

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION

NUMBER 12

Interview with  
Frank Kell Cahoon  
October 24, 1967

Place of Interview: Midland  
Interviewer: Alan  
Terms of Use: any  
Approved: [Signature]  
Date: Feb 12/68

©

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

Oral History Collection

Frank Cahoon

Interviewer: Dr. E. Dale Odom

October 24, 1967

Place of Interview:

Dr. Odom: October 24, 1967, E. Dale Odom interviewed Mr. Frank Cahoon, Republican representative from Midland, on particularly his reflections on and his experiences in the 60th Session of the Texas Legislature. Mr. Cahoon, you might begin by telling us for the record, a bit about your career up to now and what motivated you to get into politics and run for the legislature.

Mr. Cahoon: Well, reflecting a bit, Dr. Odom, a few years ago I became concerned about the way that politics were going in our country. I felt that we'd had too many professional politicians and the only way that we were going to change things was that possibly that more people should become concerned with politics and become actively concerned with politics. I became associated with the local Republican organization and when it became apparent that the man that we had representing Midland County in the State Legislature, who was a Republican, was not going to be able to seek the office again, I first attempted to find someone else working with the party to fill this job. And when it became apparent that it was going to be difficult to do this, I felt that it was wrong

for me to ask other people to do this if I was unwilling to do this myself. So, at that time I got into my first political race and I was successful. And I will say that I've never enjoyed anything more in my life than this political thing. I don't consider politics my career, however. I feel that after being involved in politics that I will be active in politics possibly for the rest of my life whether I am seeking a public office or whether I am working within the framework of a party.

Odom: Have you been a Republican all of your political life, so to speak?

Cahoon: Well, my feeling about a political party, Dr. Odom, is this: that a political party is a vehicle for the individual to try to express his political views and to see changes within government by the use of a political party. So, I think, until recently I probably did not consider myself a Republican or a Democrat. Now, in my family my uncle, Orville Bullington, who is now deceased, once ran for Governor for the State of Texas on the Republican ticket, so I did have some family ties, I guess, that might have led me into the Republican party.

Odom: You might also just briefly tell us your background up to now, about your education and your business interests, if you would? It might be helpful to future researchers.

Cahoon: Right. I am a graduate of the University of Texas with a Bachelor of Science Degree in geology. Since graduating from the University of Texas I served in the United States Army Corp of Engineers as a first lieutenant and after discharge from the service

I worked for Robert H. Ray, Geophysical Company in a geological situation. And then after moving here to Midland with Robert H. Ray Geophysical I decided to become an independent oil operator and geologist. So primarily my business career has been in the oil business. Presently my primary interest is with Tonkawa Refining Company who's physical plant is at Arnett, Oklahoma. I serve as President of this corporation. The principle product from this refinery is JP-4, which is jet fuel. Our primary customer for out JP-4 is the United States Air Force.

Odom: At this point, I would like to ask you to think back if you will, perhaps do a little bit of comparing in a general way your experiences and reactions during the first session that you served in the legislature in 1965 and the just recently completed session in which we are mainly concentrating on.

Cahoon: Well, reflecting back to my first session, I was the only Republican in this session, not by choice, I can assure you, but by circumstance. I was treated by my fellow legislators very well, and I certainly appreciated this. I appreciated the way that they treated my wife, also, because if you'll remember 1964 was not the best year for the Republicans.

The Democrats, of course, had a tremendous landslide. Their feeling, I think, was that at that time the American public had given them the go ahead to do about anything they wanted to do. So I was certainly in a minority, but again I was treated very well. I was given good committee assignments by the Speaker who I supported, Ben Barnes. I think that the, generally, I think that

the 59th session was a productive session. I think it's hard to weigh any session. I think only history can really weigh what the laws, particular laws that were passed as to their effect on the future of the state. But I think that there were steps made during that 59th session that will have some lasting effect on our state. I think there were possibly some poor pieces of legislation that were passed. The one that comes to mind is the revision of some of our criminal statutes--the code of criminal...So I think it's hard to say a whole lot without going into specifics about the 59th session.

Odom: I might...it occurred to me to ask you there after you pointed out that you were the only Republican in the 59th session, how you would account for the fact that you happened to win in 1964 as a Republican in this district when no other Republicans won in the whole state?

Cahoon: Well, I think we have a particular situation--not a peculiar situation, I don't think, but maybe a little different from the norm in the State of Texas. The reason...the basic reason that I got involved in politics and in Texas politics is that I believe that Texas needs a two-party system. I think that we can see states that have been dominated by either party. I think in the past I think we can, with a better balance between the two parties, I think that we've seen states such as the State of Ohio that has moved along as it should in relation to the other states. I think it's...they've possibly moved more rapidly in areas. So that's why, I guess more than anything, I wanted to run as a Re-

publican. I think that this feeling is fairly strong in Midland-- that you need two parties, that you need real debate over the various issues and that really people should be elected more on what they're trying to do, really, rather than a party label.

Midland has gone Republican, but I think again that the reason that it's gone is that the general philosophy here, I would say, is conservative, and I think that the people in Midland County have felt that the Republican Party was a more conservative Party than the Democrat Party. So I'd say that that's basically why they have voted Republican. Midland County in 1964 went for Barry Goldwater. It was one of the few counties of Texas that went for Barry Goldwater. And so again, I think that on the state legislative level that you run with...for a big...for the most part, you run with the top of the ticket. Had Barry Goldwater have not...if he had not carried Midland County, then I think that my chances would probably have been poor during the first election.

Odom: You did say just a little bit about the way you were treated a while ago, but I'd like for you to comment for a bit on what it's like to be a Republican legislator in a Democratic legislature. I mean, what kind of differences do you think this makes in your association with other legislators? What kind of difference it makes in your reactions and experiences?

Cahoon: There's no doubt that there is a feeling among the Democrats that the Republican Party is a growing threat to the Democrat Party.

They...the Democrat Party, of course, in Texas has for many years had the feeling that really they are a two-party system within the structure of the Democrat Party because certainly they have a very conservative wing, and they have a liberal wing. And between the two again, I guess there are many who consider themselves moderates. But within the...within the framework of the conservative party I think there is a great feeling that the Republicans are really the threat to the conservative wing because they see people who have been so-called conservative Democrats all their life who have voted in national elections for the Republican candidate for many years. So it's not a first time with many of the voters in Texas. It may be...it possibly is the first time as you get it down into the state level because the Republican Party had no...no candidate had really been too serious over the last few years, but now as the candidates become more serious on the state level, then this is certainly a threat to the conservative wing of the Democrat Party. So there's a feeling of concern but, of course, in 1964 when I was the only one, I was not any great threat to the Democrats.

Odom: What...with which wing of the Democratic Party do you have the best relationship, or is there any such pattern? Is it still on the individual basis or do you think that the Republican is...? In the legislature, which one did you tend to be closer to?

Cahoon: Well, Dr. Odom, I think too often we place too much emphasis on words such as conservative or liberal. In legislative matters, I think very few times just in a, I guess a very small portion of

the legislation that one is forced to vote on can you really say whether a piece of legislation is a conservative piece of legislation or that it's a liberal piece of legislation. So I have friends, I feel, really in both wings. I guess the thing that amazed me more than anything...I saw the so-called liberal factions of the Democrat Party in the legislature fighting for issues that I really considered conservative. I saw conservative members voting for things which I had previously considered very liberal. So I found that this thing of being a conservative or a liberal is a pretty gray area. So I feel that...

Odom: Well, you just make your stand and choose your position on these things according to your position on the piece of legislation and don't feel that you are any closer to any particular wing of the Democratic Party than you are the other?

Cahoon: Right. I would say probably as far as voting goes, I have voted with the so-called conservatives more than I voted with the liberals, but again it's a very gray area as to what you want to call it. I was amazed. I think that many legislators really have very little political philosophy on the state legislative level. Now I'm sure that in United States Congress this changes in the end. But I think most of them feel that they're there to try to represent their own particular area, and they...they're not too wrapped up in so-called conservative or liberal things. Now I think there is a great feeling, and I think this is why Texas has done pretty well in fiscal matters, that...and--of course, the way our Constitution is written causes this to a degree--but I



think that here I think you...is the only area that maybe you can start to see a liberal-conservative feeling. I think that there is a feeling among the conservatives that we must use our money very cautiously, that maybe we should be rather slow with change in our state. And I think the liberals in some instance may be more progressive in their thinking, and being more progressive, I think they're...they don't have as great a feeling or a fiscal sense. They want to get things done as fast as they can. They want to get higher education. They're...both, I'd say both wings are certainly for something like higher education. I think...my point is that the conservatives want to say, "We've got so much money. What can we do with this much money in higher education?" The liberal, maybe his feeling is, "I'm for higher education. If we can spend enough money, we'll bring more industry to our state, and then we'll have the money to pay for it." I think I...the money is really where you start seeing the difference between the two.

Odom: It seems to me slightly ironic, though, that when you get into the Democratic Party politics in the State of Texas, both on the national and the state, particularly from a national viewpoint, that it's been the liberal wing of the Democratic Party who wound up supporting conservative candidates witness the election of Senator Tower...It is my assumption that this is due to the liberal desire for a two-party system in the State of Texas--thinking they can get the conservative Democrats out of the Democrat Party into the Republican Party, then they'll have a chance to

control the Democratic Party. Would you agree with this assumption in your experience?

Cahoon: I think there's truth in what you say there, Dr. Odom. I don't think that this is the total motivating factor. Certainly practical politics is very important, and I think that you can never take away just so-called power politics. I think clear back to the days of the Greeks that they defined politics as a power game, and I think that we can never change this drastically. But I think there may be some other factors. I think that the liberal in Texas feels that too often he hasn't been heard, that we've had some problems and have some continuing problems, and he hasn't been heard within the Democrat Party. And so I think this is a way for him to gain a voice by showing that he does have some power. That if they're unwilling to listen to him, then they will vote for his Republican opponent. I feel this is true in the case of Governor Connally. I think that there's some pressures being placed on him that are to say that, "Governor Connally, if you're unwilling, to say, listen to the Latin American problem in Texas, then we very possibly are going to vote for a Republican." I think again even though Waggoner Carr really was not swept up in some of these problems such as the Latin American problem, I think this was the Latin American's way of saying, possibly to Governor Connally because he was involved in this race, "We want you to listen to our problems, or we're going to take political...a political axe against you."

