him as an attempt to embarrass him personally, which, in many cases it was and in many cases it was not. Gus, too, was very badly cut up in the special session because he backed some things, and he opposed, for example, the tax on beer when it was publicly very popular.

Marcello: Right.

Allred: He backed the tax on groceries when it was publicly unpopular.

Marcello: Right. He is reported to have told Barnes that he could come up with 100 votes, I think, from the House . . .

Allred: And he couldn't do it.

Marcello: . . . and he couldn't deliver.

Allred: I want to claim a little credit on that although I don't think I can claim too much. It was generally the people themselves who spoke out on this. In fact I have commented in some of my speeches back home that particularly during the special session, but during the regular session too, that the legislators might have reminded the people back home of two small boys with chips on their shoulders saying, "I dare you to knock it off." But that before they dismissed all of this as simply a bunch of grown men acting like children, they might consider the reason that they elect representatives. And I say, "You did not send us down there to say, 'Yes, sir, Mr. Speaker, if you want a tax on groceries, we will give you a tax on groceries.' You sent us down there to fight and that's what we did.'" Now I'm not proud of some of the things that happened. I'm not proud of having to break up fights on the floor of the House, which is supposed to be a chamber of debate. And as you know, in the special session there were some fist fights.

Marcello: Right.

Allred: Notably between Guy Floyd of San Antonio who is an obnoxious character, very sure of himself to the extent that he seldom acknowledges anyone else's viewpoint, and Representative R.C. Nichols of Houston who is a former steel worker

and a very powerfully built man. He could have broken Floyd in two if he'd ever gotten at him. In fact, he almost picked up Cordell Hull of Fort Worth on the floor one day. Cordell had a bad habit of grabbing the mike from people. The back mike at one time was on a hinge, on a free-swinging arm. If Cordell had something to say, he wouldn't stand in line he'd come grab the mike away from you. He did it to me one day, and I almost hit him, but didn't do it. And I heard a commotion one day and I looked over and Nichols was at the mike, and he had the microphone in one hand and Cordell in the other. And that was the last time Cordell Hull tried to grab anybody's microphone. But, anyway, there were a few like this. I had the feeling that both Nichols and Floyd had partaken of some liquid refreshment. I cannot prove it, but I have the feeling that they did. And there were two or three others involved, Henry Sanchez who is another hothead, and a couple of others. Henry I'm pretty sure was fairly soused. But I cannot prove it. I don't know.

But in any event, I tell my people, "You didn't send us down there to simply agree with that speaker. You sent us down there to represent your viewpoint."

And I fought the tax on groceries and I'm proud of it. But as far as Mutscher was concerned he seemed to

considered anything that went against him to be a personal affront and an attempt to embarrass the administration. In some cases it was. Certainly when the appropriations bill was under consideration and Curtis Graves began to ask Bill Heatly about the number of flights by state aircraft to Paducah, which is Heatly's home town, Mutscher called me up to the stand and said, "That Vernon Stewart," who is the other representative from Wichita County, "is the guy who's feeding this information to Graves. And it's an attempt to embarrass me and my administration. And you tell Vernon Stewart to cut it out." So I went over and I said, "Vernon, the speaker says, 'Cut it out.'" And he knew and I knew that I didn't care whether he cut it out or not.

Similarly, Gus was very quick with a threat. Twice during the session he threatened me with the possibility of a cut in the appropriations for Midwestern University in my district. At one time I think this would have scared me, but now it didn't.

And one thing I'd like to go into, if I may, is a few of the reasons why. For one thing there's the advice of a friend of mine who is a fiesty little guy from Galveston named Ed Harris, whom I consider to be a top-flight representative. A few years ago Bill Heatly

tried this on Ed. In Galveston you have one of the state medical schools and a hospital and so forth. Heatly said, "Now, you know, Ed, we can sure cut the heck out of those." And, of course, the obvious thing of this threat is that any opponent then can come along and say, "Why, look, you elected this man and what happened? Our appropriations were cut. And this man, therefore, is not representing the district responsibly. And what you need to do is elect me and I'll get it done." The other side of the coin is that sometimes in order to get it done and in order to be a committee chairman and some of these things you have to go along to get along. And there are some who feel . . . my senator for example, Senator Jack Hightower, told me that he is of the opinion that you are elected to do whatever you can to get good things for your district, to get the best for your district. And this can be a rationalization, I think, for going along to get along. But the proper course, I think, lies somewhere between that and sheer independence. You find some people down there who are so independent they're antagonistic toward everything. And this, I think, is also an improper course. And, hopefully, there is a middle ground which I tried to strike but, I don't know how successfully. When Bill Heatly made this statement, Ed Harris simply called the biggest radio station in

