

file

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DALLAS DELEGATION

<u>Name</u>	<u>Dallas Phone</u>
Fred Agnich.....	
Ben Atwell.....	
Jack Blanton.....	
John F. Boyle.....	
Bill Braecklein.....	
Sam Coats.....	
Joe Golman.....	
Joe Hawn.....	
Zan W. Holmes.....	
Dick McKissack.....	
Griffith Moore.....	
Fred Orr.....	
Dick Reed.....	
Chris Semos.....	
Jim Stroud.....	

SENATE MEMBERS FROM THE DALLAS AREA

Ralph Hall.....	
O.H. Harris.....	
Oscar Mauzy.....	
Mike McKool.....	

Unit Meetings Sept. 11-12, 1968Resource and Unit Leader's Discussion Guide on the Texas LegislaturePROGRAM TAKES 1 3/4 - 2 HOURS.....

The program part of this meeting, including the taking of consensus, will require at least 1 hour and 45 minutes. A time allowance of 2 hours would be much more satisfactory. We will take consensus on four items, all of them having at least two parts, and each of the four will need at least five minutes for consensus and may need as much as 10.

THE RESOURCE PERSON; THE UNIT LEADER.....

The resource person should be familiar enough with the accompanying resource material, Addenda, so that she can put into the discussion when appropriate items that would contribute to the discussion, clarify a point, open up a new line of thought, or help the discussion to move along.

The unit leader, who also should be familiar with Addenda, should be alert to give the resource person opportunity to present her material when appropriate. The resource person would respond primarily to a cue from the unit leader or questions from unit members, but because of her more extensive knowledge she also should feel free to give her information without a cue or question when she sees an opportunity to aid the discussion. But she should never monopolize or give information just for the sake of giving it.

BASIC MATERIAL; ADDITIONAL MATERIAL.....

The basic material for this unit meeting is the every-member material--the two blue sheets--which went out with the new roster to all Dallas League members during the last week of August. Unit leaders and resource people should be completely familiar with this material and should have it at hand at the meeting. In notifying unit members of the meeting, preparatory reading of the blue sheets and bringing them to the meeting should be stressed, although no one, of course, should receive the impression that she shouldn't attend the meeting if she hasn't done her home work!

Unit leaders and resource people should also know the material headed LOBBY METHODS, pages 2-3 of "Influence Of The Lobby" (the fourth Facts & Issues on the Texas Legislature). This is pertinent to our questions on campaign costs and conflict of interest.

VISUAL AIDS.....

Only the simplest form of visual aid is suggested for this meeting, but it is important to have that--and the resource person would usually prepare it. The four groups of consensus questions should be written LARGE on two pieces of poster cardboard, using one side per group. Or a roll of 18" shelf paper can be used, with enough spacing between the groups of questions so that only one group is visible at a time. On the basis of the saying that "one picture is worth a thousand words" it is hard to estimate how many words our suggested visual aids are worth, but they do help to focus discussion on the question at hand and they do add some "seeing" to a meeting that is otherwise "saying" and "hearing"!

And now for a different sort of visual aid--one that the resource person does for her own use. Addenda, the resource material which accompanies this discussion guide, contains two types of information: (1) what is ESSENTIAL for a good discussion of the subject, and (2) what is OPTIONAL for presentation, depending upon how the discussion develops and what questions are asked. The essential material is designated "E". Accentuating the "E" with a brilliantly colored check mark, for example, makes the indispensable information easy to find and present.

THE UNIT MEETING.....

Note that two time periods are given for three of the four topics to be discussed in the program part of the meeting. Two hours are allotted for program time if the longer periods are used, 1 hour 45 minutes if the shorter periods are used.

Announcements (unit leader).....20 minutes

Program.....1 hour 45 minutes to 2 hours

Introduction (unit leader).....5 minutes

This is the sixth unit meeting we have had on the Texas legislature in less than two years. Our first three unit meetings, a go-see tour of the legislature in session, and two general meetings with several of our Dallas County legislators gave us background information and started us on our way to forming opinions about the problems of the legislature. Very helpful, too, were the research of our Dallas League's legislature resource committee and the four Facts & Issues on the Texas legislature put out by the state League.

In the fourth and fifth unit meetings we came to consensus on various recommendations to improve the legislature. And in today's (or tonight's) meeting we will discuss questions in four further areas concerning the legislature and see if we can agree on what, if anything, should be done about them.

Much of our discussion will deal with regulations that might be made, and laws and constitutional amendments that might be passed. Let's think of these from the viewpoint of the contribution they might, or might not, make to upgrading the legislature. Let's think of them, also, from the viewpoint of: Will they contribute to obtaining an increasing number of high quality legislators for Texas?

We have four groups of questions to consider. They are: campaign costs; conflict of interest; verbatim records; and what, if any, limitations on annual sessions.