Odom: I thought now getting into some general things about this latest

session that I might get you to comment on what was apparently some conflict perhaps over future political ambitions between the Speaker of the House and the Lieutenant Governor, Preston Smith. I wonder if you might comment on that for a bit as to how it may have effected this session or any problems it might have caused or whether you know much about it or not.

Cahoon: Well, Dr., I'm, of course, not privy to many of the things that go on within the so-called power structure. (chuckle)

Odom: That's one question I wanted to ask you in a minute.

Cahoon: But here's my feeling. Of course, Ben Barnes is a very ambitious young man. I think that we see very few in the legislature who are as ambitious as Ben Barnes. I think he has decided that politics is his career, that he's got to be totally involved if he's going to do any good at it. I think you find most members of the legislature are actually businessmen or lawyers or people in the insurance business, ranchers, farmers who want to serve in the legislature, oh, for various reasons, but really are not that ambitious at it. They might, if things go their way, think about running for the House, then possibly running for the State Senate, then maybe running for Congress, but again I don't get a feeling of just being totally wrapped up in the thing for most of the members.

Now you do have a few ambitious members, and this is the category that I'd place Ben Barnes in. Now Ben, of course, is not a wealthy man. He actually comes from a farm background so he has some

things to overcome. So he really has to go after the thing with full force. So I think again the conflict here goes back to, I think, maybe even a previous session than we've talked about-- maybe back to the '58 session. Governor Connally was not...of course, he had no legislative background. He'd been involved in politics, but he didn't know much about the actual way it was run. I'm only...I'm kind of repeating things that I've been told so it's a second-hand thing, but I'm told that the Governor had quite a bit of trouble with Byron Tunnell who...I think Byron at that point was very ambitious. I think now that he's lost some of his ambition in that his appointment and in his election to the Texas Railroad Commission, I think, has placed him, oh, to the status of maybe a judge. I think that he doesn't have...it's not a step to another political office.

I'm told that the Governor did not realize--Governor Connally did not realize--that the Governor of Texas has very few powers given him by the law. He must derive his power from his personal popularity, the people who work with him in both Houses, this kind of thing. So Byron Tunnell...back to Byron Tunnell...I understand that Byron Tunnell wanted to run the House as Byron Tunnell wanted to run the House. The Governor had some plans that he was interested in seeing pushed through the legislature, and he kept running into a conflict with Byron Tunnell. Ben Barnes came to the Governor or to the Governor's assistant, and I think gave them the impression that he could be a liason between the Governor's

office and Byron Tunnell and I'm told this is what kind of worked out of that. Then when the opportunity presented itself to move Byron Tunnell into another situation, the governor could see that by working with this young man and if he was able to move him into the speaker's chair that lots of his problems in the house might be eliminated. So, I think this is where Ben Barnes came from; again, he came from it by his own ambitions, and I think that now we see him in the speaker's chair looking at where he is to go from the speaker's chair -- he is a very young man, of course, and I think that in politics it's a matter of timing. He was concerned that his timing was right. So, I think that this is where the conflict came from.

Now, Preston Smith I would consider kind of the...one of the older guard Democrats or types of Democrats of where these people are not really obligated to anyone particularly in politics, you always have certain obligations, but I think Preston Smith felt that he was elected lieutenant governor by the people of Texas and that he was going to run the job the way that he thought it ought to be run. I think Preston Smith felt like that he had a good opportunity in the future to be Governor of Texas and so that he must project to the people that he was not responsive completely to the Governor or to the President or to any particular faction.

The Governor, again, I think his feeling was that his programs were very good that in the short time that the legislature meets, a hundred and forty days, that they must immediately have committee action, immediately get it out of the house and immediately get it out of the state Senate and be on his desk for him to sign to pass into a law. I think that the Governor felt like that his personal popularity had elected, and re-elected many of the state senators, and I think he felt that they should be or look favorable to anything...look favorably to anything that he brought before the State Senate. So, I think that there has just been a definite conflict really, I think for the greater part, between the lieutenant governor and the governor really rather than the lieutenant governor and the speaker. Now, I think it came out that the conflict was between the speaker and the lieutenant governor.

But I believe it was really because of this conflict between the governor and the lieutenant governor really over the speaker... Well, it finally evolved that the governor made a move to kind of take the power away from the lieutenant governor. But I think again the governor's lack of legislative experience caused him to get into something that he really couldn't win because, of course, the story was out that he had enough members to...in the State Senate to run through about anything that he wanted to... But I think what he did not realize is that the State Senators are very responsive to the lieutenant governor. He appoints them

to committees, to particular appropriations by the rules that they operate under in the State Senate, that the lieutenant governor's a very powerful man, not only in the State Senate, but I would say that the lieutenant governor is the most powerful elected politician in the state of Texas on a state level. So, as it turned out, I think that many of the State Senators that the governor felt were completely responsive to his wishes were not so when it came down to some actual votes.

Odom: Was this conflict between the governor and lieutenant governor noticeable or apparent at all in the previous session, as you recall?

Cahoon: Yes. There has not, Dr. Odom, this conflict we are talking about is not a tremendous conflict because the lieutenant governor being basically a conservative agrees with the governor on most things. So again, I think that it has...it's more of, possibly, a personality conflict or a conflict in that the lieutenant governor is ready to run for governor and wants everybody else to step aside and let him go ahead and do it while he has got his momentum up. You got to...the speaker who is ready to make a move somewhere or another and yet somebody else is kind of in his way. This is really the conflict that I think we are talking about. Not really a conflict in philosophy or in any particular legislation.

Odom: A conflict in political ambition for political office.

Cahoon: Yes. And this has gone on in Texas for a long time of where you... it's a log jam. We have constantly had these log jams within

the Democratic party. And again...maybe I don't know if you want to go into this again or not, but this again I think is why I'm so interested in the Republican Party because I think if the Republican Party gives someone the vehicle to get around this so-called log jam. When you get some strong personality filling these various jobs -- attorney general, lieutenant governor, speaker -- then you are going to have a log jam because the man who is governor -- we do not have his term limited, of course, in Texas -- once he gets in, I think, he sees some of his programs passed but he sees other that need to be passed and so I think often times unless he has other political ambitions himself, he tends possibly to want to stay in a job and see more of his programs passed. So this creates this log jam. The governor, at least it's been so in...since Governor Connally, certainly, that the governor was the leader of the Democrat party. And so the attorney general and everything must be responsive to him at least as far as the party is concerned. Well, this is the reason that I feel that the Republican Party then is another vehicle of where a person is not a real so-and-so for challenging the governor.

Odom: I see what you mean, you would be doing it on some other basis. What...perhaps this is jumping ahead maybe but what's your opinion of the reason why Speaker Barnes announced for lieutenant governorship this time and apparently committed himself to that race rather than as much as the speculation went planned to run for Governor even, this early and it is because the timing is not right, or do you think it is because Governor Connally really is going to run again or what would be your opinion on it?



Cahoon: Again, this is just what I kind of think and whether it has any factual significance or not, I don't really know. But my feeling is this, that Governor Connally is going to seek a fourth term as governor. I think that the reason that he is going to seek a fourth term primarily had to do with possibly national politics. I think that the President desperately needs Governor Connally in the convention. I think Governor Connally is known within the Democrat party. I think in helping in the convention and I think he possibly will need help not from the standpoint of Bobby Kennedy actually, possibly taking over the convention, but I think now with the media of television that certainly within our ranks the Republican ranks, we projected the American public in 1964, that we were a confused group. I think that we're in conflict with each other and I think that this...we possibly started out on the wrong foot in 1964, and I think that this concerns the President, with the problems he is facing right now if there is no solution to Viet Nam, certainly within that convention there will be people who are possibly very emotionally upset about his particular policies. So I think he needs Governor Connally who can project a good image to help him in that convention. If Governor Connally were not seeking election, I think that he would lose some of his prestige. So, I think that is why Governor Connally possibly will seek this fourth term.

I think that Governor Connally does truthfully have mixed emotions about seeking a fourth term. I think that he thinks he's done his

job for the state of Texas. I had a feeling that they were grooming Ben Barnes for this job in different organizations and things that he was definitely making his move. But I think finally the decision was made and I don't know that it was any exact decision that more of a feeling that Ben Barnes was a little bit young. He did not have the prestige or he'd not gained the national publicity that Governor Connally had gained. So, they decided, I think, that this would be the way to go, possibly run Ben Barnes for lieutenant governor. And then I think they were afforded the opportunity when Preston Smith announced that he would run for governor. So, I think this gave them the opportunity to place Ben Barnes in the race for lieutenant governor.

Odom: I don't know that these are in any particular chronological order or anything like that or any particular order of importance but we'll just start as if they are here, and ask you to talk first about the teacher pay raise issue and the developments there, if you would.

Cahoon: Well, for both sessions that I have been in the Texas Legislature, I have been in favor of a teachers' pay raise. I feel that it's important that we place a lot of emphasis, of course, on higher education, but I think to have a good higher education in Texas, it's important that we have a good public school education system. I feel that to have qualified teachers in our system that we are going to have to pay them adequate salaries. The statistics that I have seen show that we're losing our teachers

to other states. We are losing our teachers from the profession to other professions. So, I was in favor of a teacher pay raise. I think this is one of the most important things that the state legislature is concerned with. I was a co-sponsor of the bill for the pay raise in the House.

Odom: The question occurred to me to ask...oh yes, many legislators have said that the Texas State Teachers Association is perhaps the most persistent and powerful lobby in the Texas Legislature. Would you agree with that? And comment on that for a minute?

Cahoon: Certainly they are a powerful voice. A lot of it has to do with the number of members they have. So, with that number of members certainly you are going to be a powerful force. I really don't feel that I have ever been really pushed to any position by the TSTA. I have agreed with them on most of their things during both sessions that I have been down there. I have disagreed with them, and pretty strongly disagreed with them in a couple of areas. I think generally that certainly they are a force...

Odom: You do not consider them any...You said that you were a co-sponsor of the House bill. Now there were two house bills, one by Representative Hinson for a salary increase of seven hundred and seventy-five dollars a year and the other one was introduced by Representative Heatly backed by Governor Connally which called for two hundred and seventy-eight dollar raise.

Cahoon: I was a co-sponsor on the Hinson bill, the first one that you mentioned.

