

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION
NUMBER
511

Interview with
REPRESENTATIVE DAVE ALLRED
July 29, 1971

Place of Interview: Fort Worth, Texas

Interviewer: Ronald E. Marcello

Terms of Use: After my death

Approved: Dave Allred
(Signature)

Date: October 25, 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 Dave Allred

Interviewer: Dr. Ronald E. Marcello

Place of Interview: Fort Worth, Texas

Date: July 29, 1971

Dr. Marcello: This is Ron Marcello interviewing Representative Dave Allred for the North Texas State University Oral History Collection. The interview is taking place on July 29, 1971, in Fort Worth, Texas. I'm interviewing Representative Allred in order to get his experiences and reminiscences and comments concerning the regular and first called session of the Sixty-second Texas Legislature.

Mr. Allred, very early in the session, and perhaps even before the session, I suppose you could say, you became identified with the so-called "Dirty Thirty." Would you give us some idea as to how it was organized, how it was formed, why it was formed, and so on? Give us a little bit of the background on the "Dirty Thirty."

Mr. Allred: Actually, my identification with the "Dirty Thirty" came early in the session rather than prior to it. First of all, there are those who contend that the term "Dirty Thirty" originated prior to the Sixty-second Legislature. One of these is Representative Bill Bass of Van Zandt County. Bill was a freshman with me in 1967, the Sixtieth Legislature. Right at the start of the session, Bill

moved that a pay raise for state employees go into immediate effect rather than waiting until the first of September, as I recall the motion. I'm not certain of it, but it was something to this effect. It had to do with a pay raise for state employees. And the leadership--Ben Barnes was speaker--did not want the motion. But Bill made it, and there were about thirty people that voted for it. Bill contends, and Representative Fred Head of Henderson also contends, that these were the original "Dirty Thirty." They didn't hold together, though, as the "Dirty Thirty" did in the Sixty-second Legislature. There were a few. I understand Representative Ed Harris of Galveston and Bill Bass of Van Zandt County and some others met fairly regularly during that session and discussed various issues of the day, but that's really about all it was. As I understand it, it was a discussion group. They exchanged ideas and ways in which they could operate. But Ben Barnes was running the House with an iron hand, and really the members of the "Dirty Thirty" were not that much on Barnes' team and didn't really have that much to say about how the House would be operated because of the tremendous powers that the speaker had.

The way the term came into popular use was in the Sixty-second Legislature, which opened on January 12, 1971. It's traditional that the night before the opening of the Legislature, the Democratic Party has a victory dinner, usually in the Austin Municipal Auditorium. Texas is a one-party state pretty much

still, and you can usually figure that you are going to have a Democratic governor and a Democratic majority in the Legislature. So they schedule victory dinners, and usually they have good entertainment. They had Glen Campbell one year--this type of thing. There is a steak dinner, and the ladies get to dress up in their finery. Each representative and his wife are introduced and walk across the stage in front of the crowd. It's particularly a highlight for the wives, although I think the members enjoy it, too. We all are a little human enough to enjoy a little recognition. So on the evening of the 11th of January, my wife and I were at the Austin Municipal Auditorium, which is across the Colorado River from the Capitol, and we were just in the concluding time of the Democratic victory dinner. Wayne Newton, the singer, was the program, and upon conclusion of that and a couple other things, people were kind of drifting out.

I was standing there in the crowd talking to somebody--you know, politicians are worse than anybody else about talking shop--and a very good friend of mine, who is the Austin bureau chief of The Houston Post walked up to me. His name is Felton West. Felton was my bureau chief during part of the time that I worked for The Houston Post in Washington. He is a real smart individual and an excellent newspaperman. He is one of the best newspapermen I have ever known. He has, so far as I know, no real axes to grind. He simply wants to report the

facts and do a good job. He came up to me through the crowd and asked if I had seen House Speaker Gus Mutscher of Brenham. And I said, no, I hadn't seen him since the dinner was over. Pat, my wife, and I had stayed around to get some pictures made. I hadn't seen Gus in a little while. Felton said, "Well, we just received word that the Securities and Exchange Commission, a federal agency, filed suit in Houston this afternoon against Frank Sharp concerning something to do with stock dealings," and he wasn't exactly sure at that point what it was.

I knew of Frank Sharp. I had encountered him once before, not personally, but when I was in The Houston Post's Washington bureau, Houston was selected as the site for the Manned Spacecraft Center. Frank Sharp at that time was building Sharpstown, which was a housing development on the southwest side of Houston. He, in what I thought was a very shrewd publicity move, offered to give the initial astronauts homes. You know, there were seven astronauts in the original program, and he offered to give these astronauts homes in Sharpstown, where they could live while they were in Houston. And the question became whether or not the astronauts could take him up on it. I finally called Mr. James Webb, who was then the administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I called him at home and asked him if the astronauts would be allowed to accept these homes from Frank Sharp, and he said, "Definitely not." And as far as I know, The Houston Post is the first

newspaper to report this. I don't know for sure on that, and The Houston Post didn't play it up too much at the time. There was a story on an inside page and rather brief. I had heard of Frank Sharp in this regard. I knew nothing of him owning a bank or anything else at that time. All I knew is that he was a real estate promoter, but I had heard of him.

Felton told me that suit had been filed against him by the SEC and that Mutscher and Representative Heatly and the governor, among others, had been mentioned as having participated in some way in this stock deal. And that's really about all we knew at that point. Of course, the morning papers were full of it the next day; the word passed around that evening, and then the next day they were full of it, and everybody was talking about it.

We sort of waited to see what the people who were mentioned would do. I don't know really what I expected them to do, but I expected them to do something. It became evident to us after awhile, after a few days, that they apparently intended to do nothing. I think now, based on subsequent happenings, that this was probably the counsel of Representative W.S. ("Bill") Heatly of Paducah, who stoutly stuck to this posture throughout. However, I have no direct knowledge of who actually counseled the silent course of action. The pressure on Gus Mutscher reached the point where he finally had to make a speech, but that came later in the session. At this point we were kind of waiting to see what would happen,

and it was brought in that among those who were mentioned were Governor Smith, Dr. Elmer Baum, who is chairman of the State Democratic Executive Committee, House Speaker Gus Mutscher, Representative Heatly, and Representative Tommy Shannon of Fort Worth, who is the speaker's right-hand man and general flunky. There were also a couple members of the speaker's staff--Rush McGinty, and--I believe his initials are F.C.--"Sonny" Schulte. "Sonny" is his nickname, and that's what I call him. Also, former attorney general Waggoner Carr, among others, was also named in the talk. All right, all of these people, particularly Dr. Baum, are Democrats. I say particularly Dr. Baum because he was chairman of the State Democratic Executive Committee.

So one evening a few days after the session opened, I was talking with Representative Frances "Sissy" Farenthold of Corpus Christi and Representative Tom Moore of Waco, and as I recall we were on the Capitol's second floor on the west side of the rotunda. Later, we met in Representative Moore's office on the third floor, north side, of the Capitol. He had a fairly nice office. He had a place for his secretary; he had a place for himself; and then there was a little sitting room. I don't know who the office had belonged to previously, but apparently there had been two men in there at one time. But Tom had taken over the whole thing and retained the partitions. He had bought some furniture, a couch and some chairs, and in one corner there was a refrigerator. It was a comfortable

place to meet.

The point of the original talk between "Sissy" and Tom and me concerned the fact that nothing was being done. The public was beginning to assume that we were all guilty. We said that to retain our own political integrity, and our political hides for that matter, as well as to retain some semblance of respect for the Democratic Party, we felt something needed to be done. And we needed at least to disassociate ourselves with this particular group. A meeting was held in Representative Moore's office. Several of us met in his office. We were trying to decide what to do. There were only six or eight people there, I think, at first. Mrs. Farenthold or "Sissy" came up with a letter, and she said, "Let's look this thing over and see if we are going to sign it; see if we want to sign it." And what the letter said in effect was, "We pledge ourselves by the 20th of April, 1971, to make a full and complete disclosure of our finances, and we urge every other state official elected and appointed to do the same." It was hoped that by releasing this letter that those who refused to sign or who refused to file their statement would be forced to do so by public pressure and that it would at least show the public . . . and as someone very succinctly put it, "Me no Alamo; me no Goliad," you know, that we were not involved in these stock transactions. The draft of the letter was passed around. Later, in another meeting, the letter was in final form and was signed by, I believe, seventeen

or eighteen members of the House.

Marcello: Were there any Republicans in on this yet?

Allred: Not at this point, not to my recollection, but there could have been. You know how it is. I met in so many conversational groups that I cannot be sure.

But in any event, I wasn't sure whether I ought to sign or not. I wanted to disassociate myself with the speaker and with those who were being included in these allegations. But at the same time, my finances were such that I did not want to disclose them to the public, and here is why. When I go down to the Legislature, my paper takes me off the payroll. I am put on a leave of absence without pay. The per diem that we receive makes up part of what I am paid at the paper but not all of it. In addition, I had a part-time job as interim minister of the First Christian Church of Knox City, Texas, which is about 80 miles west of Wichita Falls. We would drive out there, my wife and I and the children, on Sundays, except that my grandmother would keep our youngest, Jimmie, who was then an infant, and I would preach, and then we would come back in time for me to work Sunday afternoon at the newspaper. It's not an ideal situation, but they were paying me \$50 a week at the church, which meant an income of a little over \$200 a month on average. So I figured that during my months of service in the Legislature, I lost approximately \$500 a month. Even when I was being paid by the newspaper, it's not a very princely sum, and I was in debt.

I had had to borrow some money.

In addition, my cousin and his brother-in-law and I and some other men in Wichita Falls had gone into business in the car wash business. We had the franchise in Wichita County for Robo Automatic Car Washes, which have gone great guns in some areas. I am told, for example, that Agriculture Commissioner John White invested in a Robo on about Fourteenth Street or Nineteenth Street in Austin, one of the streets between the University and the Capitol, and he is just making money hand over fist. It was a very wise investment for him because many people use that thoroughfare. We had examined two or three Robos in other cities, and we thought we knew what we were doing. As it developed, we didn't. We got into too much on borrowed capital, and we spent too much in constructing the Robos. We had four locations in Wichita Falls. The result was that the partnership finally decided that the best thing to do was cut our losses, pay off what we could, and get out. So we sold the car washes. My cousin, Vernon McDaniel, and I were the only two who could not pay immediately. We're talking about something like \$15,000 or \$16,000. And I borrowed to the hilt on my life insurance and everywhere else that I could raise any money like this. And I still was left with about a \$13,000 note at the First Wichita National Bank at $9\frac{1}{2}$ percent interest, which is still running and is eating me up.

But we knew that we were facing a session in which a

redistricting bill would be formed. I knew that because I was not very close to the speaker, I would not have any say in how the districts were being drawn. But there was the fact that Representative Charles Finnell from Holliday, which is about fourteen or fifteen miles southwest of Wichita Falls, was on the redistricting committee. And I figured that since Wichita County had lost population in the current census, or the census reflected that Wichita County had lost population, that in the 1972 election I stood a good a chance of being thrown either with Representative Finnell or Representative Vernon Stewart, also of Wichita County--both he and I had represented the county at-large. My feeling was that, if I filed a financial statement and revealed how badly in debt I was, Stewart and/or Finnell would say, "This is the man we want to run against because he is so horribly in debt that he cannot possibly finance a decent campaign." I was really afraid that this might well get me an opponent by the simple act of filing it. But I wasn't sure.

I talked it over with Representative Head and some others and finally decided that I would go ahead and sign. But it was with some fear and trepidation that I signed. As it turned out, there were seventeen or eighteen of us who signed. However, no real effort was made in the House that we had this letter and anybody who wants to sign it can sign it. Really, we just sort of approached a few people who were considered friendly, let's say.

Marcello: Would you say that most of these seventeen at one time or another had some sort of an axe to grind, let's say, perhaps against Speaker Mutscher? Had these people traditionally opposed Speaker Mutscher for the most part?

Allred: I like the second terminology better. I don't know that we had axes to grind per se so much as our ideological and/or political outlook might have differed from that of Speaker Mutscher.

Marcello: Rather than a personal grudge, in other words.

Allred: Yes.

Marcello: It was more ideological.

Allred: Yes. Well, it was more . . . you know, you tend to form friendships down there in the Legislature primarily among people with whom you agree. So it was these people to whom the sponsors of the letter--and I was not a sponsor of the letter; I was one of the signatories--turned to, and they made no effort really to gather any more signers than that. They wanted to get the thing out before the speaker had time to make some sort of a counterstep. We didn't know what that countership might be, but we didn't want to give him time to act to block us or offset our move ahead of time. There are no secrets in the Legislature.

Later in the session--I may get to this later, and I may forget it, so let me put it in now--we considered walking out to break a quorum in the House. We figured if we could get enough people . . . I say "we." I was just on the

outskirts of it; I didn't dream up the strategy. In fact, I did very little of the strategy dreaming. I did more of the execution of the strategy. But it was felt by those who had proposed this that, if we could get enough people to walk, and all of us would leave together and stay together, and go somewhere like San Antonio and check into a hotel and just stay in our rooms, we could block business. The reason San Antonio was suggested was that it is a metropolitan area, and we would not be as obvious there--a bunch of us checking into a hotel--as we would in a small town. A bunch of strangers would stand out in a small town, and in a large city they wouldn't. We would simply all go and all stay together so that nobody broke the quorum without our knowledge and then let them whistle for a quorum until we were able to get a little of what we wanted because we were trying to figure some way to overcome the very awesome power that the speaker of the House has.

