

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION
NUMBER
502

Interview with
REPRESENTATIVE DAVE ALLRED
April 7, 1970

Place of Interview: Fort Worth, Texas

Interviewer: Ronald E. Marcello

Terms of Use:

After my death

Approved:

Dave Allred
(Signature)

Date:

Jan. 31, 1980

COPYRIGHT © 1980 THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF NORTH TEXAS STATE
UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF DENTON

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

Oral History Collection
Representative David Allred

Interviewer: Dr. Ronald E. Marcello

Place of Interview: Fort Worth, Texas

Date: April 7, 1970

Dr. Marcello: This is Ron Marcello interviewing Representative David Allred for the North Texas State University Oral History Collection. The interview is taking place in Fort Worth, Texas, on April 7, 1970. I'm interviewing Representative Allred in order to receive his impressions and reminiscences for the special sessions of the 61st Texas Legislature.

Mr. Allred, just for our record, what necessitated the calling of the first special session of the Legislature?

Mr. Allred: Basically, it was a squabble between Governor Preston Smith and Lieutenant Governor Ben Barnes. The squabble took the form of a debate conducted primarily in the public press and some of it, perhaps, privately, over whether the state should operate under a one-year or a two-year appropriation. The Barnes forces contended the state was now big business, that it was difficult to plan on a biennial basis, and that it would be a much more up-to-date, modern operation if it could use an annual budget. The Smith forces contended a two-year budget was still sufficient and the state had operated

this way in the past, and the departments were used to planning this way. It became involved both in the budgetary idea and in annual versus biennial sessions.

I voted with the Smith forces, although I'm not particularly a Smith partisan, because I favored biennial sessions. For one thing, I don't think the pay is going to come up enough to make annual sessions where a legislator could really handle them financially and perhaps from a family responsibility standpoint. I had gone through the special session of Governor John Connally in 1968 where the governor, in effect, could not pass his tax package, so he simply said, "Okay, then, I give up and I'll call a special session next year, and we'll spend our surplus now and you'll be looking it smack in the face." I was still on the Appropriations Committee at that time, and it seemed to me most of the agencies came back with a request for additional money. I have worked in Washington and have observed the federal budgetary process, and the state is very similar.

Marcello: Didn't this same situation also occur between the end of the regular session and the beginning of the special session? Isn't it true that the budget was increased, oh, from around \$260,000,000 to \$350,000,000? Isn't that correct?

Allred: It may be. I'm not sure. Are you talking about the end of the regular session of 1969?

Marcello: Right.

Allred: This may be. I honestly don't remember. But I remember in the Connally session they came back and asked for more money. And it was my feeling that any time you give a budget officer a chance to make application for more money, he's going to do it. You know, it's part of the budgeting game. You ask for more than you want to allow yourself to be cut. If you want ten new schools, you request fifteen and let them cut you. My reasoning primarily is that it would cost the state more money and that it was not necessary now. Since the conclusion of the second special session, the controversy over the legality of a common law marriage has come up. And the attorney general has ruled, I think with some validity, that a girl of fourteen and a boy of sixteen can legally contract a common law marriage under present law. And I'm about to change my mind on the necessity for annual sessions in that I think it might be well to have a brief session where we can at least iron out some of these mistakes. The difficulty is that what's important to me is not the same as what is important to someone else. And each would be pushing for those things which he considered important. Before long you'd be having a full-blown session each year. I don't know if that's really necessary or the state financially is going to put up with it. And if it is, this time of tight money and spiraling inflation is not the time to ask the public to approve this sort of expenditures. The public is,

right now, in a "throw-the-rascals-out" mood. People feel prices are too high, and they're confused and mad, and they don't know who to blame. The politician is a handy target, and probably part of the problem. (chuckle).

Marcello: Some sort of new revenue had to be found in order to pay for the new appropriations. Many members of the Legislature felt an increase or expansion in the state sales tax was the means by which the increase in the appropriations could be met.

Allred: You're saying "Bean Tax" Ben Barnes and some of those boys?

Marcello: Well, first of all, what was your position on an increase in the state sales tax or an expansion of it?

Allred: I'd like to take those separately because they really evolved into two separate issues.

Marcello: Right.

Allred: I think I've quoted before Bill Heatly's famous comment that you can look all over the Capitol grounds, and you will not find one monument to the author of a tax bill. And it's a political fact of life that taxes are a necessity but are never popular. I have a friend who likes to boast that he has never voted for a tax bill. The argument that is used on the floor is that certainly it is expedient to vote for all appropriations bills and against all tax bills, but this is really not responsible legislating. And I agree with them although I feel that the boys who advanced this argument,

the Heatly crowd and the speaker's crowd and so forth, like to reserve unto themselves the right to define responsibility and what is a responsible vote on any given bill. But I agree with them that if you're going to be a responsible legislator you have to vote for some revenue-raising sources. The question, simply, is how will the money be spent and who pays what part?

The budgetary process is complicated. The public makes no attempt to understand it. People simply know they're constantly being asked for more taxes. The truth of the matter is Texas is way down in the amount of taxes it takes from its citizens. Money is needed for services this state is going to need to catch up in such fields as education and mental health, mental retardation--things of this nature, in which the state is criminally behind the times. If you go to one of our state schools or state hospitals, it will turn your stomach. Some of the handicaps under which these people operate are sad. There are waiting lists, people with retarded children who want to get them in a state school, and the waiting lists are running literally two or three years. The state is woefully behind in educational processes and particularly in mental health and mental retardation facilities and in some other areas. But those are two that come to mind.

So there will be a continual look at more tax revenue. Lieutenant Governor Barnes the other day issued a big statement

on how the state ought to have more narcotics treatment facilities. This, of course, again will require the expenditure of money.

So, in general, I was not happy about a tax bill. No politician is. But I also recognized that we did need some additional revenue. My stated position on the campaign trail is that I would look to see if the funds were really needed, and if I found any money that was not being spent wisely, then I would oppose this expenditure. And this is the way to cut rather than slashing a set percentage across the board. But the difficulty is that appropriations hearings are rather cut-and-dried. You come in and all you have is an agency's word for what they need. The Appropriations Committee's members have no investigative staff. There's the Legislative Budget Board. But it seems to me the staff members' individual prejudices are reflected in the recommendations. The committee does hold hearings. And each state agency comes in and says, "We need this, this, this, and this." But you have no investigative staff--no way of knowing if they do, in fact, need this. You just kind of have to take their word for it. I'm not firsthand familiar with it--but I've been told the Federal Congress uses the subcommittee system, in which the subcommittee members can become experts in given fields. And they go out and visit the sites involved. If a state school comes in and says, "We need thus and such

award," the subcommittee has been there, and members can say, "Yes, you do," or "No, you don't." The other side of this is that if you become an expert in a given field you may well become an advocate of that field above others. For example, if I were to be on the State School Subcommittee, I could find many things we could spend money for in state schools to improve them. And they would be improvements. Whether they were improvements needed worse than projects in other fields is something the whole committee would have to decide itself.

But under state's appropriation process this is not done. You simply sit and listen until stopped by physical fatigue or boredom or pressure of other duties. You just get everything crowded in your mind until you can't listen anymore. People get up and walk out. Sometimes there's only two or three members of the committee in the hearings.

And then Bill Heatly and his staff write the bill. Every member of the Appropriations Committee is expected to back the bill. I think this is one big reason why I'm not on the Appropriations Committee, because I voted against Heatly's wishes on the appropriations matter. They draw up the bill, and then Heatly has a secret meeting of the Appropriations Committee. This is now in violation of the state Open Meetings Law, but he used to hold such a meeting, and I feel sure he still does it. Members have the feeling of being

"on the inside" and so don't tell of the meeting. Heatly goes over the bill page by page with the members of the Appropriations Committee. And this is where you can do a little bit of good, perhaps, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, because in this session you can say, "Well, now, look, fellas, I need to do so-and-so. Let's see if we can't slip a little in here for my pet project." And if you've been a good little boy, they might do it. But you have no guarantee that it will be in the final draft that goes to the members' desks. You have no guarantee that it will be in the bill that comes out of the conference committee. Heatly may well let it go in the House bill just to placate you, and then cut it out in conference. I don't know of anything where this happened. I'm just speculating on Heatly's personality and the way things are done. In addition, particularly with the state's Open Meeting statute now in effect, I don't know whether any action of the committee behind closed doors would be valid or not, actually. In other words, if I felt like Heatly had cheated me, I couldn't very well challenge it because it's at a closed meeting, anyway, in which I had participated, assuming I was still on the committee. But anyway, this is the way they decide how they're going to spend the money.

And then "Jumbo" Atwell, Jim Atwell of Dallas, and his Revenue and Tax Committee are looking at proposed sources of

revenue. It's my opinion that the lobby is extremely close to this committee. The only group of people who are not represented by lobbyists is the plain, old, ordinary, citizen taxpayers. I don't feel that they get a lot of representation on the committee, either. I'm not saying that all committee members are not looking out for the taxpayer--obviously most of them probably are. But then you end up with five hand-picked people, again, on the conference committee that write the final bill. These are the people that are going to go along with the lobby, in my opinion. I have no way of proving this, but this is my opinion, that "Jumbo" Atwell and the conferees are generally owned by the lobbies. And the speaker is owned by the lobbies.

But the proposals this time were: one, to increase the sales tax, or two, to expand the sales tax to some items which had previously been exempted--notably, groceries, medicine, and farm implements and seeds. Now, I think the feeling was that it might be a little easier to extend the sales tax to these exempted items than to try to increase it, because an enemy couldn't really accuse you of increasing taxes if you simply brought some other things under it, and you could always argue to an irate taxpayer, "Why, look, all we did was just make everybody pay these taxes where some people were getting off. You don't like to pay taxes and have somebody else exempted." And the guy would say, "No, really, I don't,"

without realizing that it was simply a broader area in which he was taxed. But I am convinced that no politician casts a vote without at least some thought as to how he will defend that vote against its detractors, and there are always some. So we came into the situation in which the first attempt was to expand the sales tax into a tax on groceries, medicine, farm items, and seed. It became known as the grocery tax, though.

Marcello: Well, before the grocery tax, there was also the controversy over the inclusion of alcoholic beverages under the sales tax. Isn't that correct?

Allred: No, not really. I think this was an outgrowth of this. This is my recollection. My mental wheels get a little creaky, sometimes. I don't honestly remember the exact chronology, but it seems the feeling that I heard expressed the most was, "Why tax my groceries?. Why don't you tax beer? I'm a drinking man." Let me specify this. I'm still quoting from the argument that many people gave me in which they said, "I drink. But I do not consider that a necessity. I do consider groceries a necessity. Therefore, even though I am a drinking man, I would prefer to see more tax put on this as a luxury, because I can get by without booze but I can't get by without food." And this was when Gus Mutscher and the beer lobby got all upset, and their antennas began to quiver, and they began to fight the thing. But by then, they were dealing with

something that had gotten out of hand, as far as they were concerned. They could no longer control the situation. In some of my speeches back home, in fact, I cite the grocery tax defeat as one of the times when Gus Mutscher, Ben Barnes, and company found out who was really running this state--that the people did care enough to rise up in arms and to say, "No, this is so bad we will not stand for it." And it was defeated.

Marcello: What sort of mail did you get with regard to the grocery tax?

Allred: Beautiful mail. One of the difficulties that you encounter in a representative's job is that if you're going to represent your area, you need to know your area's thinking. And most of the time you don't get much mail. In the 1967 session I got over 500 letters on liquor-by-the-drink.

Marcello: Most of them were opposed to it, I assume, from your district.

Allred: Oh, yes, I'm from the Bible Belt, and the county voted overwhelmingly in opposition to liquor-by-the-drink in the referendum. I'm reminded a little of Will Roger's comment: "The people of Oklahoma will continue to vote dry as long as they can stagger to the polls." Whatever, until the grocery tax, I had not received anywhere near that volume of mail on any other issue. You know, you might get fifty or maybe seventy-five letters on a given issue, but nowhere near what I got on the grocery tax. Now this was less of a spontaneous thing than liquor-by-the-drink. The preachers were preaching

against liquor-by-the-drink. I've been to meetings such as the Texas Restaurant Association where the association officially favors liquor-by-the-drink. And I've gotten up and said, "I realize you're for it, but my county is against it. I personally oppose it, and I voted against it." And I've had Restaurant Association members come up to me privately afterwards and say, "I don't care what the association says, you keep up the fight. I'm against it, too." This is a very personal thing with people. In all honesty, I feel like a great deal of the mail against the grocery tax was whipped-up mail. By that I mean it was people who went out and got the voters excited. The Communications Workers of America, the C.W.A. of the AFL-CIO, were the most active in my area and I think throughout the state.

Marcello: Why is that necessarily so? Or why was it so?

Allred: Because in my area they are the biggest and most active of the labor organizations. My area is not heavily labor, but the largest union there, in the normal sense of the word, is the communications workers. Maybe one like A.F.G.E., the American Federation of Government Employees or the other . . . what is the other government union? There's two of them. Oh, I'll get the initials for it. They may be a little larger, simply in membership, but they're like the postal union--they don't strike, and therefore their labor leaders are more lobbyists than they are labor leaders in the old

John L. Lewis sense of the word.

But, in any event, I think, too, the AFL-CIO had the organization and had the people that could be mobilized on short notice. Most of the time it takes people a long time to really get excited about things, and for the word to get around. We went through this flurry, which I hope is over now, on the fourteen-year-old common law marriage deal. And it took a long time for the word to filter down to the hinterlands. When it did, all hell broke loose. But it took awhile for it to filter down. In this case, we were faced with a deadline. We knew the tax bill was coming up, and this was going to be one of the proposals and so forth. The AFL-CIO had the people they could mobilize quickly and they did, notably, the Communications Workers in my area, and, I think, throughout the state.