Odom: I see, and then the...was it a compromised bill then?

Cahoon: Right.

Odom: I see. On the local option city sales tax. Now this was a pretty big issue in the sixtieth session. I wonder if you would perhaps run over the action on that and give us your views and recollections on the city sales tax bill.

Cahoon: I was on the Revenue and Tax Committee, so I was on the committee that heard this bill. I voted against the bill on the premise that I recognize that cities are in need of money. I think that in Texas that we're changing from a basically agricultural state to an urban state. So our cities as they grow larger and larger are going to need more revenue. The ad valorem tax has increased in our city. I was against the local option city sales tax though on the premise that a large portion of our present state revenue comes from our state sales tax and I think that this is the vehicle that we have chosen in Texas to raise the revenue to operate our state government. So I felt that by giving the cities, on a local option basis, the right to impose a city sales tax would possibly take away the taxing power of the state, or at least the ability of the state to raise the sales tax, as certainly they are going to have to in the future.

And I thought the ultimate effect of this would be a personal income tax, and I'm very much opposed to a personal income tax in that I feel that a personal income tax once enacted is one of those things that just increases like every other tax, I guess, that we enact. But I felt that there was a way to do it, and

the way that I would have liked to see it done was that the state possibly raise the state sales tax and rebate on a per capita basis back to the cities a certain amount of the state sales tax but still giving the state the complete power over the sales tax.

Now the other thing that concerned me on the local option basis... now I believe generally in local options, but I could see in my particular area here in Midland that, of course, we have Odessa 17 miles away that one city could pass it and the other city not pass it. And we could run into the problem of merchants using this as a competitive advantage eventhough it really might not be an economic advantage of saying "shop in our city no city sales tax." I could see these so-called bedroom cities around our larger cities again not voting...one not voting to use this as an advantage over another. So I felt that our merchants possibly could run into some difficulties because of the local option -- part of this.

Odom: Then that it might become an inequitable measure?

Cahoon: Right.

Odom: Were you on the sub-committee here of the House revenue and taxation committee was considered to build?

Cahoon: No, I was not on the sub-committee. I was on just the Revenue and Tax Committee.

Odom: I forgot I intended to ask you to, for this record anyway though it's part of the public record, to give the committees that you served on in this session.

Cahoon: I was on the Revenue and Tax Committee, the Labor Committee, the

Public Health Committee, and the State Lands Committee.

Odom: Were these committees that you would liked to have been on?

Cahoon: Yes, I've always been interested in the...and in both terms I've been on essentially the same committees...I've been very interested in the, really I guess, the first three committees that I named -- the revenue and tax. I feel that this is, of course, one of the most important areas that a legislator needs to work in. I've been very interested in the Labor Committee, and I've also been very interested in the Public Health Committee, so I felt that these...and these are the committees that I have requested in the past.

Odom: What about oil and gas? Are you interested in serving on that committee since because of your business connections or not?

Cahoon: Yes, Dr. Odom, in many ways. However, and who can say what really happens. I requested during my first term to serve on the Oil and Gas Committee, primarily because I felt that I had some experience in this line. It was kind of an interesting thing that happened. During the 59th session, a piece of legislation that had been very controversial in the past but was coming up again during this 59th session was the so-called "pooling" bill. This has to do with pooling of leases for oil and gas. Before the committee...after I'd requested this and before the committee assignments were given out, I was asked really through another party for commitment as to how I was going to vote on the pooling bill. Now a proposed pooling bill had been written, and I'd read it. But, of course, no...at that point no bill had actually been introduced. So I stated that I was unwilling to give any

kind of commitment because I had no idea what type of legislation that I was going to be forced into voting on. So as it turned out, I didn't get on the Oil and Gas Committee, and I don't know really whether that was the reason or not.

But the oil and gas committee in the two sessions besides the pooling bill has not handled really any legislation that would drastically change the oil and gas business. Now the...I don't feel that the Speaker is...really has anything against Republicans serving on the oil and gas committee because during the 60th session, Chuck Scoggins, the Republican representative from Corpus Christi, was a member of the Oil and Gas Committee.

Odom: Did you request this committee in the 60th session or not?

Cahoon: I only requested it this time as another choice besides the committees that I was already serving on. So I would have had to drop, well, one of the committees that I was serving on.

Odom: Apparently you had a good bit of company in voting against the local option city sales tax. In the House apparently the vote was...well, the final vote on March 1 was 85-63. Did you see any---in the alignment on this, did you see any kind of ideological or geographical lines develop on this bill?

Cahoon: I really wouldn't say that there was any great either geographical or...of course, the liberals or the so-called liberals have historically been against a sales tax. So I would say that the only opposition that you might say had...that had any structure to it was probably members of the liberal group.

Odom: And then otherwise there were a number of people who perhaps felt as you did about it or had some other reason other than the general liberal argument advanced against the sales tax.

Cahoon: Yes, I think one thing that...of course, the mayors of the various cities of Texas came down and worked on this very diligently. The mayor of Midland, of course, is one of the front runners in this thing -- Mayor Avery. And he and I obviously disagree on this since I voted against it, but I think a feeling was that when the mayors testified that they were asked questions to see if they were up to their legal limits as to the present statutes in Texas on local taxation, and in every instance that I know anything about they were not up to the level that they could tax, or that they were not collecting taxes in certain areas because of certain taxes possibly being unpopular. So I think the legislature was concerned with here we're about to allow another tax when we have a number of taxes on the books already, some of which are being used; some of which are not being used.

Odom: Did you ask them particularly about their efforts to collect a greater amount of personal property taxes?

Cahoon: Yes, this is really the area that I'm talking about. And the mayor of Houston, I believe, stated to our committee that -- I can't remember exactly how many he said -- but there were only a very few cars in Harris County on the tax rolls as far as the personal tax is concerned. So I think that this was a feeling of...and I think his statement was that it was an unpopular tax, but I think the legislature feels that most taxes are unpopular taxes.



Odom: Have you ever, or did you go into or did anyone raise the issue that perhaps the local ad valorem real, real estate property tax and personal property taxes are also somewhat inequitable as it is levied throughout the state?

Cahoon: Yes, I think there's a great feeling that there are inequities in it, and I think this is again why many of the legislators were concerned about imposing another tax. I think there is a feeling that we need to look at our whole taxing system in the state of Texas and see the best way to do it, and then kind of go from there rather than just allowing another local...and they sell a lot of these things on well, it's just a local thing that the people impose it on themselves. But I think most legislators know that even though you make it a local thing, it soon becomes a state-wide thing.

Odom: We may get back to that, but what about another tax bill that aroused a good deal of controversy in the 60th session -- the liquor-by-the-drink bill that was introduced?

Cahoon: This was probably one of the most controversial issues, as it always is every time that anyone talks about it because, I think many people believe that this is a moral issue, and, therefore, take a very strong stand against it. The Governor, if you'll remember, was very much a proponent on this. The Governor is a very much...is very strongly in favor of what we're doing in San Antonio and the Hemisfair. And I think that he felt that with an emphasis being placed on tourism and with Texas going into the...of course, with state funds being used for this Hemisfair that Texas had kind of a backward look to it as far as our

liquor regulations are concerned. He stated a number of times about the subterfuge of the private...so-called private clubs. And I'm certainly inclined to agree with him, and it concerns me about...I have great concern about our liquor laws in Texas. However, I was not convinced that some of the proposals were the way to go. I think that we do need a fairly drastic revision of our liquor laws, and I think that we do need strong, enforceable laws that we are willing to enforce. I feel like that this does our state a disservice when someone from out of state comes into our state and checks into a motel, and the fellow at the desk says, "Would you like a membership to our private club?" And the out-of-stater says, "Well, I thought Texas was dry." And the manager says, "Oh, well, you'll be my guest at the private club, and it won't cost you anything." Well, I think that this looks to the out-of-stater as, oh, back to the speakeasy days or something, that you have laws but really no one abides by them. And again I think that this needs to be clarified because I think to our young people this looks bad in that we say we're doing one thing, and we're really doing something else.

Odom: You were on the, again, the House committee on revenue and taxation?

Cahoon: Yes.

Odom: Held hearings on this bill. The hearing on March 21, lasted for six hours. And what kind of testimony what kind of issues other than the ones you've mentioned already were brought forth on this thing?

Cahoon: Oh, of course, a lot of statistical material is always introduced. And statistics, you know, can be made to say about whatever you want to make them say, I'm afraid. I think if you can statistically show that this would be a drastic thing to our state with possibly more fatal accidents, this kind of thing. And then on the other hand, you can show statistics that show that probably would not...there would be no change. So on both sides of the argument, a lot of statistics were introduced. The basically... basically, I would say during this session the argument was not so much on moral grounds. I think that in past sessions it had been more on moral grounds. I think this time that the groups that feel that it is morally wrong took more of the line that by allowing the sale of liquor to become easier over the state, make the ability of someone to buy a drink without as much trouble as they have to go through now, that this would increase the consumption of liquor. Now the proponents, I think that their argument was that it would not increase the consumption of alcohol, that it would be better controlled. The situation would be better controlled. The laws would be more enforceable, and that the state would derive revenue from the sale. So again I think that it's an argument that will continue because I think it's...again I think it's hard to prove your case one way or the other.

Odom: Do you think there was perhaps any opposition to the bill that might have been generated by a provision in there, as I recall it, that was going to increase taxes considerably on private club dispensations of alcoholic beverages? Do you think there might've

been any opposition to the bill on these...for this reason?

Cahoon: I didn't hear a whole lot out of the private club owners. Now I think that what was possibly occurring here was that they didn't know what was about to happen to them. I think that really now they might be more concerned after the thing was over really than while it was going on. I don't believe they realized that this was going to effect them as much as it would.

Odom: I was thinking about particularly the set-ups in dry counties. You see where private clubs operate and this sort, and it would have increased the taxation on them considerably.

Cahoon: Well, I did hear a little response out of some of the country clubs and things in these areas that really it would effect their business, but I didn't hear a whole lot of hue and cry over this.

Odom: What kind of mail did you get on this? How did it run? What sort of pressures were you subjected to or were you subjected to any on the bill?

Cahoon: Nearly all in opposition to it. I voted...I was on the...again on the committee, and I voted to let it out of the committee because I felt that it was an issue that there was enough feeling about that the House should have voted on some type of bill. My vote was not particularly in favor of the bill that was introduced, but my vote was that enough testimony and enough work had gone into it that it should be brought to the House for debate.