I'm to be the discussion leader and Mrs. _____ is our resource person. Mrs. _____ is our recorder, who, at the end of the discussion of each set of questions, will read what seems to be the consensus of the group and with the group's help evolve a final statement of consensus. This statement, of course, would be that we do not have consensus if that is the situation.

Campaign Costs. 20 - 25 minutes

The questions for discussion are:

1. DO YOU CONSIDER HIGH CAMPAIGN COSTS A PROBLEM IN ELECTING LEGISLATORS RESPONSIVE TO THE PUBLIC?
2. IF SO, WHAT SOLUTIONS WOULD YOU SUGGEST?

Following the statement of the questions the resource person would present from Addenda the several "E" items which are listed under sub-headings 1 and 2 of the main heading "Campaign Costs". The sub-headings are "Costs" and "Costs Help Limit Type of Candidate".

Discussion of the second question necessarily hinges on the group's answer to the first question. If it is "yes", the resource person would open discussion of the second question by presenting the "E" items which are listed under sub-heading 3 ("Solutions").

Formulation of consensus statement.

Conflict of Interest. 30 - 35 minutes

The questions for discussion are:

1. IN YOUR OPINION, DOES THE TEXAS LEGISLATURE HAVE ADEQUATE STANDARDS OR GUIDELINES TO DEFINE CONFLICT OF INTEREST?
2. IF NOT, WHAT STANDARDS WOULD ENCOURAGE PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN LEGISLATORS?

Following the statement of the questions the resource person should present from Addenda the "E" items which are listed under sub-heading 1 ("Present Standards") of the main heading "Conflict of Interest".

Again, discussion of the second question must hinge on the group's answer to the first question. If the answer is "no", the resource person would open discussion of the second question by presenting the "E" items which are given under sub-heading 2 ("Proposed Standards").

Formulation of consensus statement.

Verbatim Record. 20 minutes

The questions for discussion are:

1. SHOULD THERE BE A PUBLISHED VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF EACH HOUSE OF THE LEGISLATURE?
2. SHOULD THERE BE A PUBLISHED VERBATIM RECORD OF THE COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OF EACH HOUSE?

Probably both of these questions can be discussed at the same time. At the start of the discussion the resource person should give from Addenda the "E" items which are listed under sub-heading 1 ("Present Procedure") of the main heading "Verbatim Record". The other "E" items should be given when appropriate.

Formulation of consensus statement which would cover both questions.

Annual Sessions - What, If Any, Limitations. 30 - 35 minutes

The questions for discussion are:

1. SHOULD THERE BE SOME LIMIT ON THE LENGTH OF THE SESSIONS? IF SO, WHAT LIMIT?

2. SHOULD BUSINESS BE CARRIED OVER FROM ONE SESSION TO THE NEXT?

3. SHOULD ONE OF THE SESSIONS OF EACH BIENNIUM BE LIMITED TO BUDGET MATTERS?

These questions should be discussed separately and a separate consensus taken for each, with the possibility of having to take consensus for each part of Question 1.

Question 1 will probably need the most time for discussion, especially if the group decides to limit the annual sessions. Question 2 should require the least time for discussion, and Question 3 an in-between amount of time.

Before discussion starts, the resource person should present from Addenda the "E" items which are listed under sub-heading 1 ("Limited vs. Unlimited") of the main heading "Annual Sessions". If the consensus is in favor of limiting sessions then before discussion begins on the second part of Question 1 the resource person should present the "E" items under sub-heading 2 ("If Limited, What Limit?"). When consensus on that is completed the "E" items under sub-heading 3 ("Continuous Session") should be presented. And when consensus on Question 2 is completed the resource person should start the discussion on Question 3 by presenting the "E" items under sub-heading 4 ("Budget Matters").

Perhaps your group will definitely want to discuss the three questions all at once. In that case the resource person should see that all the "E" items are presented at one time or another and the unit leader should see that all three questions are covered in the consensus.

Verbatim Record. 20 minutes

The questions for discussion are:

1. SHOULD THERE BE A PUBLISHED VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF EACH HOUSE OF THE LEGISLATURE?

2. SHOULD THERE BE A PUBLISHED VERBATIM RECORD OF THE COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OF EACH HOUSE?

Probably both of these questions can be discussed at the same time. At the start of the discussion the resource person should give from Addenda the "E" items which are listed under sub-heading 1 ("Verbatim Record") of the main heading "Verbatim Record". The other "E" items should be given when appropriate.

Formulation of consensus statement which would cover both questions.

Texas Legislature

File

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF DALLAS

AUGUST, 1968

ADDENDA

Resource Material for Unit Meetings Sept. 11 - 12, 1968

This material comes from many sources. Among them are the textbooks on Texas government and politics by Professors W. E. Benton, Stuart MacCorkle and Dick Smith, and CClifton McCleskey; the history of Texas by Rupert N. Richardson; Lobbying and the Law, by Prof. Edgar Lane, of the University of California at Santa Barbara; Modernizing State Government, Committee for Economic Development; the workbook and the final report of the Texas Assembly; the report of the 29th American Assembly; recommendations for legislative improvement, compiled from various sources by the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures; the booklet, "Hamstrung Legislatures", by J. N. Miller; and many issues of the monthly bulletin, "State Legislatures Progress Reporter", published by the National Municipal League.