Communications Workers have one of the better organized unions in the AFL-CIO framework. They do a lot of civic projects, donations to blood drives, sponsor calls to Mom from servicemen, and this sort of thing, which is good public relations for the labor movement. In addition, they are quite good about their legislative opportunities.

One of the most popular of the labor lobbyists is a guy named Dally Willis, from the Midland-Odessa area out in West Texas. Dally is a Communications Worker's lobbyist during the sessions. He's a rather short fellow, you know, not a big,

imposing type the way Hank Brown is. And yet Dally is more effective than Hank Brown, because Hank Brown is so busy being Hank Brown and being pompous. I don't think he's nearly as effective as Dally Willis and some of the other boys who work with him. But I'm particularly partial, and in my experience the Communication Workers have done an excellent job. They're not the only ones, by any means.

But, anyway, getting back to the grocery tax, right at the start of the special session, I had a conversation one afternoon with Representative Joe Ratcliff of Dallas. I told him I anticipated one or more opponents. At that time I expected former Wichita Falls Mayor Winston Wallander to oppose me in the primary. And the possibility was even being discussed at that time that this guy, Phil Grace, would run in the general. Phil finally did run against me in the general, and we're in the campaign now. There were also a couple of others. There's a Midwestern student who ran against me as a write-in two years ago and so forth. I thought it very expedient to spread the word around the House that I was looking at two or three prospective opponents. Quite often when I didn't want to anger the speaker, but I would have to take a stand that would be in opposition to his viewpoint, I could say to him or one of his lieutenants, which I knew would get back to him, "I'm scared to death. I'm looking at the possibility of three opponents, and I've

got to watch what I do." This illustrates one of the things that I appreciated about the late John Field, who was a representative from Dallas, in his backing of the liquor bill. The first time he ever approached me on it he said, "Now I understand that the name of the game is getting reelected, but do you think you could go with us on liquor-by-the-drink?" And I said, "No, John, from my district I can't even if I wanted to." He said, "If that's the way it is, that's the way it is." You know, a politician has to be somewhat of a pragmatist and somewhat of a realist and realize that the name of the game is getting reelected. As my friend Norman Duncan, who used to be Congressman Graham Purcell's Administrative Assistant, was fond of saying, "If you want to be a statesman, you've got to get elected." So I was finding it very helpful to point out to people that I was facing a possibility of several opponents. I was backing Joe Ratcliff for speaker. At this time we had a little speaker's race going on on the side which added to Gus Mutscher's ulcers.

Marcello: I didn't know about that.

Allred: Oh, yes. We'll get into that a little bit later if you'll make a note of it. But there was quite a flurry, particularly during the special sessions and toward the end of the regular session in the area of a successor to Mutscher. Someone commented that when a man goes in the speaker's chair he

becomes paranoid. All of a sudden everybody is his enemy, and they're out to get him. And Mutscher was particularly this way. Anything that went against his viewpoint, he considered to be a personal insult and that the member was out to embarrass his administration. So I wasn't helping myself too much by backing Joe, but I was doing it. I think that now that he's pretty much dead as a speaker candidate, and I rode the wrong horse. But that's a chance you take. You never know. He may be a lively corpse, but at this point he's as Joel Chandler Harris says in his Uncle Remus stories, "Brer Rabbit, he lay low." That may be what Joe Ratcliff is doing at the moment.

We were speaking one afternoon in the House chamber, just talking to each other, and he said, "You know, I think that taxes is going to be one of the big campaign issues." And he said, "If I were anticipating an opponent, I would come out very strong against taxes, particularly this idea of a grocery tax."

This made good sense to me. I had planned to vote against it, but I hadn't really thought that much about coming out strong against it. But the more I thought about it, the more it seemed to have validity. So I began to issue statements in the press back home that the grocery tax was the worst thing since Genghis Khan and this kind of thing. It turned out to be one of the smartest political moves I

ever made, because when I announced for reelection, I headed my press release by saying, "State Representative Dave Allred, who helped defeat the proposed tax on groceries, has announced as a candidate for reelection." And when people started damning taxes, I say, "That's one reason why I oppose that tax on groceries." And you get them off on my particular peeves, which they are probably mad about, anyway, and it gets them off of some of the necessity of taxes, because, really, you cannot argue the necessity of taxes to most taxpayers. They don't want to think that deeply. There are some, fortunately, and the number seems to be growing. I think the League of Women Voters, and things like this are contributing to the education of the voter. Television and the classroom and so forth are also helping a great deal. There are more informed voters now than I think there used to be. But still, most people don't want to argue the theories of taxation or anything else. They just want you to get out of their pocket, in effect.

Marcello: Just to keep our record straight then, let me ask you, were you opposed to the food tax out of your own personal convictions, or were you opposed to it because your district and your constituents were opposed to it, or both?

Allred: Both. This is one of those things where it's kind of hard to say . . .

Marcello: Well, this is what I assumed, but I wanted to make sure we

had our records straight.

Allred: What is the famous old saying? "There go the people, and I must go with them for I am their leader." But I have a feeling that my opposition to the food tax came before I was really sure of the political climate. In fact, I know it did because at first I was feeling rather exposed out there. This was one reason why I was doing a lot of my artillery in the press back home rather than on the floor. Any griping I did about the sales tax on the floor was not over the microphones but in individual conferences, which is really where you make a lot of your points. When you get up on the microphone, generally it's cut-and-dried. Some issues are decided by debate on the microphone. But, in general, a great deal of the work on whether or not a bill passes is done in these little individual conferences as members gather on the floor and say, "What do you think? Can you go with this one?" And the other guy will say, "No, I can't do it, and here's why." This is why I think that the letter-writing effort paid off in this case. It gave members a reason to vote against the tax.

In any event, the extension of the sales tax to groceries, etc., was proposed. And the squabbling began then over whether or not it was such a good idea. When it did become a formal proposal, the AFL-CIO mobilized its forces, and mail began to pour in. Mrs. Esta Faye Hoffman of Burkburnett, who is the

local president of CWA, and a couple of her members got on a plane and flew to Austin and brought with them a sheaf of, I'd say, twenty-five or thirty letters. Some of them were notebook paper torn in two and a letter written on either half of the notebook paper. And they were not long letters at all. They simply said, "Dear Mr. Allred: This is to let you know that I oppose this tax on groceries. Sincerely yours, Lena Jones" or whatever.

Marcello: I was going to ask you what sort of argument these letters took.

Allred: Mostly they didn't argue at all. They simply opposed the extension of the tax. But they were valuable to me in a couple of ways. One way, selfishly and politically, in that I worked out a form letter saying, "You bet, I'm against it and so forth." And we Robotyped this.

The Robotype is an automatic typewriter. That's one brand name. I guess I should say automatic typewriter because they use several different types. IBM puts one out; Royal puts one out. They use in varying degrees some sort of tape where you have the same letter being sent, but it's typed individually. An operator types in the heading: Mr. and Mrs. Ron Marcello, such and such an address, Dear Mr. and Mrs. Marcello, and then at the push of a button, the letter is run off. In the United States Senate when I worked up there, we even had a machine with which we could sign the senator's

name. It used a pen and a plate which caused the pen to work certain ways. It was a very ingenious invention. And the upshot of it was that you could get a personally typed and signed letter from the senator without his ever having seen the letter. I had to sign all mine, but there is in the House a gal named Dolly. I don't even remember her last name. But as you know, there's a musical comedy, "Hello, Dolly," and she answers the phone, "Hello, Dolly" when you call up there. She runs the Robo room, which is right now on the third floor of the House of Representatives' chamber up behind the galleries there. They hire girls who sit in there and do mail for all the members. I have a secret suspicion that one copy of every member's letter goes to the speaker's office for perusal. It would be just to keep the speaker's finger on what's being discussed in members' letters. Dolly never would admit this, and I may be doing her a mis-service, but I have a feeling this is the case. But I didn't much care on this particular one. The Robotype is handy in that each person gets an individually-typed letter.

In any event, just from a selfish point of view, it was good for me in that I could Robo off a letter and write back and say, "I agree with you. This is a bad tax. Let's get after it." I did get some mention from some pretty politically sophisticated people who said, "We appreciated the rapidity of your answer." And people are now saying, "You didn't mind

standing up and letting people know where you stood on the thing."

Well, I can afford as a politician to stand up and take a stand on something as universally unpopular as taxes. On some other things where opinion is more split, I have to run for cover like everyone else, in all honesty. If they want to think I'm brave, I'm not about to try to change their minds. This is a part of the image-making process that every politician goes through. More than this, I could take these letters and say, "My people are mad about this. They won't let me vote for your tax."

And there was some pressure put on. The speaker, during the regular session, had mentioned in a threatening way the possibility that the appropriations for Midwestern University in Wichita Falls could be cut if I didn't get in line on the Pendleton motion. This dealt with the binding of conference committees. As it stands now, Texas conference committees can throw out the bills referred to them and just write their own bills. Randy Pendleton, who had run against Mutscher and lost and knew that he was low man on the totem pole as far as Mutscher was concerned and so had nothing to lose, moved to bind conference committees. I voted with Pendleton. There was something in parliamentary procedure where they were trying to slip something past Pendleton, and I got upon the mike and asked the speaker about it, as a parliamentary

inquiry. And he said, "Bring your inquiry down front," which he does in many cases. All right, I walked down to the speaker's stand from what they call the "snortin' pole," which is the microphone in the rear of the chamber by the back end of the press table. I walked down to the front, and the speaker leaned over the stand and pushed his mike away so that his words wouldn't be heard by anybody else, and he said, "Now Randy Pendleton can't do a thing for your school up there, and I can. And I suggest you vote with me, and I'm going to overrule your point of inquiry." And so I didn't say anymore. I just went back and voted with Pendleton, which I'm sure didn't sit too well with the speaker.

I have a feeling this will come up again since Mutscher has announced his intention to seek another term as speaker. I'm about halfway debating that if he ever tries that with me again, I'll say, "Mr. Speaker, I want your ruling out here where God and this House of Representatives can hear it." But then, while this would be very dramatic, you end up polarizing things more than you end up solving anything. From a practical standpoint, all the speaker has to do is overrule me anyway. I've seen very few appeals from a ruling of the chair attempted, and when they are attempted, I'm told, they are almost certainly foredoomed. But if I get to such a point as Randy Pendleton was, where I'm not doing any good anyway, then I might try it. Otherwise, I think I would just be

waving a red flag at the bull, and I'll probably go down and let him threaten me again, and then go and do what I want to. But in my fondest daydreams I sometimes think of myself being the momentary hero of the House. I don't know how well it'd work out in the long run.

Marcello: Obviously, Mutscher thought he could get a food tax passed.

Allred: Yes, I believe he did.

Marcello: On what did he base this assumption?

Allred: I think he thought he could do what he wanted to. I think Mutscher figured the House was pretty much his House, and the members would go along, particularly after Barnes was able to get it through the Senate. Despite his protestations to the contrary, I feel certain he would feel that way.

Let me go on in my own wandering way here for a minute and try to explain a little more of this. Going back then to the special session, when the grocery tax was about to come up for a vote, Mutscher's people were taking polls. What they do is assign each person a couple of rows or one row, and he asks everybody, "How do you stand on so-and-so?" Then before it really comes up for a vote, they can pretty much tell how the vote will go, particularly on something like this. They'll have a good idea whether they are going to be able to pass a bill or not. So Mutscher's boys were taking polls right and left, and they were still trying to put some pressure on.

Joe Ratcliff came back to see me one afternoon. I was

standing back by my desk, which is in the extreme rear of the chamber. I chose this because I just like to sit back there. I'm by myself. It's more comfortable and easier to get into and out. I can get to the "snortin' pole" quickly if they're trying to run something past us. In any event, Joe Ratcliff came back. And I think the speaker chose him deliberately because he knew that I was working for Joe as a speaker candidate and, therefore, that I might heed his words a little more. And Joe said, "The speaker asked me to come back and tell you that if you don't get in line on the grocery tax bill that he could have the appropriations . . ." This isn't the exact way, but, anyway, the threat was there that the appropriations could be cut, not that they would be, but that they could be.

Marcello: These are the appropriations for Midwestern University?

Allred: The appropriations for Midwestern University could be cut. And I said, "Joe, you tell the speaker that if he does, I will eat his lunch in public." And Joe kind of grinned and said, "I thought that's the way you'd feel," or something like this and walked off. And I know exactly how he felt because during the debate on the appropriations bill--I forget whether it was in the regular session or in the special session--people were asking some questions about some portions of it, and they got off onto the state aircraft--the number and where they were allowed to fly and so forth. One interested member

was Curtis Graves of Houston, who is somewhat of a demagogue but is, I think, in his own way, a very effective guy. I disagree with some of his viewpoints, and, as I say, I think he leans a little toward demagoguery. But in many cases Curtis and I find ourselves in agreement because we're both basically libs. Curtis is much more of a liberal than I am. I like to think of myself as a moderate, but I've had John Birch types tell me, "Oh, I think I'm a moderate." So the term is indefinite. You know, it's hard to say. Curtis Graves was standing up and questioning Bill Heatly about the number of times that the state's airplanes had flown from Austin to Paducah and back--Paducah being Heatly's hometown. Now there is very little love lost between Bill Heatly and Representative Vernon Stewart, who is the other man from Wichita County. So the speaker called me over, and he said, "You go tell Vernon Stewart that I know he's feeding that stuff to Curtis Graves." Now whether Vernon was actually doing it or not, I don't know. Vernon is a very devious-type person, and I don't know whether he was doing that particular thing or not. But the speaker said, "You go tell Vernon Stewart that he's trying to embarrass my administration by feeding this stuff to Curtis Graves, and if you want to get these bills passed, you better get him off the stick." So I went over . . . you know, what do you say to the speaker when he says this? "Hell, no, I'm not going to deliver your message. You go run your own." This

might do, but a politician's route is quite often one of seeming acquiescence. And so I went over to see Vernon. And I said, "Vernon, the speaker told me to tell you to quit giving that stuff to Curtis Graves. So I'm going to come over here and tell you." And he understood that what I was saying was, "You go ahead and do what you damn well please. I'm just carrying the speaker's message." And I think this was Joe Ratcliff's function.