Odom: How do you think you would have voted on it if...or did you ever really make up your mind?

Cahoon: I believe, Dr. Odom, that I would have voted against the particu-

lar bill because I felt that again we hadn't looked at our overall liquor regulations and decided that we wanted to really make some drastic changes. I felt that again we were bringing something out that would have maybe helped in some ways, but yet would have caused some confusion again as to what our law really was.

Odom: Why do you...do you have any idea about why both representatives from Dallas were picked to sponsor and shepherd this bill in the House?

Cahoon: Oh, I'd say the large...

Odom: Or was it an accident?

Cahoon: No, I think the large cities, of course, are...they're more in favor of it than the rural areas. And so I think this is just where...I think the feeling was that the proponents that of Dallas would probably be in favor of it. I think that they thought if the representatives had come from San Antonio that the hue and cry would be, "It's just for Hemisfair. They're just trying to make another buck down there," you know.

Odom: Do you think that this...that some sort of liquor-by-the-drink bill will ultimately become law in a subsequent session?

Cahoon: I think that we will see a revision of our liquor regulations. Now what the revision will be I think it's difficult to say, but I think that certainly we're going to see some revision.

Odom: Now, a rather closely related issue was the local option to allow pari-mutuel betting on horse racing. I wonder if you would comment on that issue.

Cahoon:f Well, again in this...this is always the controversial thing. After my first session in the legislature, the 59th session, of where...in the 59th session they introduced a bill which would have allowed the sale of the small two ounce bottles of liquor. And of course, they tried to introduce pari-mutuel betting as they have in every session. So I told the proponents after the 59th session that the next time they might go for large bottles and small horses (chuckle) as they've never done any good otherwise. But again they brought up the pari-mutuel betting bill in the 60th session. They are...they were able to have it placed on the ballot for a referendum. It will appear on both ballots. I think that this is really about all they could do during the 60th session. I think that you're going to have to have a referendum in Texas that the general populace has the right to vote on this thing. Then it comes back to the legislature. Now I don't know if that's the legislature trying to pass it back off on the public or not. But it is such a controversial issue because you're again getting involved with whether it's morally right or wrong--this kind of thing. And it's a real difficult thing.

Odom: Do you get about the same kind of line-up of opposition and support for the bill as you do...as you did, let's say, for liquor-by-the-drink?

Cahoon: Yes, since it never became quite as heated an issue, I did not receive as much mail. Had it become a heated issue, of course, I think you would receive just as much.

Odom: Why...what is the reason, perhaps there's some particular reason

but why would this bill in the House Counties Committee rather than revenue and taxation...it's not considered a, primarily, a revenue bill or what?

Cahoon: Well, you know, if you took a...if you analyzed a...where many of the bills go, I think you'd wonder why they go there. I think you've got to look at the Speaker, who he appoints to the various committees, whether he wants a bill to die in that committee or to remain kind of dormant until maybe he wants it back out. I think that there are lots of things to consider why a bill is in a particular committee.

Odom: Does the Speaker know pretty well ahead of time the views of these people he puts on the committees or does he need to sound them out as issues come up or does he have a good enough idea before the session starts what bills are probably going to be introduced that he can make his committee assignments with this in mind somewhat? Or how does he proceed there?

Cahoon: Well, I think he, of course, attempts to put on the committee... if the Speaker is concerned about legislation prior to the session, then I think that he more or less lays out a plan of how to put it into a committee and get it back out of a committee. So, yes, I would say that he knows on a lot of the issues how individuals will vote without any pressures or without anything that would change them during the session. And then I think that he certainly visits with them during the session and has his...other people who are close to him visit with him about a particular issue.

Odom: Did you get involved on this emergency appropriation bill for

Hemisfair funds that came up, I believe, early in the session?

Cahoon: Right. I voted for the first appropriation for Hemisfair. I voted against this emergency bill because at the time that this all came about, we had not given the state employees a pay raise. And I felt that this was...that the state employees pay raise was a far more of an emergency issue than Hemisfair. I am in favor of Hemisfair, and I think that it...that this is an area that the state should possibly be in because I think that the overall effect of this will not just be in the city of San Antonio, but I think we'll get a state wide effect off of Hemisfair. But I didn't...it was mainly...my vote was a priority situation. I thought we should take care of the real emergency situation and then look at other emergencies.

Odom: Now on the appropriation and tax bills, when you comment on that I wonder if you would also assess the effect of the new House rules and the general situation of the appropriation and tax bills, conference committee set-up, etc. What are your views on these matters?

Cahoon: I feel, Dr. Odom, that the...some of the rule changes without going into them any in detail, were good. Of course, we have the situation between in the House and the Senate about whether to abide by any joint rules or not, which is always a problem. I think there is a feeling of trying to start a seniority system to a degree, of course. And I've got mixed emotions about the seniority in a legislative body. I think the average turnover in the House is about one third. So you're always going to have



lots of new members apparently. And it's not...it doesn't lend itself quite as much as the United States Congress to a seniority situation. As far as the appropriation bill was concerned or any tax bill, I felt that the business of writing a one-year bill was wrong at the present time. Now there's a lot of argument whether we should have annual sessions or not. And this was all tied in to the annual session thing. I think that the Governor felt that he could get his annual session thing through and get it on the ballot. As it turned out, it didn't get through the State Senate. So I think that we were...the legislature was just kind of left with this business of this one-year appropriation. Now there is some logic. I will say there is some logic in looking at when you really need the tax revenue and what you have to spend. However, I think that there were a lot of comparisons made as to business, that we wouldn't run our businesses in this way. We would try to budget on a yearly basis. But I think the legislature and the state government is a little bit different animal. And I think that there is...that we can budget on a two-year period. Of course, the biggest thing that we have to do is listen to the testimony of the various agencies, and I think if you force them to come back every year then they have to prepare all of their facts and figures. They nearly have to have full time people who can do this. Well, I think if you do it every two years they can be spending more time working at their particular jobs rather than lobbying for their next appropriation. And I really do not...I've never... I haven't convinced myself yet that we can't run it on a biennial

basis and not be forced to make a yearly budget. I think that we can do just about as good a job.

Odom: Yes, I know our president...president of the university was very dismayed when the one-year appropriation was made that he'd have to draw up all of his proposals and spend all of his time...a good deal of time on a second year or on a budget for another year. However, as you pointed out in the logic of the argument, it's hard to project just how much revenue the state is going to get for the second year of a biennium and project spending needs as proposed very easily, but it is difficult to project the returns the state is going to have. So you were...you voted against the final bill or did you in this case, which is a one-year appropriation?

Cahoon: Yes, again I attempted to make various amendments to the appropriation bill, but it was one of those situations in the House that there weren't going to be any amendments from the outside placed on that appropriations bill. This is...this is an area, though, I think we do need to study in the State of Texas. There was talk and I believe the Speaker came out with a proposal such as this that we go into...we have a regular session and then we have a budget session. But...well, this starts making sense to me because I think that...since the ability to raise money and how we spend is really the most important thing that we do, I think that we could take the House and break it up into one large appropriations committee. And we could give...you could hear more testimony, and I think you could really write a better appropriations

bill. I think that what really occurs that a very few people actually write it or actually know anything about it. And I think that this is wrong. Not that the men who do it are doing wrong. I think they actually have done a pretty good job in most instances, but I think that it's...it is not being done by the legislature.

Odom: What kind of...do you recall what kind of amendments you attempted to place in the bill? Was this...were these amendments amendments you really wanted in the bill, or were you trying to use this tactic to defeat it or what sort of objectives did you have there?

Cahoon: No, I was trying to get some amendments that I felt ought to be in the bill. And I was pleased that on one of the amendments had to do with pollution by cotton gins. It had been written in the bill that no money could be used from the health department for investigation of air pollution caused by cotton gins. This was written in there they could use it. The Department of Health couldn't use any money to investigate this. And I felt that it should be taken out because I think that air...not just cotton gins but any facility that is causing air pollution should...at least the state should have the opportunity to investigate it. I was pleased to see that the Governor did do this when the bill came to his desk. But I was unable to do that in the House.

Odom: Any other amendments that you recall that you tried to make?

Cahoon: The only ones, Dr. Odom, that I can think of were...had, oh, had to do with trying to cut out some of the areas that I felt that

we could save some money in. And I think that again that the Governor...he did not take our suggestions or the ones that were trying to change it, particularly, but he did seem to concur because he did do some of the things that we were trying to do as far as cut the total amount of the budget down some, or cut the appropriation bill.

Odom: Do you have any feeling that being a Republican brought any sort of discrimination in the way of appropriations and so on? Anything that you were vitally interested in or anything of this sort?

Cahoon: No, I really don't. During my first session I introduced a bill to allow the University of Texas to build a permanent university lands building here in Midland. The bill was passed, and they're presently constructing the building here in Midland. So if they had wanted any kind of reprisals as to my political affiliation, this would have been...certainly have been an area that they could have done it. But they did not so I...

Odom: Have you noticed any on the part of any other Republicans?

Cahoon: No, I certainly could not see any at all. Now every...I think everyone would like to see things built in their own area. Of course, we've been working on this four-year college for the Midland-Odessa area, but I certainly don't believe that any delays have been caused because of my political situation because we've had, of course, a lot of...it's been a joint effort between Odessa and Midland...Odessa being represented by Democrats. So...

Odom: How have you fared here in attempts to perhaps to influence the

new coordinating board in favor of such a school? Will they have to...do you think it will be necessary for them to favor such a move before the legislature might act on it?

Cahoon: Yes, yes, very definitely. This was passed in the...a bill was passed in the 59th session allowing this. However the Governor vetoed it, and he vetoed it on the grounds that the...we had just created this coordinating board, and he wanted the coordinating board...to look at any new facilities. Which there's logic in this; I certainly see this. The coordinating board...I voted for the coordinating board. And I'm in favor of the idea behind the coordinating board. Now how much the coordinating board gets involved in politics is still a question. I really don't know that. Of course, when you appoint people, there are going to be politics involved in the thing, but if they will logically look at the higher education in Texas, I think it would be a wonderful thing because I think that we have had a helter-skelter situation in higher education. We've had our colleges or universities that are giving degrees in areas that they shouldn't be, possibly, or they just in...a lot of things, I think, go on that we can improve by a coordinating board. Yes, they will have to, to answer your question, they will have to take a look at it. We're very hopeful that they'll take a favorable look at it.