I. Campaign Costs

1. Costs

/E/ Writers on Texas government agree that because of loopholes in the election code and non enforcement it is almost impossible to determine the total amounts spent in political campaigns. However, educated guesses can be made, based on what candidates report, the various activities that go into a campaign, and the cost of such items as filing fees, newspaper and TV ads and radio spot announcements. The resulting estimate is \$10,000 - \$20,000 for a candidate for the House of Representatives, with costs increasing all the time.

/E/ Where does the money for a candidate's campaign come from? "From those who have it," one legislator is said to have answered. Voluntary fund-raising drives can be conducted by unions through a "Committee on Political Education" (COPE) and by business associations through a "Public Interest Political Education Fund" (PIPE). Labor can furnish organizational skills and volunteer work. "A corporation can make available without cost the services of a highly paid public relations expert....A company's budget for stamps may expand several fold in campaign season, and it may by prearrangement be billed for printing actually done for a candidate. Top management officials may as individuals contribute to candidates, and then perhaps find that they have earned a bonus from the corporation of about the same amount. A bank can without any attempt to collect write off a campaign 'loan' as a bad debt, and thus in effect make a contribution that is tax deductible....One other source of money in politics....is the criminal element." (McCleskey, The Government and Politics of Texas.)

/E/ We should not feel that elections are won by money alone. A candidate must certainly have some money to win an election but, as Prof. McCleskey says, "there is always a point in campaign financing beyond which dollars have a declining impact on the vote. If a candidate can obtain a minimum he may be able to offset the thicker bankroll of his opponent by effective campaigning and by utilizing volunteer assistance." Prof. Benton says that if campaign funds flow too freely the voters are likely to think the election is being bought and vote against the candidate.

2. Costs Help Limit Type of Candidate

/E/ The high cost of campaigns contributes to restricting candidacies to the portion of the population who have access to considerable sums of money and who hold views acceptable to one or another of the sources of campaign funds. High campaign costs add to the pressure of low legislative salaries to restrict the walks of life from which legislators come. In Texas, as in other states, the legislature is made up mainly of two groups: businessmen and lawyers, most of them with partners or families back home to keep the business running while they are gone. "This is, of course, a very thin slice of America," notes the workbook of the Texas Assembly. Solution of the problem of campaign costs would seem to be a major means of fostering recruitment of legislators from a broader spectrum of society.

"Too much emphasis cannot be given to the importance of assistance in financing campaigns. Some observers believe that this is the most effective method of influencing legislation. Many officials, both in the executive branch and in the legislature, enter office with political obligations due their financial supporters. Some members of the legislature could, in all propriety, be addressed by the presiding officers as 'the gentlemen from this or that corporation or organization' rather than by the usual form of 'the gentlemen from this or that county'." (MacCorkle and Smith, Texas Government.)

3. Solutions (Note: A good visual aid would be to write the key words of each solution on poster cardboard or shelf paper so the group can keep them in mind during the discussion.)

/E/ A. Texas election laws regarding campaign financing are based on "the conviction that public disclosure of amounts and sources," as Prof. McCleskey puts it, "will provide its own checks and limitations." But this assumes full and complete disclosure, which is not the actual situation both because of loopholes in the law and abuses of it. Suggested amendments to the Election Code are:

(1) Require reporting of every political expenditure above a minimum, say \$50. This would be applicable to candidates, to direct spending by individuals, and to any political organization, group, or committee that spends money on behalf of a candidate.

(2) Make a state agency responsible for examining reports and investigating possible violations.

- (3) Change the timing of financial reports so the public will know before the election what a candidate's total expense will be within a small variation. A legislator has suggested that the report be two days before the election and the estimate of total spending be within 10%. The post-election financial report would show what the expenses actually were.

/E/ B. Primary elections are public institutions and should be financed as such. Therefore, the state or the counties should pay for the primaries just as they now do for the general elections. This is done in a good many states.

/E/ C. Provide each candidate with a certain minimum of exposure to the voters and minimize financial inequities among candidates by

- (1) Guaranteeing a certain amount of free broadcast time on radio and TV

- (2) Guaranteeing a limited number of free mailings as is done in Great Britain

- (3) Requiring all candidates to provide their pictures and statements for a pamphlet to be produced and distributed by the state. This is a recommendation of the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Washington legislature and builds upon an existing law in that state.

/E/ D. Allow limited tax credits or tax deductions for contributions to candidates' campaigns. This was recommended both to Congress and state legislatures in the report of the 29th (1966) American Assembly, in order to encourage widespread popular support of candidates.