We were going directly from the floor to a session in the office of Representative Tom Moore to see whether we had enough people who were willing to walk. It would take seventy-six. I think it was Representative Curtis Graves of Houston . . . as he walked out the House door, reporters for the Associated Press and the Houston newspapers cornered him and said, "Are you going up to the meeting to see who is going to walk?" Apparently, the press already knew all about the meeting. We had only been just discussing it on the floor that afternoon.

There are no secrets in the House, and if you are going to do something like this and achieve any sort of surprise, you have to move rather swiftly. Otherwise, the speaker's office, people who are currently in favor with the speaker, tip him off. He is then . . . you know, "forewarned is forearmed." He could perhaps take some steps to head you off.

So for these reasons, as soon as we had as many people signing the letter as the sponsors thought they could safely contact without word getting out to the speaker, they released the list, and they said others can sign it if they want to. I think some others did. One that I recall was Representative Carl Parker of Jefferson County. I believe he signed after the initial bunch did. There were a few members of the Senate. It seems to me there were nineteen signatures in all--seventeen members of the House and two members of the Senate. I believe the senators were Senator Oscar Mauzy of Dallas and perhaps Mike McKool of Dallas. I'm honestly not sure who the other one was. We released this, and the thought was that every few days we would announce how many others had agreed to sign. As I say, Parker signed. Stuart Long, who heads the Long News Agency, has a Capitol news agency and puts out a weekly mimeographed report called Austin Report, filed a statement. Stuart, by the way, is the husband of Mrs. Emma Long, who was on the Austin city council for awhile. Stuart had been appointed to an air pollution board or something like that. He filed a statement. And if I'm not mistaken, W.P. ("Bill")

Hobby, Jr., of The Houston Post, who is also an appointed official of some kind, also filed a statement.

There were perhaps two or three others, and that was about it. The letter was greeted with great silence after that. Things kept going, and as these things do, a little more would come out each day on what the SEC was alleging and who had done what to whom and how come. The Republicans, of course, recognized in this an excellent campaign issue.

Marcello: The Republicans again were . . . this was purely partisan politics on their part for the most . . .

Allred: No, I don't think you can say that entirely . . .

Marcello: I obviously didn't phrase that correctly. Normally, these Republicans would have voted with you on very few issues, is that correct?

Allred: I feel they would have, yes, although you quite often see in a situation such as the House of Representatives a coalition between the liberals and the Republicans simply because they are minority groups, and they stick together on some issues much as the blacks and Chicanos might work together.

In any event, the Republicans saw a beautiful campaign issue being formed, and naturally they acted to take advantage of it. Also, even though I am a fourth generation Democrat, at least a fourth generation Democrat, I'm sure the Republicans were abhorred by the possibilities that existed. I think there is a possibility of a violation of the bribery statute, this type of thing, and I am sure Republicans are as much for

clean government as Democrats are. This was a nonpartisan thing. But they also know a good issue when they see one, just as in the last election the Republicans used the issue of busing school children to a very great advantage. The Republican Party does something for its people that the Democratic Party does not. They have full-time policy people apparently who think up these things. In the 1969 session of the Legislature, Representative Bill Archer of Houston proposed a resolution that said that the Legislature should go on record as being opposed to forced busing of school children for racial integration. It was really more of a Republican-Democrat partisan issue than anything else because the Legislature has nothing to do with school busing--it's ordered through the federal government only--so the resolution was turned down. Then when the next election came, those representatives with Republican opponents found themselves suddenly charged with being in favor of forced busing. What actually happened was that the resolution was tabled, which has the effect of killing it. I later read that it was stated in the rules that it had the effect of killing it, but it's my understanding that if you put something on the table, you can take it off the table if you have enough votes. Representative Archer never attempted to take it off the table. He may have felt that it was so overwhelmingly defeated that he couldn't, but I think he was trying to create an issue, which he did. And it was used against me and several

others that we were for forced busing to achieve racial integration. Busing is unpopular with many, many people. The Republicans had people who were watching out for issues. And here was a tailor-made issue dropped in their laps.

In any event, the Republicans began to introduce resolutions urging an investigation, as did some Democrats. All of these were referred--as far as I recall--to the House Rules Committee headed by Representative James Nugent of Kerrville.

Marcello: Which committee was very unfriendly to any sort of investigation and so on, isn't this correct?

Allred: Extremely so. I felt that Mr. Nugent's position was a little incongruous. He is also the sponsor of the ethics bill in the House. I couldn't see how he could sponsor an ethics bill and still sit on an investigation, but he did. And that, of course, is something that Mr. Nugent will have to decide for himself. I lost a great deal of respect for Mr. Nugent in this session. I had thought of him as a very independent-minded man who voted his convictions and did his homework. I found that he posed this way--he was a good actor in my opinion--but whenever the administration needed him, he was always there. It also suddenly occurred to my befogged little brain that he wouldn't be chairman of Rules if the speaker didn't feel that he could depend on him. He also had a very sarcastic little tongue, and I was his target on several occasions. There is humor in which you laugh along with someone, and there is humor that is barbed and aimed,

and his was of the second variety. I, at least, lost a great deal of respect for Mr. Nugent in this session. I lost respect for several representatives and former representatives. But in any event, these resolutions and so forth were referred to the Rules Committee. Then Representative Neil Caldwell of Brazoria County, a man with a very rapier-like wit and very, very smart . . .

Marcello: He was referred to as the "Gadfly" of the House, was he not, in many cases?

Allred: I don't know--perhaps in some ways. Neil is an unusual person. In college he was an athlete; he ran track. He is small in stature; I would say he is maybe 5'5" or something. I understand that he was a good track man in college. He is a spelunker; he goes around and explores caves. He is very interested in such things as the treasure off Padre Island and in excavations, this sort of thing--a very intellectual young man. I would judge that he is an excellent lawyer. When he is seriously debating in the House, he can put things in such a way that you think, "By golly, I never thought about that, but he's right." He also uses his wit very well. You know, some of your best points can be made through wit, and his wit is the kind that you end up chuckling along with him, and yet you also end up seeing the point he is making. Sometimes he would just get on the microphone to make a humorous comment. He and Representative Jake Johnson of San Antonio and two or three others liked to get on the mike

and crack jokes. Caldwell's wit, I think, was probably the sharpest in the House--sharp in the sense of being funny and well-thought-out and so forth. In any event, Representative Caldwell introduced a resolution that invited the governor, Dr. Baum, Waggoner Carr, the speaker, Representative Shannon, Representative Heatly . . . and I guess that's about it . . . to speak.

Marcello: I think they were the ones.

Allred: Yes. They were invited to appear before a joint session and make a statement. The resolution was sent to the Rules Committee, along with the others, for study. It became evident after awhile that the committee was going to study them to death. Representative Tom Moore of Waco commented that in his opinion the people involved were overlooking a tremendous chance and that were he a defense counsel for one of them, he would advise his client to appear and make a statement.

Marcello: In other words, already I think it is quite evident that Mutscher and the rest of these people had made their initial mistake. Had he appointed some sort of an investigating committee right from the very beginning, do you think he could have probably saved himself a good deal of trouble?

Allred: Yes, he could have saved himself a great deal of trouble. It was pointed out by Felton West in one of his columns in The Houston Post that precedent was that when the speaker is accused of something, he steps down and says, "I'm lily-white.

Investigate me." You know, "Have at it." However, it was argued that the speaker was not really accused; he was simply mentioned in the suit. The SEC did not file suit on him. So far as I know, he has not been accused of anything in court or by a grand jury or anything like that, although there are at least two grand juries that I know looking into the case at the moment.

In any event, I think the speaker and the others hope to ride it out, to weather the storm, and to depend as much as possible on the very short memory that is attributed to the voters. They don't think very far back on something. There are too many things presently crowding in their minds. So by the time election rolls around almost two years later, at least a year-and-a-half later or something, the public might well have forgotten a good deal of this.

Whatever the case, Representative Moore felt that this was a chance for these men to make a statement which would not even be sworn and to put their side before the public.

Marcello: Is this Representative Moore or Representative . . .

Allred: Tom Moore . . .

Marcello: Right, not Caldwell, but . . .

Allred: Moore was commenting that were he the defense counsel, he would have advised his client to do this for this reason--to get the thing out. It became obvious after some days that Representative Caldwell's resolution was being studied and studied and studied. So he moved that the House instruct the

committee to report his resolution within seven days. As he phrased it, "The way it looks now, they are probably going to report on the resolution after the '72 Olympics," which, of course, would be well, well beyond, at least a year beyond, the closing of the regular session. In any event, the motion was voted down.

So we met in Representative Farenthold's office a day or so later, and I remember we were very apprehensive about what the speaker would do. At one point Representative Carl Parker of Jefferson County came into the room, and the talk turned much more general because Parker at that time was considered to be a pipeline to the speaker's office. His father later overheard me comment that my belief was that Parker was such a pipeline. Carl came around to my desk more than a little bit hurt because he likes to think of himself as a member of the group, most of whom are in the "Dirty Thirty." He was hurt that I would think that he was a pipeline to the speaker's office. I don't know whether he was or not. He voted with the "Dirty Thirty" a portion of the time, sometimes he didn't. I'm sure he had his reasons.

There had been much criticism already of the Jefferson County delegation because many people who are pretty liberal argued that these men who were from a labor area and should be liberal, voted "right" on some real gut labor issues and then voted with the administration the rest of the time to gain influence. The last night of the regular session,

Representative Charles Patterson of Taylor called Representative Parker a "jellyfish" to his face. Patterson was sitting a desk away from where Parker was standing--there were two desks together--and Parker leaned over the other desk, which was unoccupied at that moment, and said to Charles, "I may be a jellyfish, but do you know how many bills I got passed this session?" It seemed like he said it was sixty-five or something like that. He said, "I got those bills passed. What did you do?" or words to that effect. As I understood it, he meant that he got bills passed that helped people while purists who constantly opposed the administration didn't. But he was apparently quite stung by the feeling that people who were within this group that he was used to moving in didn't trust him.

I remember we were sitting in there talking, and somebody commented that they probably had the office bugged by now. And we looked up over the door . . . this had been part, I believe, of the attorney general's office at one time, before the attorney general moved over to the new courts building. One particular door was boarded up, but there was a piece of wire running from the transom down to the top of the door, and somebody said, "What's that wire for?" And Mrs. Farenthold said, "I don't know." So Representative Caldwell climbed up on a chair and jerked it down. As it turned out, it was apparently an old piece of phone cable. But we were feeling at that point that there was a good chance that we were being

bugged.

Marcello: Getting a little paranoid about this time?

Allred: Yes, we felt there could have been some electronic surveillance going on. I'm going strictly by memory, but I believe this meeting would be the early part of February of '71. In this meeting in Representative Farenthold's office, she proposed a resolution which, as I understand it, was, I believe, HSR 87 of the Sixty-second Legislature. It is my understanding that this was originally drawn up in the Senate and that they couldn't get a sponsor for it in the Senate or felt it should come from the House. Anyway, Mrs. Farenthold proposed a resolution. The gist of the resolution was that it called for the House and the Senate to dissolve themselves into committees of the whole, and each House would name five members of a special investigating committee, and the investigating committee would then look into how the two banking bills were passed so quickly in the last special session and related items.

Marcello: Do you remember those banking bills very well?

Allred: Not very well . . .

Marcello: Apparently, not too many legislators did.

Allred: No, Representative Charles Patterson, who has had a degree in finance, was on the committee that considered the bill, and he started asking questions about it. He and one other representative whose name escapes me at the moment voted against them, as did Senator William Patman of Ganado in

the Senate. Senator Patman has quite an interest in banking. His father, of course, is chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee in Washington in the House of Representatives, and he is kind of a watchdog on banking bills.

Marcello: Had you ever received any sort of advice on these bills from the banks in your area? Apparently, the banking lobby is fairly careful in Austin, is it not, and keeps up with all these things?

Allred: Well, whether or not it keeps up is something else. The banking lobby is a powerful lobby, but whether they could keep up with this particular bill or not is something I don't know because these two bills were whisked through the special session in rapid-fire order. Charles Patterson told us later that when they came up in committee that he got to a phone and called Sam Kimberlin--it's Sam O. Kimberlin, Jr.--who is the executive vice-president or the general counsel or something like that of the Texas Bankers Association and a cousin of mine. He asked Sammy about it, and Sammy said he didn't know anything about the bills at all. And armed with this, Patterson went back to vote against the way things were being carried on. But at that point at least, as near as I can ascertain, the bankers didn't even know about the bills.

I remember that the bills were presented as bills that would extend the insurance coverage available to Texas banks. The way I understood it was that if a bank had more on deposit by a single depositor than the \$20,000 limit sponsored by

the F.D.I.C., the bank then couldn't make a private contract with a private insurer to cover what was beyond the F.D.I.C. coverage. The F.D.I.C. coverage right now is \$20,000, and if you had \$30,000 in there, you might want private insurance for the extra \$10,000.

It was later alleged in the Sixty-second Legislature that what was really happening was that the bank examiners from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation were giving Frank Sharp a real problem by telling him that some of the loans he had made were not the shrewdest thing he had ever done and that they were going to have to close him down or make him do some changes--something along this order. The allegation was that this bill was designed to get Sharp's bank out from under the F.D.I.C. examiners and thereby allow Frank Sharp to continue his wheeling and dealing, if, indeed, that is what he was doing.