Odom: You said...do you anticipate that if they take a favorable view of it that there'll be any difficulty in passing a bill through the legislature?

Cahoon: No, I believe that we'll be able to pass it with relative ease.

Odom: That seems to be indicated by the vote in the 59th session. Now, also let's take up this matter of the criminal code revision in this session of the legislature. I know you expressed some interest in that in the previous session so I wonder if you'd go ahead and say whatever you'd like to say about that matter. I don't know too much about it.

Cahoon: Well, I think the biggest thing about this criminal code revision... it was embroiled in the national thing of certain Supreme Court decisions. I think the feeling around the state was that the... our law enforcement officer's hands were being tied just at the time that crime was seemingly increasing by leaps and bounds so I think that the feeling was that the 59th session went more along with what we've seen on a national level of restricting our law enforcement officers to even a greater degree than they were being restricted at the time the thing was passed. So I felt like that we needed to look at some of the things that were done and to try to give our law enforcement officers the opportunity to protect the population of our state without taking...certainly taking any advantage of someone's individual rights.

Odom: What about the bill that was passed? I see, of course, that you voted...must have voted for the final House bill on criminal jurisprudence, but in a note here that the House rejected by seventy to seventy-eight votes to admit oral confessions as evidence in court. Do you recall your reaction to that particular issue?

Cahoon: Well, this is a controversial thing about oral confessions, and truly...truthfully, I'm not...of course, I'm not an attorney.

And this is one of those things which is very difficult for me to weigh because of the evidence on both sides. I am in favor of giving the law enforcement officers nearly every tool available to convict the guilty, but yet again, we're toying with a human life. And I questioned about oral confession why in today's time when literacy is at the level that it is if this would to be any imposition on the people who were trying to bring someone to trial or to conviction to have a written confessions over oral confessions. I think it concerned me whether then the trials might be reversed down the line over oral things. I just think that you may be trying to do something and you really may not be...

Odom: In other words on this matter of oral confessions, you do admit a good bit of leeway for injustices that might be or result in trial reversals, I suppose from oral confessions.

Cahoon: Right.

Odom: I take it that you probably were in the group that voted against the...admitting oral confessions.

Cahoon: Right, the majority.

Odom: On the matter...now this is a big issue that I would like to get your views in several aspects on the matter of constitutional revision. And I think that perhaps you, as a Republican, might have particularly or singular viewpoint maybe, or rather a different viewpoint from many Democrats on the matter of constitutional revision. So I wish you'd tell us about your position on that, and I may want to ask some more questions about it, too.

Cahoon: I'm in favor of constitutional revision. I guess as a political

matter, I would like to see more Republicans elected before we really revise the Texas Constitution. I think that we can certainly update it. I think that we can improve it. The one thing... the one thing that I would certainly want to see in the Texas Constitution is our...is the section that would keep the state on a good fiscal plane.

Odom: Did you have any views favoring any of the particular plans that were put forward in the legislature to revise the constitution?

Cahoon: I...as I remember, Doctor, the plan that I favored most was the Cory plan. And I felt that this is the plan as I remember, if I remember correctly, that was passed. But I think that the Cory plan seemed to be more logical than any other plans that I remember.

Odom: Do you have any particular objections to some of the others? Weren't there at least a couple more that were proposed?

Cahoon: Yes, yes. The Jamison plan, I believe, was one...no, I just felt that, if my memory serves me correctly, that this was a better overall plan.

Odom: I have heard objections raised to constitutional revision on this basis. I wonder if you would react to it--that there are complaints many times when the legislature passes out, say, fourteen, sixteen, eighteen amendments...new amendments to the constitution. That the voting populace do not have a chance to adequately assess these amendments because of their being...and intelligently vote on them because of there being so many. And the point has been made that if you revise the constitution, how many more of these



would they have to intelligently assess and vote on?

Cahoon: Well, I think that this is very true that we force the people of Texas to vote on things that they know very little about, and often times care very little about. Now I think that we can eliminate many of the things that they're forced to vote on. However, I think that there's a good possibility that you're going to have to revise the new constitution. But again it's according to, of course, what type of constitution do you want to draw up. Do you want it one that limits certain powers to a great extent? Which, of course, the one we're presently operating under limits the governor, the executive department of the state, and the legislature to a great extent. Now there again is a lot of logic in limiting powers. Of course, in the days that it was written, this was the feeling, to limit the powers. And I'm not for sure there isn't some good in this today. But I think that we can draw one up that will give the legislature more powers to do the things that they should do. Now I think that the legislature, possibly because of the constitution or a number of other factors, have really, over the years, they've changed the form of government to more of an agency form of government. We've given these agencies lots of power, and I think that we've taken some powers away from the legislature in many areas and given them to a state agency. But I think this is what we all need to kind of scratch our heads about right at this point of really what kind of a constitution do we want to be governed by.

Odom: Do you favor giving the governor considerably more power?

Cahoon: Yes, I do. I think that the governor needs more power by law because I think he's forced to do things today because he does not have the power under the law. I think some of this so-called power politics that we're forced...we seem forced to do. He's trying to get something through, and he has to do it by another means since he has no legal means really to do it.

Odom: I think I'll pass over this pay raise for state employees unless you have some particular things you'd like to bring up. I know you noticed...I know you stated a while ago your feeling as priority when the emergency appropriation bill came up.

Cahoon: Right.

Odom: Did you want to comment any further on that or do you really need to?

Cahoon: Well, the only thing that I might say on that that I think that we were falling behind rapidly, as far as the way we were paying our state employees, and I could see problems coming up on the horizon. I'm thinking of in our particular area--Department of Public Safety. We had a large number of vacancies, and were losing the type of men that we wanted patrolling our highways. So I think that we moved here, and I'm hopeful that we moved in time to avoid what could have been a real bad situation for the state.

Odom: And there's one last item on here before we go on to some more general things. This women's rights bill--did this get into the House?

Cahoon: Yes.

Odom: Well, they literally passed the House committee on constitutional amendments. But this finally died in the House. Do you have any particular view or attitudes or relations on that issue?

Cahoon: Well, again I listened mainly to the lawyers both in and out of the legislature. And the great controversy here is, not really the women's rights. I think that we're all convinced that suffrage is upon us, and we've got to live with it whether we like it or not. I think the great controversy here is whether to do this by statute or whether to do it by a constitutional revision. I tend to favor a statute change because of the testimony that I've heard that...because of the way our laws are written. The possibility that we would throw many areas into nearly a state of chaos by going at it by just stating in the constitution that you cannot discriminate against someone because of sex. We have in our criminal laws and many things that really...provisions that are not intended to discriminate but are more intended to protect. So often times, I'm afraid when you protect one, of course, you discriminate against the other sex. So I think that if we look at statute by statute and try to update them to give the woman the right to manage their property and this type of thing without really taking away some of the protection that we tried to write into the law.

Odom: Let me ask you, Mr. Cahoon, in referring perhaps to both sessions. Who were the legislators that you felt closest to, that you perhaps went most often to for advice or counsel on legislative matters? Who were your closest personal friends in the legislature and so

forth? Would you comment on that for a bit?

Cahoon: Well, Doctor, a person that I feel very close to in the legislature was the fellow that I sit by, Dean Nugent of Galveston--a real wonderful fellow. I think I have many friends in the legislature--personal as well as the business that we had to do in Austin. I think there are any number that I can name, and I think it just has to do with the particular piece of legislation you may talk about. Representative Hinson--I can think of him on education. Just...I think you have...we have to kind of talk about...I think this is what most of the members do. They try to find the one that would know something about the piece of legislation that's being discussed. The one that might have some business experience if we're talking about a...how it'll effect a certain industry in the state.

Odom: And do you look for someone you think has a fairly objective viewpoint on it or do you think has pretty much sort of the philosophical position that you have on the matter?

Cahoon: Let's take a piece of labor legislation. I think that what I attempted to do at times were to one...we have a few representatives that are members of labor unions, and I would talk to them about really what labor's position was in the thing. And then we have some legislators who were, say, very close to TMA--the Texas Manufacturers Association. And I get their viewpoint and them maybe try to weigh what's the correct viewpoint. You know each of them are probably biased, but somewhere in between there's probably the truth, and of course, at times they agree. Take, for

instance, the Industrial Safety Act that we passed. Both TMA and ...this thing, of course, may be a rare instance, but both the TMA and the AFL-CIO got together on...and we came out with an industrial safety act. Which was a compromise, we think. Most things are compromises.

Odom: Would you take a few minutes to comment on the labor problems from the legislator's viewpoint? Include as much as you would like to here. Maybe even get into the minimum wage controversy and the Texas Ranger incident and whatever you'd like to take up there.

Cahoon: I think, generally, that the representatives who are close to labor in Texas are good representatives. I think that they are genuinely concerned with the laboring man. Now I disagree with them. Here we can kind of get into philosophies a little bit. I disagree with them on some of their principles--not principles exactly, but premises. But I think that Texas is going in the direction of recognizing the laboring man. I'm thinking about, say, this Industrial Safety Act, and wanting to do by law anything they can do for the laboring man without destroying the industrial section of our state. I think that we've all...we've seen that Texas is moving towards an industrial state, or becoming an industrial state. The minimum wage--this thing again I haven't been able to resolve in my own mind what is the proper way to go on this thing. I recognize that we have very critical areas of Texas as far as some of our underprivileged groups, some of them that are not being paid a living wage. They can not exist on the

wages that they're able to earn. Now...now what do you do then? That's the...and how much law...how much law do we want to live under? And who do we hurt by passing such a law?

Honoré Ligarde, who's the state representative from Laredo, who was an author of the minimum wage bill...his family were owners of a dress factory in Laredo, and they were more-or-less a subcontractor for a larger firm in the East who were...the larger firm was organized. And they were forced to go to a minimum wage in Laredo and were forced to close their doors because they could not afford to pay a minimum wage. So here you had to let employees go. Now the minimum wage bill that he came up with was a bill that undoubtedly he could have lived under at his plant. But again I'm not for sure in my own mind if the passage of that bill is the solution to the problem. Now...now one thing that I'm very interested in and think the state needs to move in the direction of is vocational education.

