

# **MAJOR AND MINOR CALENDARS IN THE TEXAS HOUSE AND SENATE**

Harvey J. Tucker\*  
Department of Political Science  
Texas A&M University

Prepared for presentation at the Legislatures and Representation in the U.S. States: Second Annual Conference on State Politics and Policy, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, May 24-25, 2002.

\* My understanding of the Texas Legislature has been enhanced by many individuals. Those whose ideas have contributed to this paper include Gary Halter, Steve Ogden, Fred Brown, William Roman, Kent Grusendorf, Senfronia Thompson, Penny Beaumont, R. Ellyn Perrone, Doug Davis, Tiffany Britton, Amanda Green, Jessica Geeslin and Christi Bearden.

## INTRODUCTION

For nearly a century political scientists have noted that state legislatures face increasing workloads and have suggested structural and procedural changes to facilitate dealing with them (Bruncken, 1909; Jones, 1913; Perkins, 1946). A number of legislative scholars and practitioners have advocated separate calendars and distinct legislative consideration for bills that are (a) broad and/or controversial and (b) narrow or non-controversial (Illinois Legislative Council, 1952; Burns, 1971; Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, 1971; Gove, Carlson and Carlson, 1976; Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 1985). Normative prescriptions for using legislative calendars have been abundant, but empirical analyses have been sparse in number. This paper is a contribution to the latter.

I am aware of one publication that analyzes empirically with comprehensive data the use of major and minor calendars in a state legislature: Tucker, 1989. That article studied how the Texas House used major and minor calendars in the 1985 legislative session. The major finding was that major and minor bills were treated differently, and the differences facilitated the more efficient management of legislative workload. This paper examines the 1995 regular session of the Texas legislature and expands the empirical focus to include the use of major and minor calendars in both the House and the Senate. Four questions will be pursued:

1. Does the House use major and minor calendars in 1995 in the same ways it did in 1985?
2. Does the Senate use major and minor calendars the same ways the House does?
3. Do the two chambers tend to agree or disagree on placement of bills on major and minor calendars? To the extent they disagree, what explains disagreement?
4. Do some legislators make greater use of minor calendars than others? In particular, are legislators who are most successful in getting their bills passed achieving success because of their use of minor calendars?

## MAJOR AND MINOR CALENDARS IN THE TEXAS LEGISLATURE

The Texas Legislature meets for 140 calendar days every two years. For the first 60 days there are no limitations on bill submissions. Beginning with day 61, a member must obtain the approval of 80% of his or her chamber to submit a bill. A majority of bills are submitted in the 10 days prior to day 61. Only emergency bills identified by the governor are eligible for floor consideration during the first 60 days. As a result, almost all bills are brought to chamber floors for second and third readings during the second half of the legislative session.

The Texas House of Representatives has two calendars for minor bills: the Local Calendar and the Consent Calendar (Tucker, 1989; House Research Organization, 1995; The Texas Legislature Online, The Legislative Process in Texas, <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us>). Bills must pass a series of tests before they can be put on these calendars for expedited floor action. A local bill can affect no more than one of Texas' 254 counties. Notice of a legislator's intention to file a local bill must be published in a newspaper in the affected locality at least 30 days before the bill is introduced. Candidate bills for both the Local and Consent Calendars must be recommended unanimously by the substantive House committee reporting them. Bills so recommended are forwarded to the Committee on Local and Consent Calendars. If that committee decides that a bill does not belong on a local or consent calendar it forwards the bill to the Committee on Calendars for placement on one of the major House calendars.

Once a bill has been placed on a local or consent calendar, it may be removed. A bill must be removed from either calendar if contested by five members. In addition, bills placed on local or consent calendars are withdrawn automatically if floor debate exceeds ten minutes. These calendars are normally lengthy, but consideration of them is expedited because debate is limited and amendments to measures on these calendars may not be offered unless they have first been approved by the Committee on Local and Consent Calendars.

The regular legislative session lasts 140 calendar days. The Local and Consent Calendars are normally considered by the House once a week during the last half of the regular session (Table 1). In 1995, House minor calendars were heard 10 times in the final 60 days. House rules call for bills to be considered on second and third readings on different legislative days. The legislative day begins at noon. By considering minor calendar bills on second reading in the morning and on third reading in the afternoon, the House disposes of minor calendar bills on consecutive legislative days but a single calendar day.

#### Table 1 About Here

There are three calendars in the Texas House for major bills: Emergency, Major State, and General State. The House considers bills on these major calendars, in order, before it considers bills on the minor calendars. In principle, bills are assigned to one of the major calendars according to the substance of the proposed legislation. In practice, the House Calendar Committee is virtually unlimited in its power to assign major bills to major calendars (the annual appropriations bill and bills the governor designates emergencies that clear substantive committee are supposed to appear on the emergency calendar). The difference between major calendars becomes important only in the final days of the legislative session when time constraints make it impossible to clear all calendars.