But as I recall, I voted for the bills because it made sense to me that if somebody happened to have by some miracle more than \$20,000, they could keep it in that same bank and simply have the bank purchase additional insurance. I think I understood it that the bank was going to purchase the additional insurance. Whatever the case, the bills passed through the House. I am told they passed the Senate in less than four hours and went on to the governor. And as you recall from the newspaper headlines, former Governor Allan Shivers contends that he called Governor Smith and urged him to veto

the two bills. Whatever the case, Smith had opened the special session call to include them, and he now vetoed both the bills. Otherwise, they would have passed and become law, and Frank Sharp might have made it through. I don't know. But they didn't become law.

Mrs. Farenthold's resolution called for an investigation of how the bills passed each House and also things related to it, which, I am sure, would have taken in the so-called stock scandals as well. We were talking it over in her office, and it was generally acknowledged that if we simply dropped the resolution in . . . if we simply let it go to committee, it would be studied to death like the others. And Representative Curtis Graves of Houston spoke up and said, "Look, we want to call attention to this particular subject." Public opinion was already being acknowledged as our strongest weapon because we were virtually weaponless within the House system. And public opinion was really the only appeal that we had.

Marcello: Most of the members of the "Dirty Thirty" had minor committee positions. Is that a good way of putting it? You didn't have too many influential . . .

Allred: No big chairmanships or anything that I know of, outside of Representative Tom Bass of Houston. Representative Bill Blythe of Houston was on the Redistricting Committee and later told the House that he had been to all the meetings and had never yet seen the committee sit down and put pencil to paper. He

felt the redistricting was drawn up by Delwin Jones and the speaker.

Anyhow, Graves suggested that Mrs. Farenthold announce on the public address system at a meeting of the House that she had this resolution on her desk and that it was open for signatures. I think they got a few more. But Curtis Graves' feeling was that by doing this, Mrs. Farenthold got a double ride. She captured the headlines on the day that she announced the resolution was available for signature, and she held them until the day that it became like any other resolution.

So this is what she did. She announced she had the resolution sitting on her desk, and it was ready for anyone who wanted to sign as co-sponsor of the resolution. Eighty-five, I think it was, signed the thing; it was some goodly number. No, it couldn't have been that many. But anyway, some signed as co-sponsor, including myself. Still nothing happened. I think I'm getting lost here.

Marcello: Somewhere along the way--and I don't understand this; this is a parliamentary maneuver, and you probably know more about it than I--wasn't it decided that this was a privileged motion?

Allred: Yes, that's where I was. I've only had about four hours sleep, and I'm sorry. I'm getting a little fuzzy. In any event, Representative Farenthold and some of the others talked it over, and it was felt that if we simply introduced it that it go the way of the others--probably to Representative Nugent's Rules Committee to be studied forever and ever. Therefore, a

Therefore, a search was made of the rules.

Now the man who made this search, and who was of great use to the "Dirty Thirty," was a man named Terry O'Roarke. Terry was a law student and was on the staff of Senator Oscar Mauzy of Dallas, but he helped Mrs. Farenthold in the House, also--though not on her staff as far as I know. I remember at one point during the floor maneuver on Mrs. Farenthold's resolution, we kept going back to the back. The staff members had to stay behind the brass rail, which is set out about six or seven feet from the wall and surrounds the seats of the members. It became quite obvious that Terry O'Roarke was one of the generals who was helping call the shots. He had done the research on the House rules and so forth, in fact, had read more of them than most of us had, and he knew what to do in a given case. I remember somebody coming up and saying, "Hey, who is that guy back there?" And I said, "He is a member of Mrs. Farenthold's staff." I found out later that he was a member of Senator Mauzy's staff, and I don't know whether technically he would have been admitted to the floor or not as such. But at that point the members chose not to challenge him, and he continued his generalship. But it was felt that the only way that we could have the resolution brought up for a vote was for Mrs. Farenthold to move that her resolution was privileged, which means that it should be considered prior to anything else. It should be taken up immediately by the House.

Speaker Mutscher ruled that the resolution was not privileged

as we had anticipated. Now there is in the House Rules a provision that says that any ten members can in writing, as I understand it, challenge a ruling of the chair. And when that happens the speaker has to vacate the chair and allow someone else to take over, and then the motion is placed, "Shall he be sustained." We anticipated that the speaker would overrule Mrs. Farenthold's motion, and a number of us, myself and Representative Reed and Representative R.C. Nichols of Houston and probably Representative Rex Braun of Houston and others, had signed. We had ten or eleven names, including a number of the Republicans. I think this is probably really where the Republicans joined the "Dirty Thirty."

Marcello: I was going to ask you when they did get in there.

Allred: This is my feeling. It was probably right along in here. I don't believe there were any Republicans that signed the letter pledging financial disclosure. So this is probably where the Republicans came in as part of the "Dirty Thirty" movement. Representative Will Lee of Houston signed as one of those who was protesting and then later voted to uphold the ruling of the chair and then later commented that he didn't understand this particular maneuver. I don't know if he had it to do over again whether he would vote with us or against it.

But be that as it may, we were waiting with the list. Representative Lane Denton of Waco was standing at the back microphone when Mrs. Farenthold introduced her resolution

and moved it was privileged. The speaker overruled her. Denton was the first to speak up in the planning session and volunteer to vocalize the challenge. We anticipated Mutscher would overrule the privilege motion. I was standing in back with Lane, and he looked over and said, "Should I go now?" And I said, "Go," to reassure him this was the right time. And he said, "Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the chair." The speaker said, "Is it seconded?" or something to that effect because this is the same thing as some other . . . like, previous questions must be seconded. A motion for a previous question must be seconded, I think, by twenty-five members of the House, something like that. Denton, then standing at the back microphone, which is known in the slang as the "snortin' pole," held up the list of names and said, "Mr. Speaker, I have here a list of names of those members who challenge this ruling of the chair," and brought it down to the speaker's desk.

The speaker and Bob Johnson conferred briefly. Bob Johnson is a former member of the House from Dallas and is now the parliamentarian of the House and also runs the Texas Legislative Council, which helps members draw up bills and this sort of thing, along with a man named Mr. Wilmot, who served as his right-hand man when it comes to legislation and having bills drawn up and so forth. At the Legislative Council, if you see Mr. Wilmot, it's the same as seeing Bob Johnson in effect. In any event, Bob is the parliamentarian,

and it was his job to advise the speaker on the rules of the House. It may well be that the speaker did not need the advice. I don't remember, but I think he talked to Bob a minute.

In any event, he stepped down from the chair after summoning Representative DeWitt Hale of Corpus Christi. DeWitt Hale has been in the Legislature since the '30's. He told me one time that during his first session in the Legislature, my father was still governor, so it would have been before 1939. He laid out a few terms, but he has always been reelected since. Mutscher called Hale to the chair. Hale is an expert on the rules. He helps to redraw them each time. The rules are redrawn every two years.

Hale assumed the chair, and the question was put to the members of the House: "Shall the ruling of the chair be sustained?" There were thirty of us who voted not to sustain the ruling of the chair, that Sissy's motion was privileged and that therefore the House should take it up immediately.

This is where the name "Dirty Thirty" came from. Now Bill Bass says that a friend of his gave him the title and that it was used for this group that I mentioned earlier that met just to discuss really. I don't know whether I heard it there or where, but I remember chuckling with somebody, knowing there were thirty votes and commenting, "Well, there's the 'Dirty Thirty'" or something like that. But I don't believe it was original with me.

In any event, Speaker Mutscher came back in and made a little speech to the effect that he appreciated being vindicated and all this sort of thing and then went on with the session. All this time, however, public opinion was growing.

Marcello: That was voted down pretty decisively, was it not? It was 118-30.

Allred: There were only thirty members who voted for it. This was then the "Dirty Thirty"--probably its first official act outside of this letter advising people to report their finances.

Marcello: And obviously this "Thirty" was a rather nebulous term, was it not?

Allred: Oh, yes.

Marcello: There were not always thirty people in this group who were opposing the speaker or . . .

Allred: No. Sometimes it went up into fifty or so. I think once or twice it may have gotten up to eighty-three or eighty-four toward the end of the session as the speaker's popularity waned.

Marcello: How many would you say were really hard-core members of this group? How many could you at least count on every time?

Allred: Probably twenty.

Marcello: Around twenty.

Allred: I would guess about that many that were really dependable every time.

Marcello: I would assume that you would include yourself among these

twenty.

Allred: They ran a survey of members' voting records and published it in the Legislature. And my voting record was such that out of nineteen votes, eighteen votes of mine were "right" votes, and one was a "wrong" vote according to the "Dirty Thirty's" own voting analysis of whether or not a person voted for or against reform. And there was one . . . I forget what it was, or why I voted against it. I think it was because I felt it was unworkable--a proposal this man was making. Whatever, I voted against one that they felt was a reform vote. There were many times when the people would vote with us or vote against us. Sometimes it would be the same people who would vote with you one time and not so much with you the next.

But when it was decided that the speaker's ruling would be upheld, we began to do what we could to get the press to arouse public opinion. Really, the press was our most powerful ally because it was only through public opinion that we were able to exert any pressure at all. And the more that we did . . . there were some people who thought, "Oh, no, not again," and who felt that we were simply making pests of ourselves.

Representative Nugent at one point accused us of doing it for our own personal glorification, and he and I had a brief hot exchange. I got to the back mike and said, "Mr. Speaker, point of order. If the gentleman feels that we are

doing this for our own personal glorification, I think he should think again." I wish I had phrased it a little differently because I gave him the opening, and he responded, "I have thought again, and I am still of the same opinion," or words to that effect. Mr. Nugent is a very good trial lawyer and very good at thinking on his feet, and, as I say, he has a very sarcastic thrust which was well-used in this case and in a few other things during debate.

At one point he was making some statements to which I objected, and I would raise a point of order, and he would keep on making statements. And then I wanted to ask him some questions to point out different things in his comments and try to point out where I felt he was incorrect. The proper procedure for this is to inquire of the speaker, "Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?" And to do this, you have to interrupt the man who is speaking. And Mr. Nugent said, "No." He would not yield the first time I asked. And the next time I asked, I was afraid that he would complete his remarks and leave the microphone, surrender the floor in effect, before I could ask my question. So a little later I asked again if the gentleman would yield, and he became extremely sarcastic and said something to the effect that "If you don't mind, let me finish my remarks. Can you understand that?" you know, as though he were speaking to an absolute imbecile. I recognized this, and I hope other members of the House recognized this, as oratorical tactics.

You attempt to tear down your opponent's case any way you can; sarcasm is a very good way to tear down an opponent's case. I wish I had had enough gumption to say something like, "We understand that people with a weak case have to resort to sarcasm, Mr. Nugent." I'm very good at thinking of things later that I should have said at the time, but I did not say it. This was during the debate, I believe, on whether or not the speaker should be sustained. His ruling was sustained, and we went on about the business of the House, but pressure was growing from the public. The public wanted something done.

Marcello: All of these resolutions were bottled up in the Rules Committee, isn't that correct?

Allred: Yes, all in the Rules Committee.

Marcello: Including Mrs. Farenthold's?

Allred: Yes. As far as I know, they were all in the Rules Committee. The press then began to ask Representative Nugent, "When are you going to hold a hearing?" I'm pretty sure he argued against adoption of Representative Caldwell's attempt to have his resolution reported out of committee.

Marcello: I'm almost positive that this is true. Incidentally, the chairman of that subcommittee, Mr. McAlister . . . is that his name?

Allred: Yes, R.B. McAlister of Lubbock.

Marcello: He apparently made this statement with regard to the Caldwell resolution. I'm quoting him now from the Dallas Morning News.

"We have better things to do than go around putting a microscope on House members." Would you say that is a typical comment that he perhaps might give in this case?

Allred: I don't know because I later talked to Mr. McAlister--I believe it was at a press conference--and he seemed much more a man on the spot. I don't think McAlister enjoyed his position. I don't think Nugent did either, but Nugent was tough and a good enough trial lawyer to where he was better able to handle these things.

So we went on trying as best we could. Nugent was under much pressure from the press saying, "When are you going to hold a hearing on these things?" And there were different actions by individual members of the "Dirty Thirty." People who were taking the most initiative at this point were Mrs. Frances Farenthold of Corpus Christi and Representative Dick Reed of Dallas. Representative Reed at one point even introduced a resolution calling for the impeachment of the speaker, Representative Shannon, Representative Heatly, and perhaps for the governor. I've forgotten. It, too, was referred to committee for study and never heard from again.

Marcello: I think he said expulsion was the only legal way for the House to enforce whatever existing code of ethics there was, or something like that.

Allred: Representative Ed Harris of Galveston and I discussed impeachment of the governor at one point. We discussed introduction of the bill of impeachment, and we decided that we didn't have

a strong enough case and that we would probably be turned down, and for this reason we decided not to do it. But we did discuss it. We even went so far as to look up the law and some of the precedent and this sort of thing--primarily at Ed Harris' urging. Ed Harris is a smart lawyer from Galveston, and, I think, a very conscientious member of the House.

But in any event, for some reason there was a press conference called by some of the members of the "Dirty Thirty." I think it was to announce whether anybody else had signed our letter for financial disclosure. Well, whatever the case, one of these conferences was attended by Representative Nugent, who commented to the "Thirty" that . . . or to the people who were holding the conference--not all thirty of them participated--that the speaker and no one else, none of these other people, had really been accused of anything. I felt that it was politically unwise for him, as I commented to Representative Head later. Nugent married the speaker in public as far as I was concerned, and I did not think it was politically wise. I've forgotten exactly what his point was, but I felt the way in which he presented it was rather intemperate.