Further information on some of the above solutions. Solution A.(2): the state agency would have local offices, would act upon complaints and tips from citizens, and would initiate its own inquiries and actions. "Much information concerning money in Texas politics of vital interest to the electorate could /thus/ be developed," says Prof. McCleskey.... Solution A.(3): At present candidates frequently declare minimum expenses in the pre-election report (which must be filed 7 to 10 days before the election) and report complete costs only in the final declaration which is made after the election. "Thus publicity about campaign spending is misleading before elections and publicity concerning complete spending comes too late to have any effect on elections," points out Prof. W. E. Benton of Texas A & M. Solution C.(1): The procedure would be for the federal government to make the stipulation of free time when it licenses radio and TV stations. Prof. McCleskey comments that "Since the stations are receiving their very valuable licenses free of charge, such a requirement could hardly be said to work a hardship on them, and it would do much to ensure a minimum exposure of candidates to the public."

.....

II. Conflict of Interest

1. Present standards

/E/ TEXAS. Professors MacCorkle and Smith describe the law in these words (underlinings mine): "In general, the law passed in 1957 enacting the Legislative Code of Ethics provides that no legislator or other state official or employee shall have any interest or engage in any business or profession which is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of his public duties. Specifically, the act prohibits employment, gifts, favors, or services that might reasonably tend to influence him. No legislator with a personal interest in a bill is supposed to vote on it, and such interest is to be disclosed to the house. Anyone subject to the act who is an officer or agent or owns a controlling interest in a business regulated by a state agency must disclose that fact. Any firm with such legislative or other official connections cannot sell goods or services to the state agency which regulates it. The penalty for noncompliance is expulsion, removal from office, or discharge." BUT THERE IS NO PROVISION FOR ENFORCEMENT. It is interesting to note that the legislature in 1957 did not enact legislation requested by Governor Daniel to establish a new state law-enforcing agency with prestige and broad powers to scrutinize the conduct of public officials. And the legislature has continued to refuse to define "substantial" as used in the prohibition in the Ethics Code of "substantial conflict with public duties." Because there is no provision for enforcement, Professors MacCorkle and Smith conclude that "the practical value of the Code of Ethics is far from certain, but conceivably it could consist of two things:

1. It could serve as a possible basis for disciplinary action. Removal from office....might result from flagrant violation of the code.
2. It could serve as a guide to a conscientious legislator or other officer if he were in doubt as to whether a certain line of action was ethical or not."

NEW YORK. An Associated Press article of about a year ago on the weakness of codes of ethics in state legislatures says: "New York's 1965 ethics code is regarded as a model by many officials in other states. It bars lawyer-legislators from practicing in the state's Court of Claims, keeps former legislators from lobbying for two years after their terms, bans promoting of legislation by legislative employees....and forces financial disclosure by legislators in connection with interests in businesses regulated by the state. Penalties up to a \$500 fine and one year in jail are provided." The article does not say whether New York's code contains provisions for enforcement, but it says that New York, Ohio, and California have "tough codes".

/E/

FLORIDA. Since 1959 in the wake of State Road Board scandals, codes of ethics bills had been introduced but failed to pass in the legislature. In 1966 there were Purchasing Commission scandals. The 1967 legislature adopted a comprehensive code of ethics for the first time in Florida's history, despite "massive, clandestine and persistent" efforts by lobbyists to defeat the measures. Also, "The very proposal of a code of ethics, some legislators said, was a reflection on their character. If a code were required, they argued, a short and simple exhortation--such as 'be honest'--should suffice." Nevertheless the reform measures carried. The Senate adopted a code of ethics for its members, and a code for lobbyists. The House incorporated in its rules a code for members as well as for lobbyists. An honor system is established for legislators and a committee on standards and conduct is provided in each house to interpret and apply standards. Those are the provisions for enforcement. Penalties, aside from any provided by law, are that "either house of the legislature, by two-thirds vote after notice and hearing, may censure, reprimand, place on probation or expel a member."

FLORIDA. The 1967 legislature "enacted a general law establishing standards of conduct for officers and employees of state agencies, legislators and legislative employees in areas of possible conflict between their private interests and official duties. It focused on six areas: using public office for private gain, giving preferential treatment to any person or organization, impeding governmental efficiency or impartiality of action, making governmental decisions outside official channels or affecting adversely the confidence of the public in the integrity of government."

The information in the above paragraphs about Florida and all quotations are from an article by Prof. Paul Douglass, director of the Center for Practical Politics at Rollins College, and member, secretary and draftsman of the lay committee which recommended canons of ethics and legislation to the 1967 Florida legislature.