The Texas Senate has one major calendar and one minor calendar for bills reported from committee and awaiting floor consideration (Rules of the Texas Senate, <http://www.senate.state.tx.us>). The major calendar is the Regular Order of Business Calendar. The minor calendar is the Local and Uncontested Calendar.

As is the case with House local bills, notice of intention to submit Senate local bills must be published 30 days prior to introduction and must be limited in scope of application. Bills to which no opposition is anticipated are uncontested bills. The Senate

Administration Committee considers bills nominated by substantive committees for placement on the Local and Uncontested Calendar. A bill must meet three additional criteria to be eligible for submission to the Senate Administration Committee:

1. the substantive committee must have voted unanimously to approve,
2. the Senate author or sponsor must apply for placement on the Local and Uncontested Calendar, and
3. the chair of the substantive committee must submit a written request for placement on the Local and Uncontested Calendar.

A bill may not be considered if any two or more members of the Senate object in writing before the bill or resolution is laid out for passage on the Local and Uncontested Calendar. Only amendments offered by the committee reporting the bill can be considered for bills on the Senate minor calendar.

The Senate Local and Uncontested Calendar is considered at times designated by the Senate. In the 74th Legislative Session of 1995, the Local and Uncontested Calendar was considered on 17 legislative days from the 79<sup>th</sup> to the 138<sup>th</sup> calendar day (Table 1). Senators must be furnished copies of the calendar no later than noon of the day preceding the session at which it is to be considered. Bills are considered on second and third reading in the order in which they are listed on the calendar, and no motion to suspend the regular order of business is required. The Senate Local and Uncontested Calendar is always the first item on the morning agenda. It normally is heard before 8:00 AM. There is no debate. Typically, only the presiding officer and clerks are present. All bills and committee amendments on the calendar are listed in the Senate Journal as unanimously approved by all 31 Senators. Unless they are removed prior to floor consideration, bills on the Senate Local and Uncontested Calendar are passed by the Senate.

The Texas Senate assigns major bills to its Regular Order of Business Calendar. Senate rules call for bills to be considered on second reading in the order in which committee reports are submitted to the Senate. However, the first bills reported from committees are stopper bills. Bills from the Regular Order of Business Calendar are considered for floor action only when two-thirds or more the members vote to suspend the rules and consider them “out of order.” The Senate also suspends the rule that bills must be considered on second and third reading on consecutive legislative days for bills brought to the floor “out of order.”

Once brought to the Senate floor, only a simple majority is required to pass all but a few bills. Amendments also usually require only a simple majority. The upshot is nearly all bills brought to the Senate floor are passed. Only a well-conceived series of killer amendments can defeat a bill on the floor. Senators have agreed that they will have public floor votes only when there is supermajority consensus to pass a bill. They choose not to record formally their issue positions when there is insufficient support to approve legislation. By limiting such information they seek to avoid criticism in general and criticism from opponents in future elections in particular.

## USE OF HOUSE MAJOR AND MINOR CALENDARS IN 1985 AND 1995

Are bills placed on House major and minor calendars treated differently in 1995 than they were in 1985? Table 2 compares the use of House major and minor calendars in 1985 and 1995. In 1985, 32 percent of bills submitted were placed on a House calendar. In 1995, 33 percent of bills submitted were placed on a House calendar. In 1985, 56 percent of bills achieving calendar placement were on major calendars. In 1995, 59 percent of bills achieving calendar placement were on major calendars. The percentages of bills placed on calendars and placed on major and minor calendars are essentially the same for the 1985 and 1995 sessions.

### Table 2 About Here

For the most part, the attributes of bills on House major and minor calendars are the same for the 1985 and 1995 sessions. For both sessions major bills are:

- a majority of bills submitted,
- a majority of bills introduced in the Senate,
- a majority of bills introduced in the House,
- a minority of bills introduced after the 60<sup>th</sup> day,
- more likely to have companions,
- more evenly distributed across House committees,
- more likely to be amended,
- more likely to have final action taken late in the session,
- more likely to be killed late in the session
- more likely to be vetoed.
- less likely to be passed.

For both sessions major bills and minor bills are equally likely to be passed late in the session.

The few noteworthy differences between 1985 and 1995 sessions concern the size of difference between major and minor bills. For most of the items in Table 2 the percentages for bills on either calendar are within 5% of each other for 1985 and 1995. In 1995, as compared to 1985, major bills were more than 5%:

- more likely to be introduced after the 60<sup>th</sup> day,
- more likely to be amended,
- more likely to be vetoed,
- less likely to be killed after day 126.

In both sessions the major and minor bills were treated differently. In both sessions major bills were given longer, more widespread, more intensive and more critical consideration than minor bills received. In both sessions House major and minor calendars differentiated more important from less important bills to facilitate the efficient management of legislative workload.