Marcello: Sure.

Allred: Joe was simply coming back and carrying me the message. I do not think that he went back and gave the speaker my reply. I talked to a man I respect very much named, Jim Nugent, representative from Kerrville. Jim is much more conservative than I, but I think he is one of the honest, hard-working guys in that chamber. I think my opinion is shared by most of the chamber. I have a great deal of respect for him. He is somewhat of a maverick, which is a role in which I find myself increasingly. And I went over and told Jim about it. And I said, "Jim, what do you think I ought to do?" He said, "I would go up and say, 'Mr. Speaker, don't you ever threaten me. If I vote for something it's going to be because of so-and-so!'"

And I thought about it. And I talked it over with my friend, Representative Fred Head from Henderson, Texas, from over near Tyler, and finally decided that all I would be

doing there would be throwing salt on the wounds and that I might be better off simply to ignore the guy than to go up and spat with him. I'm not so sure now but what he might not have respected me more if I'd have gone up and said, "Don't threaten me, you so-and-so, and get off my back! I'm going to do what I want to."

The speaker did kill one of our bills, I think. Stewart and I had a bill we were trying to get through on special order. But this may have been at the end of the regular session, and it was knocked off the calendar. Mutscher said a point of order had been raised on it, that it hadn't been on the calendar long enough. And I said, "Who raised the point of order?" And he wouldn't tell us, so I feel sure it was the speaker himself trying to strike back at Vernon and at me because we had both not really gone along with him too much. As it turned out, there was another bill that did the same thing our bill was trying to do, and it passed so we just screamed like he'd really hurt us and let it ride.

In any event, the speaker was leaning on people, making threats. It got to be a joke, finally, that if the speaker was really to carry out all of his threats that he would need a card file to remember who he was hating, because he was threatening just about everybody. And his threats became so much of a shotgun blast and so indiscriminate that they lost much of their punch. For example, I was worried about

Midwestern's appropriations but not really too much, because I knew that in addition to me there was Jack Hightower over in the Senate who is a former Midwestern regent and wasn't going to let anything happen to Midwestern. Hightower is more of a Ben Barnes favorite. Hightower agrees more with the conservative viewpoint than I do. And he's less of a maverick, I think. He sort of works on the idea that he's there to do whatever he can for his district. And I am, too, but it's where you're going to draw the line as to how much you're going to go along to get along.

Marcello: Let me ask you this. From the standpoint of chronology, was this pressure being exerted by Mutscher before the Senate had voted on the food tax?

Allred: I don't remember.

Marcello: They introduced the food tax, I believe, on a Friday. Then did Mutscher not adjourn the House for the weekend?

Allred: I've forgotten exactly how this happened. But, yes, I would think that it was during the debate in the Senate, because I know it was . . .

Marcello: Well, it must have been because I don't think the House was in session while . . .

Allred: I know it was a big issue, enough so that I went over to the Senate chamber, and I was talking to Jack Hightower in the back of the Senate. Here is one of the things that has me firmly convinced that Ben Barnes was in actuality pushing

the grocery tax. I said, "Jack, you're not going to vote for this bad ol' tax, are you?" And he looked at me and said, "I've got to." He just shrugged and walked off down the aisle. I gathered from this that probably Ben Barnes had called in a due bill, but it could have been a constituent who called in a political debt or "due bill." This is a time-honored political system. You scratch my back; I'll scratch yours. The lieutenant governor does you a favor and names you to special committees and this type of thing. But when he really needs you, then you've got to come through for the vote. I think this is the situation in which Jack found himself, although I don't know for sure. It's a situation where I would not want to be. This is one reason why Jack and I operate differently. There is some question, but not much, as to who is more effective. I think Jack probably is more effective in many ways than I am in getting things done in the system because he will do this.

Marcello: Also, over in the Senate there was a group of liberal senators led, I believe, by Oscar Mauzy of Dallas who were vehemently opposed to the food tax.

Allred: Yes.

Marcello: Now they organized their forces there.

Allred: You'd find Babe Schwartz of Galveston not too far away there; Senator Mauzy; Senator Barbara Jordan of Houston, I believe; probably Senator Don Kennard of Fort Worth, although there

is a phrase in some political circles that calls a person a "Don Kennard liberal" meaning that he is a liberal. Don looks out after Don pretty well (chuckle).

Marcello: Well, what I was going to ask you is, was there a similar organization or group in the House?

Allred: No, and there were a couple of reasons. One, I think, is that the House operates under different rules from the Senate. The House, for example, has limited debate. The filibuster is a child of the Senate. It is not usable in the House, although we do have ways of slowing down debate. The filibuster is very useful in the Senate, although people don't really understand it. Senator Charlie Wilson of Lufkin, who is a fine legislator in my opinion, fought this thing right down to the wire and helped to filibuster it. But a woman called him, according to a story making the rounds, and said, "What are you trying to do, putting a tax on our groceries?" And he said, "Why, lady, I voted against it, and I filibustered against it, and I fought it every way I knew how." And she said, "Yeah, but you were there, weren't you?" I think one of the feelings that finally helped pass the tax bill was that you're damned if you do and damned if you don't. And we're looking worse all the time. We've got a reelection campaign coming up next year, and we'd better get out of there. But this was much later than this particular time I'm talking about where Mutscher and Barnes were both putting on the

pressure for a food tax--to extend it to food. I feel pretty sure that Mutscher's pressure was beginning to build up as the Senate approached a vote. When the Senate did pass the tax and it came over to the House, then the bee was really on us. And the bill . . .

Marcello: Well, as I explained earlier, I think this was done on a Friday, and the House adjourned for the weekend. And during that time the enemies of the food tax in the Senate had provided for ample television coverage . . .

Allred: Well, this is actually a tool of the . . .

Marcello: . . . of the food tax.

Allred: . . . of the AFL-CIO.

Marcello: Right.

Allred: The opponents in the Senate did not have the money to buy this time, but the labor boys came through beautifully. What they did was form a committee. I was asked to be on the committee, and I couldn't make it to the telecast for some reason. I've forgotten what it was. But I wish I had because I think it would have been, for many reasons, politically very good. I'm looking at it selfishly here because I think the program did help defeat the sales tax on food. Labor put up the money for this and handled the organization and sent out the invitations. I got an invitation to join the committee. You know, they were forming a committee of legislators opposed to the sales tax or something like that.

I talked it over with my office mate, Representative Bob Thomas of Waco, who is as shrewd a political analyst as I've run across, and was really thinking about going, and then something came up that I just couldn't get out of. I don't know whether it was an Army Reserve requirement or what it was at the time, but I didn't get to go. But this is true-- the forces were marshalled.

One of the things that did it was this anti-grocery tax television show. Whatever happened in addition to this, as far as individuals being contacted by their local citizens, I would imagine there was a great deal of it. But when we came back in, Mutscher's boys had run a poll, and they knew they could not pass the extension bill. So the word went out, "All right, as long as we can't pass it, then there's no future in some of us getting cut up on it, so let's all vote against it." If you'll check the record, everybody in the House that day voted against the sales tax, which was a real victory for the anti-sales tax forces.

Then was when there were several different compromise packages that came out and were bounced around. Really, the average representative's or the average senator's role in most of this was simply a waiting game. I saw lots of movies during that time while just waiting for the tax committees to meet. There was nothing I could do about it, but wait to see how the bills fell. I can remember voting against one bill toward

the end--I think it was next to the last bill--before the one that finally passed. Jack Hightower was standing in the back of the chamber when I voted. I wavered a long time because I knew that by then we were hurting ourselves and so forth. I finally decided that there were some things that I just could not buy, and I voted "no" in the last minute.

In fact, I came very close to hitting a reporter named Fish in the face. I walked back by the press table later that afternoon, and he said, "I noticed you sure wavered a long time." And I thought, "You son-of-a . . . You don't have to make any decisions. You're not the one who has to put your career on the line, and you sit up here so smugly judging." Of course, all he does is put out the Legislative Digest, or whatever they call it, where it reports what bills passed each day. To him it makes no difference. He's simply there with his personality grating. But I came pretty close to smacking him right smack in the face, and ordinarily I wouldn't have even felt that way, I don't think, except the pressure was on so heavy.

When I voted against this bill, Jack Hightower came up to the brass rail--it's right behind my desk--and said, "Why did you vote that way?" And I said, "Jack, I just couldn't go the other way." I didn't really want to discuss my reasons too much with him. I was rather vague in my answer. He said, "Well, you've really done it now," and just turned

around and stalked away. Oh, he was really mad! Boy, the pressure was really on, and, of course, Jack by then was beginning to feel the barbs of having voted for the grocery tax. He's been trying to cough that hook up ever since. I don't think, though, that it's going to hurt too much. For example, Hightower's not opposed. But Senator Tom Creighton of Mineral Wells, who voted for it, has Walter Steimel of Fort Worth running against him, and I don't think he's going to be breathing hard at the end of the campaign. I think he's going to defeat Steimel easily even though Steimel harps on the grocery tax.

Marcello: Well, let me just add this. One senator that I interviewed, and who voted for the food tax, rationalized by saying that you can't be hurt if you vote for a food tax which doesn't pass.

Allred: I doubt this rationalization is entirely valid, but it is true that the fact that the House turned it down takes a lot of the sting out of it and partially lets the senators off the hook. If it had passed, then those who had voted for it would be in real hot water. I think Hightower then would probably have had an opponent; I think Steimel would have a much better chance against Creighton. Of course, there are a variety of things that enter into any election. Very seldom can you say one thing decided an election. Now you might could say that the television debates were what put Jack Kennedy

into more national prominence and helped elect him President, but it's seldom that there is anything that dramatic. However, I think this would be one of the things that would have contributed to some real housecleaning down there had it passed.

There are other things. Creighton is well-entrenched in his district. He has long-standing. His name is known. Nobody has ever heard of Steimel. He's not running a good campaign--not for lack of enthusiasm, but for lack of knowledge in many cases. He got Creighton on the ropes in some little meeting somewhere, and he said, "I wish there had been a reporter there." Well, had he realized it, he should have called the papers himself and said, "This is what happened," or had one of his henchmen call and say, "Look, let me just give you a report about this meeting out here." But people who are outside the press game don't think of that, I guess. In any event, the tax was turned down, and then we waded through several other packages.

It seems to me that at that time--after the sales tax on food was turned down--the tax on liquor came into prominence. My publisher, Rhea Howard of the Wichita Falls Times and Record News, had a front-page editorial in the paper. We very seldom run front-page editorials, but this one said, "Let's get after this liquor tax." He sent it down and told me to give a copy to Speaker Mutscher, and I was only too happy to do so. I could go up and say, "Look, Mr. Speaker,

this is some more of the pressure I got on me back home." What I was trying to do was to dilute his anger at me for being a maverick. I may be a maverick, but I hope I'm not completely crazy.

But in any event, let me throw in one thing here, parenthetically, that this reminds me of; and that is that by the end of the session tempers are fractious, and you are heavily burdened with fatigue. I know Senator Hightower has been mad at me because I handled a little bill for him in the House, and fumbled. He explained the bill to me--it dealt with health insurance. It said, in effect, the health insurance companies could not cancel a policy for anything except fraud after two years rather than the present three-year limit. It wasn't a real tough bill that the health boys were very much "anti," and it was, I think, a pretty good bill. He explained it to me briefly, and the way he explained it made it seem like everybody but me ought to know what it meant. So when I got up to present it, I just assumed the House would understand it, and instead they turned me down. I went over and told him, and he came over and worked the floor, and we were able to get it brought up again, and it passed.

Joe Golman of Dallas got up and said, "I think this shows what we think of Senator Hightower." Jack is a very effective guy, even though I disagree with some of his methods and some of his viewpoints. I sort of took Golman's comment as a

personal thing. I don't know whether Joe intended it that way or not, but I sort of took it as a personal affront. But one of the things that I rationalize is that I was so tired at that point. This was the last few days in the session.

Bud Sherman, who is not one of my favorite people, a very acid-type representative from Fort Worth, did make one point that I thought was very valid even though I didn't think of it at the time. I enjoy a good joke, and when I got really knocked down on this . . . I believe it was Temple Dickson, who came over and said, "I think I've found a bill that you can pass," and he held up a copy of the Holy Bible. Well, this struck me as very funny, and I was going around with the Bible telling several people, "You know, I finally found a bill I can pass." Bud Sherman came over and said, "Let me give you a little advice, kid. You're not helping yourself." And I think he was right. I was not helping my image as a thoughtful legislator, but it just struck me as pretty funny.

The only reason I throw this in is because the purpose of this interview is to preserve for history not only the decisions the Legislature made, but also some of the background--including some of the personal background--of the type of conditions under which legislators had to work. I was just so "punchy" that it made sense to me at the time that maybe I was the only guy that didn't understand Jack's bill. When

he explained it to me, it was as though it was the simplest thing in the world, To him, as a lawyer, it was; to me, as a non-lawyer, it wasn't.

Marcello: This is the impression that I have received from a lot of legislators by the time the session was near its end.

Allred: Oh, you're "punchy." You're on the ropes. This is one thing that made me believe in a bicameral system, because you can get so confused or tired that they can sneak things by you, and you have to rescue them in the other House.

In any event, the pressure began to build for a tax on liquor, and the beer boys were squirming every which way. They had a booklet made up--a very professional job--showing that in the long run you would hurt the state if you passed more taxes on beer, that beer already had all these taxes on it, and that if you put more taxes on it, what you were going to do was drive breweries out of the state. It was a very coherent argument, the way this book presented it, and these beer lobbyists were coming around. They even came to see me, even though they know how I stand.