2. Proposed standards

/E/

A. Introduction. Apparently there are two major ways of tackling the problem of conflict of interest: (1) set up standards for legislators and specifically prohibit various actions that would violate the standards; (2) require public disclosure of legislators' income. The first approach tells the legislator what he may not do, the second tells the public what he did do. The present Texas law uses the first approach, but without any provision for enforcement. The "setting of standards" approach seems to be the one that is used in all states having conflict of interest laws or legislative rules; our resource committee has so far discovered no state which uses the "public disclosure of legislators' income" approach. However, there is more and more discussion of the latter approach as conflict of interest problems increase and the former approach proves relatively ineffective. Recommendations of both sorts follow.

/E/

B. Strengthen the present Texas law by, at the very least, including a definition of "substantial" and "reasonably" and making provision for enforcement.

/E/ C. Recommendations for public disclosure of legislators' income.

- (1) Public disclosure by each legislator of sources and amounts of receipts that create conflict of interest.
- (2) Public disclosure by each legislator and the lieutenant governor of the amount and source of all monthly and yearly income.
- (3) Public disclosure by each legislator of the amount and source of outside income, along with associations that he or his immediate family may have that might imply "special interest".

An explanation of conflict of interest, and arguments for and against public disclosure laws are in paragraphs 2 - 5 in the section on Conflict of Interest of the every-member material--the blue sheets.

D. Recommendation of the 29th American Assembly (1966).

"Increasing connections between public and private life have led to public concern over conflicts of interest. Efforts to define and control conflicts of interest have satisfied neither the public nor the legislatures. We recommend:

First, codes of ethics should be adopted, applying to career, appointed and elected public officials, in all branches of state government.

Second, ethics committees or commissions should be created with advisory, review, and investigative functions which should extend to the activities of lobbyists.

Third, all instances of corruption should be vigorously prosecuted.

E. Recommendation of the Texas Assembly (1967).

- (1) Legislators should be prohibited from appearing before state agencies in adversary proceedings for compensation. This should be made to apply in any case where the legislator might in any manner stand to gain financially from the action of the state agency.
- (2) Safeguards should be established to prevent abuses of the law providing for legislative continuances /the practice of postponing for the duration of the legislative session lawsuits where any party is represented by a lawyer-legislator/.

.....

III. Verbatim Record

Enough fuel for a lively discussion is in the every-member material--the blue sheets. Following is supplementary material on the present situation in state legislatures and legislative committees regarding recording of their proceedings, and also material illustrative of the value of verbatim records in the "legislative history" of a law.

1. Present procedures, as of 1965-66. (From The Book of the States, 1965-66, quoted in the workbook of the Texas Assembly)

/E/ A. Maine, Nebraska, New York, and Pennsylvania maintain verbatim records of the proceedings of the legislature, and West Virginia does for the House. Seven additional states maintain such records with one or more limitations. The states are: Connecticut, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey, Tennessee, Utah, and Washington. Common limitations are that the records are typed only, or that they are maintained only in part, or that they are maintained only upon request, or that debate is not included. Nevada's limitations are unique: both houses record all proceedings with mechanical recorders, but only partial transcriptions are made and those only occasionally.

/E/ B. Only two states--Hawaii and Oregon--give an unqualified "yes" answer to the question: Are records of committee hearings and proceedings taken? Seventeen additional states maintain such records subject to one or more limitations. The most common limitations are that the records are taken only at the request of the committee or committee chairman, or that they are taken for the most important committees only, or that they are typed only or taken only occasionally.

2. Value for legislative history of laws.

/E/ A. "Testimony and legislative debate should be fully recorded for future reference, as in Pennsylvania." --Committee for Economic Development, 1967.

/E/ B. A Missouri legislator says that he gets calls about once a month from attorneys asking for transcripts of committee hearings that would show legislative intent, but there are none. (The Missouri legislature publishes a daily journal which shows the rulings of the chair and all votes, but there is no verbatim record maintained of the legislature's proceedings, nor are records of committee proceedings and hearings taken.)

/E/ C. With regard to records, Texas is like Missouri, and the absence of a legislative history of laws must often have been a handicap to interpreting them. An example is the county home rule amendment and its enabling act. Lack of a record of what the legislature intended in these poorly-drawn acts has helped appreciably to stymie attempts to achieve county home rule.

.....