## HOUSE AND SENATE USE OF MAJOR AND MINOR CALENDARS IN 1995

Do the Texas House and Senate use major and minor calendars the same way? To the extent that the chambers agree on using calendars to facilitate workload management by identifying more important and less important bills, the answer should be yes. However, there are significant differences in House and Senate calendar procedures. Bills placed on the Senate minor calendar are guaranteed to be passed by the Senate. Bills on House minor calendars have no guarantee of House approval. The House permits unrestricted amendment of minor bills; the Senate permits only consideration--and guarantees approval of--amendments approved by reporting committees. Decisions to let bills die on House major calendars are nominally made by House Committee on Calendars. Bills die on the Senate major calendar because Senate authors or sponsors cannot win approval from 67% of Senators to bring them to the floor, or the Lieutenant Governor will not recognize a motion to bring them to the floor, or both. Thus, assessing similarities and differences between uses of calendars is a legitimate empirical enterprise.

In 1995 22% of bills submitted appear on House calendars and 37% of bills submitted appear on Senate calendars. This reflects the fact that more bills appear on Senate calendars and die before being placed on House calendars than vice versa. A larger proportion of Senate bills (29%) are passed into law than are House bills (18%).

### Table 3 About Here

As Table 3 documents, bills that survive to each succeeding step in the legislative process have an increasing likelihood of being passed by both chambers. Bills on minor calendars are more likely to be passed than those on major calendars in both chambers: House—49% vs. 18%; Senate—53% vs. 29%. Overall, bills placed on a major calendar in the first chamber have a 51% rate of passage while bills on a minor calendar in the first chamber have a 66% rate of passage. Surviving to the second chamber major calendar increases passage rates to 76% if the first chamber calendar was major and 67% if the first chamber calendar was minor. Virtually all bills placed on a minor calendar in the second chamber are passed: 96% if the first chamber calendar was minor and 99% if the first chamber calendar was major.

Bills are placed on House major and minor calendars at nearly the same rate whether they originate in the House or Senate (Table 4). Overall, the proportion is 60% major and 40% minor. The Senate is significantly more likely to place Senate bills than House bills on its major calendar: 71% versus 51%. The Senate places a much larger proportion of House bills than Senate bills on minor calendars: 49% versus 29%. However, the distribution of total bills on major and minor calendars in the Senate is essentially identical to that in the House: 64% major and 36% minor.

### Table 4 About Here

The distribution of all bills on Senate major and minor calendars is the opposite of the distribution reported by Green (1997) for the first 300 engrossed Senate bills. Green reported that 63% of bills passed early were on the Senate Local and Uncontested Calendar and 37% were on the Regular Order of Business Calendar. For all bills, a 64% majority appeared on the Senate major calendar. The first 15% of bills engrossed were not representative of all bills in the 1995 legislative session.

### Table 5 About Here

Table 5 reports the relationships between bill attributes and placement on House and Senate major and minor calendars. For 11 of 12 bill attributes, relationships are in the same direction for both House and Senate. The following appear more often on major calendars than on minor calendars in both the House and the Senate:

- Bills submitted
- Bills introduced in the Senate
- Bills introduced in the House
- Bills with companions
- Bills amended
- Bills with final action after day 126
- Bills passed by the legislature
- Bills vetoed
- Bills with multiple authors
- Bills with multiple sponsors

In addition, bills on major calendars are more evenly divided across substantive committees in both the House and the Senate.

For these 11 common relationships the division between major and minor calendars is usually essentially the same for the House and the Senate. The exceptions are:

- Each chamber assigns a larger share of its own bills to its major calendars and a larger share of bills originating in the opposite chamber to its minor calendars.
- A larger share of vetoed bills appear on Senate major calendars than on House major calendars.
- A larger share of bills with multiple sponsors appears on Senate major calendars than on House major calendars.

The single difference in the division of bills between House and Senate major and minor calendars concerns bills introduced after the 60<sup>th</sup> day, the deadline for unrestricted bill introduction. A 59% majority of bills introduced late appear on House minor calendars. A 59% majority of bills introduced late appear on Senate major calendars. Overall, about equal numbers of bills appear on House and Senate calendars. Yet a much larger number of late introduced bills appear on Senate calendars than on House calendars. It is easier to win 80% approval for late introductions from 30 Senate colleagues than from 148 House colleagues (The Speaker does not vote on late bill introductions.). The House may specialize in late introduction of minor bills because it is significantly easier to win approval for late introduction of minor bills than major bills.

## **HOUSE AND SENATE AGREEMENT ON DESIGNATING BILLS MAJOR OR MINOR**

Table 6 presents a cross-tabulation of bills that appear on the major and minor calendars of the House and Senate. The largest proportion, 40%, appears on major calendars in both chambers. The next largest proportion, 26% appear on minor calendars

in both chambers. Overall, the House and Senate agree on calendar placement 66% of the time and disagree 34% of the time. Clearly, agreement is the norm.