Galveston and said, "You state employees better find another job because Bill Heatly, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, tells me that they're going to cut this out if I don't get in line. And I'm not going to get in line. I'm going to vote to represent my people." And he just turned it on them beautifully. And I've found several people doing this. Particularly in the special session when Gus would threaten them, they'd go tell the press and that sort of burned Gus' fingers and cured him of it a little bit. Another reason that I didn't worry about him as much is because--there was a certain amount of pressure but it was not what it would have been had I been a freshman. Also Senator A.M. Aikin from East Texas was an old friend of my father's. My father helped him get into the Senate. A.M. Aikin is a person who remembers this and, when Gus threatened me, I went over and said, "Senator, he's threatening me, and I ain't agoing to do it. And I'd appreciate it if you'd look after my school some because they ain't agoing to do it in the House Appropriations Committee. He said he would. Another thing, I went to Ben Barnes and said the same thing. And my publisher of the newspaper that I work for, Ray Howard, is a personal friend of Ben Barnes and a big backer of Ben Barnes. Barnes puts a great deal of credence in Ray Howard's political judgment.

I think it's misplaced confidence because the old man is quite old now, and his advice to me, generally, has been very poor, politically. But he has been a staunch backer, and I've appreciated his backing. But his political advice, I've felt, has been from the establishment viewpoint and not from what is really the wisest thing politically. For example, when I told him one time that I was going to make a speech at the labor temple he said, "I don't see why you have to talk to those people." Well, this is not really a responsible political position. But, anyway, that's beside the point. I could go to Ben and say, "Look, my publisher . . .," you know, or I didn't really have to say it. I just said, "They're trying to push me around over there." And he knew who my publisher was. And he knew who would be unhappy if Midwestern was cut. Then my Senator, Jack Hightower, even though I don't agree with him entirely, is a very effective member of the legislature and a former member of the Board of Regents of Midwestern. I knew that Jack wasn't going to let them do too much to Midwestern. And all of this put together with the fact that quite often they threaten much more than they actually do, because if they did there would be the wrath of God come down on their heads from the supporters back home. I would not be the only one cut and they know it.

So when Gus pulled this on me, I didn't worry that much about it.

But the first time that he did it was the consideration of a move by Representative Pendleton of Andrews to limit the conference committees. Now between Pendleton and Mutscher there was no love lost. Pendleton was a Barnes man and was trying to run for speaker against Gus. And Gus just did him real dirty. He put Randy on, you know, the "Broom Closet Committee" or something. I forget what committee assignments. But Randy was a nothing in the House. And just as you have a peasant in South America or in Southeast Asia who says, "What have I got to lose? I haven't got anything now," this was Randy's position. The Texas Legislature is one of the few bodies of its type left in which the conference committees are not limited. By limited I mean that when you pass a bill through both Houses and there are points of difference, in most places when the bill is sent to a conference committee the conference committee can deal only with the points of difference. In Texas the committee members can throw out both bills and write their own, and have done so. Witness the governor's veto after the regular session. You know the governor has line item veto power within the appropriations bill. It's the only bill where he can veto part of the bill

and not kill the whole bill. One of the line items that he vetoed was the purchase of some state land in Bill Heatly's district which was not in the original bill of either House or Senate as I understand it. But this is an example of the way the conference committee system is abused. So a question came up. Pendleton introduced this motion, and a question came up as to if we voted one way what would happen. And I got up and asked the speaker for a parliamentary ruling. From the way my question was phrased--I've forgotten the actual point, but it was some point in parliamentary procedure--he knew that I was backing the Pendleton motion. And he said, "Bring your question down front." So I walked down to the speaker's stand, and he leaned over and he said, "Now, listen." He said, "Randy Pendleton can't do a thing for your school, but I can." And he said, "I think you better vote with me." And then he stood up and overruled my point, in effect. And I've about decided that the next time he tries something like that I'm going to say, "I can hear you from the back mike, Mr. Speaker. I've had experience with this before. You make your ruling before the entire House." But I don't know really whether it would be worth it because then he'll simply say, "Overruled." And it's very seldom that a ruling of the chair is ever successfully

challenged. You just can't get enough people to buck the speaker to go with you on it. So while it might be very dramatic and in my mind's eye I might see Super Representative standing up and doing this, whether I'll actually do it is a question that'll have to be resolved and may depend on whether I'm mad enough at the time. But in that case I went ahead and voted with Pendleton to limit the conferees to points of difference.