Now I certainly don't believe that vocational education is the solution to everything. In fact, in some ways I think it can be dangerous to a society if you go overboard of where the only thing you want to give a man is a technical training. I think that education has to be far beyond this. But in the other sense, I think that we graduate a young person from high school, and we've taught him something of mathematics and literature and things, but we haven't taught him how to make a living wage. So I think

that we'll see far more effect if we can get these people employed and employed where they can make reasonable wages.

Odom: Emotions run pretty high on this subject in the legislature, don't they?

Cahoon: Yes, it's one of those things, Doctor, I think like on the conservative side, we talk about the right to work, and it's almost like one of the ten commandments, you know. I mean it's just when someone says they're against the right to work laws, to the conservative they've said something real bad. Now on the liberal side, when you say that you are not for a minimum wage, you've done about the same thing to him. You've said something about what he is very much in favor of. And their arguments, pro and con on all of it, and I think everyone...I think anyone who's looked into it at all is not against trying to bring these people up to a good economic level. That's not the argument. I don't think anyone wants to keep someone just down where they are at a...

Odom: The argument is about tactics.

Cahoon: How to do it. How to do it. And I really truthfully don't think that...and I would blame this on the conservatives as much as anyone, and possibly blame it on myself because...and blame it on the Republicans as much as the Democrats, that I think that we've argued that semantics of minimum wage and right to work and all that without really looking at, "Okay, we've got the problem. Now what are we going to do about it?" I think that there needs to be more discussion and more action and let's do something about

it.

Odom: In other words, you feel that the emotion on both sides on the matter complicates the solution. Do you feel that...or do you see any signs of this thing moving in either direction in the two sessions of legislature that you've been in? You pointed out we are moving toward or becoming more of an industrial state all the time, but as far as the two emotional or polar positions, do you see any change or foresee any change?

Cahoon: I would say as a practical political matter that we might...Texas might pass a minimum wage. Now I think it would be of such a level that it really would not be meaningful. If we're talking about fifty cents an hour, this would allow the conservative in his own mind to say, you know, "Well, this is not going to hurt anyone." But in my own mind it doesn't really help anyone either because it's hard for me to see how anybody's going to live at fifty cents an hour. Now, what again, what do you do? My feeling is that rather than place emphasis on math, I would be...and it's a...if you come out and say, "I'm for a minimum wage," and don't put the price tag on it, then you're going to get a segment of the voters for you if you're careful enough not to be trapped into them asking you how much you're really for. But I think rather than continuing argument about that, I would certainly like to see us move more into the area of how we're going to bring these people up to a good wage, and everybody making a decent living.

Odom: So, you've sort of implied that you foresee the passage of a minimum wage bill that will not be very meaningful.



Cahoon: This is just my own feeling, and this is the way I think the conservatives as they may feel political pressure. They may have to move in this direction. They think, "Well, let's go ahead and pass the thing." But I'm not for sure that's the right solution in any way.

Odom: At this point would you...oh, there's one other question somewhat later. I believe ya'll were in session when the...no, you weren't in session when the Texas Ranger crisis came up down in the valley.

Cahoon: No.

Odom: That was in the summer after the session ended.

Cahoon: Right.

Odom: Did you get any reaction, any feelings from your constituents or friends on this point?

Cahoon: No, Doctor, I haven't really discussed it with other legislators much. It is something that...it is something that concerned me a lot. I am a proponent of the Texas Rangers. I think that they have done our state a service. I think--to my knowledge--and I'm sure that there are cases where they have infringed on an individual's rights, but for the most part I think that they haven't infringed to a great degree on anyone's rights. Now the liberal, and again there he has certain points...the liberals argue that since these people are primarily only responsible to the governor, that this gives the governor his own little police force, really, to maybe use politically if he wants. And of course, this has a lot to do with the valley controversy, I think. But I feel that maybe certain labor unions, liberal factions are maybe using in-

cidents to try to tear down the reputation that the Texas Rangers have enjoyed over the years. I don't know again about all that went on in the Valley' in fact I have very little knowledge of it. I visited with the minister of our church the other day about why the Texas Council of Churches was a plaintiff now over an incident that was involved with the Texas Rangers. He really didn't know the whole facts of the case, but I felt that the minister involved should, if he felt his liberties were being infringed on, should be the plaintiff himself and not bring in, possibly, bring in...try bringing a larger group that was unaware, or was unimformed about what had happened. But this does concern me, and I think the controversy may go on for many years. But I think that that's why we haven't had the organized crime in Texas that other states have possibly had because I think that organized crime...they have certain concern for an agency such as the Texas Rangers that might move more rapidly than other law enforcement agencies.

Odom: Well, you also have need for some type of state crime fighters to go in and help out county officials--local officials when they have cases that get beyond their resources, don't you? You have to have some type of resource other than just the Highway Patrol, wouldn't you, or the Department of Public Safety?

Cahoon: Yes. I think that the Texas Rangers also give you a more of a statewide organization that...if a criminal is moving into some area, they can alert the local police and work with them just if for nothing else a surveillance matter. Where if you didn't have

a branch such as this there might be certain delays and some things might occur that could have been avoided had you had a little quicker reaction to a known situation.

Odom: Let me ask you about...ask you to comment on another labor issue other than the minimum wage one. And that is the many complaints that you get from labor unions and labor people about the laws on picketing and demonstrations and so forth. Would you comment on the problems involved there a bit?

Cahoon: Well, we kicked around one--the so-called strike-breaker bill. The final bill...this really got more publicity in the 59th session. But the final bill that labor came up with was a bill which, I think, wouldn't have really done anything for labor, but they were interested again in getting a bill or the books that said it was a strike-breaker's bill. Well, I...I'm really very much against just getting something on the books that is really in title only. I think, for the most part, certainly we're all against a strike--a so-called strike-breaker...someone who's going to do someone bodily harm for participating in a strike. I think that it is labor's...they have a right, certainly, to strike, and I think they have a right to peacefully demonstrate for their particular situation. The laws...I think it's difficult to write a law to totally protect someone in these given situations, and I think that here again, and I don't know the...how each situation was carried on...carried out, but I think here's the way the Texas Ranger can be just as useful to the laboring man, to protect him from another influence if he is striking or is attempting to have

his wants known.

Odom: Do you believe the laws on picketing and so on that we have now are okay? Or do you favor some revision of those?

Cahoon: What I've seen of them, and again I'm certainly not an authority in this area at all, but I believe of what I've seen a man does have in Texas the right to picket and things. So I think of what I've seen, basically they're all right.

Odom: Are there any other particular issues in this 60th legislature or any of your own bills or activities that you would like to comment on? I've about run out of things that I particularly wanted to ask you about so I'll let you think of some.

Cahoon: The bills that I sponsored or co-sponsored beside some of the larger pieces of legislation like we've already spoken of...I'm thinking of the teacher's pay raise, this kind of thing, were local bills. During the 59th session we needed a court of domestic relations, and I introduced a bill to allow Midland to set up a court of domestic relations, and it was passed. And the governor appointed a former judge here in Midland, and we have that in motion. But beside local bills, my concern has been in the area of economy in state government, I'd say more than anything.

I think that we could streamline our state government. I think that the only practical way that this'll ever come about is this two-party system. During the last session, I introduced a bill or co-sponsored a bill which would have allowed some of our state printing to be done in the prison system. However, a large con-

tributor to the Democrat Party in Texas is also one of the larger state printers. He really never directly, but indirectly I could see quite a bit of opposition to that bill. So as a practical matter, and as far as what he was printing it for...it's a competitive thing. And I think the state is probably...is getting their money's worth. But my feeling was that we could maybe train some of these people in prison, yet, get a little bit better price for the state of Texas by using what we already have available to us. Well, I can see practically that those kind of things are going to be very difficult to do unless we have a real opposition that can mount and get these facts out to the public and generate some public enthusiasm.

Now the same way with the state agencies. I think that we can streamline the state agencies a whole lot. But I think that if you take on any of our large state agencies, again, you have to take them on from really mounting an opposition to them. I think that Texas has enjoyed really as fine a state government as practically any state in the United States as far as dollar spent versus what we got for our dollar. I think there's been very little so-called graft--not a whole lot of waste. But I think again we're going into kind of whatever you want to call it--the space age. I think we're in the days of computers and things. And I think that we can analyze some of these agencies that we can show by consolidation. I introduced a bill that would have allowed more of a consolidation of the use of duplicating machines

where we could...if one's being rarely used, we could move them more or less into a duplicating service. This kind of thing I think that we can do, but there're going to be, I can see, nearly impossibly to do unless you can really mount an opposition and because you're not mounting the opposition to the agency, you're not saying they're not using their money well. But you're infringing on their domicile there.

Odom: Do you see any chances where constitutional revision'll accomplish any of these things as the state government is now constituted without a two-party system?

Cahoon: Oh, a very little, Doctor, because again I think this is just more of a practical thing. It's something that really can be done partially by law, but I think a lot of it can be done, really, without law if someone...I don't know that we really...On the duplicating machines, maybe you need that written in the law or maybe you don't even really need that written in the law. But practically it won't happen until some change is made.

Odom: Is there any other particular matter you would like to comment. I did have another question I intended to ask you and forgot to. I wanted to ask you about this matter of lobbying, what kind of pressures a legislator might be subjected to, whether you think there is any difference in your being a Republican, or being a Democrat, or whether you're probably approached as much or as little as someone else might be.

Cahoon: Oh, I again...the so-called lobbyist is a person who is trying to influence legislation. The person that he would try to in-

fluence the most is the person who can first either bring his legislation, say, to the floor or get it passed through. So, certainly there are those who are more lobbied with than others. But as far as my contact with the lobbyist for the most part, it's been pretty good. I think that this word, lobbyist, for a lot of people has really a terrible connotation but generally a lobbyist is just representing some organization which is trying to either keep a kind of a status quo or is trying to have the law revised. I think the lobbyist certainly they're going to be biased as to their particular point but yet I see very little influence--direct influence--I think that most lobbyists would be reluctant to attempt to sway a man to vote a certain way prior to the legislation actually being introduced. Now I am thinking of the matter of coming to a man during a political campaign and saying, "I will give you so much money in your political campaign if you will vote for a particular piece of legislation." I think that if he were able to get a commitment, the type of person that he would get a commitment out of would not be probably the most desirable one. So, I think that only in the sense of bad legislation do you probably get bad lobbyists. (chuckle) So, I think the majority of legislation that is going to have a chance of passing probably has some merit to it. So, I think it has to be carried on on a fairly high plane.