Marcello: I was just going to say, I was wondering how much contact you had with the beer lobbyists since, obviously, they knew how you were going to vote. So far as they were concerned, you were a hopeless cause, I suppose.

Allred: Yes, I was. Well, that's kind of a funny question, but I think it will illustrate the role of the lobby some. I had very

little to do with the beer lobby. Now once in a while they would have a catfish luncheon.

Marcello: That's a shindig that Homer Leonard throws.

Allred: Well, a guy named Burke somebody used to run it. He died of a heart attack during this session. I didn't like him at all because he was always calling me names. He reminded me of my distant cousin in Lawton, Oklahoma, who used to call me a "big horse," and I didn't appreciate that at all. This guy was just an abrasive personality, and yet I think he meant to be friendly. This was his way. You know, it's kind of like a Labrador retriever that may mean to be friendly, but you're still sitting in the mud with his paws in your face.

However, once in a while I would go to their luncheon. Really, it began during my first session when I just wasn't having anything to do with the beer lobby. I wouldn't accept any of their invitations. They are one of the smoother lobbies as far as trying to get legislators on their side. The Brewers Association owns a home out on the lake, and it's a beautiful place. It's a little cabin. When you go in, there are toys all over one wall--dolls and trucks and all kinds of things hanging on this wall. Then there's a couple of other rooms, and they have a fishing pier and a little boathouse with some seats out there,

What they do is go through and invite the House by groups

alphabetically. There's 150 members of the House. Well, they might invite twenty-five members and their families out to the lake on a Sunday afternoon. We never went, but I'm told by some who did go that they had white-coated employees to bait the children's hooks and to oversee their fishing. What you did was turn the kids loose. They had swing sets in the yard, and the kids could go fishing. They could run around, play in the yard. They could play with these toys. All this occurred while mama and daddy sat around and drank and visited with folks. You know, it was a nice, pleasant Sunday afternoon. But I had turned down all these invitations, and I never did accept for Sunday afternoons. I just didn't want my kids exposed to that sort of thing.

But a couple of my good friends came over and said, "Look, if you treat the beer lobby too bad, they're going to hunt up an opponent for you. And even if you beat the opponent, it's still going to cost you money." I will probably beat Phil Grace--knock on wood; famous last words--but he is still going to cost me some money. He's going to keep me from re-enrolling in seminary. He will probably hurt me some by pointing out to some people who already dislike me different votes that I made that I'm not particularly keen on them knowing about. You know, when you're with one group, you talk about things of interest to it. When I'm with the Texas Manufacturers Association, I talk about the points on which we can agree;

when I'm with labor, I point out that my AFL-CIO voting record is 17 right, 2 wrong, and 1 absent out of 20 selected votes. It's not really lying to anybody. It's simply talking about the things on which you agree and trying to be as pleasant as you can with each group. Many people vote for me because I'm my father's son or my mother's son, or because they like me personally. I think an opponent can hurt you by going under the TMA and saying, "You think he's such a fine guy. Look how he voted on this." I have a feeling they're going to say something like, "Look how he voted for the unions. Look what he voted for the workingman. That's taking money out of your pocket." And they can hurt me on it. They can go to labor and say . . . where I thought the bill was right, I have voted on some bills that helped the employer. You can kill the goose that laid the golden egg, i.e., jobs, if you went 100 percent with labor. I don't mean that I just look on it like, "Let's keep the employers alive so we can milk them." When I thought the bill was right, I voted for it. In any event, an opponent can cost you money; he can cause you trouble; he can lose you friends and so forth.

So my friends were worried, and they came over to me and said, "You really ought to accept one of their party invitations, because otherwise they're very likely to get you an opponent. If all it takes to keep from having an opponent

is to go to a party of theirs once in a while and be civil to their lobbyist, have at it."

So my wife and I went to one of their parties at this lake house. This party was strictly for the adults; they didn't have any kids. It was an evening thing. One of the things I'll never forget . . . when we walked in, I think it was Homer Leonard's daughter. Homer Leonard is the chief of the beer lobbyists. Pat said, "I'm Pat Allred," and she shrieked, "An Allred here?" because my parents were also well-known dries, particularly my mother. My mother's on the board of TANE, the Texas Alcohol-Narcotics Education. Although she wasn't on that board at that time, her position on liquor was well-known. I've been told that when my father was given liquor while he was governor--there were people who sent him a case of liquor for Christmas or something--she made him pour it down the drain. My grandfather, who was kind of like "Cactus Jack" Garner and didn't mind "strking a blow for liberty" once in a while, would sit there and shake his head watching all that booze go down the drain. But anyway, her position is known. I just have always had kind of a feeling that we should have turned around and left right there. We stayed. The party did develop.

One of the interesting things was that one of the drunkest people there was Coke Stevenson, Jr., who was the head of the Liquor Control Board at that time and the guy, also, that I

felt was kind of a political hack. I think subsequent events and reports proved it.

But, anyway, the party was fairly nice. They had food, and they had all the booze you wanted, of course. We knocked around, and we went out and sat in the boathouse and watched some people fish out there for a little while. You know, any time you get politicians together they talk shop the way doctors, or, I guess, any professionals do. So it was pleasant to sit around, talk shop, and pick up the latest rumors. Then they had the Geezinslaw Brothers for entertainment. It was the first time I'd ever heard them. One of them, in fact, is named Sam Allred, the same as my younger brother. I talked to him after the show and compared notes a little bit on family. We're apparently not related. He and his partner seemed to be fairly nice boys. I thought their act was hilarious. I nearly fell off the table bench laughing at their stories about Snook, Texas.

We were having babysitter troubles, and my wife and I were off by the phone trying to call and be sure everything was all right at home. Homer came over and said, "You having a good time?" He seemed to be really rather apologetic. Now this may be projection on my part, but I think he knew that we were "fish out of water" out there.

That was the last beer boys party I've been to. It bothered my wife as much as it did me. What I would do after

that was go to some of their catfish dinners that they have, although I don't like catfish. But I'd go down there and backslap them a little bit and let them know I didn't consider them subterranean beings or something, in the hope that they would not run me an opponent.

Now I doubt very seriously the beer boys will make any contributions to my campaign, but at least I don't think they're backing my opponent, particularly. They may back Phil Grace because he favors liquor-by-the-drink, and this would be the logical place for them to put their money. But I don't think it will be a heavy contribution.

Another thing that the Brewers do, by the way, parenthetically, is that each Christmas I get in the mail a catalogue, and I'm free to choose one gift from this catalogue. It's fairly nice stuff. I'm sure that they get a reduced price because they buy in volume. The catalogue features things like a brass tea kettle or a door scraper and some such. I really haven't looked through the catalogue that much. I've never ordered anything; I just file the catalogues. I've got them in my file there along with a little card that I'm supposed to send in, stapled to the catalogue. I figure I may need to show some day that I didn't do it. But they're very good about sending things along. You'll get things in the mail once in a while. They sent me a rain gauge one time--a little, small rain gauge.

My wife got a book from Nina Leonard, who is Homer's wife, and she used to get invitations from the beer lobby once in a while to come have catfish. One time, particularly, she was asked to come have catfish because the men were having all the fun. This particular time the girls were going to be Wednesday Catholics, as they were referred to (chuckle). They never said beer. They said, "the beverage that sparkles and refreshes" or something. It was so coy that it just really made me sick! But this was the way the beer lobby operated.

However, I think it was a very effective lobby in many areas, because the beer lobby is one of the more powerful lobbies down there. The beer lobby, the Texas Restaurant Association, the truckers, and two or three like that are effective but for different reasons. The Restaurant Association and the truckers are good because their people get out and work. The beer lobby does, too, but I think, also, it's because they send you these little things along. And some of the others do. The truckers send us a little tile with the House of Representatives seal on it, which, I guess, you could use as a hot plate or put on your wall or something. You get these little trinkets from various groups but nothing really of the quality or expense that the beer lobby does. They are well-financed, and nobody throws these little weekly parties the way the beer lobby does.

But their lobbying was not effective enough because by the time that this really came up--despite all Mutscher could do and despite all Leonard could do behind the scenes--the proposed tax on liquor was passed, and I think part of it was that even many drinkers favored it. The beer lobby found difficulty in picking up support even among their own members.

Marcello: Let me ask you this. If the beer lobby had its choice of the lesser of two evils, that is, an increase in the excise tax or the inclusion of beer and liquor under the sales tax, which do you think they would prefer?

Allred: I think there's no doubt that they would take beer and liquor under the sales tax. It's easier passed on; either way, the consumer would eventually pay. They're going to pass it on. But for something like this, they can just add it right on to the drink so that its price per drink increases a nickel a drink or something like that. It will be a source of revenue. Of course, being one who is pretty firmly convinced that the world would be better off without liquor, even though I know prohibition does not work, I would just as soon see them go ahead and price liquor right out of the market. I see it about as Renal ("Al") Rosson from Snyder commented. He's kind of a slow-talking country boy, and he said, "Well, I just don't see that liquor has ever done anybody any good, and I can show you several cases where it's

done some harm," I sort of subscribe to Renal's approach to the thing, as far as my own personal belief on it. So I don't really mind seeing them taxed (chuckle) out of business, myself, with the exception that they are a large, well-financed, well-organized group, and they could cause me political misery. But I still am voting against them and have not taken advantage of much of their hospitality.

Marcello: And, of course, Speaker Mutscher was vehement in his opposition to the inclusion . . .

Allred: Well, of course, Speaker Mutscher is a German who comes from a German area where they drink beer like water. He is very close to the beer lobby, as might be expected. When they had Speaker's Day, which is when they have a big day, and all of the lobby gives him gifts--and they do it right out in the open, so everybody figures it must be legal--Leonard was one of the speakers. And he gave one of the truer statements he ever made. He is a former Speaker of the House. He got up and said, "I'm in better shape than you boys in the Legislature now because, if I did anything, the statute of limitations has a run on it now, where you guys don't have that immunity," or something to that effect. I thought, "Well, that's one of the truer statements I've heard made today." Speaker's Day is another thing that goes against my grain, because it is simply a day when the lobby courts the speaker,

But they put this up, and it did pass. I think that among the things that finally helped to pass a tax bill was the feeling that the public was mad in general and that the longer we stayed down there, the more public resentment would be engendered. Here I think the press fell down. The press reported all of our fighting, including the literal fighting on the floor when Representative Guy Floyd of San Antonio and Representative Nichols of Houston got into it. They are a famous pair of pugilists.

Marcello: I was going to ask you if the press gave their coverage to this . . .

Allred: No, I think the press really did a lazy job on covering it, but it's difficult to lump the press because some of them did an outstandingly good job, such as Glen Castleberry of the Austin American-Statesman. Even though the Austin American-Statesman is a lousy paper, Glen Castleberry did a very fine job of legislative coverage. I think Felton West of the Houston Post did a pretty good job. I may be partial there because I used to work with Felton. I consider him one of the better newsmen I know in the entire nation.

But going back to these fights for a minute, we literally had fisticuffs on the floor or at least a great deal of acting like a small boy: "Knock a chip off my shoulder" sort of thing. The most famous two, because they were "David and Goliath" in size, or "Mutt and Jeff," were Representative

R.C. Nichols of Houston and Representative Guy Floyd of San Antonio. Nichols is a great, big guy, a former steelworker, with muscles like the steel bands he used to work with. Guy Floyd is very small, feisty, quick-on-the-draw. I don't like him personally. He is quick to pop off. I remember one time in the '67 Session when he said to someone, rudely, "You have the gall to stand up here and tell us so-and-so." And the speaker ruled him out of order on it. But this is the type of guy that he was. These are the two most famous because if Nichols had ever gotten at him, Floyd would have been a grease spot on the floor. But I helped restrain Nichols, and he wasn't really trying that hard. If he had really been mad, he would have thrown us all aside and just pounded Floyd into the floor. Another one who was also involved in this little affray that for some reason did get his name mentioned as much was Representative Henry Sanchez from down in South Texas. There were a couple of others--I can't remember right offhand--but those are the three that stand out in my memory--Nichols, Floyd, and Sanchez.

I have a feeling that all three of them, particularly Sanchez and Floyd, had been partaking some of Homer Leonard's liquid refreshment. I don't know whether they got it from Homer, but they seemed a little boozed-up, particularly Sanchez, I think. The press enjoyed playing up this sort of thing, which it should have. It should have reported it.

But I think it was negligent in pointing out a lot of this maneuvering and so forth, which is the way the Legislature operates. I have a standard speech that I make to any groups that will listen right now, in which I say that there were many things that happened in the special sessions that I am not proud of--the fighting on the floor, for example, and the way that some of the members, and I emphasize the word "some," were, I think, unduly influenced by the lobby. But not everyone should be completely dismissed as a bunch of clowns who ought to be at the Maskat Temple. This is Wichita Falls' Shrine Temple, and it has a clown unit that entertains and is well-known in the area. So they follow me when I say some could be clowns at the Maskat Temple. But people should stop and think what they sent us down to Austin for. And I say, "You did not send me down there to say, 'Yes, sir, Mr. Speaker, if you want a tax on groceries, I'll vote for a tax on groceries, and if you want one, Mr. Barnes, yes, sir, we'll go right on.'" You sent us down there to fight, and any time that you have 181 people from different parts of the state, representing widely varying viewpoints, you are going to have some deep feelings. But you sent us down there to do this, and it's just a matter of the way we do it. I think this is a very valid point. But a lot of this that the press enjoyed playing up was what they said it was. It was fighting, but I think the press was derelict in not pointing

out that this is the way things are done. I don't refer to the physical fighting but to the idea that people sent us to Austin to stick up for certain ideas and ideals.