At one of these press conferences, Mr. McAlister was a spectator. The initial statement was made, whatever it was, and then things were thrown open for question. The press asked several questions, and then McAlister said, "May I ask

a question?" We said, "By all means, go ahead." He began to ask about, or to express what was in effect, a defense of the Rules Committee and the reason that they had not held the hearings yet. He seemed to me to be a little more apologetic at that point. As I say, I don't think he relished his role, but he felt that for his own political benefit--and I don't mean necessarily for his own personal benefit, but in order to get his own legislative program through--he should stick pretty much with the speaker. He admitted at one point that they had some microfilm, I believe it was, of the documents that had been filed up to that point in the SEC case that had been brought to the Legislative Library. I think the question was whether or not the resolutions would be studied to death, and he said, "We are studying them; we are looking into them; we've got this microfilm in here." I said, "Well, that's very interesting, Mr. McAlister. This is the first that I, or any of these members that I know of, knew that we had this microfilm here." I don't know whether McAlister really, deep down, didn't feel that perhaps an investigation would be a good thing. I got the feeling, but it is simply a feeling that I could have easily have misinterpreted, that he really did not relish the role in which he was cast.

Marcello: What was Representative Heatly doing all this time?

Allred: Representative Heatly was being like Brer Rabbit in Uncle Remus' story of the tar baby. If you will remember in the famous Joel Chandler Harris story, probably one of the most

famous of Joel Chandler Harris' Uncle Remus tales, Brer Rabbit has a tar baby. The tar baby is seated by the road. Brer Rabbit is in the briar patch waiting to observe, I think, how Brer Fox will react to the tar baby. Brer Fox comes along and engages the tar baby in conversation. Tar Baby doesn't say anything, and Brer Fox becomes mad and hits him and gets his paw stuck. But all the way through, every few lines, Uncle Remus says, "Brer Rabbit, he lay low," and that's exactly what happened. "Brer Heatly, he lay low."

I had the feeling increasingly through the session that Representative Heatly was letting Speaker Mutscher take the heat, and it was his considered opinion, and, I think, a very wise one politically, that all you did when you got in a running fight like that was simply prolong the fight, and it was better to ignore it and go on. I've seen the tactic used successfully in other political fights but never one that had the pressure on it that this one did. And, of course, Mutscher was much more out in the forefront.

I think the press left Heatly pretty much alone. Heatly is a rather gruff individual when he wants to be, and the result was that Mutscher made better copy; I think Mutscher opened his mouth more. I don't think Mutscher frankly is as shrewd an individual as Mr. Heatly. And Shannon again was sort of like Heatly. The speaker was taking most of the pressure, so much so that the speaker eventually felt that

he had to make a public statement.

Marcello: Which he did later on.

Allred: Yes.

Marcello: Well, anyhow, here all these resolutions are in the Rules Committee. Eventually, they were moved out of the Rules Committee, is that correct? Or what exactly . . .

Allred: They were taken out of the Rules Committee. Now I'm not sure whether this was before or after the speaker made his statement where he bared his chest in effect.

Marcello: I'm almost positive that it was after . . .

Allred: I think it was. I think the speaker finally said, "Okay, I'm going to make a big statement."

Marcello: In the meantime, the public pressure is building up . . .

Allred: . . . building and building.

Marcello: Newspaper pressure is building up. Something has got to be done about it.

Allred: Well, public pressure as well. I didn't receive too many letters on this particular issue, and any that I did receive were along the lines of, "Thank God, you are down there. Give 'em hell!" Apparently, some of the members were receiving a great deal of mail--highly critical of this situation. In the eyes of the public, Speaker Mutscher and Governor Smith had long since been convicted whether they are actually guilty or not. Both of them probably are through . . . I don't want to call it stupidity, but they are guilty of not too swift thinking. Some say the guy who engineered the whole thing

is John Osorio, who is an attorney in Austin and a lobbyist and a very close friend of Dr. Baum. I don't know for sure.

Marcello: One of Carr's partners, too, is he not?

Allred: One of Carr's former partners in law. I don't think they are now law partners, but they were. He is also a very close neighbor of Dr. Elmer Baum. My guess is--it's strictly a guess--that one night John Osorio got Elmer Baum aside, and they were having cocktails on the back porch, you know, sitting around watching the fireflies or something, and he said, "Say, Elmer, there are a couple of bills that we would like to have included in the special session if you can get Preston to put them in. They are just a couple of little ol' banking bills." And Baum, anxious to do a favor for his neighbor and for a man who has supported the Democratic ticket, probably went to Smith and said, "Listen, Preston, John Osorio has a couple of bills that he would like to have included in the call."

I doubt seriously that either Baum or Smith explored them at any great length at that point. They were included in the call. They were carried, I think, in the House by Representative Tommy Shannon, and I believe Senator Jack Strong carried them in the Senate. I noticed in today's paper where Strong said he did so at the request of John Osorio. My guess is then that the bills were pushed through as quickly as possible. Most members want to pass bills as quickly as possible--but these apparently had help from

some persons who could help the bills move. And it is my understanding that about the last day in which the governor could have vetoed the bill, somebody called former Governor Allan Shivers and put a bug in his ear about what the bills really would do. And he called Smith, and after some talking, he persuaded Smith to veto the bills even though he had opened the call for them. And I think Smith did this. He probably put them in the call because John Osorio asked him to; perhaps Frank Sharp's name was used, I don't know. But I don't think he felt so obligated that he couldn't veto it, and he did veto it. But this is my own sheer speculation. I don't know.

Marcello: Now you were speaking of your own financial status just a little while ago. Suppose somebody came up to you with a stock tip and, in addition to offering you the stock tip, offered to loan you \$200,000 or \$150,000 at no collateral in order to buy this stock. Would you perhaps be a little bit suspicious of that person's motives, you being in politics?

Allred: I would. I think that those who participated in these deals should have been very suspicious of the motives involved. It's not a new thing. My father told me some years ago that when he was in office, the oil companies came to him and said, "We are going to drill on Mr. Jones' land out here, and he doesn't know it. And you can acquire the land at a very low price and hold it a few months, and we will buy it from you at a higher price."

Marcello: All right, like stock tips, I mean, there is absolutely nothing wrong with somebody giving you a stock tip or something.

Allred: That is inside information. The oil companies were contending their tips were not a bribe. It was simply a legitimate business deal. I am proud to say that my father turned them down. He came out of office in 1939 \$15,000 in debt, and that is in 1939 dollars. In answer to your question, I would be very suspicious.

I think Bill Heatly and Gus and Tommy Shannon knew that they were not being made these large loans because Frank Sharp liked the way they cut their hair. They were being made these large loans because of the positions they held in the House. Gus and I later had a discussion about this. I think Gus really probably didn't think too much about it at the time. I have heard of some people's opinions that if they were in Gus' shoes, they would have done the same thing and it was just too bad he got caught. But I don't think I would have done it. I would not have really felt right about it.

This leads to something else. People have been saying, "You sure were brave to be in the 'Dirty Thirty,' and stand up to the speaker when he has all that power." I didn't think of it as bravery. I'm not really a brave person per se. It's simply that I didn't feel that I could take any other stand. I couldn't vote any other way. I just didn't see any other route to go, and it wasn't any great bravery on

my part that caused this to happen. Also, in all honesty, most of us in the "Dirty Thirty" hadn't been on Mutscher's "team," and so our legislative programs weren't going much of anywhere. But I like to think I'd have taken the same stand regardless.

The pressure became so great that the speaker finally put the word out that he was going to make a speech and tell all. He got up and told basically what he had said before--that he was innocent, that he really had lost money. As I understand it, the speaker bought some stock with a loan from Frank Sharp's bank, Sharpstown State Bank, and made a very handsome profit, as did his father.

Marcello: Then he got a little greedy, I think, did he not?

Allred: That is my feeling. He got greedy and went back and bought some more. I think Gus really felt that this was a good investment. I'm told that he was advised to sell and turned them down and said, "No, this is a growing company." He didn't sell. But to me this only proves that Gus was not in on the kiting of the prices, if there was indeed kiting of the prices, and apparently there was. This does not, in my book, excuse him from accepting a loan when he could pretty well figure that the only reason he was getting a loan was because he was speaker of the House, and the man making him the loan was seeking influence.

Whether it was a direct bribe, I don't know. Perhaps Frank Sharp said, "If you will get those bills passed, I

will do this, or I'll put you next to a good deal." I doubt seriously that it was that sort of a deal. Men like Frank Sharp operate by being friendly to power. Then when they walk into the banking board offices, the people in the banking board know that this is not just another Houston banker: "This is Frank Sharp, the governor's friend, and Frank Sharp, the friend of Speaker Mutscher." These people bask in this reflective glory.

Marcello: I was going to say that there are people who revel in this sort of thing.

Allred: Well, it's more than revel. It's a very real sort of power because you don't have to run for office, but still the agencies are apt to think twice before they cross you because they know that all you have to do is pick up the phone and call your friend Gus or your friend Preston, who does have some power over them. Guys like Frank Sharp operate this way, and I doubt seriously that it was exactly "you do this for me, and I'll do that for you," sort of a deal. The timing isn't there, but it could be. I think there is enough so some of the grand juries are looking in now to see whether there is a violation of the bribery statute. As far as the speaker is concerned, I think there may not be. It may be because I have a personal dislike for the way Representative Heatly uses his power, but I feel that he very much engineered a good deal of this thing. I have nothing to prove it. It is only my own hunch, and I could easily be wrong.

Marcello: What do you base your hunch upon? Do you think that Heatly

is a little bit smarter than the others?

Allred: Yes. Heatly is a very shrewd individual. He is in my book a very ruthless individual who uses his power. I think Heatly is of the school that holds that power is to be gained and used. I'll give some examples later of how his power was used on me.

In any event, I think Heatly was the brains behind the thing, and it's just my own hunch--I could easily be wrong. I frankly think Gus Mutscher was stupid. Of course, it's easy to judge another man stupid, and Mutscher is not unintelligent in some ways. But I don't think he could have put something like this together. I doubt seriously that his aides could--Schulte and McGinty. Tommy Shannon just went pretty much where Mutscher led him. Tommy has a great personal friendship for Gus Mutscher. I have also caught Tommy in a couple lies, so I don't know that he is above, a little bit, this type of thing. But I think they all look on it as one of the natural spoils that fell to them because of their offices.

I say I caught Tommy in some lies. During my campaign with Phil Grace of Wichita Falls, who is the Republican nominee for the House of Representatives, I spoke at a rally on the East Side, a very sparsely attended rally. I started not to say anything about it, but I had been making a stock speech for some time to different people in the area, telling them about the pressure that had been put on

me the last time to vote for the grocery tax. Here I was on the East Side, which is the Negro section of Wichita Falls, and these were people who would have been particularly hit by the grocery tax. I felt they needed to know that their representative had stood up against pressure. So I told them that Mutscher sent a message back to me through Representative Joe Ratcliff of Dallas, whom I was supporting for speaker to succeed Mutscher, and I believe that's why he was chosen. I don't believe Joe was lying to me. He came back and said that the speaker had asked him to tell me that if I didn't get in line on the grocery tax that they could cut the appropriations at Midwestern University. I didn't get in line, and the appropriations were not cut. But the fact that the threat was made, that the pressure was there, I thought the people ought to know this, so I said something about it. A few days later, Tommy Shannon called me on the telephone while I was at work at the newspaper in Wichita Falls and wanted to know why I had said such a thing about the speaker. My reply to Joe Ratcliff was, "You tell the speaker if he does that, I'm going to eat his lunch in public." I don't know whether Joe ever relayed that to the speaker or not, but I was pretty mad (chuckle). In any event, Tommy Shannon called me and said, "Why did you say that?" And I said, "Because it's true, Tommy." "No-o-o-o," he said, "the speaker has been opposed to those bills from the start." I knew this to be a flat-out lie. Or the speaker told Tommy that,

and Tommy accepted it without question. So as I say, this and something else which slips my mind at the moment are instances where I found that what Shannon said and the truth were at odds pretty well convinced me that Shannon could not be trusted.

Marcello: Well, how did Mutscher then finally get around to appointing that special five-man investigating body?

Allred: Well, first--and I started on this a couple of times and have gotten sidetracked--Mutscher made his famous speech baring his soul, which we didn't feel really said a whole lot.

Marcello: He didn't say anything new . . .

Allred: We said to the newspapers that we didn't feel that Mutscher had said anything new. I said, "I think there are still some very serious questions to be answered, such as, were those bills passed because of this." I've forgotten exactly what points I raised because I don't remember exactly what he said in his speech. Representative "Gib" Lewis of Fort Worth was seated nearby. We were back in the northeast corner of the House, standing by the rail there, and "Gib" was seated a few seats away. We were telling the press why we felt that the speaker really hadn't said anything new in his speech. And "Gib" said, "You know, if you guys had Gus Mutscher nailed to a cross at the front of this House, you'd complain about the size of the nails." I considered this a display of bad temper on Mr. Lewis' part and did nothing about it except make sure that his hometown newspaper, the

Fort Worth Star Telegram, knew about it and quoted him.

I let the voters take it from there. He may be reelected. He probably will be because the voters don't seem to care that much. I just felt that it was a very poorly-timed remark.

But in any event, Mutscher made his famous speech. We jumped him on that; the pressure increased. Finally, Representative Nugent announced that there would be hearings on the various bills. The hearings were held in a very small hearing room.

Marcello: Was this done deliberately?