In the other case it was the grocery tax--the extension of the sales tax to groceries. And Gus sent another member back . . . or the member said he did, and I believe the member. He came back and said, "Gus said for me to tell you that the appropriation for Midwestern could be cut." In effect, "If you don't get in line on this thing." I had been opposing the tax on groceries and talking to some people about it, primarily defending my own position with the speaker. What I try to do when I have to buck the speaker is a little public relations job, if you will--a little snow job, if you will--is to say, "Mr. Speaker, . . ." as I did with . . . on . . . on the Pendleton motion to limit the conferees. I said, "Mr. Speaker, I made speeches back home several years ago in which I said we ought to limit them. And I've got to vote that way. I've taken a public position." You know, no politician votes without thinking how he can defend that vote. And I've got to not only defend my

vote to the people, I've got to defend it to that man up there with the gavel, or he's going to kill my bills. And so it was a great help on the tax on groceries to have many, many people get mad about it, notably the communications workers. It got me a bunch of letters. Of course, I was opposing the thing anyway, but it was a great help to be able to wave these letters at the speaker or at the speaker's representatives and say, "I can't do it. My people won't let me." And I think that Gus Mutscher and Ben Barnes and a few others found out who's really running this state and that the people got mad enough to put their foot down on this one. The unfortunate thing is that the people do not do this on enough issues. But, anyway, in this particular issue this guy came back, and he said, "Say, the speaker said to tell you that you better get in line or you can" The threat was not that he will cut it, but that it could be cut. And I said, "You tell the speaker that if it is cut I'll eat his lunch in public." And the guy never did go back and tell him as near as I could tell. He may have told him later. But either way I remained against the grocery tax. And as it turned out, Gus took polls and found that he couldn't pass it. So he just said, "Everybody vote against it. There's no future in anybody getting hurt."

But Gus' feeling all along was that anything that was done in opposition to his viewpoint was a move to insult him personally. Ben Barnes had a little of this, but not quite as much. He told a couple of people, "I take that as a personal insult." When actually, you know, shoot, you're going to differ in different things like this. But I felt this was a weakness, particularly in Mutscher's case, because by the end of the special session, members were laughing and saying, "Gus has got to have a card catalogue to remember who he hated today." And when it's used with a shotgun effect that Gus employs, the threat loses a great deal of its potency because he couldn't possibly carry through on all the threats.

Now he probably figures that I am a double-crosser because I was pledged to him from the last session--from the 60th Session. I waited awhile before I pledged because I wasn't the first one, and I wanted to see if Gene Fondren was running and so forth. And I finally decided, frankly, that Gus was going to be the winner, and I better get with the winner. I didn't have that strong a feeling about Gene Fondren or Gus either one. They were about the same. Both of them seemed to be rather blah. And, since that was our choice, I figured I better get with the winner. And Gus seemed to feel pretty good toward me. When he came up to Wichita Falls,

I squired him around and helped him handle the press and this kind of thing. This was not a hard job because the press outside of your major cities is not very astute politically. Many in your major cities radio and television boys particularly, aren't either. Many broadcast reporters seem to consider themselves to be in show business rather than the news business. They are not well informed on state issues. I was able to suggest some questions to them that Gus could answer without political harm and this kind of thing. And they were free to ask any mean questions they wanted to, and they just didn't know any mean questions to ask. Of course, at that time there weren't too many mean questions you could ask Gus because he was just coming in. This was before the session. We in Wichita County wanted to make a good impression on the incoming speaker because we wanted an agriculture experiment station and we were afraid Bill Heatly would put it in his district. We wanted Gus to rein Heatly in. But Gus felt that I had helped him and all this kind of thing. And this is something you do for public relations with the speaker. And he made me vice-chairman of the School Districts Committee. He took me off the Appropriations Committee, I think, at Bill Heatly's request--several of us, Joe Ratcliff and myself and Don Cavness and two or three