Table 6 About Here

Why would a bill appear on the major calendar of one chamber and the minor calendar of the other? One might think that legislators' would always prefer that their bills be placed on minor calendars because they are more likely to be passed. However, that is not always the case. Texas legislators and their staff identify three explanations for placing bills on major calendars that are otherwise qualified for minor calendars:

- *Amendment.* Bills that are amended are more likely to appear on major calendars because it is more difficult for minor calendar bills to be amended. When substantive committees approve a bill unanimously, they frequently ask whether floor amendments from other members will be proposed. Only if such amendments are not expected will they nominate the bill for placement on a minor calendar. So, if only one chamber amends an otherwise low conflict bill, it will appear on the major calendar of one chamber and the minor calendar of the other.
- *Timing.* In the last few days of the legislative session, major calendars may be considered every day but minor calendars are rarely considered. House minor calendars were considered twice and Senate minor calendars three times in the last two weeks of the 1995 legislative session. Placing a bill on a minor calendar may be a high-risk strategy in the last two weeks. Sponsors who think they have sufficient support to pass a bill on a major calendar refuse minor calendar placement. In many cases, they remove their bills from minor calendars and have them placed instead on major calendars. So, at the end of the session, bills are likely to appear on a major calendar in the second chamber even if they appeared on a minor calendar in the first chamber.
- *Idiosyncratic Preference.* Bills may appear on different calendars in the two chambers for idiosyncratic choices made by committee chairs, bill authors, or bill sponsors. These individuals have the power to assign bills otherwise qualified for minor calendars to major calendars. Why would they do so? Reasons include seeking visibility and publicity, delaying consideration to hold a bill hostage, and increasing the likelihood that a bill will fail of enactment.

While bills are placed on major calendars in one chamber and minor calendars in the other for all of these reasons, only the first two can be analyzed with empirical data. Table 7 assesses how many of the 428 bills placed on different calendars in the House and Senate are amended bills and/or bills considered at the end of the session.

Table 7 About Here

The amendment explanation applies to 149 of 428 cases of calendar disagreement. The late action explanation applies to 140 cases of calendar disagreement. The two explanations are equally important. The two explanations combined apply to 251 cases or 59% of the calendar disagreements. Of the 1270 bills that appear on calendars in the House and Senate, 66% are on major or minor calendars in each and another 20% can be

explained by amendments and late consideration. Only 177 bills, 14%, remain to be explained by idiosyncratic preferences.

## **BILL AUTHORS AND CALENDAR PLACEMENT**

Past research has established which Texas legislators are significantly more successful in having the bills they submit passed into law (Hamm, Harmel and Thompson, 1983; Tucker 1996, 1997). The most active and successful members of the Texas House are leaders--holders of committee chair positions and/or members of important committees. The most active and successful members of the Texas Senate are committee chairs. These findings held for analyses of all bills, bills on House major calendars, and bills on House minor calendars (Tucker 1996, 1997). After leadership, seniority is the second most important factor related to legislative success. Hamm, Harmel and Thompson (1983) found seniority a significant correlate of activity in the 1970s although analysis of the 1980s found seniority of lesser importance (Tucker 1996, 1997).

Legislative leaders are most successful in having their bills passed. And bills that appear on minor calendars are most likely to be passed. Is it the case that legislative leaders are successful in having their bills pass because they are successful in placing their bills on minor calendars? Green's (1997) analysis of the first 300 engrossed Senate bills in 1995 found that Senate leaders' bills were more often placed on minor calendars. Will those findings also apply to all bills?

### **Table 8 About Here**

When all bills are included in analysis, legislative leaders are not successful because their bills are more likely to appear on minor calendars. On the contrary, leaders' bills are less likely to appear on minor calendars. The proportions are virtually the same whether leadership is defined in terms of committee chair status, membership on a power committee, or a combination of the two. In all cases, most successful legislators use minor calendars less often than legislators overall.

Green found a significant positive relationship between seniority and placing one's bills on minor calendars. Analysis of all bills documents a negative relationship between tenure and minor bills. Bills authored by members with greater than median tenure are less likely to appear on minor calendars.

An analysis of the relationship between appearance on major and minor calendars and other attributes of bill authors is presented in Table 9. For all members, a majority of bills appear on House and Senate major calendars. A majority of bills appears on minor calendars for only one group: freshmen. For all other author attributes, sex, party, race, religion, and non-freshman, a majority of bills appear on House and Senate major calendars. Moreover, for all the author attributes other than being a freshman, the breakdown of bills on major and minor calendars is close to the breakdown for all members.

### **Table 9 About Here**

Legislative leaders specialize in major bills. Minor bills are left to others, including freshmen and other legislators with little experience. They pass more minor bills because minor bills are easier to pass. Newcomers tend to learn the legislative

process through minor bills. In many cases, experienced senators help the freshmen whose representative districts are within their own senate district with minor bills. Experienced senators serve as sponsors for bills authored by freshman representatives. Frequently, the bills originate with the senators who help their colleagues establish a record of legislative success.