Now in part of this, too, I think, the public is derelict because it doesn't bother to realize this. It just looks at "all of those damn politicians down there spoutin' off again." And yet in the representative government, this is the way it's done. It's done through debate.

In any event, I think the feeling was, by the time the final bill came out, that "We better just pass something and get out of here." Those were the arguments that were heard the most: "This is the best bill you are going to get."

Marcello: This was in reference to Ralph Hall's compromise package.

Allred: I don't know whether Ralph Hall was the author of it or not. Ralph, of course, wanted to run for governor, and he might be claiming credit here and there. I don't really know who came up with the compromise. But the argument was being made that if you don't take this one, then it's going to get worse as far as the consumer is concerned. And in some cases they might have made it stick, because by then everybody was reeling, including the public. They didn't know what was going on, either, I don't believe. Here, I think, again the press was derelict in not pointing this out. Of course, running through this, you had the press hotly on Representative Heatly's heels, looking for scandal, and this took away some

of their zeal, I think, from recording some of the sessions, because I had a number of reporters come around and wanted to know what I knew about Heatly. They disliked Heatly and wanted to find something bad about him.

Marcello: What sort of a tax bill would you like to have seen passed?

Allred: I would like to have seen a bill that did not increase the sales tax, that put either a corporate income tax or some heavier burden on the corporations, because I feel that they are not carrying their fair share. I think one reason is that they can afford to hire lobbyists to come down there, and the legislator finds it easier to pass a bill that taxes others. I think there's a great deal to the gripe that your middle-class American is the one that's carrying the tax burden, and I would equalize it by putting some more on the corporations for one thing, and I like the idea of this liquor tax.

Marcello: Do you have any other specific sort or kind of corporation tax in mind?

Allred: No, there were different types proposed. This franchise tax was probably the least injurious to corporations, which I think is why they allowed it to be put into the package. You know, they said, "Well, we gotta have something on business, and this is the way to do it." There were several proposed by Representative Carl Parker of Jefferson County and some others. I don't remember the exact details of them, but

they would have put more on the corporations. I pretty heavily voted with them on those, and I really believe that this would be the better way. I make no claims at being a revenue expert. Therefore, I have not really tried to introduce any tax proposals of my own, but I have, I think, voted pretty consistently to tax the corporations more.

Marcello: What part do the Republican lawmakers play in this episode with regard to revenue?

Allred: Very little. At least that I could see. They had a few like Billy Archer of Houston who got up and made a couple of speeches on the appropriations bill. But by then the machinations were already in operation for George Bush to run against Ralph Yarborough, and Bill Archer was looking toward running for George Bush's seat in Congress, I think. When he got up to pound on the appropriations bill, he was looking at his constituency, or his proposed constituency, in Houston much more than he was any real savings or anything else. He just got up, you know, because it looked good to the Houston Post: "Archer Hits Tax" or "Archer Hits Spending Bill" or something like that.

Really, the Republicans were so miniscule that they couldn't do anything. You had Bill Archer, Malauf Abraham, and, I guess, Tom Christian is a Republican. He doesn't say a whole lot, and there was this ol' boy from Hondo, John Poerner, who later changed to the Democrats but was elected

as an independent. There was Maurice Angley of Austin. There was a little of the demagogue in Maurice, too, I think, and he got up to rap the bill a few times. But I didn't really feel there was much partisan politics in it at all.

Marcello: What about Preston Smith? What was he doing while the special sessions were progressing?

Allred: Fighting with Ben Barnes mostly (chuckle). I don't know that the governor was backing any particular tax proposal. For him, as I say, his best role was "Brer Rabbit, he lay low," and let the Legislature take the brunt of the blame and let them do the fighting. I think the governor did come out with some tax proposals. The one that I remember right offhand . . . and I don't have any notes here with me or anything to go over.

He proposed a tax on the petrochemical industry or on the chemical industry, which in Texas is primarily petrochemical. And, oh, they came unglued at the seams. I had engineers and people to come in and ask me why pick out this one industry. You know, they'd say it's discriminatory taxation, and it did not go anywhere. My feeling is that the governor probably burned his fingers so badly on that that he figured he'd let the boys fight it out.

His press secretary told me that Preston just likes to operate within the constitution and let the legislative branch do the legislative branch's functions, but then he had his

reasons for phrasing it that way. I didn't think the governor was too active in the consideration. It was primarily the lobby and the conference committees, as near as I could see.

Marcello: Let me ask you a few general questions, then, with regard to politics in general, I suppose we could say. How much credit do you give to the so-called "taxpayers' revolt" about which we've heard quite a bit during the past year? Do you think there is such a thing in Texas?

Allred: Yes. I think it has not reached the proportions that it has in some of the eastern states. For example, you didn't see so much of the marching on the supermarkets as you did in other states, where the housewives would go out and hit the poor supermarket manager, who really had very little to say one way or the other. But they were protesting high prices. As some woman up East recently pointed out, while this was going on prices did drop down, but as soon as the enthusiasm wore off a little bit, the novelty wore off, prices came back up. And I think there is a taxpayers' revolt. I think the people, as I said earlier, are mad. It's very tough for middle-class and lower-class people to get along. They feel the politicians have led them down the primrose path, and to an extent they have. I think, for example, that some of the proposals and some of the attitudes that I heard expressed during the session pretty much showed that the politician, some of them at least, were more concerned with their careers

than they were with the welfare of the people. Still, I'm not talking about the majority, but sometimes these are the more active minority. Ben Barnes is a good example of this. But in general the people are mad, and they don't know who to be mad at. It's really a liability in many areas to be an incumbent. I don't think this alone is enough to defeat a candidate, but it would certainly be a potent brick to add to some others to weight him down.

Marcello: Along these same lines, then, do you think the bickering which occurred during the regular and special sessions of Legislature will affect the status of Legislature so far as the voter is concerned?

Allred: Yes, very definitely. As I say, I think the voter did not understand that bickering is the name of the game, and that's what they really sent us down there for. I think they look on politicians as someone really to laugh at or fear. I made some of these statements and some similar statements to a couple of government classes, one in particular at Midwestern University. Really, I was trying to offset my opponent. He is saying "I was an observer at the special session. The Republican Party sent me down as an observer, and it was just awful. Legislators were walking around their offices with their mistresses on their arms, and there was very liberal leadership and much chaos."

There was very little leadership, it's true. Mutscher,

for example, did not have the House in his grasp the way Ben Barnes did. Barnes had the Senate right where he wanted it, but Mutscher in the House just was not the commanding figure that Barnes was. And I use the past tense deliberately.

In any event, one of the things that I was trying to do without mentioning my opponent--because my political strategy at the moment is to ignore him--was to say that I'm not proud of some of the things that go on down there, but I don't like the idea of lumping everybody into one group. You know, "All Jews will cheat you"; "All 'niggers' are lazy." These generalizations obviously are not true. I remember there were a couple of "longhairs" in the back of the class, and I said something like, "Everybody with long hair must be a dope fiend," and this obviously is not true. Anytime you make a generalization, you are doing a disservice to many of the people who are in the group which you are generalizing, and this is true in the case of your legislators.

I went down there, and I went in debt. My father before me was \$15,000 in debt when he came out of office in 1939. We are talking about 1939 dollars, friend, and, therefore, it kind of irks me when I hear people say that all politicians are crooked. It irks me when I have people imply to my face that I'm a thief. This guy in the back shop at work the other day was talking to some of these cronies but with an eye on me, knowing that I was approaching the group on the way back

to the linotype machines or coming back from them, I guess. He said, "I think we ought to have elections every year so that more people could get in on the graft." I'm afraid I wasn't very courteous to that voter. Really, I was just sick and tired of having everybody assume that I'm a thief and a crook and everything else simply because I'm in politics.

My wife has mentioned that she has felt much the same way, that many women, when they find out that her husband's in politics, will say, "Oh, isn't that nice," and turn around and talk to somebody else, because they are not sure about how they should relate to her. Also, they are afraid that they might either be contaminated by her presence or seem to be social-climbing. Does that paradoxical statement make sense? She mentioned this to a friend of ours here who is a counseling professor in the seminary, and he said, "Well, that's one of the prices of leadership." He said, "Ministers face some of the same things--ministers' families do and all." But, really, we had both discussed the fact that politicians seem to have fallen in disrepute. There's always been the bad jokes about politicians, but people seem much more disillusioned right now than they have been for some time.

Marcello: Do you think this was evidenced in the fact that the voters turned down the referendum calling for a pay raise?

Allred: Yes, I very definitely do. I think that was one of the facts involved. When I was a kid coming up, I respected a man in

public office. That's the way I was brought up. Now maybe because I'm the fifth generation in politics and my father was in public office that I was taught to respect him and all who were. But it seems to me that there is much less of this now.

What I was going to say about this government class, before I go into the pay raise, is that they filled out sheets and made comments later, and the instructor told me that they thought I had a persecution complex. But to me it's a very real thing that people do think this way, you know. If they catch me with my finger in the till, that's something else. But to simply dismiss me as a crook because of the fact that I'm trying to do something, and particularly when I remember that I've been bucking the Establishment down there and that I have been spending my own money when I ran out of state funds--you know, they only pay you so much--it really grated on me.

Now, as far as the pay raise, I think very definitely that this psychology entered in, along with the idea that "they knew what the pay was when they ran." It's a tight money period, and inflation is eating us up, and they just couldn't see raising their taxes anymore, which they knew a pay raise would do. I think it was very much of a protest vote against the Legislature.

Marcello: Do you think the failure to approve annual sessions of the

Legislature is also related to this vote, or do you see other reasons at work here, or other factors?

Allred: Well, I see some other factors, but I also think, yes, that this, too, was one of the indications. I don't think it's a new feeling. What's the old sign that's attributed back into the 18th century about no man's life, property, or family is safe while the Legislature is in session? It's a sign that's supposed to have appeared in some tavern or at some politician's door. It's attributed variously, and I don't know what its actual derivation is. But I think many people have bought this old saying: "That government is best which governs least." I'll buy that, to an extent.

The question becomes, "What is the least amount of necessary government?" And most people who harp on this are conservatives who want little or no government.

The last guy who quoted it to me, I'm sure, is one of these who would say, "I am for local self-determination," and what he means is, "I want to have local control because we can keep them 'niggers' in their place." He was jumping me about a law we passed which said that you could not have a prohibited weapon, which includes pistols and knives with blades of a certain length and so forth, in a place where liquor is served or consumed, and it makes it a felony offense. This was aimed at the fact that most of our killings occur in a bar with a "Saturday night special," and Manuel del Populopo shoots Juan Gonzales or Rastus Jones shoots Willie Smith in

the bar. The police tell us that this is where they have a great deal of the trouble. This law is aimed at cutting down on these injuries and murders in bars.

But my managing editor came over the other day . . . he is a racist; he is a conservative. Therefore, he is looking for something like this. He came over and said, "Why, do you realize that if I had been fishing, and I had my sheath knife with me, and I go into the 7-11 store (little drive-in grocery) to buy a loaf of bread, I am in violation of the law and can be convicted of a felony because they serve beer in these drive-ins, and the blade on my sheath knife makes it a prohibited weapon?" I have found that with him the best thing to do is just listen to him and let him talk himself out. Then he'll go home and let you alone. Obviously, no policeman is going to arrest a fisherman who is buying a loaf of bread in a drive-in grocery. And if he did, the case would be thrown out of court. But you can't argue with a guy like that, so I just find it better to listen to him and let him talk himself out and go on.

One of the reasons I've stayed with this, though, is that I feel like that I can do a job of education here. I speak every chance I get. In fact, I even call up schools and volunteer sometimes. They view me with suspicion, particularly during a campaign. They're trying to figure what my angle is. Right now I've got a film called "Inside the

Texas Legislature," made by former Representative, now Senator, Hank Grover of Houston. It's bipartisan . . . non-partisan, really. It tells about how the Legislature operates, and I take it out and let classes show it. I speak to classes every chance I get. I answer every letter I get from kids and try to go to great lengths to reply. I write them three- or four-page replies in trying to explain what's going on, because I have a firm conviction that, first of all, as Sam Rayburn used to say, "This is their only brush with their government"; secondly, if they understand the process, and if they feel that they're getting some attention and are being heard, they're less likely to be out there in the streets kicking police and calling them pigs.

I think a great deal of this violence is a direct result of the young people's ignorance of our legislative process, and the fact that there is the method of change built in. Another thing, of course, is their immaturity. This is one reason why I voted against eighteen-year-olds voting. They see everything as black and white with no shades of grey, and they're very immature in many of their judgments. One thing is their immaturity. They want what they want now, and if they want it, it must be right regardless of what the rest of the people feel.

But just in general, I think people are very much down on politicians in general and on the Legislature in particular

as a result of the special session especially.

Marcello: As one of my closing questions, let me ask you this.

Allred: I get the clue. I get the hint.

Marcello: No, no, that's not the case at all. It's simply that I've run out of questions.

Allred: Well, we . . .

Marcello: If you have any more comments, please feel free to give them. But what I wanted to ask you is this. Do you feel that the problems confronting Texas now and the problems which will be confronting Texas in the future are necessarily liberal-conservative in nature, or do you think they are more rural-urban in nature?

Allred: I think they're both, really. How's that for straddling the fence (chuckle)?

Marcello: Okay.

Allred: I noticed in this last Legislature a good deal of rural-urban split. But I think you're going to see less of it, and I think you're going to see the rural boys become more paranoid, because the most far-reaching decision of the Warren Supreme Court was the one man, one vote decision.

Marcello: Let me just add that several of the urban legislators in my interviews have been rubbing their hands and waiting for this . . .

Allred: Yes.

Marcello: . . . to come into effect in Texas.