IV. Annual sessions.1. Limited vs. unlimited

- /E/ A. Limited sessions of legislatures are not necessarily really limited. Some states do have an absolute limit, which often means "stopping the clock" so that the session can continue and still be legal. In other states the length of the session, although specified, can be extended, but legislators' pay may or may not continue. Unlimited sessions, likewise, are not unlimited in actual practice, although they are so far as constitutional and statutory provisions are concerned. They are, actually, flexible in length, according to the amount of business with which the legislature will deal.
- /E/ B. Six of the 8 states which do not limit their legislative sessions are comparable to Texas in the very important areas of industrialization, urbanization, and the problems they bring. California, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania find annual sessions, with no limit by constitution or statute on their length, to be necessary for the business a legislature needs to take care of in these times. Is there a lesson in this for Texas?
- C. "All states with heavy work loads need the kind of legislative freedom that comes from annual general sessions of unrestricted duration.... Unrestricted annual sessions allow time for detailed study of major problems and more careful review of bills proposed to solve them. They afford more days and weeks for deliberations and they eliminate the long, 20-month period in which no legislative determinations are possible without the governor's initiative /his calling of special sessions/. They reduce the flood of hasty and ill-considered legislation in the waning hours of a session.... They also allow continuity and more effective use of research and secretarial staffs."--Committee for Economic Development, 1967.
- /E/ D. Unlimited annual sessions necessarily develop legislators to whom legislating is a profession. Is this good or bad? Says Robert Crown, chairman of California's Assembly Ways and Means Committee, "Look. This is the twentieth century. The California legislature is the board of directors for a \$4 billion corporation. The average assemblyman serves an electorate of 200,000 people. Serving and getting elected is a full-time job. We need professionals. In fact, I like to think I am a professional."....The opposite view is taken by Edward Staples, executive director of the Missouri Public Expenditure Survey, who says, "You don't want to develop a staff of professional governmentals; you want /in the legislature/ the broad viewpoint of the farmers, the lawyers, the teachers, the doctors, the businessmen. A good farmer gives the flavor of the general citizenry to the legislature."

2. If limited, what limit?

- /E/ A. In the 13 states that limit annual sessions the highest limit is 160 calendar days (Colorado), the next to highest is 90 legislative days (Delaware), the lowest limit is 45 calendar days (Georgia), and the next to lowest is 45 legislative days (South Dakota).
- /E/ B. House Speaker Ben Barnes has said that "real progress will forever elude Texas" so long as the legislature holds only one 140 day session every two years. This would indicate that in his opinion annual sessions should be longer than 70 days.

3. Continuous session

- /E/ A. The term "continuous session" applies to legislatures with annual sessions. It means that the unfinished legislation of the first session of the biennium is automatically carried over to the second session and starts in the second session at the place where it left off in the first. In effect, this gives bills the opportunity to live for two years rather than one. And there is more time for consideration of bills, more time to draft them carefully, and more time for legislators to become familiar with the bills--to know their content, how well they carry out their expressed purpose, and what "jokers" may be in them. There is more time, also, to understand and assess the forces that support and oppose important bills. Legislators have the interim between sessions in which to study problems and meet with constituents.... Opponents of the continuous session say that legislators probably spend little time studying carry-over legislation and that practically all important legislation is passed or defeated during the first session. Opponents question letting controversial issues be carried over, on the ground that delaying the decision-making process of the legislature is undesirable.

4. Budget matters.

- /E/ A. Texas has had much unhappy experience with budgeting for a two-year period. The way to budget for a one-year period is for the legislature to do it every year. True, that may mean that each of the annual sessions may be tied up for some time by adoption of the budget....It may help the unit group in its discussion of whether to limit one session of each biennium to budget matters to know the point of view of the authors of the three books on Texas government which the resource committee has found most helpful. Prof. McCleskey says that the state's budget is particularly difficult to handle on the biennial basis. Prof. Benton says that another advantage of annual sessions is that it would permit the state budget and appropriations to be set up for a year ahead instead of requiring finances to be figured for two years in advance. Professors MacCorkle and Smith do not express an opinion of their own....Perhaps additional help to the discussion may come from the following facts:

1. That of the 8 annual session states holding budget sessions every other year, only one (Pennsylvania) is comparable to Texas in size of budget and in industrialization, urbanization, and the problems they bring.
2. "More careful attention can be given to budget matters if annual budgets replace biennial..... To prevent undue delays, specific deadlines may be set for financial enactments." -- Committee for Economic Development.

Dear Resource People:

After the final consensus has been achieved on the many questions regarding annual sessions, here is a suggestion for finishing with a flourish -- read to your group the following quotation from the American Assembly and see how closely they and the Assembly agree!

"To develop more responsibility in legislative performance, and more independence, legislatures should be continuing bodies meeting in annual plenary sessions, without limitation of time or subject."

Yours for a grand finale,

Elizabeth F. Brownscombe
Legislature Committee Chairman

Consensus on the Legislative Study
State Item I

Member interest and participation (over 150 at each of the two Unit meetings) were high, discussion was lively, and a great variety of improvements in the Legislature were suggested. Time allotted for a subject of this scope and complexity was insufficient to explore many areas of special interest and possible agreement.

Consensus

The following consensus emerged from our membership. The underlined statements were especially strong.