## CONCLUSION

Scholars and practitioners have articulated normative guidelines for legislative work to be organized and managed by the use of major and minor calendars. Bills for minor calendars are to be nominated, reviewed and approved sequentially by separate committees. Even then bills are subject to removal from minor calendars by a small number of legislators. Minor calendar bills are to receive less extensive and intensive consideration than are major calendar bills during floor consideration. As was the case in the 1985 session, the Texas House uses its major and minor calendars in the prescribed manner. Furthermore, the Texas Senate does too.

Bills passed early in the legislative session are atypical in many respects. A majority of the first 300 Senate bills passed in 1995 were placed on minor calendars and experienced Senators and those holding leadership positions authored a majority of Senate minor bills. A majority of all bills that appeared on Senate calendars in 1995 were placed on the major calendar. And experienced Senators and those holding leadership positions authored more major bills than minor bills. Only first term legislators authored more minor bills than major bills.

Despite different formal rules and informal norms for major and minor calendars and floor consideration, House and Senate use of major and minor calendars was parallel. In both chambers major bills were a majority of:

- bills introduced,
- bills with companions,
- bills with multiple authors,
- bills with multiple sponsors,
- bills amended,
- bills with later final action,
- bills passed and
- bills vetoed.

The single noteworthy difference between use of major and minor calendars in the two chambers concerned bills introduced after the 60-day period of unrestricted introductions. A majority of bills introduced after the deadline appear on House minor calendars while a majority of bills introduced after the deadline appear on Senate major calendars.

The two chambers agree on placement of bills on major or minor calendars in 66% of cases. Most cases of inter-chamber disagreement on calendar placement are related to amended bills and/or bills brought to the floor in the last days of the session. Only 14% of disagreements must be tentatively designated as related to idiosyncratic preferences of bill authors, bill sponsors, committee chairs and other legislative leaders.

In both chambers bills of legislators most active in submitting bills and successful in having them passed appear more frequently on major calendars than on minor

calendars. Legislative leaders are not successful because they make greater use—take advantage—of minor calendars. On the contrary, they specialize in the more important and more-difficult-to-pass major calendar bills. First term legislators are the only members whose bills appear more frequently on minor than on major calendars. There are no large, systematic differences in major and minor calendar placement related to authors' sex, party, race or religion.

What is missing from these analyses is a finding that suggests any group of legislators makes selfish use of minor calendars to advance agendas or reputations. Nor is there evidence of frequent or systematic violation of legislative rules or other abuse of the calendar systems. It would seem that major bills are the more important bills on which disagreement is expected. It would seem that minor bills are the less important bills on which consensus is expected. The picture is of a state legislature using major and minor calendars appropriately to facilitate efficient handling of its enormous workload.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Browne, William P. (1985). Multiple Sponsorship and Bill Success in U.S. State Legislatures. **Legislative Studies Quarterly** 10: 483-488.
- Burka, Paul and Patricia Kilday Hart (1995). The Best and the Worst Legislators, 1995. **Texas Monthly** 23:102-115.
- Bearden, Christi. 2002. The Impact of Caucuses and Coalitions: A Study of Voting Cohesion in the Texas House of Representatives. Unpublished manuscript, Texas A&M University.
- Campbell, James E. (1982). Cosponsorship Legislation in the U.S. Congress. **Legislative Studies Quarterly** 7: 415-422.
- Cooper, Joseph, and Rick K. Wilson (1994). The Role of Congressional Parties. In *Encyclopedia of the American Legislative System*, ed. Joel Silbey. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Frantzich, Stephen E. (1979). Who Makes Our Laws?: The Legislative Effectiveness of members of Congress. **Legislative Studies Quarterly** 4: 409-428.
- Francis, Wayne L. (1962). Influence and Interaction in a State Legislative Body. **American Political Science Review** 56: 953-961.
- Francis, Wayne L and Ronald E. Weber (1980). Legislative Issues in the 50 States: Managing complexity Through Classification. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 5:407-21.
- Geeslin, Jessica Michelle (1997). Bill Consideration in the 73<sup>rd</sup>, 74<sup>th</sup>, & 75<sup>th</sup> Legislative Sessions of Texas. Unpublished paper, Texas A&M University.
- Gray, Virginia and David Lowery (1995). Interest Representation and Democratic Gridlock. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 20: 531-52.
- Green, Amanda (1997). Factors Influencing Bill Assignment to the Texas Senate Local and Uncontested Calendar for the 75<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session. Unpublished paper, Texas A&M University.
- Guide to the Texas Legislature** (1994). Austin, Tex: Reference Guides.
- Hamm, Keith E. and Robert Harmel (1993). Legislative Party Development and the Speaker System: The Case of the Texas House. **Journal of Politics** 55: 1140-1151.