Allred: Because you're going to see more and more of the votes going

to the heavy urban areas. It's going to affect my district. I'll probably pick up another county, and they'll split up Vernon Stewart and me and probably split us into another district somewhere. We may pick up part of Charlie Finnell's district, because our population is staying static or going down a little bit, where Houston and Dallas and Bexar County and Tarrant County and so forth are growing by leaps and bounds. El Paso County and so forth are growing like mad. But this is the way it should be, because we saw in the New York Legislature until very recently how much a city vote was outweighed by a rural vote because of the way the districts were drawn.

Even though it will hurt me, I subscribe to the system. It will hurt me in that I'll have to learn a new legislative district and that we'll have to go through the agony of splitting up the county, and neither one of us want the Republican areas. Even though it will cause me some difficulties, I subscribe to this idea of one man, one vote. I think every legislative body should be elected by districts. I think school boards, where the members run them at-large perpetuate the Establishment, for example. Anyway, I foresee more and more urban strength in Texas. And the rural boys will form a little coalition and fight where they can, but they will not be too effective.

I heard Graham Purcell say something on it the other day.

Congressman Graham Purcell is an avowed rural advocate. He was raised in Archer City. He is on the Agriculture Committee. I have felt that as a resident of Wichita Falls he put too much emphasis on farming, especially for a man whose district includes Richardson, which is a bedroom community of Dallas, and Wichita Falls along with other towns. But that's his business, you know. I'm not in the business of educating him or Phil Grace or Jack Hightower or anybody else of that political stripe.

He said this in front of the University Kiwanis Club, which is not noted for its liberal thought, in Wichita Falls. Let's put it this way: many of the club members there consider the John Birch Society to be a left-wing organization. I don't know that the club as a whole has a particular outlook. There are some pretty good "libs" in there, too. But Purcell got up and said, "We're having real difficulty with farm legislation. I think, as the cities increase their percentage of representation, we're going to see more of this. City people just don't understand rural problems. And you might say, well, why haven't I told them about rural problems? I've been trying for eight years to tell them, but in all honesty I haven't been listening about their city problems. When I vote to please some of you, when I vote to protect myself and some of you by voting against social legislation, I am showing that I don't understand the cities' problems. And how can I

expect them to understand my problems if I don't understand theirs?"

This, particularly considering the group to which he was speaking, I thought, was a pretty courageous stand. I told one of the state labor leaders about it, and he said, "Well, all these guys who have got a Republican opponent suddenly become very democratic." But I think that Purcell was really saying something. He was saying, "You're going to find me voting more to help these people with their city problems 'cause they are big problems."

I think you're going to see more of this. You're going to see the rural boys forming more of a fanatical little knot, and I hope they won't go the route of the Farm Bureau, which is "oppose everything." The Farm Bureau is a large organization with a great many members because they have a good insurance plan, but there are not very many members who actually attend the meetings. A bunch of heavy right-wingers own it and make the policies, most of which are anti-everything. But they're like organized labor and a bunch of these others but more so: they can't vote their members. By that I mean that they can't influence their members' votes that much. I think they have made the same mistake the American Medical Association has made and that the postal unions have made, the letter carriers being one example. Rademacher, at least, is a letter carrier, and even then the rank-and-file hasn't followed his leadership

too well. It's like some preachers that get out in social action. They get out ahead of their flock.

But in general I think that a lot of these people simply oppose something just to be opposing. The American Medical Association fought Medicare down to the wire without ever considering even the least little bit of compromise. I hope that the rural boys don't take this attitude, although I'm afraid they might because the average farmer doesn't care about rats in the city slums. He wants to know how come they're trying to tax his farm machinery and how come . . . "it just ain't the way it used to be. We had a good government 'til these politicians started messing it up."

I think you're going to see much more of a liberal-conservative split. There are, as you know, already predictions of the demise of the two-party system, but there have been for some time. Many voters now pride themselves on being independents. In some cases I think this is actual independence; in other cases, I think it's laziness. They can say, "I'm an independent, and I vote the man," and this sort of thing. And that way they don't really have to take any political stands or really have much political conviction. I think in many cases it's a dodge, but not always. In the present vernacular, it might be termed a cop-out.

But I think more and more you're going to see a split between the liberals and conservatives, with the liberals

on the minority, and some of it may get pretty bloody. The liberals already have many heroes, and many of their heroes are the type that like to say, "Look at my scars," much more than they are people who like to get anything done. They sit around with their liberal friends and say, "Well, we almost got them that time," and, "Boy, look where I'm bearing all of the honorable battle scars." But it's much the same as AMA attitude that I was just describing--no willingness to compromise.

I don't foresee the demise of the two-party system anytime soon. I think you may see, as the Republican Party grows, more people who in the past have styled themselves as conservative Democrats switching over to the Republican side. And liberals--arch-liberals, the Rex Braun cut of liberal--will say, "This is good." But I don't agree because right now these people are voting Democratic on many things, and they're getting better representation than they deserve. Look at Alabama. Lister Hill and John Sparkman are much better senators than, in my opinion, Alabama deserves. I think this is also the case here: people are getting a lot of representatives who are better men than the people who elected them deserve, because the people who elected them quite often voted out of hatred, prejudice, ignorance, and this kind of thing. Many qualified voters didn't bother to cast a ballot. I don't mean to be too hard on the voters because I think they make some

pretty good choices, but I think they do the right things for the wrong reasons sometimes.

Marcello: Let me ask you this. How can a liberal, such as yourself, or a moderate, whichever term you choose to use . . .

Allred: I prefer moderate.

Marcello: . . . get elected in Wichita Falls? Maybe I'm wrong in thinking that the Wichita Falls district is conservative.

Allred: The Wichita Falls district is a conglomerate, and this is one reason I say that you can never really point to any one thing in politics and say that's it.

When I was working in Dolph Briscoe's campaign and running his Austin office, a Mexican kid came in to see me. He said, "I got John Connally elected." He said he put out some sort of a publication, and it got umpteen thousand votes. And that's how many votes John Connally won by. "So I got John Connally elected." I facetiously thought, "Yeah." (Chuckle) No one person can have that much effect on any sort of a race.

Wichita County, first of all, is a Democratic county. Ralph Yarborough carries it. It's only gone Republican three times in its history, so basically I've got sort of built-in Democratic bias. Wichita County is still much the same as it was in the 1920's and the 1930's, principally the 1930's, in its political attitudes and in its general attitudes. Part of this is deliberate. Until very recently the city government wanted to keep it this way. The Establishment liked it in

those days because oil was "king" and a lot of the Establishment is the oil-type. We were laughing the other night at the newspaper office that if you have several million dollars, then you become a famous pioneer, and your obituary gets put on the front page of the paper; otherwise, you are relegated to some inside page. But I think it was the type people who got elected to office until very recently, and still to an extent, in Wichita County and Wichita Falls. They were the type who wanted to keep it the way it always had been.

We just had a school board election in which the two candidates who vehemently opposed the busing of black students to white schools were elected. I think the people were elected, by the way, by about one-tenth of the actual number of qualified voters. Out of something like 30,000 qualified voters, 10,000 voted so these people each had about 3,000 votes. You could vote for two people on the ballot. But I think many of the people interpreted the opposition to busing as being, "We'll get the blacks out of the white schools," and I don't think that's going to happen. I think it would be tragic if it did, because we had a separate but not an equal school system. Even though they had a fine high school plant in the Negro area, the courses offered there were not of as wide a variety or of as good a quality.

Anyway, Wichita County, first of all, is a very traditional-minded county. In obituaries in the newspaper, the first thing

you say about them, "John J. Jones, forty-eight, a life-long Wichitan," or "who had lived in Wichita for twenty-five years," or something like that, "died in the hospital here today." Anyway, what I'm getting at is that the opening phrase tells how long they have lived in Wichita County. My wife, whose father was in the Coast Guard and who moved around consistently all over the East Coast during her childhood, has commented that these people seem to consider living in Wichita Falls such a chore that they wear this sort of like a badge of honor or a battle scar or something.

But they are very much traditional, so I attribute my election to several things, actually. One, it is a Democratic county; two, I ran for an open seat; three, I was not taking on an incumbent.

The man who was my opponent had been the city judge there in the traffic court, and he had fined (chuckle) most of the town at one time or another. When he fined a citizen, he made the citizen unhappy; and when he turned somebody loose, he made the policemen unhappy, because no policeman makes a case unless he's sure the guy is guilty. You end up with both of those groups hating him.

In addition, he owned some loan companies, and very recently Frank Miskell, the Consumer Credit Commissioner, was after him, contending that he had cheated a bunch of people--notably, residents from the east side, the black

residents--by owning two loan companies. This is what Miskell alleged. Whether it actually happened or not, I don't know. He said the people would come and want to make a \$200 loan, let's say, and he would say, "All right. I can't lend you but \$100, but if you go see my friend here at XYZ Finance," or whatever it is, "he can probably loan you the other \$100." What they were doing was that there is one rate that's allowable under the law for a \$200 loan and another for a \$100 loan, and the interest on two loans of \$100 comes out to more than one loan of \$200. So what they were doing was forcing these people to pay extra interest.

Titus wrote me about it when Miskell was jumping on him, and he said, "I didn't do it, and furthermore, if I did, I'm not the only guilty one," or something (chuckle). But that was his whole pitch in this thing. But he admitted on television--in fact, he volunteered on television--that he owned a loan company.

I have a good relationship with the press, and I was able, for example, to mention to one television reporter that it was against the law to put political signs on telephone poles; and Titus was a man who had been enforcing the city law, and he wanted to be a lawmaker, but he was putting these signs on telephone poles. The guy got on television on the least popular of the two stations and just rapped him good for doing it and said he ought to know better. All of this,

I think, contributed.

When he first went on the air, they had a radio show--a type of show that I don't like--where people can call in questions. The reason I don't like it is two-fold. One is that one side can stack the deck against you. The other reason is that nuts can call in, and the people who listen are not sophisticated enough to know whether the questioner is a nut or not unless the guy really goes way off the beam. For these reasons I didn't like the show, but politically you sort of had to appear on it. Titus appeared on it, and Gordon Cole, who was running the show, said, "Would you debate Dave Allred?" He said, "Well, yes, I probably would, but it really wouldn't be fair because I'm a trained lawyer, and Allred is just a newspaperman."

We appeared on some civic club luncheon programs together. By the end of the campaign, he would not even appear on the same program with me because I just went rings around him. Part of it was that he didn't know that I had been making public speeches all my life, my vocabulary is better than his, and I'd just come out of Washington. I'd been a political reporter and then worked on congressional staffs. I was up on many of the issues. I had just outshone him. I know this sounds braggadocio, but you ask why and I think this was a contributing factor. I think the same thing is going to be true of this present opponent.

Marcello: I was going to ask you, first of all, why you thought you had an opponent to begin with. Did you, perhaps, make some particular group unhappy in your district?

Allred: I have made some people unhappy. In fact, I speak plainly to some of my enemies, and I've got to cut it out because it's not wise politically. You're supposed to look like a dynamic young man on the way up and a winner and all this sort of thing as part of the image. But the truth of the matter is that I don't know how far I'm going to go in politics, and I suspect it's not too far, because I have not served either group.

It's great to be a maverick. It does wonders for your own self-respect to say, "By golly, those guys aren't telling me what to do." But as I pointed out, Jack Hightower, who has much more of the "go-along-to-get-along," is really in some ways getting more done as far as little things--jobs, projects in the county, this kind of thing--than I am. Part of it is because he goes along to get along. More than that, I have difficulty getting bills passed and this type of thing. I have to fight for any bill I want to get passed because of this same sort of a syndrome.

When I look down the line at my personal political future, I think, "Who is going to back me for office?" Certainly not the Texas Manufacturers Association. The way I voted? And yet I haven't voted 100 percent for labor.

a young man named David Schapiro, whom I met in the Yarborough campaign years ago, was fond of saying that to be an Allred in Wichita County was like being the Virgin Mary in San Antonio, that you can't be beat.

I don't necessarily subscribe to that, but the fact that I am the son of a former governor, and a very highly popular man--and my father was very popular, particularly in Wichita County--has helped me. He had a marvelous memory for names, and many people were just flattered out of their minds that the governor would remember them. The same managing editor that I was talking about still carries in his wallet a hand-written note that my father wrote him thirty years ago when he was sick. He carries it in his wallet. This is the type thing that really helps.

I was down in the Valley with my dad one time, and we were driving along. I was driving. I was doing about sixty miles an hour, and he said, "Charlie?" We had just passed a group of men standing on the shoulder of the highway. He said, "Son, pull over." We turned around and went back down there, and it was the Border Patrol and local law enforcement officers who had set up a road block checking on migrant workers to see if there were any wetbacks. They hadn't stopped us because we were, obviously, two Anglos in a passenger car. They were looking for trucks. As we passed at sixty miles an hour, Dad recognized one of the men

and so forth. I think I'm as feisty as my father, in that I care deeply about things, but I'm much quieter about it. I do my in-fighting a little more . . . well, it's a different era for one thing. The era of the old orator is gone, and Dad was a real fire-eater. I'm sure that's part of my image.

And looking down the road, my only hope is that they will say someday, "Well, we need somebody, and we can't have anybody that's too closely aligned with us, and this kid, well, you know, he's got a name, and he's been pretty independent, and maybe we can run him." But I don't much foresee that happening. I can say this in this interview because this will not be released until after my death. I don't really think I've got too much of a political future, but you never know. And I'm not about to keep from appearing as dynamic as I can to my voters.

All of these things that I've mentioned, though, I think, are reasons why I got elected. People said, "Here is a dynamic young man." I looked better than my opponent as far as my knowledge of things and as far as my speaking ability and all.