others who were considered unreliable in that we wouldn't take orders. Now, I don't know that this is the case but it is my feeling that we were taken off the Appropriations Committee because of this. In my case, and in some of these others, I voted with John Hanna to put extra money in the Appropriations Bill for the Indians over in East Texas, the Alabama- Coushatta Indians. And to Bill Heatly's eye, I didn't take orders. I crossed the brotherhood in effect. Members of Heatly's committee were expected to defend the Appropriations Bill as it came out of committee. It was principally written by Heatly. If he liked you, your district did all right. So Gus took me off that. But he did make me a vice-chairman of the School Districts Committee. And he put me on one of "the big four." He had split up one of these committees and made it into two parts. I think it's State Affairs and he made the other part the State . . . I can't think of the name of it. Anyway, it was the committee headed by Representative Cavness. It dealt with state agencies, in effect. And it was one of the big four, too, so I was able, in my press releases back home, to say that I was still on some good committees, in effect. And that, I think, defused a little bit my opponents--potential opponents--you're always looking out for a potential opponent. But really, I came to discover more during this session that to be

a committee chairman or a committee vice-chairman--I was only called on to preside once, so this is not so much a personal experience, although there was one bill where I was told, "Don't let them act on it, today." And I didn't feel strongly about the bill, so I just went ahead and did it because I felt like I could get along a little better with it. But all being a chairman or vice-chairman did was to put a member in a position where he had to take orders.

And I'm beginning to see that there are some benefits to the maverick position. As long as you're not so much a maverick that it becomes a religion with you, as it does with Curtis Graves, for example. Curtis Graves is a black. And he is so much a maverick that he told me one time that, "When Whitey slaps me down, it helps me in my district." Well, it may do this. And politically this may be very good for him, but it's not a responsible position. And Curtis Graves made many derogatory remarks towards guys like Joe Lockridge, Negro representative from Dallas, who was later killed in a plane crash. Joe came to the House the same time as Curtis. He and Joe and Barbara Jordan were the three Negroes who entered the legislature together, the first blacks in the Texas Legislature since Reconstruction.

And Curtis was openly contemptuous of Joe because Joe really was trying to be a responsible representative. He voted with the Negro where he felt the Negro was right but he also considered other things besides. At one point he became the first Negro to pass a bill through the Texas House since Reconstruction. It dealt what was an innocuous piece of legislation really. It dealt with clearing up a point in the law that made it legal to sell chicken by the piece which, of course, Colonel Sanders and all these others have been doing all along, anyway, with nobody really prosecuting them. Lockridge was a smart young lawyer from Dallas, hand-picked by the Dallas establishment as are most successful Dallas candidates. Joe Ratcliff and Dick Reed are the only ones I know of who have bucked them recently. Ratcliff's a moderate and Reed's a lib. But, anyway, Graves got up and he said, "Now, Mr. Lockridge," with his best southern darkey voice and his voice dripped with sarcasm and southern accent, "Does dis bill include 'possem?" And what he intended to do was embarrass Joe.

Marcello: Yes.

Allred: Joe said calmly, "Mr. Graves, if you want to introduce an amendment I'll be glad to accept it." And threw it right back in Curtis' face. And I thought it was a beautiful squelch.

But, for the most part, you can be a maverick in

the legislature if you are a responsible maverick, if you have a defensible position. I backed Joe Ratcliff for speaker which Gus looked on as a threat to try to unseat him, or, more accurately, succeed him before he's ready. Uneasy sits the head that wears a crown. Joe was trying to get a jump. It has since folded, primarily because Joe has allowed himself to be scared off, I think. Joe may look on it as strategy, that he's going to wait and jump again. But what it amounted to was that we got out early and now the balloon has busted. And I don't think Joe can ever recover from it. Perhaps he can. But I was working very hard in Joe's behalf. We were making it clear that we were not trying to oust Mutscher. We simply wanted to be the ones to succeed him. And Mutscher took it as a personal insult or threat. And so my relations with Mutscher were deteriorating rapidly. And when I had a bill, I would get some lobbyist who was interested in it and get him more interested in it if I needed to. Then when I went up to Gus, particularly toward the end of the log jam when there's a lot of manipulation of the calendar and you try to get your bills on and so forth, I would go up to Gus and tell him that I needed to get a bill on the calendar. I would say, "Now, you know that's the bill that's backed by so-and-so, the lobbyist."