- Hamm, Keith E., Robert Harmel and Robert Thompson (1983). Ethnic and Partisan Minorities in Two Southern State Legislatures. **Legislative Studies Quarterly** 8: 177-189.
- Harmel, Robert and Keith E. Hamm (1986). Development of a Party Role in a No-Party Legislature. **Western Political Quarterly** 39: 79-92.
- Harmel, Robert, Keith Hamm and Robert Thompson (1983). Black Voting Cohesion and Distinctiveness in Three Southern Legislatures. **Social Science Quarterly** 64: 183-92.
- Hedlund, Ronald D. (1975). Perceptions of Decisional Referents in Legislative Decision Making. **American Journal of Political Science** 19: 527-542.
- Hedlund, Ronald D. and Patricia K. Freeman (1981). A Strategy for Measuring the Performance of Legislatures in Processing Decisions. **Legislative Studies Quarterly** 6: 87-113.
- Hinojosa, Juan J. (1985). The Mexican-American Caucus. **Texas Journal of Political Studies** 7: 27-32.
- House Research Organization (1995). How A Bill Becomes Law. (Austin: House Research Organization Report 74-5).
- Matthews, Donald R. (1960). **U.S. Senators and Their World**. New York: Vintage Books.
- Moore, Michael K. and Sue Thomas (1991). Explaining Legislative Success in the U.S. Senate: The Role of the Majority and Minority Parties. **Western Political Quarterly** 44: 959-970.
- Olson, David M. and Cynthia T. Nonidez (1972). Measures of Legislative Performance in the U.S. House of Representatives. **Midwest Journal of Political Science** 16: 269-277.
- Polsby, Nelson W. (1975). Legislatures. In **The Handbook of Political Science, vol. 5: Governmental Institutions and Processes**, ed. Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Rosenthal, Alan, and Rod Forth (1978). The Assembly Line: Law Production in the American States. **Legislative Studies Quarterly**, 2:265-91.
- Squire, Peverill (1998) Membership Turnover and the Efficient Processing of Legislation. **Legislative Studies Quarterly**, 23: 23-32.

- Schiller, Wendy J. (1995). Senators as Political Entrepreneurs: Using Bill Sponsorship to Shape Legislative Agendas. *American Journal of Political Science*, 39: 186-203.
- Thielemann, Gregory S. (1992) Minority Legislators and Institutional Influence. *Social Science Journal* 29: 411-21.
- Thielemann, Gregory S. and Donald R. Dixon (1994). Explaining Contributions: Rational Contributors and the Elections for the 71st Texas House. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 19: 495-506.
- Tucker, H. J. (1985). Legislative Logjams: A Comparative State Analysis. *Western Political Quarterly* 38: 432-446.
- Tucker, H. J. (1987). Legislative Workload Congestion in Texas. *Journal of Politics* 49: 565-578.
- Tucker, H. J. (1987). Legislative Calendars and Workload Management in Texas. *Journal of Politics* 51: 631-645.
- Tucker, H. J. (1996). Bill Authors and Bill Sponsors in the 74th Texas Legislature," paper prepared for delivery at the 1996 Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association, San Francisco, California, March 14-16, 1996.
- Tucker, H. J. (1997). "Bill Authors, Bill Sponsors, and Bill Passage in the Texas Legislature," paper prepared for delivery at the 1997 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 10-12, 1997.
- Tucker, H. J. (1998). "DOA Bills in the Texas Legislature," paper prepared for delivery at the 1998 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 23-25, 1998.
- Tucker, H. J. and Gary M. Halter (1999). *Texas Legislative Almanac 1999*. College Station, Texas, Texas A&M University Press.
- Tucker, H. J. and Gary M. Halter (1997). *Texas Legislative Almanac 1997*. College Station, Texas, Texas A&M University Press.
- Wilson, Rick K. and Cheryl D. Young (1997). Cosponsorship in the U.S. Congress. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 22: 25-43.
- Zeller, Belle. Ed. (1954). *American State Legislatures*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

**Table 1**  
**Consideration of Minor Calendars**  
**74<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session, 1995**

House Local and Consent Calendars

CALENDAR DATE	CALENDAR DAY SECOND READING	CALENDAR DAY THIRD READING
March 30	81	82
April 6	86	87
April 20	100	101
April 28	108	109
May 7	117	118
May 8	118	119
May 12	122	123
May 16	126	127
May 19	129	130
May 24	134	135

Senate Local and Uncontested Calendar

CALENDAR DATE	CALENDAR DAY
March 27	78
April 3	83
April 6	86
April 12	92
April 20	100
April 25	105
April 26	106
April 28	108
May 2	112
May 4	114
May 8	118
May 10	120
May 12	122
May 16	126
May 22	132
May 24	134
May 27	137

**Table 2**  
**House Major and Minor Calendars**  
**1985 and 1995 Compared**

Bills Introduced

	Major	Minor
1985	725 (56%)	574 (44%)
1995	890 (59%)	630 (41%)

Bills Introduced After 60<sup>th</sup> Day

	Major	Minor
1985	60 (30%)	137 (70%)
1995	68 (41%)	98 (59%)