I think, too, that the fact that I was my parents' son . . . since my father was successful, Wichita County likes to claim him as their own, even though he was actually born and raised in Montague County. He practiced law in Wichita Falls when he came there out of the Navy. A friend of mine,

a young man named David Schapiro, whom I met in the Yarborough campaign years ago, was fond of saying that to be an Allred in Wichita County was like being the Virgin Mary in San Antonio, that you can't be beat.

I don't necessarily subscribe to that, but the fact that I am the son of a former governor, and a very highly popular man--and my father was very popular, particularly in Wichita County--has helped me. He had a marvelous memory for names, and many people were just flattered out of their minds that the governor would remember them. The same managing editor that I was talking about still carries in his wallet a hand-written note that my father wrote him thirty years ago when he was sick. He carries it in his wallet. This is the type thing that really helps.

I was down in the Valley with my dad one time, and we were driving along. I was driving. I was doing about sixty miles an hour, and he said, "Charlie?" We had just passed a group of men standing on the shoulder of the highway. He said, "Son, pull over." We turned around and went back down there, and it was the Border Patrol and local law enforcement officers who had set up a road block checking on migrant workers to see if there were any wetbacks. They hadn't stopped us because we were, obviously, two Anglos in a passenger car. They were looking for trucks. As we passed at sixty miles an hour, Dad recognized one of the men

as a man he had appointed to the Texas Rangers maybe twenty-five years before. Dad got out and greeted the guy by name, and the guy was just flattered out of his mind. This was the type of man Dad was. He was much better with names than I am.

Then, too, my mother's very deeply religious. She tries her best to do her good Christian duty, which includes visiting people in hospitals. It includes listening to lonely old people who call her on the telephone and this type of thing. She is aligned with the Church of Christ, which is one of the larger Protestant denominations in my district. The Southern Baptist Church is probably the largest, and the Church of Christ is probably next. Mother doesn't do any of this for my political gain or hers. Bless her heart, she's the best Christian I know in really trying to do good things. But looking at it pragmatically, it doesn't hurt me politically at all. And I've been told there are many people who say they vote for me because I'm Jimmie Allred's boy or because I'm Joe Betsy's boy.

I think all of this helps to get me elected. I think the primary factor that got me elected was that I was Jimmie Allred's boy; secondly, that my opponent was a city judge; and thirdly, that I had some abilities of my own. I'm not trying to be modest. I really think that's the ranking that it went.

Now as far as to why I got an opponent this time, even though I have made some groups mad, I had not made any groups that mad. As to how I knew I might have an opponent, there is no such thing as a secret in politics--very, very few. The only way you keep a secret is, generally, if only you know it. Politicians are the worst gossips in the world. They beat any women's club, bridge club, or small town.

Marcello: College professors come in a good second there (chuckle).

Allred: But in politics he who has information has power in one sense of the word. If you know what's coming off, then you're pretty "hep," and you can sometimes turn things to the benefit of your district or to your own personal benefit. There is some question, for example, right now about some land that Dick Slack bought out in West Texas. And knowing Dick Slack, I think he probably bought it deliberately. But he claims he didn't. I don't really know. But then my wife says I'm suspicious of Santa Claus.

There are many people who are hangers-on in politics, who like the glamor, but don't want to do any of the work. Their attitude is quite often "let's you and him fight." Anytime somebody starts stirring around and making noises, some of your friends can always be counted on to warn you: "So-and-so has been talking about running against you."

Winston Wallander, who is a former mayor, a heavy

conservative, anti-labor type, was making some noises as he did before, and in the last minute chickened out as he did this time and didn't run. I've heard now he's looking at the State Senate. He really hasn't got a chance, I don't think. Of course, I'm the guy that said Pat Boone wasn't going anywhere, too. One reason I thought Winston might run against me is because my wife and Winston's wife are both on the YWCA Board. My wife was working with a project for under-privileged girls, many of whom are Latin and some of whom are Negroes. The group is called the "Live Wires." It was fought down the line by the old WASP types on the YWCA Board, which included Juanita Wallander, Winston's wife. The YWCA paid her way to a national meeting, and when she came back, they asked for a report of what went on, and she said, "I don't agree with what they were talking about, so I'm not going to give any report." And she didn't! They're pillars of the First Baptist Church and very much the Old South type. I shouldn't equate being a pillar in the First Baptist Church with that attitude, but I've seen it in some of the members of the First Baptist Church--absolute dogmatism and the belief that there can be no opinion but theirs. In any event, Winston started stirring around.

There was a kid from the college, named Mike Allen, who had run against me as a write-in two years before and who had the political bug, and I had a feeling he might run. Instead,

he announced he'd run for the city council and then didn't file. He's pretty much of a lightweight. But he still might run.

When Phil Grace decided to start making noises, I heard he had run for the school board and placed seventh in a field of ten. He began to ask everybody's advice in town. My Lord, he asked half the Democrats in town. The guy is just politically naive, I guess, because some of the most liberal Democrats are the ones he asked to serve on his campaign committee--Ray Farabee and Webb Darden and Dr. Isabelle Hunt out at the university. They've showed some "lib" tendencies, and here is my Republican opponent asking them to serve on his campaign committee. Webb Darden called me and said, "Phil's carrying me on his letterhead as a member of his advisory committee, and I told him I'd give him some advice if he was interested sometime. So he got me on there." Darden said, "I'm for you, and I'm sending you a \$50 contribution to show it." That's the way it is. And when Phil began to make his noises, one of the people in whom he confided is a close friend of mine, and I had a real pipeline into the Grace camp until my close friend told him off.

When he came out with his opening statement, in which he rapped me for going to seminary . . . and he didn't list it this way, but he said something to the effect that "my opponent, who is, according to his critics . . ." I think

"critics" was a very carefully chosen word there. He's hired a public relations firm, and I think they wrote his statement. I think the firm is a Dallas firm, and they're used to that gut-cutting brand of Dallas politics, and Wichita County is still more of the old gentlemanly school. It hurt him more than it helped him. But, anyway, he made the statement. He said, "My opponent is, according to his critics, a pretty good" or "a pretty fair writer," or something like that, "but he can't seem to make up his mind as to what profession he wants to follow at an age when he should be able to have done it." I'm thirty-six years old, and I'm going to seminary, which he knew. He had us over to dinner and felt us out a few days before he announced.

And I had the feeling at that time he was going to run against Vernon Stewart, which is what I would have done if I had been in his shoes, because Vernon has no other job. His wife supports him outside of what he makes in the Legislature, and he really is kind of a fink, and he's pretty vulnerable. Some of my friends told me, as the time drew near for Phil to make his announcement, that Vernon was so afraid he was going to run against him, he was getting almost paranoid. He was cutting Phil every chance he got and so forth. Vernon and Phil still spend a great deal of their time cutting each other. On the grapevine circuit, Phil seems to be concentrating more on Vernon than he does on me

even though I'm his opponent.

But, anyway, he said something to this effect, and my friend was so incensed by it that Phil came around a little later and said, "What did you think of my opening statement?" He said, "I thought it was absolutely reprehensible," and just really chewed him up one side and down the other. Their relationship has cooled a good bit, which denies me a real pipeline that I had into Phil's camp.

Phil is the son of a millionaire oilman, and he's supposed to be in business with his father. However, I was talking to two ladies this morning, who are employed by his father, who say they've never met Phil. So I don't really know what the story is there. I have a feeling that they're not in employed in . . . wait. Only one of them was employed by his father, and I think what she meant, when she said "we" are employed, was that her husband worked for him, but I think he works in the oil patch and not in the office. Anyway, they never met Phil. Phil inherited a good bit of money from his father. I've been told that he's not really too proud of his father because his father still maintains the coarse manners and speech of the oil patch. His father was a driller in Burkburnett. He struck it rich during the boom of the 1920's. Phil is very talented. I've been told that he was dominated by his mother. This will give you some idea of some of the minutiae that comes into a politician

about his opponent. I'm sure that he's getting the same feedback on me on, whatever my faults are, if I have any (chuckle).

One guy came up and said, "Why, I remember when that kid was in high school and my daughter was in the band with him. The band was trying to raise money, and they were selling candy bars, and Phil's mother came down and bought a case of candy bars so he wouldn't have to go out to sell." He said, "That was his job of work." I'll never forget how the guy phrased it, "job of work." He said, "That was his job of work, was to have his mother buy all the candy bars that he was supposed to sell, so he wouldn't have go out and work and do it." And this guy was holding it against Phil. He was going to vote against him for that reason.

And Vernon Stewart is constantly telling me about how Phil had a grand piano taken down to the University of Texas, and I see nothing wrong with that, really, if you've got the money to do it. Phil is a musician. I've never heard him play, but I'm told he plays the piano beautifully. I have seen two of his paintings. He paints very well. He has four original Norman Rockwell's, including one of Bobby Kennedy that he's bought after he announced his Republican candidacy, and two original Jamie Wyeth's in his home, which is in Country Club Estates. The kid's rolling in dough, which is disquieting in some ways to his opponent.

But he's politically naive in many ways. "Prof" Edwards, who is a good "lib" and is the Democratic county chairman in Wichita Falls, told me that a little while before he jumped on the Republican bandwagon, he was out talking to "Prof" about being a Democrat. He said, "My talents are basically in organization, and I feel that the Republicans are so well-organized here that there's no room for me, and I'd like to be a Democrat and help the Democrats organize." "Prof" sort of let him down easy, and the kid turned up a little bit later as a Republican observer at the Legislature. The speculation was that the Republicans did this to lock him in as a Republican, because they didn't want that money going over to the Democrats. The bug has bitten the boy, and he's real hot on politics.

In some ways he's pretty shrewd, because he announced he was going to run for the Legislature and wouldn't say which seat. This got him a lot of attention that he wouldn't have otherwise gotten. Then when he announced, I think he hurt himself by the way he phrased it, and since then things have been rather quiet.

We've sat and visited back and forth a little bit when we run into each other at places where we campaign. I have the feeling he doesn't enjoy campaigning too much, but this may be because I want to have that feeling. When you're in a campaign, you develop a myopia as far as your opponent

concerned. But I noticed, for example, in one night here recently--this is the peak of one night's activity, I guess-- I first went to a pancake supper at the First Presbyterian Church. Then I went to a chili supper that the Farm and Ranch Club was giving to raise funds. You know, you go there, and you shake hands, and you say, "Hi" to everybody you can and so forth. Then I went back and picked up my wife, and we went to a dinner that the North Texas Chapter of the Professional Engineers were giving, and then we went from there to the remnants of a Sunday School party. I also admit that at two o'clock in the morning I went to the bathroom for some Tums from that mixture of foods. But the only place I saw Phil was at the Farm and Ranch Club.

Marcello: That sounds like the politician in the Alka Seltzer advertisement.

Allred: My point is that the only place I saw the boy was at the Farm and Ranch Club chili feed. He sat in the bleachers at the 4-H arena there and talked to three people who were seated around him. Of course, I knew I was only to be there briefly, but I worked. I spoke to about twenty-five people . . . oh, maybe not that many, but eighteen to twenty different people. I tried to do more than simply go over and say, "Howdy, how are you?" and go on to the next one, because this is offensive, really. I find this in Graham Purcell. He never has time to talk to you. What I'll do is go over, and

if I can think of something to say to them that shows them that I think of them as an individual, I'll say it. Mrs. Clack, for example, from Burkburnett is very big on history, so I'll try to say something about history to her. If I can't think of anything else, I'll tell them a joke or just something where I pass the time of day with them a little bit instead of simply hit them and go, because they know that's politically motivated. I could see Phil's look, and it may be projection on my part, but I felt he was saying, "Why, that glad-hander! Who does he think he's kidding?"

We ran into Phil at the open house of the Electra State Bank one Sunday afternoon, and he was leaving just about the time we got there. He said, "I'm going to leave it with you." I sort of read into that that he was a little unhappy with campaigning. I run into him about one out of every four or five stops that I make. I think part of it is he never realized how tough it is to campaign. I think, too, that we'll see more of him in the fall.

Let me throw in something else here. This is sort of aimed at history and to give you an insight into what can injure a politician. Everybody tells me, "Why, you've got this kid beat hands down." I probably do; they're probably right. But you've got to remember, too, that people tell you what they think you want to hear, generally. There are two types of people. Most people want to be friendly, and

they tell you what they think you want to hear. Then there's the other type who insult you just because you're in politics. They go away and smugly say, "I told that so-and-so." They'll insult your opponent, too. But for the most part, people try to flatter you and tell you what you want to hear.

The thing that worries me is, that the guy does have millions of dollars, literally, and he has hired a public relations firm, although the last press release I saw he had issued had three misspelled words in it, which makes me feel a little better. They're at least not omnipotent and not completely all-powerful. The rumor is that they're the same outfit that got the Republican governor elected in Virginia. I don't know how true that is. If it is, they've got a pretty poor account executive on this account.

Phil has sent out a thing to some little committee at the University of Houston--Student Committee for Population Control or something. The committee wrote us both a letter, advocating abortion and birth control. He wrote them a long reply and then xeroxed this plus their letter, plus a form letter, and sent it to every minister in the county in which he took a very staunch anti-abortion stand. I guess this is one way he's trying to get his name around. At least two, so far, of my minister friends have mentioned it to me. One of them sent me a copy of the letter. This is

the sort of thing he's operating on, which at least so far shows me that he hasn't been getting real good advice.

But there's always the factors to be considered. As I say, the people are disenchanted right now, and to be an incumbent is not the best thing. Secondly is the fact that he does have a lot of money with which he can buy television and radio time, so forth. Finally, he has a public relations firm hired. Paul Eggars, who is running for governor, is from this county. Senator John Tower is from this county. The result is that there's always that growing little fear that, by golly, this could be the year, you know, and you could be the guy that gets upset this time.

What I am doing is ignoring him and making every gathering in sight and shaking every hand in sight. Most people think I have a primary opponent, but I've got to put up with this malarkey until November. I'd much rather have a primary opponent and have it over and done with one way or another in May.