For example, one of my bills which dealt with parking lots was backed by the Texas Restaurant Association which has one of the most effective lobbies in Austin. And I could go up and tell Gus who's behind it. He's probably beholden to them if not to me. At one point Gus said rather mildly, "Mr. Allred, I don't decide on bills by which lobbyist sponsors them." And I said, "Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker." But the truth is that the son-of-a-gun does. And this was one way I got around him.

Another way is that I do not antagonize him openly any more than I have to. And I'm about decided that there is something to being independent. I will never be a committee chairman unless we get a speaker of a different persuasion. But being committee chairman quite often simply puts you in the position of having to take the speaker's orders. And I think there's much more freedom as a non-chairman and that you can still be a fairly effective legislator if you play your cards right. Now I could be mistaken. I may be going down the primrose path. I don't know. But I'm trying to walk a responsible chalk line between dissent and "go along to get along." It's a difficult thing to do.

One other thing about Joe Lockridge from Dallas. When he was trying to walk a responsible position, he was ill a good part of the time from high blood pressure,

and his stomach was acting up. I think it was simply nerves because he had Curtis and the black community saying, "You're an Uncle Tom." And he had the whites not really accepting him either and yet saying, "Joe, you've got to . . ." or "let's be responsible about it." He was trying, I think, really to be responsible. He was killed in a Braniff plane flying between Houston and Austin that crashed south of Austin in a thunderstorm in 1968, I guess.

But, basically, my criticism of Mutscher throughout both sessions was that he was too quick, much quicker than Barnes was, to take personal offense of anyone who crossed him. He tended to be a little vindictive. Vernon Stewart and I had a little old bill in, and it was coming up on the consent calendar. Generally you just vote bills on this calendar through automatically because they're uncontested and so forth. And all of a sudden it was knocked off. And Gus said, "A point of order has been raised on this bill." It hadn't been on twenty-four hours or something, some technicality, and the point of order was valid. He was correct in taking the point of order. But, we said, "Mr. Speaker, who raised the point of order?" And he wouldn't tell us. And my feeling is that it was Gus trying to get back at Vernon and me for some imagined or real insults that we have had during the session. A

friend of mine called me off the floor, a lobbyist, and said, "If you'll check such and such a bill, it accomplishes what your bill's trying to do anyway." I've forgotten the provisions of the bill, even. But it wasn't any earth shaking thing one way or the other. We checked and it did so. So we squealed like stuck pigs and Gus felt like he'd hurt us. And we accomplished our purpose and he accomplished his. But, basically, I wanted to get in an assessment of the House leadership in the session, which I felt was very poor. Gus had very little team. Most of his people were rural, Steve Burgess, some of these boys. Representative Uher really prostituted himself in my opinion. He came in and just said, as I think Barnes did, "Here am I, send me." And it is always a temptation to a young representative to do this. And where Uher went, generally went Hubenak because they called themselves the Bohemian Mafia. And this type of thing.

This reminds me of one other thing I'd like to throw in just as a point. In the 60th Session there was a move to make Memorial Day a state holiday. Bill Heatly opposed it saying, in effect, the state employees have too many holidays as it is. Gene Fondren, who was then running for speaker, got up, and he was going to show us how to, "Come now, let us reason together." And he said, "Look,

we can solve this very simply if this member wants Memorial Day . . .," (I forget, Mr. Ward or somebody was sponsoring the resolution,) "and Mr. Heatly feels that they have too many holidays, let's simply substitute this for another holiday that nobody much observes like Columbus Day. Frank Lombardino, who prides himself on being an Italian, got up and begged the members not to do away with Columbus Day but they did anyway, in the House. The next morning there was a black funeral wreath on Lombardino's desk, and several of his friends wore black armbands including Rex Braun of Houston who is a Jew and who explained that he is a member of the Kosher Nostra. And while I was thinking about humor in the House I was thinking about something like this. Neil Caldwell is very good with coming through with humorous comments that help break the tension which builds up. I think we better call it quits for today.