Allred: I think so, but I don't know. We were trying to line up as much support for Representative Farenthold's resolution as we could, and they knew it. I think that they could just naturally assume that we would do this. It was held in a small room on the third floor, just off the northwest corner of the gallery. I forgot what the room number is--346 or something like that. I'm not sure of the room number, but it's a very small room.

The Rules Committee convened, and the room was jammed--there were any number of resolutions to be considered and several witnesses--and then there were the curious, the spectators, the press, and so forth. Nugent announced at the start that he was not going to have any outbursts and that they were going to conduct this hearing, and they were going to have decorum. He did his best to maintain this. I thought

sometimes he was unduly harsh, but my judgment was probably given to be prejudiced at this point.

In any event, he took a series of these . . . a number of them were the Republican resolutions, and some of them had people who appeared and who testified to the effect that the people were concerned about this and did feel that there was a need for an investigation. We had some telegrams. I had gotten a telegram from my mother and called some of my friends in Wichita Falls and asked them to round up telegrams. Out of my own pocket, I paid the airfare for my county chairman, Professor A.F. Edwards, who is a retired chairman of the Government Department at Midwestern University, and is now a Democratic Executive Committee chairman in Wichita Falls. "Prof" has retired on a teacher's salary, doesn't have much money, so I put it on my credit card and flew him down to Austin to testify in our behalf. We had a bunch of people sending us telegrams. In addition, I contacted Dally Willis, who is probably the most effective lobbyist the AFL-CIO has; he represents the Communications Workers of America. Dally is from Midland or Odessa . . . Midland, I believe. But he spends some time in Austin during the session. I contacted Dally and told him we needed some telegrams, and they started coming in from El Paso to Houston. We had forty-some-odd telegrams by the next morning to turn over to the Rules Committee. We xeroxed all of them and gave them to the Rules Committee to be read. Then Sissy Farenthold and I took the

ones from our districts to respond to by letter, to thank people for sending them in.

So they had several of these resolutions that were heard, and finally it came time for Sissy's resolution to be heard. A packet of xeroxed material had been prepared, including copies of the banking bills and other things that would support her arguments. We presented the telegrams that we had and some of our witnesses, such as "Prof" Edwards and others who argued that this should be done and that it should be done this way.

Then they heard a resolution by Representative Carl Parker of Jefferson County that said that certain agencies such as the Insurance Board, I think the comptroller's office, the attorney general's office, the Securities Commission, and some others, and certain individuals, including, I believe, the executive secretary of certified public accountants, and others, or some organization similar to this, should tell whatever they knew, should come forth with any information they had that showed any violations of the law. Parker had argued for this in the meetings of the "Dirty Thirty" that he attended . . . he didn't attend too often, I think, because he was not informed of them. As I say, we still considered him to be the speaker's man. He was a committee chairman and cooperated in many ways with the administration. I think in his own mind he justified it by saying that he was doing it to get his bills passed and that the bills were

for the good of the workingman. I don't know that I can entirely argue with this thinking. I can see, in a way, how a man would feel this way and would feel in good conscience that he was representing his district and doing the right thing. But feelings were running high at this point, and Parker was arguing that nobody really had accused Mutscher, et al, of anything. He was saying, "What do you really know? You don't really know a lot about this thing, and it's easy to jump to conclusions."

By the next day, when the resolutions were reported out and were going to come up for a vote, it had been brought out that one of the men mentioned in Representative Parker's resolution as one who should be turning over information, who should be forming the group rather to receive this information and collate it and so forth, was the guy who wrote the bills that were being questioned. I don't know whether Representative Parker knew this or not at the time he listed him, but it turned out that's who it was. We were all primed with a number of amendments for Representative Parker's resolution.

And out of the clear blue the speaker called up a resolution by Representative Don Cavness of Austin, Travis County, calling for the creation of a general investigating committee, the members of which are appointed by the speaker. It's a normal resolution. You usually have a general investigating committee created in any given session. Seldom

are members actually appointed, and seldom is the committee actually activated. But in this case, they caught us off-stride. The Cavness resolution was pushed through before we were really able to do much amending because we had all our movements drawn for the Parker resolution. That's the one we were aiming at and the one we thought they were going to bring out. They really did sneak a march on us there.

Then they did pass the Parker resolution with this particular man's name taken out as well, saying anybody that knows anything, ought to report it. We went on from there. Gus said that in a few days he was going to announce who the members of the committee would be. And he did eventually name a committee. Now most of these men are his very close friends.

Marcello: Menton Murray was the chairman of the committee, is that correct?

Allred: Yes, Menton Murray of Harlingen. Now Menton Murray, I consider to be a cut above the other members. I have known him. I have served on committees with him. He was chairman of Higher Education for two sessions while I served with him on it. I like the man personally. I think he is a good representative, as near as I've seen. I've never had him lie to me. I have felt that he really is working at representing his people. He would be more in agreement with Gus than I would. He is basically a more conservative person than I am. I think his philosophy would be more in agreement with Gus' philosophy.

Also, my wife and his wife are fairly close friends in

an unusual sort of a way. Mrs. Murray and my wife are members of the Legislative Wives Club, and my wife wrote the closing ceremony for the Sixty-first Session of the Legislative Wives Club, and Mrs. Murray bragged on it, and they've become . . . not close friends the way my wife and Marsha Head are close friends, where they swap babysitters and exchange confidences and this sort of thing. But they have a very high regard for each other. Mrs. Murray is a most gracious lady.

I really feel that Menton Murray is going to try to do something. Now I have disagreed with some of the ways he has gone about it, but I have enough feeling for the guy that I feel that he is really going to try to do something. For this reason, I have laid off criticizing him because it is much easier to criticize than it is to be out there trying to do something. I have felt that he has been unwise in his holding committee hearings in secret. I have felt the committee has not really done a lot yet, but I can see where this might be; they didn't want to do too much during the session and stir up things any more than they were. And I can see where a man might feel that this is a wise decision to take for one reason or another, either to get his own program through or simply to preserve the decorum of the House. I think Murray is the sort of a man who would have a very general feeling for the House and would not want to see the decorum disturbed too much. He is also an attorney.

Marcello: DeWitt Hale was another member of the committee, was he not?

Allred: Yes, I believe DeWitt Hale is. DeWitt Hale commented to me one night that we needed a man in times like these that had the integrity of my father. And my thought was, "Where were you, DeWitt, when we were voting on these things?" I like DeWitt Hale personally. I have been very disappointed, however, in his conduct and in his voting in this particular controversy.

Marcello: Do you think it is possibly because he is Chairman of the Judiciary Committee?

Allred: Yes.

Marcello: Would you consider him to be on the Mutscher team? Now, of course, he is a liberal. He votes for most of the liberal legislation, does he not?

Allred: Yes, he does. And he is very active in education. He is the Hale of Hale-Aikin, one of the groundwork bills of Texas education. I have always liked him--In fact, at one time, I was pledged to DeWitt as speaker. This was at the end of the sixtieth session. Along with Representatives John Hannah, Bill Bass, and a couple of others, I was talking to DeWitt one day in the chamber. I found out that he was thinking about running for speaker, and I felt he was a good man. I signed a pledge card to him. As the session progressed, and Representative Ratcliff began to move and DeWitt Hale didn't, and I heard that he had run for speaker before and really hadn't gone that far, I became more and more convinced that what DeWitt was doing was gathering a few cards and then swapping them off for a chairmanship. Now I may be doing the

man great wrong, but this was my feeling.

Marcello: He apparently also is still very much interested in some sort of a judgeship, is he not?

Allred: Yes. And I had heard that he was being considered for this, too. So I went to DeWitt and told him that I wanted my card back, that I felt that I wanted to go somewhere else. He commented that he didn't think that I would find Joe Ratcliff to be thinking along the same lines that we were, and I said, "Well, perhaps not, but that's the way I feel, and I want it back." And, so far as I know, DeWitt hasn't ever let it get in the way of being friendly to me. But I did take my pledge card back because I felt he was using me and, as I say, I could easily be doing the man a great wrong. But he didn't appear to be running very hard for speaker.

Marcello: We've talked about Mr. Nugent. Now Jim Slider was also a member of that committee. Would you care to comment on his selection?

Allred: I'd like to relate two incidents that I think point up Jim Slider. I served on the Insurance Committee when Jim Slider was chairman in the Sixty-first Session. Senator Hightower of Vernon, who is the senator from my district, passed a little old insurance bill that dealt with health insurance companies and said that they could no longer cancel a policy for no reason up to three years, and the term would be cut to two years in which they could cancel a policy for any reason they chose--I say for no reason, but for any reason they chose. After that the cancellation had to be because you had lied on your application or something like that.

I became the House sponsor of this little bill. And I went to Representative Slider--it was referred to the Insurance Committee--to ask for a hearing. And he said, "You go and talk to Sam Winters about that bill." Sam Winters is the chief insurance lobbyist. And I felt that I was being told that if Sam says okay, then we will have the hearing; otherwise, forget it. Jim did not say this to me. He simply said, "You go talk to Sam Winters about the bill." And then later in the Sixty-second Session, Slider commented, "I came here with my integrity, and I plan to leave with it," and I almost choked. I am not one of Mr. Slider's greatest admirers. Again, it's extremely difficult . . . I am quick to judge people, and I have to stop and recognize that people have other motivations that they consider just as valid as I do my own. But I felt Jim Slider was pretty close to the lobby.

Marcello: And then finally the fifth member of this committee was Clyde Haynes, I think.

Allred: Poor Clyde. Clyde Haynes is a nice guy. Clyde Haynes wants to go to Congress. I think he stuck with Mutscher because he thought he was going to get a congressional district cut out for him. And at the last minute, they cut his guts out.

Marcello: He and Wilson were competing for essentially the same district, weren't they?

Allred: I forget who got what. I don't know for sure who struck John, but what it amounts to is that poor Clyde got his guts cut out. And here he had played along all session and found that the

speaker's promises apparently weren't worth very much or the House was out-flanked in the Senate. Some of this is second-hand--the information that he wants a congressional seat and so forth. Apparently, the speaker felt here was a man he could use, too. And, of course, at that time he didn't know he was going to have to spread his guts later on. I don't know, but this may make Clyde feel that he can act with a little more independence in this investigation.

Marcello: Were there ever any attempts at all made to put any member of the "Dirty Thirty" on this committee?

Allred: Mrs. Farenthold's resolution would have called for the author of the resolution to be on the committee. What we were trying to do was split it up some way where you get something besides Mutscher's cronies. We talked about such things as dividing the House according to seniority. One of the suggestions was that if we divided it according to seniority and had them select from in there, there were some places where they would almost have to select somebody that was not necessarily a team man. I don't know that we were seeking "Dirty Thirty" members per se because I think we were realists enough to realize that we probably couldn't get that. In fact, one of the criticisms that was offered against Mrs. Farenthold's resolution was that she would be on the committee. Some said they didn't think she ought to be because she was so outspoken. And she said, "All right, I'm willing to amend it, to take that part out. I just want to get this committee, and let's get doing something,"

But when the resolution for the general investigating committee passed, I think everybody knew there was no hope for any member of the "Dirty Thirty" to be included, or at least at the outside a very slight hope. I don't know whether Gus even considered it. It might have been, you know, "throw them a bone," but on a small committee like that, one member can do a lot of hell-raising, and it may have been felt that you better take your old tried and true friends. Whatever, this committee was appointed, and I feel it didn't do a great deal through the rest of the session.

Marcello: Well, it wasn't even really charged to do anything until the session was over, isn't that correct? Was this called a general investigating committee?

Allred: Yes.

Marcello: How do they operate? Do they operate during the session, or can they operate during the session?

Allred: My only experience with it was in the Sixtieth Session when Representative Hale offered a resolution at the end of the session to create a general investigating committee in the interim. I requested membership on it in the innocent belief that there really would be one appointed and that they might look into something. And I thought that here was a chance perhaps to really find out something and do some good and so forth, but Ben Barnes never appointed the committee. The resolution was duly approved, and Hale could go home and say, if he wished, "I have sponsored the general investigating committee."

It never even came about. So that one was created, as I recall, to be an interim committee.

This one may very well be the same thing. I noticed in yesterday's paper that State Senator Oscar Mauzy of Dallas had written the general investigating committee also look into the activities of Representative Ace Pickens of Odessa. Ace, by the way, is his real name, it's not a nickname. Representative Pickens has apparently made a statement that he is going to represent the railroads in Washington. Senator Mauzy contends that this could be a conflict of interest, and he has asked the general investigating committee to look into it. So it really is set up to cover anything they wanted to cover.

There were attempts to amend the resolution to specify that they had to look in to the passage of those two bills. But these were beaten off with the reasoning that you shouldn't restrict the committee, that these were good men. And they very well may be good men. I'm going to wait and see on that. I'm just not great admirers of some of the ones that they have selected. So I don't know on that part. And that was pretty much the way that part of the "Dirty Thirty's" operation took place during the session.

Marcello: Essentially, it all centered around basically the stock-fraud scandal. That got it started? Many of these people, like you say, were outsiders, outsiders in the sense that they really didn't hold any real power in the House?

Allred: They weren't on the team and therefore held little power. But one of the difficulties with someone who is not on the team

has been in the past that he could not get anyone else to join him in any sort of an organization. This has been particularly true of the liberals who have been the dissident element in the House sometimes or the element that has been on the "outs" with the speakers. And one of the difficulties has been that when you try to put together a coalition of liberals, they flake, as the expression is in the House. On a given vote, you can't count on them to come through for one reason or another. This one or that one is going to go the other way. They're free thinkers and tend to go their own ways.