- I. Structure
 - Annual sessions of the Legislature
 - Higher salaries for legislators
 - Four year terms for representatives
 - No increase in size
- II. Procedure
 - Reduction of Lt. Governor's power
 - Assignment of bills to committee by subject matter
 - Resolution of local issues by local governments
- III. Committees
 - Conference committee action confined to resolution of differences between Senate and House Bills.
 - Fewer committees, with sufficient staffs
 - Public records of all hearings and meetings
 - Adequate advance notice of hearings and meetings
- IV. Aids to Legislators
 - Adequate staff, both clerical and research
 - Decent office space in the Capitol and in home districts
 - Expanded bill drafting and analysis services
 - Wider use of electronic and mechanical aids
 - Continuation of internship program
 - Continuation and expansion of orientation program
- V. Governor
 - Increase of Governor's power in Executive Department
- VI. Lobby
 - Reports from candidates containing all contributions, whenever made, both monetary and otherwise
 - Enforcement of requirement that lobbyists file expenses and inclusion of interim expenses in report
 - Provision of better research facilities and higher pay for legislators to reduce their dependence on the lobby

Areas of Interest

Not strong enough for consensus, but approved by approximately half the Units were the following suggestions:

- Election of rules committee in each House
- Single budget, submitted by Governor
- Salaries of legislators set by statute, not by constitutional amendment
- Readoption of 1967 House rules by 1969 House, and encouragement of Senate to adopt similar rules
- The only subject that aroused a real conflict of opinions was the question of single member vs multimember districts for representatives

Possible Subjects for Further Study

- Unicameralism
- Reduction of size of House
- Bill procedure - prefiling, printing according to 1967 House Rules, checking for legality, adequate time for consideration of amendments from the floor before voting

Consensus on the Legislative Study

Joint and parallel committee activities
Possibilities of computer uses in research, comparative studies of other States, statute retrieval, etc. (with attention to invasion of privacy)
Advantages of electronic recording of votes in the Senate
Feasibility of a lobby law which would plug loopholes, and a realistic code of ethics for legislators (possibly including sources of income)
Limitation of campaigning expenses and/or campaign time

The following consensus emerged from our membership. The underlined statements were especially strong.

I. Structure

Annual sessions of the Legislature
Higher salaries for legislators
Four year terms for representatives
No increase in size

II. Procedure

Reduction of Lt. Governor's power
Assignment of bills to committee by subject matter
Resolution of local issues by local governments

III. Committees

Conference committee action confined to resolution of differences between Senate and House bills
Fewer committees, with sufficient staffs
Public records of all hearings and meetings
Adequate advance notice of hearings and meetings

IV. Aids to Legislators

Adequate staff, both clerical and research
Decent office space in the Capitol and in home districts
Expanded bill drafting and analysis services
Wider use of electronic and mechanical aids
Continuation of internship program
Continuation and expansion of orientation program

V. Governor

Reduction of Governor's power in Executive Department

VI. Lobby

Reports from candidates containing all contributions, whenever made, both monetary and otherwise
Enforcement of requirement that lobbyists file expenses and inclusion of interim expenses in report
Provision of better research facilities and higher pay for legislators to reduce their dependence on the lobby

Areas of Interest

Not strong enough for consensus, but approved by approximately half the Units were the following suggestions:
Election of rules committee in each House
Single budget, submitted by Governor
Salaries of legislators set by statute, not by constitutional amendment
Rescission of 1967 House rules by 1969 House, and encouragement of Senate to adopt similar rules
The only subject that aroused a real conflict of opinions was the question of single member vs. multi-member districts for representatives

Possible Subjects for Further Study

Unicameralism
Reduction of size of House
BRI procedure - printing, printing according to 1967 House Rules, checking for legality, adequate time for consideration of amendments from the floor before voting

REPORT ON INTERVIEWS WITH DALLAS COUNTY LEGISLATORS

All eighteen legislators were asked a battery of questions similar to those that we are asking ourselves in evaluating the effectiveness of the legislative process in Texas. Their comments are summarized below. Names have been used only in connection with past history, not with opinions or suggestions.

Structure of the Legislature: Seventeen legislators prefer a bicameral structure. One felt that unicameralism is worth considering because he believes that each house, instead of checking the other, is inclined to pass the buck to the other, expecting it to be the watchdog for poor legislation--especially when pressed for time. Rep. Stroud mentioned that when a constitutional amendment for a unicameral legislature was proposed in the 59th session, only 32 out of 150 representatives voted for this proposal.

Size of the Legislature:

House--Eleven legislators want to see the size of the House left at 150 representatives. Two felt it should be increased and four, decreased in size.

Senate--Two-thirds of the delegation like the present size of the Senate (31), and one-third want it increased in size.

Several legislators commented on the ratio of representatives to senators (presently 5 to 1). One wanted 4 to 1, one 3 to 1 as originally set up by the Texas Constitution, and one wanted a 2 to 1 ratio in order to enhance the prestige and influence of the individual representative. Five legislators mentioned that many senatorial districts already cover too large an area, and one pointed out that if either house is reduced substantially, in our state of growing urbanization, rural citizens would be poorly represented.