Democracy Strikes Again

The rumored author of this theatrical piece is Rep. Neil Caldwell, Alvin Caldwell, queried about the matter, declined, on the record, to claim authorship.

CHARACTERS:

Knott Mucher — bespectacled Speaker of the House.
Dick Story — legislative leader of the lower house.
Karl Kaldwell — effervescent hero — loosely used, again.
Zero Babbit — just some members.
Grave Curtis — an uppity member.
Fuzz Pigg — sgt.-at-arms of the House.
Vanilla Bland — inspirational governor of the state.
Ben Beantax — lt. governor and sage political strategist.
Hot Meatly — a powerful, but warm lawmaker.
Homer Fabacher — lobbyist on the "In."
Mumbo Jumbo — chairman of THE committee.

ACT I, SCENE I

The House is at ease awaiting the Senate's action on the tax bill. The chamber is less than full and the members are in small clusters mumbling in conspiratorial tones. Anger is evident. Three separate fist fights are in progress but the noncombatants scarcely notice them. The speaker rises, with gavel in hand.

SPEAKER: Babbit No. 62, keep your punches up. You're hitting low again. I am warning you for the last time . . . FIGHT FAIR.

The Speaker then resumes a conversation at the podium with his Legislative Lieutenants, Dick Story, and Hot Meatly.

DICK STORY: Mr. Speaker, I have seen three reporters in the chamber, cleverly disguised as spittoons. How did they get past the sergeant-at-arms, Fuzz Pigg, and what are you going to do about it?

MEATLY: I'll answer that. Fuzz Pigg will reveal the spittoons for what they are and throw the bastards out. The trouble-making sons-of-bitches have been a thorn in the side of Good Government since that stupid First Amendment was adopted.

STORY: I've always been four-square for law and order. Turn old Fuzz loose.

Meatly calls Sergeant Pigg to the podium and mumbles instructions to him, whereupon old Fuzz systematically goes to each spittoon and spits. Three of them complain and are summarily ejected from the chamber.

Once again the speaker interrupts the cacophony as his gavel crashes repeatedly.

SPEAKER: Babbit No. 62, you're kneeling that member in the groin.

BABBIT NO. 62: But, Mr. Speaker, the knee-ee is Grave Curtis.

SPEAKER (soberly): Continue the kneeling.

A messenger from the Senate advises the House the Senate has passed the tax bill, with amendments. The House won't have anything to do with it. A conference committee is appointed. The speaker announces its members.

SPEAKER: The chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: Mumbo Jumbo, chairman; Hot Meatly, vice-chairman; Dick Story, secretary-treasurer; and Homer Fabacher, fairy godfather.

The House explodes in raucous confusion. Nothing much changes. Karl Kaldwell makes his way to the back mike.

KALDWELL: Mr. Speaker, point of order! Homer Fabacher is not a member. He is a LOBBYIST.

SPEAKER (after consulting briefly with the parliamentarian): It is highly irregular, but these are highly irregular times that call for highly irregular solutions. Your point of order is overruled.

KALDWELL: Wait until the press learns that a LOBBYIST is involved in writing the tax bill.

MEATLY: (turning to the speaker and announcing matter-of-factly): Knott, we gonna meet the Senate conferees.

SPEAKER: Did you make reservations at the Forty Acres?

MEATLY: Mumbo insisted on the Deck Club.

The speaker recesses the House. The chamber slowly empties leaving a scattering of employees and six or seven pugilists wallowing on the golden carpet.

ACT I, SCENE II

Into the Deck Club, one of the capital city's middle class watering holes, quasi-private, catering to middle aged men, comes the conference committee. The Senate conferees don't appear but dynamic young Ben Beantax shows the House conferees signed proxies and announces he is acting for and as the Senate conferees.

MUMBO: Ben, you sure looking dynamic and new!

BEN (modestly): Texas needs me.

DICK STORY: Let's get down to cases.

FABACHER: I'll have a case of Lone Star.

STORY: First, let me summarize the relative positions of both houses, with a brief analysis of the tax structure placed in historical context.

FABACHER: In that case, make it two cases.

MEATLY: Story, I have to listen to all that bull [censored] on the floor of the House, but I'll be damned if I will in here. I have a PhD from Paducah U. and enough smart!

BEANTAX: I have a dynamic, new idea.