Odom: Do you find them useful?

Cahoon: Yes, very definitely. I think that they can give you statistics and things again as to their side of the case. Now, again you

are going to have people lobbying for something. You're probably going to have them lobbying against it. But again, if you weigh both sides of it, you get a better picture of what they're talking about. And I think with as much legislation as goes through the Texas Legislature and various legislatures you have to depend to a degree on people who are knowledgeable. Now you don't have to take their...what they tell you as factual, but you have to depend on what's really what they're telling you why this thing ought to be introduced, why this law should be changed.

Odom: What...is there an industrial or financial or any kind of particular economic group in the state of Texas that has the most influential lobby or most effective lobby, we could say. Is there anything--any conclusion you might draw there?

Cahoon: No, we spoke of the TSTA there of course, influential by numbers. All of the major industries, of course, the large ones are influential. Take the oil industry as one of our largest industries--they, of course, are influential. But really surprisingly, I feel that they are not the...the larger corporations are not near as influential as one might think.

Odom: I've heard it said that a man couldn't become or probably wouldn't have a chance to become Speaker of the House unless he had made, not what we are talking about specific commitments that he is going to sell his soul but unless he has made commitments in the right way, to the oil industries, to insurance...would you comment on that statement?

Cahoon: Very definitely the lobby--lobbyist plays an important role as



far as the election of the Speaker. If they become enthusiastic about one man, certainly they will help him with his race for Speaker. Lieutenant governor, it's often said that the lieutenant governor is elected by the lobby. I question that. They certainly may help him with his campaign. But I would not say that they gain a whole lot of commitments. I think they--the only thing they are hopeful of gaining is some kind of fair response and I think...

Odom: Or you could even say favorable response to their interests.

Cahoon: Yes. This is why...excuse me...I would say this is why I think that you will see, a man who is Speaker has to move on fairly rapidly or go some way because he may not have made commitments in many instances, but the lobbyist may feel that he has made a commitment and then when the bill never comes out of committee then the lobbyist may blame it on the Speaker saying, "Well, you appointed the chairman, the chairman is a good friend of yours, why didn't you get my bill up, you know, to vote on it?" And I think the Speaker just has to walk a tight rope between all these various groups because there is no way to please them all.

Odom: How do you feel about--how does the legislator feel about matters here where he selected and he may have, say, a few...a handful of fairly large contributors and people who helped with his money and used their influence in getting him elected, what sort of... Did he feel some kind of an obligation to those people, or does he feel that those people may want to take advantage of having done this? Is this a pretty common matter or is it pretty hard

to find those people who, you know, who might feel just because they contributed a large amount of money that they have no particular advantage in asking for favors or anything like that?

Cahoon: I really don't know. That's a very difficult thing to say because it is always based on the individual. Personally I have financed my campaign by small donations. I've never really had what I would consider any kind of sizable donation. I have done it kind of for a particular reason. One is so I could kind of vote without feeling it regardless of whether any pressure was bothering. I think that someone that has helped you in the campaign either by money or by work you would certainly be inclined to listen to what they might have to say on a particular issue. You might not agree or you might not vote that way but you would be inclined to listen. The other reason that I've tried to generate small contributions, again I was interested in, I think, primarily on a party viewpoint, I thought that the more involved and particularly if someone will contribute to somebody's political race, then they get involved in it--they're a part of it and so that's why I've encouraged it. A man running for governor of Texas certainly he has to expect some fairly large donations unless he's a tremendously wealthy man. Whether...what his obligations are I think it is just the individual's case. Now, certainly someone who would give a large contribution would expect to be heard.

Odom: I imagine so and I suppose it's probably almost impossible to find an individual that this wouldn't be the case, that he wouldn't

feel like he had some right or some obligation to have his interests be especially considered. Well, I think I have about exhausted my general questions.

Cahoon: Doctor, I was just going to kind of briefly here in conclusion go over something that I'm very enthusiastic about and enthusiastic from not only party position but just the possibility of really doing some good for the State of Texas and this is the Republican Task Force situation. I have felt that on the conservative side and on the Republican side that we have been guilty of saying that we are against things and without positive solutions to these things and this is just not true of the conservatives or Republicans but I think that just too often we say, "Leave things as they are or don't change things or don't spend any money but yet bring everything back home that you can bring." So the Republican party of Texas, about a year ago went into this thing we call the Task Force or Task Forces and we divided them up into eight Task Forces being the clean air and water, job opportunities, and economic growth, crime and law enforcement, education, modernization of state and local government, human rights and responsibilities, revenue and fiscal policy, and agriculture. Then, we went through the Republican organization and outside of the Republican organization, trying to find people who were knowledgeable in these various areas. Oh, to mention one in crime and law enforcement, heading that Task Force is Will Wilson, the former Attorney General who has staunchly, of course, been a Democrat but is now leaning toward the Republican party.

Odom: Hasn't he actually become a Republican now or do you know?

Cahoon: Well, I think I would say that he has. He supported Senator Tower and so I would say that he probably has fallen into that. Well, again the idea here was to first find out what the problem is. Do we have a problem in Texas? Now this again was just a state thing. This is where it--why it enthused me. I think you have to look at it on a state or on a local situation. Do we need...do we have a problem in this area? If we have a problem, what are some possible solutions to this problem? I think that really here the idea is to get a grassroots effect. What is the fellow in Kermit, Texas, thinking we ought to do about crime and law enforcement rather than going and sitting in the legislature listening to the District Attorneys of Texas saying that this is what we have got to do about crime and law enforcement to try to get some...generate some new ideas.

And then to build these over the years into party platforms into actual legislation that's taken to the legislature. Not really as much as Republican legislation but a, really what might be helpful or good legislation. So, I'm very enthusiastic about this. I think...I've been amazed at the response that we've gotten. I think that too often we don't call on people who are tremendously qualified in some areas and I'm amazed at some of the ideas that have come up and I think that Texas really will be helped by this type of thinking.

Odom: Is this handled entirely by volunteer work now or is the Republi-

can Party financing this thing, or how is it handled?

Cahoon: Yes, the Republican Party is actually financing some staff work but all of the members of the various Task Force committee are volunteers. So, I again, it's hard to say and really to this point what's been done is just to determine what are the problems, but now the problems are being summarized and then as the Task Forces meet they will attempt to come up with positive solutions to some things.

Odom: Are you on one of these or more than one of these Task Forces? I've asked you, I think, if you were on some of these and also you might note some of the people involved in working on these problems.

Cahoon: Doctor, I'm on the Coordinating Committee which will attempt to coordinate these various committees. I've attended some of the committee meetings. Really, again, just as a member of the coordinating committee. Our position as far as anybody elected has been to really not try to bias them at all but to just let them try to determine the problem and come back with a solution. Running as far as the staff work is concerned is Vernon McGee. Vernon, of course, has been very close to various staffs and as far as drawing up the state budgets in the past. He's a man who's very knowledgeable about what the problems are. And I think he has been the guiding light in determining and trying to let these people know what the problems are but trying not to bias them in any way. Some people that we might mention that are...we mentioned Will Wilson, Dr. S. J. Skinner in Houston was serving on the clean

air and water. Of course, the Houston area this is a big problem with them. On the human rights and responsibility, Segal Wheatley, an Attorney from San Antonio, has been working on that. Again, we tried to zero in on where the problem was in Texas and Texas is such a large state and such a diverse state that we have different problems in different areas. So, we tried to find somebody in a particular area. On revenue and fiscal policy we have a fellow by the name of Paul Edgars up in Wichita Falls. He's working and doing a real good job. Sproesser Wynn in Fort Worth, who again had considered himself a Texas Democrat but really came to the forefront in Republican matters in the Tower campaign. He comes from Fort Worth. But again only the future will say whether we are able to come up with positive legislation but I feel that we very definitely will.

Odom: Do you think that this is a thing that needed to be done before the Republican Party could really build a pretty good state wide Republican Party?

Cahoon: Well, I think that the voters will look at the Republican Party in this way. One, who is a candidate, what kind of a candidate are you putting up in front of us? And what is the candidate going to do, if elected? And so I think this gives the candidate some knowledge about some things that he might not have knowledge about.

Odom: Do you have a problem in Texas, in many localities in finding good qualified candidates who are willing to run?

Cahoon: Very definitely. I think this is the biggest single problem that

both the Republican and the Democrat party...have.

Odom: Ya'll probably have more than the Democratic Party, don't you?  
With a smaller number?

Cahoon: Well, I guess that's true but I think it's just difficult on a state level to find someone who's willing to give their time and the effort involved to win a political race and to serve in the legislature. Even in the gubernatorial race it's very difficult to encourage a man to get into this, it's a tremendously expensive thing. It's certainly not an easy job if you obtain it.

Odom: You're going to have to...it's a problem, I suppose it seems to me where, except in a few districts where you have the Republicans elected already to convince a man that he has a chance to win.

Cahoon: Yes, this is certainly true. I think that John Tower's re-election has changed a lot of the thinking in that we saw areas that historically had gone Democrat and I...there may be various reasons why this occurred but at least we saw people in Texas will vote Republican where historically I think that people felt that if they voted for a Republican candidate that this was doing something completely out of the ordinary.

Odom: You might say again, what you just said while the recorder was off.

Cahoon: Doctor, I was just saying that something that has interested me lately in politics is that I think that we are going through some changes in politics in our country and possibly I think that we will see these changes in our state. I think that political parties will be very meaningful in the future as they have

always been meaningful. I think that we'll possibly stay with the two parties. I don't see at this point a real rising of the third party, even though Governor Wallace is stirring around over there. The big change that I see is though, of course, we are having this tremendous influx of young people into our society. And I think that this young person is going to be pretty concerned about politics and about the person who is representing him and what the fellow does. I think in the past that we've had a lot of apathy, and I'm sure we're going to have apathy in the future. But I feel a growing concern. I think, you know, we read a lot about the hippies and the far left and about their anti-war stand, but I think that we have so many young people who are just as concerned on the other side of the coin if not more concerned about the future of our country. I think something that's going to have a fantastic impact is television. I think where we saw politics on the lines of what you read about a particular politician, you rarely, I think in more modern times...you rarely met the man. Now in the old days you probably met him on the courthouse steps even if he was running for governor. He came to your local community. You saw him and met him.