Marcello: And, also, I think, one of the smart things that the "Dirty Thirty" did apparently was that in addition to protesting against something, which liberals are very good at doing, they also, in addition, had an alternative program, did they not, that they did list certain other things that they were working for, such as changes in house rules and so on.

Allred: This came out later.

Marcello: Right. Yes, this was later on.

Allred: I think that we should point out here that really the "Dirty Thirty" is described as being a coalition of liberals and Republicans, and it was that primarily. I didn't appreciate the press doing this and even at one point asked the Associated Press to describe us as liberal-moderates. For example, I consider myself a moderate, although I am probably more liberal than conservative. But we have men in there like Charlie Patterson or Taylor, who I consider to be a man of great good

conscience. Charles is one of the two people who voted against the banking bills when they came up in committee. And Charles is anything but a liberal. He is a conservative in most things, and in his dress he wears suits with vests, a Homburg and this sort of thing. He is not the type of person that you would ordinarily call a liberal, and yet he was a member of the "Dirty Thirty." I think it was because he couldn't in good conscience go any other way. We had the Republicans there almost en masse.

Marcello: How many Republicans were there altogether?

Allred: Ten.

Marcello: Ten of them?

Allred: Yes. There was about twenty Democrats and ten Republicans that made up the "Dirty Thirty" as near as we could figure at the time we made up this list. That was before the voting records . . . around the end of the session. But it became after awhile a sort of a war between the "Dirty Thirty" and Mutscher's forces. And because the "Thirty" had more organization, we, I think, were much more effective than most people who argue against somethink like this. We would meet regularly on Wednesday afternoons at four o'clock in Representative Moore's office. Tom had a refrigerator there with cokes and different kinds of drinks. People would sit around and talk. He always had peanuts, and people would sit around and munch peanuts and drink cokes or beer or something like this and discuss what was going on--discuss what we were going to do next. Even the meeting to

decide whether or not we were going to walk--and we finally decided we couldn't get enough members to walk--was held in Tom Moore's office.

Marcello: Now were all thirty of you gathered in this office?

Allred: It varied.

Marcello: It varied? But the Republicans were invited, also?

Allred: Yes, Republicans as well as Democrats attended the sessions. You stayed as long as you could or as long as you wanted to. Sometimes the sessions ran until late in the evening; they started at four o'clock on Wednesday afternoon.

Marcello: What did a typical session talk about, or what was the general topics under discussion?

Allred: There were any number of topics taken up. We would discuss the current news, whatever was going on, what stands we ought to take. We would discuss different things that different people had in mind. For example, Dick Reed might say, "Look, I've got a resolution here, and I want to see what you all think about this?" And somebody else would say, "Well, what do you think about this?" And someone else would say, "Well, I wonder what we ought to do in case this happens?" And it was really just a general strategy session. There were no formal leaders of the "Dirty Thirty." I think the ones who really helped to plan a great deal of the strategy were initially Representative Farenthold and Representative Reed and Representative Moore--probably Farenthold and Moore more than any others. They were sort of the unofficial leaders of the "Thirty," and along toward the end

Representative Tom Bass of Houston became more and more active.

At times, it was just a flat-out open war between us and the speaker. And there were little things that happened. The "Dirty Thirty" became more and more famous, and some people suggested that the name should be changed to the "Ethics Minority" and things of this nature. But the "Dirty Thirty" was a catchy name, and people caught on with it. And many people, I think, still believe that Mutscher gave us the name when actually the name was adopted by the members themselves, not at any formal vote. We just sort of began calling each other the "Dirty Thirty." But it came from within our own ranks and not from the speaker's office.

Marcello: And no newspaperman.

Allred: No, it was done on the floor because many times when you have votes like this, you would comment, "Well, there's the Filthy Fifty," and, you know, whatever. And the "Dirty Thirty" just happened to catch. There were several times in different portions of the arguments on bills where it became a question of whether or not. . . you know, it was almost a pro-or anti-Mutscher thing. And there were several times when Mutscher would announce that he felt that he had been vindicated by a particular vote. I'm trying to think of an example of one. I think, for example, when they voted for the general investigating committee, Mutscher said, "Thanks a lot, fellows, and I'll sure name a fine committee."

Marcello: And also on the Caldwell resolution he considered that as vindication, did he not?

Allred: Yes. And many people were saying, "Mr. Speaker, don't take this as a personal thing, old friend." It's just that we felt on this particular issue that there were a great many people who still voting with the speaker because of his control over their bills. For example, the other man from Wichita County is Representative Vernon Stewart. A friend of mine who worked in my campaign wrote Vernon a real hot letter after the Farenthold resolution vote. He really chewed Vernon up one side and down the other for voting to sustain the speaker's rulings rather than voting with the "Thirty." And Stewart called him. My friend told me about this later. He said Stewart called him, and his argument was that I wouldn't get any bills passed, but that Stewart would and that he had a responsibility to his constituents to get these bills passed. I think there were many people who sincerely felt this way who were not necessarily voting pro-Mutscher so much as they were voting pro their own legislative program.

Toward the middle to the end of the session, a boy with whom I had worked on Senator Yarborough's staff, David Shapiro, who is now a lawyer in Houston, leaned over my desk--I sat by the back railing--and he leaned over my chair and whispered in my ear, and he said, "There are two ways to play politics. You can play politics down here and get your bills passed, or you can play politics back home." And he said, "I think the 'Thirty' is going to be finding that they are playing politics back home." Apparently he felt we were looking good back home, even

if we couldn't get any bills passed. When we got beat on a couple of bills, I commented to Mrs. Farenthold and some others, "We are losing in trial court, but we will win on appeal," meaning that the voters would vindicate us at election time.

Marcello: Sometimes the critics of the "Dirty Thirty" often accused individual members or perhaps even the whole group of demagoguery. Do you think this happened on occasion?

Allred: Yes. I think there were occasions when demagoguery was used on both sides. I think also that there was some who were looking at other offices, and the criticism was leveled, "Well, all he is doing is running for office."

Marcello: Do you think any of these criticisms were valid with regard to those seeking another office?

Allred: I don't know. I certainly was not unaware of the fact that my stance was being approved back home. I didn't know how widespread the approval, but I knew that there were many people who were saying, "Have at it and stay with them." I think probably others were the same way, but this is something where you really have to get into man's motives, and that's difficult to do. That's why I'm a little hesitant on my comments on the investigating committee because I can't go inside their heads, and I don't know what was their reasoning for doing the things they did. Perhaps I'm being unfair to them by even commenting on them. In any event, I remember there were a number of other deals that came up particularly right toward the end of the session when the "Dirty Thirty" began to gain. For example, the session was due to end on Monday night, 30th

of May, or something like that . . .

Marcello: Thirtieth of May. You are right.

Allred: And that Sunday the speaker called us into session to handle what is known as a Local and Uncontested Calendar. I didn't understand the strategy at the time, but Tom Bass and Fred Head and a couple of others recommended that we begin to object to Local and Uncontested Calendars.

Marcello: This is when he started to push through all those bills. Was this at that time?

Allred: What happened was that we had one Local and Uncontested Calendar just prior. We had several. Usually, when we get a Local and Uncontested Calendar, I would look over the summary of the bills--they list what they are with a little bit of explanation about them--and if I saw nothing to which I objected, quite often I would just let things ride. And many members, myself included, sometimes would not even be on the floor during much of the debate on these things because you just had three minutes each way--three minutes pro, three minutes con--and so forth. Often there was no debate.

They are supposed to be local and uncontested bills, but the Rules Committee, some of the members felt, was slipping bills on that calendar that were not so local or so uncontested. Mrs. Farenthold and Representative Patterson, I think, and a couple of others voted "no" on all these bills. And Mrs. Farenthold expressed their reason by saying, "We are passing practically a bill a minute. I don't think they have received

proper debate, and therefore I'm going to vote 'no' on these bills."

So on Sunday afternoon another Local and Uncontested Calendar came up. Representative Tom Bass took the back microphone. He had a list of five names that objected to the consideration of bills. Under the rules of the House, any five members can get together and knock a bill off the Local and Uncontested Calendar. The House can, I believe, by a majority vote move up the number required to knock it off of the calendar--up, I think, to 50 percent of the House membership, in other words, seventy-five members. And for some reason, for his own reasons--and I think it was probably because he thought he could discredit us more by not doing it--Speaker Mutscher chose never to have his forces make the motion to raise the ante.

So we ran through every bill on the Local and Uncontested Calendar, and it was three or four pages of one- or two-line entries on each one, double-spacing in between the entries. It was three or four legal-sized pages. We wanted debate on the bills. A bill would come up, and Representative Bass would say, "We object, Mr. Speaker." And we knocked off an entire Local and Uncontested Calendar.

Some of the members were extremely mad about it. Some of them got up and made little snide remarks. They are supposed to stand up and explain their bill, and then the objection would come next. Some would say something like "This bill is the next bill that is going to be knocked off the calendar." But we

knocked off the entire Local and Uncontested Calendar, and Mrs. Farenthold and Representative Moore explained to the press that the reason for it was that we felt there were some important bills on there. For example, the banking reform bills were on this Local and Uncontested Calendar, and they should be debated more freely than was allowed on this particular calendar. In addition, I think the "Thirty" was showing its muscle a little bit.

Marcello: By this time you were picking up quite a bit of strength?

Allred: Yes, somewhat. As the session ended, Mutscher's popularity was nose-diving. Also, as more and more bills passed, fewer members were under the speaker's power.

Marcello: You mean the redistricting fiasco had taken place and so on to a great extent.

Allred: And I think Mutscher, too, was being showed as more of a dictator than he may have liked to. He was going to go ahead and roughshod some of his things through. I felt very old at one point. Representative Silber of San Antonio and I were both trying to get to the microphone at the same time. And I was really there first in this particular case. Silber came up and tried to grab it. The speaker recognized Silber, perhaps because I had been on the mike quite a bit, and he thought I was probably trying to take it away from Silber. And I said, "Mr. Speaker, I was here first." He said, "I recognize Mr. Silber." And I said, "Sieg Heil, Mr. Speaker" with a great deal of sarcasm. And I'm told later--Bill Braecklein of Dallas told me--

that a young man seated near him looked around at him and said, "What does that mean?" And I felt terribly ancient because "Sieg Heil," of course, is out of World War II, twenty-five years ago.

Returning to the Local and Uncontested Calendar, after the entire calendar was knocked off, different members began to use their suspension. Under House rules each member is allowed to move for suspension of all necessary rules to take up and consider a particular bill. And these are very closely guarded because once you use your suspension, you don't have another one until everybody else in the House has used theirs. The speaker had the say on who gets to use a suspension, and he began to let certain of his favorites bring up the bills that we had knocked off on suspension. So we debated with them. Many of the bills passed. Some, I think, were turned down. So then we adjourned until Monday.

On Monday they brought the Local and Uncontested Calendar up again, and one of the first bills was carried by Representative Braecklein. It had to do with blood transfusions or something, really a bill that nobody would object to, but Representative Curtis Graves, who was a member of the "Dirty Thirty," had some questions about it. And by this time we had men taking turns at the back microphone asking questions about every bill that came through. We "hawked" the back microphone. That is, we watched like hawks, prepared to dive if necessary to question a bill. We had somebody back there most of the time. It was generally

myself or Representative Denton or, quite often, Representative Tom Bass, sometimes Representative Head. We were pretty much the ones, although some others did it, too. And we found before long other guys that weren't even in the "Dirty Thirty" were back there joining us on things. Representative Sam Coats of Dallas was not in the "Dirty Thirty," but he impressed me as a man of very good conscience and one who was really trying to be a good member. He would come back and help us ask questions simply to find out about these bills.

At this particular time, Representative Head was on the back microphone. Fred is a very blunt individual when he needs to be, and nothing much buffaloes him. Fred told me one time that Heatly had told him that he (Heatly) felt that the president of the junior college in Fred's district wouldn't like a certain vote Fred was about to cast. Fred said he had to say, "Mr. Heatly, you do what you think best, and I'll do what I think is best." He said Mr. Heatly had never bothered him since. In any event, Fred was on the back microphone. Curtis Graves asked some questions, and Braecklein tried to run over him. I'm sure Braecklein felt he had enough votes. Curtis, I think, had tried to recommend a minor amendment. Of course, an amendment is a dangerous thing on a bill on the last day because then you have to go back to the Senate for confirmation of that amendment, and sometimes it can get caught in a filibuster or something and die over there. So Braecklein just didn't go for Curtis' amendment at all. Fred Head very impassively said, "Mr. Speaker, you have five names

We object." And the speaker said, "The bill is off the calendar."

Fred and I and Tom Bass and Graves walked up to Braecklein as he stepped down, and he was hopping mad. He said, "I don't care whether you pass it or not. I've been on television about this bill, and I can just tell the people that you blocked it." Fred said, "Bill, just don't try to run over us." So Bill finally calmed down. He talked it over with Curtis Graves, and they agreed . . . I don't think the amendment was finally put on, but I think he answered Curtis' question. At that time, Fred withdrew the objections, and the bill was passed. But the handwriting was then on the wall, and these clowns knew that when they got up there, if we asked them a question, they had better answer it, or their bill was going to go bye-bye. I think, really, we proved our point on the thing, even though some of the members were very upset by it.

I think we also ought to comment on the appropriations bill and the controversy that we had over whether or not to limit conferees to points of difference. At the time the appropriations bill came back from the Senate and the House voted not to concur in Senate amendments. The House wrote a bill, and as is traditional, the Senate simply amended it by substituting the Senate bill and sent it back. The motion was made by Mr. Heatly that the House fail to concur in Senate amendments and request the appointment of a conference committee. This motion passed.