Bills Introduced in the Senate

	Major	Minor
1985	287 (56%)	222 44(%)
1995	329 (57%)	252 (43%)

Bills Introduced in the House

	Major	Minor
1985	438 (55%)	352 (45%)
1995	561 (60%)	378 (40%)

Bills With Companions

	Major	Minor
1985	256 (64%)	147 (36%)
1995	298 (64%)	165 (36%)

Distribution Across Committees (CRV)

	Major	Minor
1985	.516	1.07
1995	.583	.817

**Table 2**  
**House Major and Minor Calendars**  
**1985 and 1995 Compared**  
 continued

Bills Amended

	Major	Minor
1985	573 (63%)	331 (37%)
1995	680 (79%)	176 (21%)

Final Action After Day 126

	Major	Minor
1985	565 (55%)	451 (45%)
1995	612 (55%)	502 (45%)

Final Action to Pass After Day 126

	Major	Minor
1985	413 (51%)	398 (49%)
1995	443 (52%)	402 (48%)

Final Action to Kill After Day 126

	Major	Minor
1985	152 (74%)	53 (26%)
1995	169 (63%)	100 (37%)

Bills Passed

	Major	Minor
1985	532 (49%)	553 (51%)
1995	451 (47%)	502 (53%)

Bills Vetoed

	Major	Minor
1985	24 (55%)	20 (45%)
1995	20 (67%)	10 (33%)

**Table 3**  
**Legislative Success and Major and Minor Calendars**  
**74<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session, 1995**

<b>HOUSE BILLS</b>	<b>N Fail</b>	<b>N Pass</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Fail</b>	<b>% Pass</b>
All House bills	2653	584	3237	82%	18%
House bills on House Major Calendar	329	312	641	51%	49%
House bills on House Minor Calendar	139	272	411	34%	66%
House bills on House Major Calendar and Senate Major Calendar	48	182	230	21%	79%
House bills on House Major Calendar and Senate Minor Calendar	2	130	132	2%	98%
House bills on House Minor Calendar and Senate Major Calendar	34	81	115	30%	70%
House bills on House Minor Calendar and Senate Minor Calendar	8	191	199	4%	96%

  

<b>SENATE BILLS</b>	<b>N Fail</b>	<b>N Pass</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Fail</b>	<b>% Pass</b>
All Senate bills	1228	492	1720	71%	29%
Senate bills on Senate Regular Calendar	283	324	607	47%	53%
Senate bills on Senate Uncontested Calendar	83	168	251	33%	67%
Senate bills on Senate Regular Calendar and House Major Calendar	74	203	277	27%	73%
Senate bills on Senate Regular Calendar and House Minor Calendar	0	118	118	0%	100%
Senate bills on Senate Uncontested Calendar and House Major Calendar	25	38	63	40%	60%
Senate bills on Senate Uncontested Calendar and House Minor Calendar	6	130	136	4%	96%

  

<b>ALL BILLS</b>	<b>N Fail</b>	<b>N Pass</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Fail</b>	<b>% Pass</b>
All bills	3881	1076	4957	78%	22%
All bills on first chamber major calendar	612	636	1248	49%	51%
All bills on first chamber minor calendar	222	440	662	34%	66%
All bills on first chamber major calendar and second chamber major calendar	122	385	507	24%	76%
All bills on first chamber major calendar and second chamber minor calendar	2	248	250	1%	99%
All bills on first chamber minor calendar and second chamber major calendar	59	119	178	33%	67%
All bills on first chamber minor calendar and second chamber minor calendar	14	321	335	4%	96%

**Table 4**  
**Bill Placement on Major and Minor Calendars**  
**74<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session, 1995**

	House Major Calendar	House Minor Calendar		Senate Major Calendar	Senate Minor Calendar
House bills	641 (61%)	411 (39%)		345 (51%)	331 (49%)
Senate bills	340 (57%)	254 (43%)		607 (71%)	251 (29%)
Total bills	981 (60%)	665 (40%)		952 (64%)	528 (36%)

**Table 5**  
**House and Senate Use of Major and Minor Calendars Compared**  
**74<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session, 1995**

Bills Introduced

	Major	Minor
House calendar	890 (59%)	630 (41%)
Senate calendar	952 (64%)	528 (36%)

Bills Introduced After 60<sup>th</sup> Day

	Major	Minor
House calendar	68 (41%)	98 (59%)
Senate calendar	134 (59%)	92 (41%)

Bills Introduced in the Senate

	Major	Minor
House calendar	329 (57%)	252 (43%)
Senate calendar	607 (71%)	251 (29%)

Bills Introduced in the House

	Major	Minor
House calendar	561 (60%)	378 (40%)
Senate calendar	345 (51%)	331 (49%)

Bills With Companions

	Major	Minor
House calendar	298 (64%)	165 (36%)
Senate calendar	317 (68%)	149 (32%)

Distribution Across Committees (CRV)