I think this is untrue today. I don't think...I think you're going to see this man primarily on television. So I think this media is going to change a lot of the concepts of what a political race should be and what kind of candidates you want. And the thing I see is this that the press can sway public opinion...there's no



doubt of this in my mind of how they write about the man and how they write what he says. But I think the balance...the great balance that is coming up is television of where...You may read a lot about this in the press, but then when you see him on television, you make up your own mind of what you read about him--whether it's true or untrue or how he says the things is going to be very important. So I think what's going to happen is this, that rather than...you're not going to see a whole lot of straight party picket voting in many instances. You're going to see that on the larger races...you're going to see individuals vote on how that man appeared to him, principally, I think on the television and what he said--what he said he was going to do.

Odom: Do you think this is responsible for Governor Reagan's zooming popularity?

Cahoon: I think that this is a part of it. Now, and some people weigh this as maybe his strong suit and certainly it is his strong suit. But I think this is the other thing that's changing in politics and that is that I think that the public is more aware of some of the problems, and the public, I think, is more in the mood of voting for maybe what is right for the country, even if it's not possibly right for him. Now I think that we've seen this in Governor Reagan to a degree. He's had to impose more taxes on the state of California, but I think the people of California say, "Well, we were in a bad financial problem and Reagan come right out and said, 'We're in a bad financial problem. If we want to continue the way California's going, we're going to have to pay

for it.'" And so I think the people responded to this. Where I think in the past the politician has felt, "Well, I better go another route here. We've got a bad fiscal situation. But maybe I can get them off on another tangent, and they'll kind of forget about it.

The point I'm trying to make is I think honesty is really coming back in politics. The voter wants that man regardless of if it's a real bad thing he has to tell them. He wants him to be honest with them. I think this is a great concern in foreign policy that's going on right now. I think that the American public...a lot of people, I think, are confused about Vietnam, not just about our situation over there, but they're confused as, "Do we really know all the facts? Are we really able to make a compromise? Is there one really available? Maybe we're not really being told the facts." I think the American public wants to know, really, and they realize that some things need to be of a secretive nature. But I think for the most part, they want to be told what really are the facts.

Odom: Do you think that Senator Goldwater was ahead of his time, then maybe, in 1964? It seemed to me that he was brutally honest in the way...in what he saw as the problems and the solution, wasn't he?

Cahoon: Yes. Now, of course, I think Barry Goldwater was swept up, and I think your point that maybe he was a...asking if he was ahead of his time, I think there's no doubt about it. Now I think that on

national campaigns, that was probably as poor or poorly done national campaign as we've ever seen. He was never able to project himself. He was...he was, I think...the American public was... they had the feeling that he was confused about really what he wanted to do. And the presidency has to be a situation of stability. I think you want a man who is flexible, to a degree, but he has to be...represent strength and a firmness, and I don't think that Goldwater ever projected it. He projected himself, I think, as a senator, really. I think the American public would have elected him as a senator, you know, but not as a president.

Odom: Now this was an even worse run campaign, I suppose, than Thomas Dewey's campaign in '48. That was a pretty badly run one, too.

Cahoon: That's right. So I think that the Republicans have to learn that politics is kind of a game, and you can run the game correctly. And I think again, I think that the timing is right to be very truthful with the American public. But in the same way, you're in a political situation, and you better run it as such--a political campaign that you're trying to elect someone. Now, I think Senator Tower is a...and maybe this is a very local situation, but in analyzing his campaign, I think that here he ran a political campaign. He wanted to be re-elected. He did not attempt to come on television and say, "Debate as far as a labor situation. Let's debate the minimum wage." Even though he disagreed with them, possibly, about a minimum wage, he...I don't think that he ever said that he did not disagree, but yet he didn't just bring out or flaunting them that he was anti-labor.

But...so I think that it...

Odom: I've been somewhat amused. It seems to me that our two senators, the closer you get to the time they're going to be elected, the more they move toward the middle of the spectrum in their voting and in their public statements. I think you'll see Senator Yarborough move considerably towards the middle in his votes and his statements. And you'll find Senator Tower will move in the same direction. It seems to me there is some difference in the way they view things at different times.

Cahoon: Oh, I think that...oh, I think that there's no doubt of this. And this is...and some people find great fault at the...would either with anyone that would do that. But again I think that, though, the politician...he again is walking that tightrope that he knows he can do nothing if he's not re-elected as far as changing the course of government. And how far he has to sway from his real, maybe philosophical position to be re-elected, I think it's difficult to say.

Odom: I've seen...I read an article, in fact, not long ago that one of the best run campaigns that's ever been accomplished was Governor Rockefeller's re-election campaign in New York. And I was surprised at the...how closely the techniques used there were to those that Weldon Hart put forward as the techniques for campaigning, just the day to day running the campaign, the kind of things you have to do to win an election in a state-wide campaign. I was rather amazed at how much they...

Cahoon: Well, I think that there are some basic things that you need to do,

you know. Again, I think you're in kind of a business situation. It's a public relations thing, I mean, and there are certain kind of rules that if you follow them, your chances of success are far greater than if you attempt to completely deviate from some kind of given rules. There's, you know, this company in California which is a public relations firm, but primarily they do political campaigns. They've come up with some apparently just exact rules that they say if they give them the right candidate that if he follows these rules that his success potential is real good.

Odom: Would you mind saying who...well, you might not want to say on record or you can if you want to, who in the national sweepstakes, I'm particularly interested myself, in who you think at this point you would most likely support for the Republican nomination for president?

Cahoon: Well, I think that it's, of course, we're in a situation...where there're a lot of changes going on. I think Romney represents, I would say, more of the liberal. Romney came out fairly strong at first, and now he's obviously, he's faded pretty badly. He considers himself moderate, but as far as the wings of the party, I think you'll find Romney in the Rockefeller camp, this deal. Nixon, I think he has now attempted to come in more as the moderate--the middle ground between, say, Reagan and this group--the more conservative group, and the Rockefeller group. I'd say if you drew the ticket up today, and again this is just my feeling, that the ticket would possibly be Nixon and possibly Reagan as vice-president at this point.

I think Rockefeller and his wing of the party at first discounted Reagan completely. But I think that they've just been amazed with his...the speed at which this man is moving at. And I'm not...I haven't convinced myself in my own mind that Reagan is really pressing for any particular position. I think he is pressing that the conservative viewpoint is going to be heard, that they're going to have...the position is going to be there, and that he is now, I think...now feels if he is the leader of this faction. But I'm not convinced that he is really pressing for the presidency. But in the same sense, the possibility...the press has made a lot of this...but the possibility is the ticket could be Rockefeller and Reagan. Now whether this can ever be... all the philosophies and philosophical distance can be resolved, I really don't know.

I feel that there is a good possibility, and I would certainly support a Nixon ticket, but I feel that there is a good possibility that the ticket will be with Reagan as the presidential nominee and Percy or one of the more liberal candidates being the vice-president. I have that feeling because of Reagan's...the speed at which this man is moving and the enthusiasm I think that he's generating because he's primarily generating it outside of the press. I think that this man has some of the traits that John Kennedy had, in a way. I think that he can, as far as political traits I'm talking about, he can enthuse. I think he's the type of person that could enthuse people. So I think that there is a

possibility that he could be the nominee.

Odom: Where do you consider yourself on the spectrum with regard to national Republican politics? Where do you think you fall?

Cahoon: Oh, I would fall in the...well, really, I have to look at it from a Texas viewpoint. I support Senator Tower on most of his votes in the United States Senate so I would say, and he at times falls not just in campaign times, but I think falls at times more in the moderate position and I would probably fall under that.

Odom: Sort of a moderate conservative position?

Cahoon: Yes. Now Reagan has been painted as the ultra-conservative, and really I don't think anybody knows enough about Reagan. He's so new to really know what the man's true philosophy is. He admittedly was a nearly an ultra-liberal at one time during his life. But the thing that impresses me about Ronald Reagan more than anything else is I honestly believe the man has true integrity. I believe that he said he's going to do something and is going to do it really not for political reasons. And I think Americans...

Odom: I think this seems to be a pretty general reaction to Mr. Reagan.

Cahoon: Nixon had this, I believe, at one time. And again I'll support... I would support Nixon, but I think Nixon falls more into the politician, the professional politician mould. And I think if it were not for Johnson, this might not be so important, but I think America is leaning the other way. They...maybe they don't want the professional as much as they...They wanted the professional in Johnson. We were in...we had a tragic situation. We had some foreign situations that were still before us, and so I think

American said, "We want a man we know can handle the job." But now I think maybe now they're swaying away where they say, "Well, maybe we really don't want this."

Now one thing I think that Republicans are wrong in a way in thinking that the Gallup polls and all are really meaningful at this point. It certainly gets popularity for them, but any man, I believe, in the situation that he's in right now would be in nearly the same situation. If the Vietnam situation is resolved, his popularity will come back very rapidly because I base most of the slippage in his popularity on the Vietnam situation. Now again I say that Reagan is astute because Reagan has really supported the president for the most part on the Vietnam issue, but has hit hard on the domestic side. Now whether he is...if...I don't know how much politics is in this, but it's good politics because the president really has the power to resolve the Vietnam situation and has political problems in resolving the domestic things.

Odom: There's been speculations that Governor Reagan were he nominated, might be embarrassed by support of the ultra-right groups like the John Birch Society which he would not repudiate. What do you think about that speculation?

Cahoon: I think that the situation with the John Birch Society is this-- I think that they've about whipped that horse to death.

Odom: You don't hear as much about it lately as you used to.

Cahoon: I think that the situation was just right in the Goldwater cam-



paign and then, of course, he possibly exaggerated the situation by his speech. It was a building thing. But I think now the John Birch Society, one way or the other, has kind of lost its, you know, meaning as far as any national thing is concerned.

Odom: Do you think that will continue to be true, or do you feel that it might come back? I suppose it depends on the circumstances.

Cahoon: I think that that will continue to be true just as really the situation of saying, "Hubert Humphrey was one of the originators of the ADA." I don't think this is very meaningful. It was meaningful. The ultra-right thing was meaningful in that particular situation, but I think for the most part in '68 that neither the ultra-right organizations or really the ultra-left will be so meaningful. But I think some effects are. I think the riots and things and the anti-war demonstrations will have an effect on the election.