At that time Mrs. Farenthold and I had some motions. Mrs.

Farenthold moved that the conference committee would be bound solely to points of difference. This was defeated. I moved that the committee be instructed to hold open hearings. A friend of mine, who was a reporter, told me that last session, even when they had open meetings, they had the room arranged where the press had to sit next to the air conditioner; and if they spoke very low, the press couldn't hear them. So I included in my motion that the room be arranged in such a way that the press could hear. And this was defeated on the grounds that there was already in the House rules a provision that meetings of conferees had to be announced, had to be posted.

Through some members of the press, we learned the Appropriations Committee was meeting without posting its meetings. I think this sheer arrogance on Heatly's part. Mrs. Farenthold got up and said, "Mr. Speaker, could you please interpret a rule for me," or something along this line. "It says in the House rules that the conference committees must post the time and place of its meeting, and this hasn't been done. Could you comment on it?" The chair just took note. I've forgotten exactly the exchange, but it amounted to the chair taking note of the fact that the conferees had met without posting notice. I asked the speaker that since the rules said that they had to post notice in due time or something like that, I asked him when that would be. He said, "The chair does not rule on hypothetical situations." I contended, "This is not a hypothetical situation," and he contended it was. He was in the chair and had the gavel. This happened again. Mrs. Farenthold

got up and said, "Mr. Speaker, are you aware that the conferees of the Appropriations Committee have met a second time without posting notice?" "Yes," the chair was aware of it. "Mr. Speaker, do you care?" "Yes, the chair cares." And that's about all there was to it.

So a day or so later, we learned the conferees had met a third time. Mrs. Farenthold said, "I'm going to call it to his attention again." I said, "You know what I think I'll do? I believe I will move the conferees be discharged for violation of House rules and that new conferees be appointed." So Gus was getting pretty cagey by then. Curtis Graves, a few days before that, had gotten up and moved to adjourn or move to recess for lunch or something like that, and Gus said, "The chair does not recognize you." The way you usually do it is, "Mr. Speaker." The speaker would say, "Mr. Graves." "I move so-and-so." All through the session and, I believe, through the session before that, Gus had been saying, "The chair does not recognize you for that motion." In this case Curtis moved to adjourn. The speaker said, "The chair does not recognize you for that motion." Curtis said, "Mr. Speaker, you've already recognized me." He took his point down front and argued it with Bob Johnson and the speaker. Finally, the speaker said, "All right, Mr. Graves has moved that we adjourn." The motion was voted down. But the point was made that if he called your name he had recognized you. So from then on, whenever Gus was thinking about it, he would say, "For what purpose do you rise?" Then you would say to make a motion or whatever. He would ask what your motion was, and then he could

say, "I don't recognize you for it," or he could recognize you if he wanted to.

But on this particular day, I guess, "Sissy"--Mrs. Farenthold, her nickname is "Sissy"--I guess "Sissy" had him a little shook up because she pointed out for the third time that the conferees had met without posting a notice. As soon as she pointed it out, she stepped away from the back microphone, and I stepped up. "Mr. Speaker." "Mr. Allred." He didn't ask me for what purpose, and I said, "Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the House conferees and appoint new ones, and I'd like to be heard on my motion." Then, following the rules, I went down front and spoke and explained that they had three times violated the House rules and so forth. One man pointed out that the speaker could just reappoint the same people, which was true. But I still wanted to make the motion and point out to the public that this was happening.

By this time we were looking for some reform. We knew Mutscher was unpopular. We knew the people were mad about the stock scandal, and we were hoping the pressure could carry on for some reform. I got a call later that afternoon from Dr. Travis White, president of Midwestern University in Wichita Falls. He said, "I am calling you because I was told to call you. I have told them I would call and therefore I am keeping my word. But you do whatever you please down there and keep up the good work." He told me a House member had called and said they didn't appreciate what I was doing and they could cut the appropriations to Midwestern and the state hospital and the mental health center,

and all this kind of stuff in Wichita Falls. The member said some of those people in Wichita Falls had better call me and get me on the ball. I didn't see Mr. Heatly when I made the motion. I understand that he was livid from some people who saw him. Heatly is not used to being crossed. At any event, they were calling people in my district. I know of two people who were contacted. One was Dr. White. The other was Charles Worth Ward, the managing editor of the Wichita Falls Times and Record News. He said he got a call, and he didn't even bother to call me. He said he figured I knew what I was doing (chuckle).

One thing during the debate, I think, should be pointed out. During the debate on whether or not the conferees should be discharged, Representative Dick Slack of Pecos got up. I think he really thought he was going to shoot me down, shoot down my arguments, because he said, "I'm very touched by your concern for this Appropriations Committee." He said, "We've been meeting there for some time. Why haven't you ever showed up there?" And I said, "Well, Mr. Slack, I appreciate your pointing that out because it simply proves my point that you have been meeting without announcing your meetings. Whether or not I come or whether the press does, you need to announce your meeting so that people who are interested can come." Slack had admitted, in effect, that they were having meetings without posting them.

Marcello: Anyhow, what happened to your motion?

Allred: It was defeated, of course. But some of these motions by then were beginning to get forty and fifty votes. I remember there was one

point when the governor did something, and I've forgotten what he did, but he did something that was in accordance with the "Dirty Thirty's" position. And as soon as the governor's statement was announced, Tom Moore stepped up to the back mike and said, "Mr. Speaker, is the the 'Dirty Thirty-one?'" (Chuckle) By then we were beginning to needle Gus as much as we could, not in any concerted plan but just through sheer frustration, I think.

And on the last night of the session, tempers were very, very short. This was one of the bloodiest sessions I've ever seen, anyway, and by the last night, everybody was mad at everybody. There were several of us who spoke on different things. I spoke against the adoption of the appropriations bill because we felt that such provisions as a million dollars for the LBJ State Park and no money for kidney dialysis machines and this kind of thing was not the best way to spend the money. I was also looking toward the future, toward the races that were going to be run, and I was trying to link Bill Heatly with Mutscher because I feel Mutscher is known, and Mutscher is unpopular. I wanted to try to hang Mutscher around Heatly's neck like the ancient mariner's albatross on the offchance that we might have a chance to defeat him in an election in his home district or at least to make him smell so bad that no speaker would dare appoint him the next time. I think Mutscher is done for; Mutscher's political future is sealed. The thing that worries me is that some other speaker will be elected with help from the lobby, and he

will again appoint Heatly, and we will just have the same song but a different guy in the chair.

Marcello: Suppose, for example, Rayford Price were to be named the next speaker. What would Heatly's chances be of being appointed?

Allred: I think Rayford has said he wouldn't appoint him. I know Price Daniel, Jr., has said that. We are hoping that we can get someone in, but the lobby has so much to say in who gets elected speaker because it costs so much to make a statewide race, and people don't donate to you. The lobby generally makes most of the donations to speaker candidates, so lobbyists have a great deal to say in who gets to be speaker. I'm just afraid we are going to end up with somebody else who is going to reappoint Heatly.

So both in my speech that night against the appropriations bill and in my statement on television on Channel Three in Wichita Falls when I got back home, I referred to the "Heatly-Mutscher Railroad." I told the House that night, in urging members to vote against the appropriations bill, "You don't have to buy this ticket on the 'Heatly and Mutscher Railroad.'" This is the way I closed my speech. There was applause from the gallery, and the speaker banged his gavel and said something to the effect, "We'll have no more demonstrations in the gallery."

Well, a little later, Representative Reed or someone else spoke, and there was applause from the gallery again. The speaker said, "If the gallery doesn't behave itself, I'm going to have it cleared." I said something I really shouldn't have because

I felt I weakened my case, but I said, "Mr. Speaker, point of inquiry." "State your inquiry." "Mr. Speaker, when you stated that you'd have the gallery cleared, did you mean that you didn't want the people of Texas to hear the deliberations of this House?" The speaker said, "Certainly not." I stepped away because I felt that it was a tactical error at that point. It was too much picking on him, Jim Slider came over to me and said, off the mike, "If you will read the rules, he's got the right to close out this whole thing and run everybody out of the gallery; it's in the rules." I said, "Oh, really," and just let it go at that.

A few minutes later, just almost the next thing, Curtis Graves, I think, made some move. I've forgotten what it was, but Curtis, of course, was needling the speaker all the time. He's the one who introduced the proposal to include the Sharpstown State Bank in the speaker's district (chuckle). Curtis or someone made a proposal, and the members of the House quite often are very vocal about something. There was a big groan from the floor of the House from the members themselves. I was by the back microphone, and I just grabbed the back microphone, and I said, "Mr. Speaker, I submit that that constituted a demonstration on the floor of this House, and I ask that the floor be cleared." House members were at each other's throats throughout the evening.

There were also press interviews and things that Gus took very much to heart. There was a television program that was shown in Houston and on the stations that are on a cable. Channel Nine,

I think, the educational television station, KLRM, ran it.

Marcello: Was this some time near the

Allred: It was toward the end of the session, probably . . .

Marcello: Right, in the spring.

Allred: It was called "Capitol Eye."

Marcello: You were on that, were you not, with a couple of other people?

The reason I mentioned it is because I happened to have been in Austin at the time. Wasn't it cabled back to Austin?

Allred: Yes. The Austin cable runs from San Antonio to Waco.

Marcello: As I remember, you made the statement that Mutscher wasn't going to be re-elected as speaker.

Allred: Oh, and it made him mad.

Marcello: I've got to admit, I'd thought you had lost your marbles by that time. I'll apologize now.

Allred: (Chuckle) Winston Bodie produces that show, and he came to me one day and asked if I would be on the show. I thought to myself, "If I'm on that entire thirty minutes, and they start asking me, I'll make so many statements that I will later regret," because at that point my relations with several of the members were pretty precarious, and I just felt that I didn't need to be popping off for an entire television show by myself. So I said, "Well, look, why don't you get a guy from the other point of view?" As it finally turned out, it was Representative Moore of Waco and myself from the "Dirty Thirty" and Representative Hilary Doran of Del Rio and Representative John Traeger of Seguin, both of whom were more or less on the speaker's team, for the other side.

The speaker was already mad at me because I had appeared on a show on KWTX in Waco-Temple earlier with Moore and John Bigham and Lane Denton and Dan Kubiak and Bob Salter, who are all from the central Texas delegation. That was the best political show I've ever seen any TV station do. They just turned a half-hour over to these boys and said, "Have at it," and it was the most freewheeling political discussion you ever saw. At that time, we were commenting on some of the points about the investigation and why we felt the Farenthold resolution was good and this sort of thing.

When I came by the speaker's stand, a day or so later, the speaker leaned over, and said, "Mr. Allred, I saw that program that you were on on Sunday." They tape it Friday night, and it runs on Sunday afternoon. He said, "If the people in central Texas are misinformed politically, I can certainly see why." I said, "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of opinion." So he was already hacked at me.

So we sent through this show, the four of us, in "Capitol Eye," and right toward the end I believe it was Ernie Stomburger of the Dallas Times-Herald or Jon Ford of the San Antonio Express-News--they had reporters asking us questions--and one of these two reporters asked if we thought Gus Mutscher could be re-elected as speaker of the House. I thought it was rather ironic. Hilary Doran said, "Yes." John Traeger said, "I think there is no doubt of it." Tom Moore was the next man, and he said, "I think it would be a travesty on the people of Texas if that man is re-

elected," you know, something along these lines. And I said simply, "No, I don't think he can."

Marcello: I caught about the last fifteen minutes. Like I say, just by coincidence, I happened to be in Austin when it was on. I figured, "Dave has completely lost his marbles," because I didn't think it had gone that far.

Allred: I simply stated my opinion, and I thought it was a very mild statement. I didn't say anything except, "No, I don't think he can."

Marcello: I remember because you were the very last one to comment, as I recall, and they were running out of time.

Allred: The next day--that ran Sunday afternoon, and it was taped, I think, Saturday night; we were there until about midnight taping the think--I was up at the front microphone to make some sort of a motion. The speaker leaned over and said...wait, I don't know whether it was before the show had even run. John Traeger, anyway, had just left the speaker's side, and whether or not the show had run or whether John had simply told him what I said, I don't know. But the speaker leaned over and said something about, "I understand you've been commenting on my chances of re-election." I said, "I expressed an opinion, Mr. Speaker." He made some other little remark.

I thought, "Well, I've had just about enough of this." Every-time I'd get up there, he was leaning over . . . he leaned over at one point and had said something about whether or not I was going to support him for re-election. I had said something like, "You never know," or something along these lines.

And then a day or so later, he said, "I've talked to some good people in Wichita Falls, and they tell me you may very well support me for re-election." And I thought, "Well, you silly jackass, nobody knows but me whether I'm going to support you for re-election or not," and I said, "Well, you never know." But he just kept this little deal up, you know, leaning over the speaker's stand and commenting to me.

I decided on this particular occasion that I'd had just about enough. So after I made my motion and got it through or got it voted down, whatever--I forgot even what it was--and I went up on the speaker's stand with him, and we just had it out. He said something about, "You boys are after me, and you are embarrassing me in front of my family," or something along this line. What he said was, "You are probing in my private affairs." And at one point he said, "How do you think my family feels when they hear all of this?" I thought, "Well, that's something you should have thought of some time ago," but I didn't say it to him. In any event, he was saying, "Now suppose that someone probed into your private financial affairs," which I took to be a veiled threat; I don't know whether it was or not. I said, "Mr. Speaker, my financial statement is on file with the secretary of state." He said, "Yes, but nobody has gone over it with a fine-toothed comb yet." I thought, "My Lord, I hope they don't, or they will find out how broke I am and that I can't afford an election campaign."