I think part of it is he just doesn't know how to go about making some of these things, and I have a built-in thing, being the incumbent. One of the things that is to the incumbent's advantage is that more people know him. Another is that when I go somewhere, like we both made the Northwest Texas Field and Stream Association's wild game feed where they feed you venison or rattlesnake or Lord knows

what all, and Jim Alexander, who is a friend of mine, said, "We are very glad to have our state representatives here." I was introduced, and Vernon Stewart was introduced. Phil was not introduced. All he did . . . he came and stood in line, gave up his ticket, and went in and sat down. I shook hands with people coming down the line. In fact, I let my family go on ahead and waited to shake hands with people, not every person, not the way you do in a real hot campaign. But anybody that I knew, I'd pass the time of day with them and say, "Golly, I lost my family around here," so I wouldn't be so conspicuous standing there at the door. This is the sort of thing that I think will probably partially be Phil's demise. Then, too, he reads speeches, and in question-and-answer periods he's not cognizant of the state's agencies or what they are doing. So for these reasons, I think probably I'll come out on top.

That's plus the fact it's a Democratic county. I started out to try to help Ralph Yarborough get people registered and turned out to be doing myself a favor, too. We have a record voter registration in this county, and in the November election we're going to have the liquor-by-the-drink issue, which Phil favors and I oppose. We are going to have that on the ballot, and we're going to have the Yarborough-Bush . . . I'm predicting here that Yarborough will defeat Lloyd Bentsen, and that he and George Bush will be in a very hot

race. I think we are going to have a big turnout.

What I've done on liquor-by-the-drink, aside from voting against it, is that during the voter registration drive, I went through the yellow pages of the phone book and picked out every church that I could think of, like, Baptist and Church of Christ and the Assembly of God, people who might well be opposed to liquor-by-the-drink, and I wrote them a letter and said, "I hope that you'll urge your people to register to vote because liquor-by-the-drink is going to be on the ballot in November, and we really need to get them registered." One guy even reproduced my letter in the church bulletin, which means his members saw it, too. I think all of this is going to be helpful to me because of the overwhelming dry vote that the county has leaned toward. These are some things that I don't think Phil has thought about or figured out.

So for these reasons, even though there's always an "if," I think I'll take him probably by a pretty good margin. But you never know, and when you start thinking you have it made, that's when you're in trouble. So I'm making everything I possibly can. It's playing hob with my studies in seminary and with my family life. When the Burkburnett Lions Club had its pancake feed, I was there at six o'clock in the morning, really about five or ten minutes after six o'clock, talking to the workingmen before they went to work, cutting

up with them. I was back there at noon meeting a different group entirely, because the workingmen had already gone to work. They'd had their pancakes. At noon you get the businessmen. And while I was there, I ran into the principal of the junior high, and he told me about an Americanism program they had, and I arranged to get him some pamphlets on the flag and on America and to get this film on the Texas Legislature for his classes. Another guy wanted to talk about taxes on a trailer.

It's very similar to the ministry in the way you relate to people in these things. I carry a tablet with me, and when somebody asks me about something, I make a note of it and follow through on it and get back to them. If a person does something special for me, I thank them.

The secretary of the North Texas Oil and Gas Association said, "Well, I think of all the portions of a given meeting that we're having, this is the place where you really ought to be." So I made this particular dinner. She saw to it that I got a ticket. It cost about \$7.00 or something. I can't afford that sort of thing. She saw to it that I got a ticket.

Another time, Roy Majors, from whom I bought a ticket because he was in a contest, saw to it that I knew about the pancake feed in Burkburnett. A day or so later I called him up, and I called his secretary up, and I said, "I just

want to thank you for your help." They were just real pleased.

This is the sort of follow-through that I don't think occurs to Phil. Anyway, that's enough of our thing on campaigning. I didn't mean to get off and all that except for right now campaigning is the closest thing to my heart.

Let me hit on the speaker's race that you were asking about before we close this thing up.

Marcello: Okay.

Allred: During the regular session, there developed a race for who would succeed Gus Mutscher as speaker. Rumor was going around that Gus was trying to carve himself out--and he may still be planning to do it, although if he did, I think he made some serious blunders during the session--a congressional district on the Brenham side of Houston and try to go to Congress when we have redistricting. There is much talk about who would succeed Gus Mutscher.

I was pledged to DeWitt Hale of Corpus Christi. DeWitt is an old friend. He's generally a pretty good "lib"--not always, but generally--and he votes pretty good. He first came to the House when my father was governor. He's an expert on rules. He's a nice guy. Sometime back, along with several of my friends like John Hannah and Bill Bass, both of whom are "libs" from East Texas, we pledged DeWitt Hale.

Well, then the drive began as to who was going to be speaker. Jack Ogg of Houston, who is very close to Mutscher

and is really, I think, kind of a power politics-type . . . Jack is a real dynamic-type that I think is probably owned pretty much by big business. He was real keen on being speaker himself. There were a couple other guys, but I can't think who else it was right now. Charles Finne11 for one was wanting the job. I think Charles is whistling in the dark. But Ogg might really have a chance. Rayford Price wanted to be speaker, except Rayford's a dry, and I don't know whether the beer lobby would stand for a dry going in. Joe Ratcliff began to really move, and my friend Fred Head was trying to push Joe.

We got to talking and I talked to several people who said, "Why, what DeWitt Hale does is collect a bunch of speaker pledges, and then he sits on them. He just holds them. And then whoever is elected speaker, you know, when it gets down to horse trading at the end of the speaker's race, he says, 'Well, I've got this many, and I want to be a committee chairman.' And they say, 'Why, sure, DeWitt. If you want judiciary, by golly, you've got it.'" Well, I didn't want to be used.

So I became convinced that we really had a chance with Joe Ratcliff and that we were moving well. And I liked Joe. He convinced me, although I've later discovered Joe talks a better game than he plays sometimes, that he had lobby backing. I know he is a very close friend of W.Price, who

used to be executive vice-president of the Texas Restaurant Association. He is a good friend with another lobbyist, James K. Presnall. James K. is a former member of the House, and his brother, Bill Presnall, is currently a member of the House from the College Station-Bryan area. So I figured that Joe had the money to make the race. This is one of the real difficulties with the speaker's race. You campaign solely among the members. The reason that the lobby has such a hold on the speaker is that nobody can afford to campaign all over the state on \$4,800 a year, so the lobby finances it. One of the realities of the thing is that if a guy is going to make a race for speaker, he's got to have the money. Well, it seemed to me that Joe had the money and that we were really getting off to a pretty good start there.

So finally I became so convinced that I went to DeWitt and told him I wanted my pledge card back. Now there are some guys who pledge more than one person, but this is generally frowned on. The pledge system is that you pledge in advance. Your pledge supports someone for speaker. It's a built-in advantage for the present speaker because, if you don't pledge the present speaker for reelection, then he can kill your bills and all sorts of things. So what we were doing was taking second pledges to Gus. We were saying, in effect, that we're not trying to defeat Gus, but when Gus goes, we want Joe to be the next speaker. Obviously, whoever is on

that speaker's team, whoever are the guys that are pushing him in, they're going to end up being the committee chairmen and being able to get their bills through and have the speaker's ear and so forth, which is a very definite advantage.

DeWitt, I think, was a little hurt, but he gave me my card back. Another rumor that was going around then--and I'm told by a friend of mine in Corpus Christi that it is true, although it didn't happen the way DeWitt wanted it to--was that DeWitt wanted a district judgeship. As it turned out, DeWitt was not appointed. County Judge Noah Kennedy of Nueces County was appointed to the district judgeship instead. But at that time we didn't know who was going to be, and the rumor was that DeWitt was angling for it and that he wasn't going to run again and several things.

So I went in and said, "DeWitt, I want my card back." And he said, "Well, I think you'll find that Joe does not think the way we do." And I said, "Well, that may be," but down deep I knew that the "libs" don't have a chance of electing a speaker. If you're going to go, you're going to have to go with the moderate as the better of two evils, if evil is the word. But the moderate is the best choice rather than to get a big right-winger, and I felt like Joe really had a chance.

I ran into Dick Cory, who is, I think, one of the best debaters in the House. At that time I still trusted him. I've

learned since then that he is not to be trusted all the time. He took Speaker Barnes' orders and debated any side they wanted. But at that time I still trusted him. He led me down the primrose path beautifully on that jukebox bill because I trusted him, and mainly because I trusted Jim Clark of Dallas. The bill to which I refer is the bill that came out of Cory's hearings on the involvement of organized crime in the jukebox industry. They said, "What we need to do is put a large licensing fee . . ." Well, I didn't know anything about the jukebox industry, and if guys that I trusted, like Jim Clark and Dick Cory, said that this would help cut out organized crime, then, by golly, I was for it. I just thought it was an anti-crime bill. But I found out very quickly, after the bill had passed and the session was over--there's nothing we could do about it--that there were a bunch of little guys in the jukebox field . . . there's one man in my county who still hates my guts and with justification. In fact, a friend of mine just told me the other day he was down at some bar and ran into this guy sitting there just still . . . the conversation turned to politicians and what an S.O.B. Allred was and how he was going to get all them politicians. The guy really has justification. He had a little business going, and he had a few customers. He was buying used jukeboxes and rebuilding them. But to have to pay a \$300 fee plus so much per machine put this guy out of business and really

just helped the big boys. I think Jim Clark was led. I still don't believe Jim Clark really knew what he was doing. He's not running for reelection. I think part of it is that he may be a little disillusioned, and maybe I ought to be some. But this is one bill that I really regret voting for. Yet, what do you do? Do you say to the guy, "Yeah, I made a mistake, ol' buddy. I didn't even read the bill. I just trusted a friend of mine, because you can't read all the bills. I just trusted a friend of mine, and it turned out he wasn't such a good friend." Well, shoot, you make an admission like that, and it will be all over your district in no time. And they'll say, "Well, this incompetent so-and-so!"

In any event, in the speaker's race, Rayford Price got into it. There were some who felt that Mutscher was trying to get his own man in, and that Rayford was it. Jack Ogg wanted to run and, I think, may still run. He was boomed on the cover and the feature article in the Texas Industry Magazine, which is a totally conservative magazine which has come out recently. The City of Houston and the City of Pasadena were arguing over some land out by the NASA Center, which had previously just been pasture out by Clear Lake. But all of a sudden with a manned spacecraft there, this was extremely valuable real estate and a good tax base, and the courts decided in favor of Pasadena, as near as I can understand it. Ogg, during the regular session, introduced an amendment to

a bill that would have had the effect of reversing the court decision, and he got caught at it. Jamey Bray from Pasadena is a freshman and really kind of a lightweight, I think, but in this case he did himself justice and got up and caught Jack Ogg in trying to relegislate a court decision, and this really chopped him up.

Then somebody else got up and verbally pushed Bob Thomas around. I forget who it was, but it was some other guy that wanted to be speaker. He got up and shook his finger at Bob Thomas, who is in a wheelchair and is a very popular representative, a boy from Waco, my office mate. This really hurt him as far as trying to get pledges. At least this is what we figure in the Ratcliff camp. Bob Thomas and I both pledged Joe Ratcliff along with Fred Head, Joe Allen, John Bigham, and a couple others. We were the ones sitting around planning most of the strategy.

Anyway, I ran into Dick Cory one night at a reception given by the retail merchants or the retail association or the broadcasters or somebody, one of these that you have to make because you've got a few constituents there. And you greet your constituents and they go off to drink, and you sit around and talk politics with your cronies. I was over by the shrimp bowl or something, and Dick Cory wandered by and said, "Better make room there. There goes the right-hand man of the next speaker." There was a lot of venom in it, and I

turned around, and he said, "Dave, that's not the way a speaker's elected." And he went on to tell me about how Ben Barnes, he said, was elected. I don't know whether it's true or not--that he was part of Ben Barnes' whirlwind campaign when . . . who was it . . . Tunnell . . . stepped down, I think, and . . . Turman or Tunnell . . .

Marcello: Tunnell.

Allred: Byron Tunnell, yes. Turman wouldn't be helping Ben Barnes. Tunnell stepped down, and Barnes had everything already organized, and the whole thing was planned. According to Cory, it may well have been, as I recall his words. Anyway, Cory was one of Mutscher's men--Establishment to the core and so forth and so forth. I didn't listen to him too much, but it turns out he may well have been prophetic.

But we would meet in Joe's apartment and plan and talk to people and take them out to dinner for which Joe picked up the tab. So he seemed to have some financing. We were doing pretty well. I think we were really out in front to start.

Then Gus nearly came unglued. He said he considered it an affront to him. What if he wanted to run for another term? We kept saying, "Mr. Speaker, we're not trying to do anything except follow you. We just want to be next." I think part of his coming unglued was deliberate because he was trying to head us off. Then the rumor was that he got Rayford Price

in the race so that Rayford jumped in and different ones were in.

Finally, when Gus stood up and announced that he was going to run for reelection, then everybody kind of laid off. Joe seems to have run out of steam, but it may be that he considers that he's laying low until the heat's off some.

But it seemed like Fred Head, who I think has real political ambition . . . Fred is a hard-working boy. He's got a temper that's against him, I think. And you can't afford to lose your temper in public life. But Fred Head went out to Amarillo, for example, when they had a reception for Walter Knapp, who is a representative from there. I think he's running for the Senate now. Walter was pledged to Joe, but Joe didn't show up at his reception. This type of thing occurred all over the state when things were happening, and different people would say, "I ran into Joe Allen when I was down on the Alabama Coushatta Reservation when they swore in the new chief." And Joe said, "I was at so-and-so's deal, and Ratcliff wasn't there." So this is why I think he may as well have given up. I don't really know. But as far as I know, that's my experience with the speaker's race so far. We'll see who finally succeeds Mutscher. I don't know who it will be.