	Major	Minor
House calendar	.583	.817
Senate calendar	.569	.715

**Table 5**  
**House and Senate Use of Major and Minor Calendars Compared**  
**74<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session, 1995**  
 continued

Bills Amended

	Major	Minor
House calendar	680 (79%)	176 (21%)
Senate calendar	403 (77%)	122 (23%)

Final Action After Day 126

	Major	Minor
House calendar	612 (55%)	502 (45%)
Senate calendar	630 (60%)	416 (40%)

Bills Passed

	Major	Minor
House calendar	553 (52%)	520 (48%)
Senate calendar	587 (55%)	489 (45%)

Bills Vetoed

	Major	Minor
House calendar	14 (58%)	10 (42%)
Senate calendar	16 (67%)	8 (33%)

Bills With Multiple Authors

	Major	Minor
House calendar	156 (71%)	63 (29%)
Senate calendar	125 (69%)	55 (31%)

Bills With Multiple Sponsors

	Major	Minor
House calendar	52 (70%)	22 (30%)
Senate calendar	66 (80%)	16 (20%)

**Table 6**  
**Inter-chamber Agreement on Calendar Placement**  
**74<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session, 1995**

	<b>House Major Calendar</b>	<b>House Minor Calendar</b>
Senate Major Calendar	507 (40%)	233 (18%)
Senate Minor Calendar	195 (15%)	335 (26%)

**Table 7**  
**Inter-chamber Disagreement on Calendar Placement**  
**74<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session, 1995**

Explanation 1: Amended bills  
 Bills on House Major and Senate Minor

Total bills	195
House bills amended by House	64
Senate bills amended by House	23
Total amended bills	87

Bills on House Minor and Senate Major

Total bills	233
Senate bills amended by Senate	35
House bills amended by Senate	27
Total amended bills	85

Explanation 2: Late Final Action  
 Bills on House Major and Senate Minor

Total bills	195
Senate bills final action after day 126	39

Bills on House Minor and Senate Major

Total bills	233
House Bills final action after day 126	101

Combined explanation: amendment or late consideration in second chamber.

Bills on House Major and Senate Minor

Total bills	195
House bills amended by House	64
Senate bills amended by House or final action after day 126	45
Total combined explanation	109

Bills on House Minor and Senate Major

Total bills	233
Senate bills amended by Senate	35
House bills amended by Senate or by House or final action after day 126	107
Total combined explanation	142

**Table 8**  
**Legislative Calendar Specialization**  
**Most Successful Legislators**

All Members

	Major	Minor
House calendar	890 (59%)	630 (41%)
Senate calendar	952 (64%)	528 (36%)

Author is Committee Chair

	Major	Minor
House calendar	434 (65%)	235 (35%)
Senate calendar	453 (65%)	248 (35%)

Author is on Power Committee

	Major	Minor
House calendar	575 (61%)	375 (39%)
Senate calendar	694 (68%)	322 (32%)

Author Holds Power Position

	Major	Minor
House calendar	708 (61%)	444 (39%)
Senate calendar	776 (66%)	405 (34%)

Author Tenure Above Median

	Major	Minor
House calendar	512 (63%)	305 (37%)
Senate calendar	433 (63%)	250 (37%)

**Table 9**  
**Legislative Calendar Specialization**  
**Other Legislators**

All Members

	Major	Minor
House calendar	890 (59%)	630 (41%)
Senate calendar	952 (64%)	528 (36%)

Author Male

	Major	Minor
House calendar	822 (59%)	569 (41%)
Senate calendar	830 (63%)	497 (37%)

Author Female

	Major	Minor
House calendar	159 (62%)	96 (38%)
Senate calendar	122 (59%)	85 (41%)

Author Democrat

	Major	Minor
House calendar	605 (60%)	397 (40%)
Senate calendar	563 (62%)	348 (38%)

Author Republican

	Major	Minor
House calendar	376 (58%)	268 (42%)
Senate calendar	389 (62%)	234 (38%)

Author Anglo

	Major	Minor
House calendar	775 (61%)	491 (39%)
Senate calendar	726 (62%)	439 (38%)

**Table 9**  
**Legislative Calendar Specialization**  
**Other Legislators**  
continued

Author Hispanic

	Major	Minor
House calendar	144 (52%)	131 (48%)
Senate calendar	160 (60%)	107 (40%)

Author Black

	Major	Minor
House calendar	62 (59%)	43 (41%)
Senate calendar	66 (65%)	36 (35%)

Author Protestant

	Major	Minor
House calendar	613 (60%)	410 (40%)
Senate calendar	574 (61%)	370 (39%)

Author Catholic

	Major	Minor
House calendar	298 (59%)	211 (41%)
Senate calendar	296 (49%)	309 (51%)

Author Freshman

	Major	Minor
House calendar	52 (47%)	59 (53%)
Senate calendar	48 (48%)	51 (52%)

Author Experienced

	Major	Minor
House calendar	929 (61%)	606 (39%)
Senate calendar	605 (70%)	265 (30%)