Marcello: Financially, you are irresponsible. (chuckle).

Allred: Well, this, I think, could also be used on me a little bit, but

the main thing I was worried about is Charlie Finnel and Vernon Stewart figuring that I was the guy they wanted to have incorporated with them in redistricting because I couldn't afford to run a good campaign.

In any event, Gus was commenting about how we were pushing into his private affairs. Finally, I said, "Well, Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that there is nothing personal in it, but I just don't think this is the way that these things should be conducted." He finally said, "Well, we'll talk about it later," or something and kind of closed me off. But he was really, I think, rather personally hurt.

For one thing, before the session had started this last time, and after Tommy Shannon had called me about this speech in the East Side rally, I had called Gus. Tommy said he'd tell Gus about it, and I thought, "I know what you will tell Gus," so I had better get my licks in, anyway. This was before I knew about the stock scandal. It's generally not wise to be on the bad, bad side of a speaker. You shouldn't get there unnecessarily. So I called Gus; he wouldn't return my phone calls. Finally, I just flew down to Austin, walked into his office, and bearded the lion in his den. I said, "Now look, we've had our differences, but I want you to know I'm not coming down here to gut you in the session. I don't want you gutting me." He said, "No, I want to help you in your campaign. How can I help you?" And he ended up sending me to California to a Council of State Governments school. I borrowed enough money from the credit union

to take my wife, and we learned a lot and had a great time. He offered me chairmanship of an interim committee or a trip. I figured I was too busy to do a proper job with a committee.

But, anyway, Gus and I had sort of made our peace at the time. I had mentioned that I had been in the seminary, and he said, "Oh?" Gus is a Lutheran. He is on the board of Texas Lutheran College, I think. He said, "At one time I had contemplated going into the ministry." And I have a feeling--and this again is simply conjecture, and it may be projection on my part--but I have a feeling that Gus particularly cared about how I felt because of the fact that he associated me with the clergy. I think I might have made him feel a little more sheepish than some of the other members that he could put down and say, "Well, that's just politics." But in my case, he knew that I wasn't trying to grind an axe on him. I told him that there was nothing personal about it, that I just didn't dig these things, and we didn't agree on them. I was very proud of myself because, as I say, I'm not a brave man particularly, but I stood up to the old boy (chuckle) and just told him, "Well, you've got your opinion, and I've got mine."

I think one of the things, really, that helped me, oddly enough, was the parliamentarian, Bob Johnson. Bob is a very crusty sort of an individual, and he's given to sarcastic remarks, most of which he doesn't mean. It's his type of humor. Some of the members have gotten their nose out of joint with him, but I've just started giving him in turn, and we've gotten

to be pretty good friends. I know Bob has his private opinions.

As parliamentarian, his job is to serve the speaker, to help the speaker and all that, but he is an intelligent guy. Parliamentarians are supposed to help everyone, but the speaker hires them. Bob is a former member himself. He has been where we are, and I always found that I could talk to him and that he would help me and advise me on how to draw up a motion, what my rights were, and how to present it, what the rules of the House were. He never lied to me that I know of. Also, I think that even though he couldn't say anything, he was kind of proud of me for standing up and not letting the speaker buffalo me. I think knowing that somebody was kind of rooting for you, even if it was silent rooting, helped a little bit because Bob sat up there by the speaker and he could hear everything we said, where the members out on the floor couldn't. Bob Johnson did his job well and always helped me and others when we asked for it, without worrying about the possibility of the speaker retaliating. Bob is gutsy and straightforward.

In fact, I had made up my mind...and I finally talked Tom Bass into it one time, and I wasn't sure later that I should have. When a question was raised, like, a point of order, the speaker would say, "Bring your point of order down front." Well, he did that to me in the Sixty-first Session, which was his first term as speaker. At that time Representative Randy Pendleton of Andrews had opposed Gus for speaker and lost. And Gus had him, you know, on the "Broom Closet Committee," that is,

gave him poor committee assignments. I think Randy realized there just wasn't much hope for him as far as having any decent assignments, and he didn't really mind. This is one of the mistakes that a vindictive person makes. When they take you off all the big committees, you've got time to plan more mischief, as Ed Harris of Galveston used to say. But in any event, this was again the question of binding conference committees. Randy moved to bind the conference committees; they tried an end run around him through ~~some~~ sort of a parliamentary maneuver. I saw through what they were doing and stood up and asked a question as a point of inquiry that pointed out what they were doing. And Gus said, "Bring your inquiry down front."

So I trooped down front like a good little trooper, and Gus leaned over the podium and said, "I want to point out to you that you've got a school in your district, and Pendleton can't help you, and I can." So the threat was made, but it was done, you know, just between us with him leaning over the podium. So I made up my mind that if he ever pulled that on me again, I was going to say, "Mr. Speaker, I can hear it from here, and you can say what you've got to say before the whole House." The one time I could have said it, I didn't feel like I should at that particular point because the point had been raised, and the whole House knew what was going on. I had to go down front to argue for my position. It was on a point of order.

Marcello: I assume that he and Mr. Heatly were leaning on all of the members of the "Dirty Thirty," that they weren't particularly

singling you out.

Allred: Oh, no, no, I don't think I was singled out in the least. I think they did it to all of us. But at one time I talked to Tom Bass--Tom was going to go down front with one of his points of order--and I said, "Tom, let's all hear it." Tom said, "That's right." He stood back there and said, "I'm going to stand right here, Mr. Speaker, and you can tell me from back here," because I think he probably had the same experience I had as having Gus lean on him when he got down to the podium.

We had several really knock-down-drag-out things. At one point the speaker refused to recognize Representative Rex Braun of Houston on a point of personal privilege. Rex had gotten previously when he was recognized on personal privilege and began to read the Constitution of the United States. It was obvious that we were trying to "chub" for time. The word "chub" means . . . when you are "chubbing" a bill, you are trying to put it off. You are trying to do any sort of delaying tactic to keep a certain bill from coming up. In our case it was late in the session, and we were trying to get the House to adjourn before certain bills came up. So when Rex again applied to be recognized on personal privilege a little later, the speaker said, "I will not recognize you." Tom Bass, said, "Mr. Speaker, you have no choice. Under the rules you have to recognize a man on a point of personal privilege. You can rule him out of order if he is not speaking on personal privilege, once he has begun his speech, but you have to recognize him." Gus said, "I don't recognize him."

Tom said, "Mr. Speaker, unless you recognize him, I'm going to stay back here and raise a racket, and you might have to put me out of here with the sergeant-at-arms." Later, in a personal privilege speech himself, he apologized for this, but he was trying to get through because Gus had the power of the gavel, and he has absolute power on who he will recognize, except on things like personal privilege. I think Tom's point there was well-taken. But one of the things that this session accomplished was making the members read the rule books more than they ever had before. This was much, much more of a rule book session than any ever before.

Marcello: As you look back on it, do you have regrets about being identified with the "Dirty Thirty" or being a member of the "Dirty Thirty?"

Allred: None. I think probably I'm beginning now to realize that politically it may have been the smartest thing I could have done.

Marcello: In what sense?

Allred: In that the people are saying, "Were you in the 'Dirty Thirty,'" and I say "Yes." And they say, "Great." I've now got a voting record that we've drawn up of nineteen votes, including the vote on the Caldwell resolution, the vote on the Farenthold resolution, and so forth, and both of my prospective opponents voted with the speaker. It's my feeling that's going to help me politically. Now I may turn out to be wrong, and the people may have a very short memory and all that, but I think

the Republicans can be counted on not to let this stock scandal die.

I think for the first time that I've ever known of, the speaker of the House is going to be a political issue next time. In fact, Gus himself said that it's largely due to the efforts of the "Dirty Thirty." I still feel that if we don't get Heatly and some of the others behind him, we'll just get a new figurehead. But I think it's a compliment that Gus has even acknowledged that. In fact, he came up the Monday after the session was over, and I'm told his comments about Representative Heatly were that here was a man who didn't have to join the "Dirty Thirty" to vote his conscience or something like that. But again, in stabbing the "Dirty Thirty," he was making an unofficial bow to the fact that we had really spanked him.

I think the "Dirty Thirty" may well go down in history books along with the "Immortal Fifty-six," who stood against O'Daniel's transaction tax, if for no other reason than the catchy name and the fact that there was a scandal and that the "Dirty Thirty" was for the investigation. We didn't plan it that way but apparently it's worked out that way. I'm making speeches now in my district along the lines of, "It doesn't matter what they say now. How were they voting back in the session?"

I don't mention either of my prospective opponents' names, but I think the point is not lost on some of the people.

Now I may end up getting beat for re-election--I don't know-- because the guy I'm paired with right now, and the one I probably will run against, is Vernon Stewart. He's been in this House for twenty years. But you never know. I'm finding a great deal of support and practically no criticism for my actions in the "Dirty Thirty."

Marcello: I hadn't realized that you were paired with one of the people in your district. You mentioned Vernon Stewart. You will be running against him?

Allred: Yes, if the House redistricting bill stands. My personal opinion is that it will not stand. It's been appealed in the courts, and I think the courts are going to throw it out. But even so, we may end up with the county being split because Wichita County has lost population; that entire area in North Texas has, and what it boils down to is we have three incumbent representatives, and we only have people enough for two seats. The way it is now, Wichita County is split by a line that runs just west of Burkburnett and kind of S-curves down south and takes in this census tract and leaves out that one. But basically it cuts off some of the western suburbs of Wichita Falls, and the district from there to the Clay County line is one district--there's Burkburnett and the major part of Wichita Falls--and then the other district, which includes the western suburbs of Wichita Falls--Iowa Park, Electra, and so forth in Wichita County, plus Clay County, Young County, and Archer County, which is where Holiday is--that's Charlie Finnell. Charlie Finnell is

a member of the Redistricting Committee. My feeling at the moment is that I can run against either one as long as I'm living in the district by November 1st. The constitution requires that you live in the district a year prior to your election, and that's interpreted, as I understand it from the Legislative Council, to be the general election in which you are elected, which is in November. So if by November 1 of '71 I'm living in a given district, that's the guy I'll have to run against.

My thought right now is it will probably be Vernon Stewart for a variety of reasons. These are all my people. I've represented them just as he had, although only for five years, whereas he has represented them for nineteen. Also, I think if I were in Charlie Finnell's shoes, and I was running from a little town like Holiday against someone from Wichita Falls, I would urban him to death. I would say, "Wichita Falls already has one representative. Why should we give them another one? They don't understand our rural problems, but I'm a rural boy, and I understand our rural problems," you know, this kind of thing.

On the other hand, Vernon Stewart has showed that he is a pretty shrewd individual. I personally don't like him, but some of that could be jealousy which you would always encounter when two guys are working and both trying to get recognition. There were little things, though, like when I had an opponent last year, and he didn't. He had a ceremony that he had planned

at the railroad station at Burkburnett. The passenger station, of course, is no longer being used because passenger service has been cut out on the railroads. Vernon arranged with the railroad to donate this to the city for a museum, and he was master of ceremonies, introducing visitors at the ceremony there. I was standing in the crowd as was my opponent. Vernon is ostensibly a Democrat and could have easily recognized me as a state representative, and it would have been a little plug, and it would have helped me along, but he didn't do it. In fact, I simply showed up there. He didn't even invite me. When he got a new stone marker to be put in by the Red River Bridge, a stone map of Texas, he didn't even invite me to that ceremony. This kind of thing strikes me as being very petty, and perhaps I'm being petty in noticing it, but the fact is that a politician lives by publicity, and Vernon is apparently determined that I'll get as little as possible.

When we discuss a vote privately, he'll say, "Now the safe vote . . ." and so he seems to me to be very concerned with what the safe vote is, and maybe this is how you stay in twenty years. I don't know.

But those are my thoughts as to why I'm going to take on Vernon rather than Charlie Finnell, unless at the last minute I decide that Vernon might be too slippery, and it might be worth taking on Charles because in the "Dirty Thirty" vote analysis Vernon has something like twelve bad votes, five good ones, and two absent and not voting; Charlie Finnell has nineteen bad votes.

I think I could more easily "Mutscher" Charlie Finnell because he has posed for pictures with the speaker and all this kind of thing. I may decide at the last minute to move over there. This is one of those things that I haven't decided yet. For one reason there is the possibility that Congressman Graham Purcell may move to Denton and run in that new congressional district there. He has said he's considering it. If he does that, State Senator Jack Hightower will run against Representative Price, the incumbent congressman from Amarillo and Pampa, and that will leave the State Senate seat open for which I might run or Charles or Vernon might. I think Vernon almost certainly will run, and Charles most likely will run, and I may very well. I don't know. So at this point, the best thing to do is just sit tight and wait, but it's one of the hardest things to do when you want to be out there working or doing something. We don't even know at this point what the senate district will be. But the House redistricting bill was definitely designed to get the "Dirty Thirty."

Marcello: I don't think there is any question about that. I think this is really the straw that broke the camel's back, you know, so far as Mutscher's support was concerned. I think even some of his closest supporters couldn't stomach the redistricting bill.

Allred: One of the freshmen from Fort Worth and I were walking down the steps after that vote. And the guy said, "I promised him I would vote for it, and I did because I promised him, but I sure don't like myself." And I could really sort of understand because

your word is your bond, and you need to keep it, but I sure felt sorry for the guy. I think he'd be a little slower to commit next time before he does anything like that.