MEATLY: Hope it's better than your last one. [To the others:] This sage political strategist wanted to slap a dollar head-tax on everybody going to church. The comptroller wouldn't even certify the typewriter ribbon bill with that one.

STORY: Ben, the House and Senate have been at loggerheads for months. Perhaps we should look to the chief executive for leadership, direction, and inspiration.

FABACHER: Ben, Story is right. Why don't you call old [pause] old . . . say, who is governor anyway?

BEN: I'll never forget old what's his name.

MEATLY: You know, [pause].

STORY: I know him when I see him.

Giving up on Story's suggestion, the conferees' deliberations are interrupted by five scantily clad baby dolls who descend on the table a la shuffling off to Buffalo) to the tune of "Which Side Are You on Boys." The girls have brought five boxes of peanuts, four calling birds, three French hens, two turtle doves, and a partridge in a pear tree.

MEATLY: Homer, you shouldn't have.

BEN: I never saw so many interesting ways to serve peanuts, Homer. The Texas Peanut Association, under your leadership, is to be commended. I, a dynamic, new leader, commend you. Homer, I like you personally and I am crazy about peanuts, but I don't think the Senate will buy any tax bill without a peanut tax.

HOMER: Then I'll buy the Senate.

BEN: Not on your tintype. We must be reasonable. The damned newspapers have been blabbing.

HOMER: Screw the goddamn papers. Think of the good peanut climate in Texas.

STORY: I'm sort of worried about the political climate.

Mumbo and the girls leave singing a capella, "I've Got Music, I've Got Rhythm." The conferees sit in silence until Ben Beantax bolts atop the table and says:

BEN: I've got it! We'll increase the tax on toilet paper 300%.

MEATLY: I like it. A broad-based tax if there ever was one.

STORY: Do you think we can sell it to the public?

BEN: Don't worry about them. We've had a running love affair for several years.

STORY (incredulously): That many?

BEN: The Senate, I can deliver. But the House . . . will they go along?

MEATLY: Don't worry about the dumb-dumba. They never say no to Knott! All solemnly shake hands and sign the

Fade Out for Movie Tax

Austin
Sen. Ralph Hall's proposed tax on dirty movies got as far as the Huntley-Brinkley evening news (the duo speculated that if Texas has as many X-rated films as Washington has, it could finance state government for some time to come), but the movie levy did not make it into the final tax bill.

The Senate voted 21-9 in favor of a \$1 tax on "dirty" and "underground" movies. Hall cited "Midnight Cowboy" as an example of a film that would be taxed.

At one point, Hall suggested that the commissioner of education act as the state censor in deciding which pictures should be penalized.

"I don't want J. W. Edgar going to dirty movies all day long," Sen. A. R. Schwartz protested. He suggested the

job be given to the governor since he has experience. (Preston Smith owned a movie house in Lubbock.)

After some light-hearted debate, the censorship job was given to a "younger man," the commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Chet Brooks of Pasadena was the only senator to speak strongly against the proposal. He called it "idiotic" and "hypocritical," as well as "unconstitutional."

Like many other taxes introduced this year, the movie tax fell by the wayside when the House refused to concur. The measure that finally survived both houses did not include the movie tax, but many senators felt they had made up a few points lost on the food tax issue by at least coming out for decency, and against freedom of expression.

conference committee report as the lights dim.

ACT I, SCENE III

True to his word, Ben Beantax and the Senate approve the conference committee report - with the active support of the corn cob lobby.

As the curtain opens in the House of Representatives, pandemonium has broken loose. Fuzz Figs vainly tries to seat the members who are furiously battling the House leadership. Grave Curtis and Ebbitt No. 62 are shoulder to shoulder. A new day, a new day.

SPEAKER: The chair lays before the

House the conference committee report on HB 4, and Mr. Meatly moves that the House concur.

THE HOUSE (in unison): The House refuses to lay before the chair!

SPEAKER: You are an irresponsible rabble. Do you want to destroy the good peanut climate we have in Texas?

THE HOUSE (in unison): We like it here. We want to be beloved back home. If we pass this tax bill, we'll . . . we'll . . .

SPEAKER (subdued): If you raise the tax on toilet paper, you will . . .

THE HOUSE (in unison): We'll be WIPED OUT.

CURTAIN