Terms for Legislators:

Representatives--Twelve members argued for two-year terms in order to be as responsive to the people as possible. Six would prefer four-year terms for at least one of these reasons--that the cost of running every other year is exorbitant, or that it takes two years to learn the job and two more to make a significant contribution.

Senators--Sixteen men liked the present four-year term for senators. One wanted it reduced to two years, and another preferred a six-year term.

Sessions: Everyone felt the need for annual sessions; however ten wanted them to be limited in time, and five wanted a short session every other year devoted to taxation and budgetary matters only. Six wanted annual sessions with no limitation of either time or subject.

Salaries:

Legislators--Only one man liked the present salary of \$4800 a year, but agreed that if much more time were required in Austin more pay would be necessary. Others hoped, at least, for the \$8400 that will be put before the voters next fall, and figures from \$12,000 to \$20,000 a year were mentioned, depending, of course, on whether we want full-time legislators.

Presiding Officers--Almost all of our delegation felt that both the Lt. Governor and Speaker should receive higher salaries than other legislators. Several mentioned that these officials have large expense accounts already, and others mentioned that travel, which is one of their biggest expenses, is taken care of by the lobby. One senator wanted to see more executive duties given the Lt. Governor along with much better pay (\$35,000).

Two men blamed the high turnover in the legislature on low pay. One questioned whether more pay would attract better-qualified men, and another said it was the only way to attract and hold good people. One pointed out that higher salaries would make them more independent of the lobby. Most would like salaries taken out of the con-

stitution and set by statute.

Expenses:

Travel--It was unanimous that one reimbursed round trip from the county seat to Austin is not enough. Some legislators would like one-a-month trips home to their districts, one wanted legitimate travel expenses to any part of the state reimbursed, and some felt that higher salaries might allow them to discontinue travel-expense accounting.

Interim Expenses--Almost everyone agreed that a representative's \$200 per month is too little and a senator's \$1,000 per month is too much, though five representatives were managing to get by on their allowances. One senator is using his full allowance for tax research by four PhD candidates but would prefer to see this kind of work done by permanent committee staffs.

Other Expenses--Half of the delegation felt that their office and clerical expenses were adequate and half would have liked more latitude. A few mentioned raising their \$12 per diem expenses; others mentioned limiting campaign expenses.

Methods of Election:

Single-member Districts for Representatives--Five legislators were in favor of single-member districts, nine were for a Dallas County delegation as it is now, three were for members-at-large within senatorial districts, and one was undecided. Several of those opposed expect that single-member districts will be required in the future, but all opponents of this method pointed out the strength of the delegation in cooperating for the interests of Dallas, while Houston, which has members-at-large from congressional districts, suffered because of disagreements within the Houston delegation.

Odd-year Elections for State Offices--Not many of our legislators had given any thought to holding state elections in years when there are not national elections. Four opposed the idea, seven saw advantages, and the rest wanted to consider the matter. Some liked the idea because it would give state issues and state offices the thoughtful consideration they deserve instead of burying them under more widely publicized national issues and elections. Others felt that party strength would be undermined if state and federal candidates did not work together during campaigns. One objected to the complication resulting for a state official wishing to run for a national office, who would be forced either to resign in mid-term or to remain idle for a year before running for a congressional seat.

Timing--one representative would like to see primaries moved from May to July so that publicity from this campaign would carry over to the campaign for election in November.

Procedures in the Legislature:

Power of the Lt. Governor and Speaker--One senator and one representative felt that the power of his presiding officer was too great. The rest felt either that this power is essential to the orderly flow of legislation, or else that this power is in the hands of the house over which he presides and is accorded him by the rules they adopt. One senator and one representative, both from the latter group, would like to see their respective rules committees elected by their houses rather than appointed by the presiding officers. This would, of course, reduce the power of the Speaker and Lt. Governor.

Rules--Only one of the delegation (a representative) does not approve of the new House rules written last year. Three want to reserve judgment until the rules have been in effect for a while. The others approve of them and hope they will be readopted in the next session. Two senators predict new senate rules next year.

Legislative Load--The majority of legislators believe that the best solution to the legislative load is annual sessions. Such matters as hunting and fishing regulations might better be set by the Parks and Wildlife Commission, but several members had reservations about more local autonomy. One pointed out that what might seem local in nature could set a precedent which might affect other areas eventually. Another said that authorization to spend local money shouldn't need action by the

Legislature, but that when state money is involved the Legislature should be involved. Rep. Moore commented that his subcommittee on counties handled 400 bills concerning salaries for court reporters all over Texas. Two senators pointed out that votes for local and uncontested bills are used for bargaining, and that loss of this tool would hurt those in positions of power.

One representative suggested that the appropriation bill be introduced not later than the 70th calendar day. A senator felt that the first 60 days of the session are largely wasted. (In the past session only two bills were passed during the first 60 days; more than half of the legislation was passed in the last few days of the session.) Another senator suggested carrying bills from one session to the next wherever they are pending at adjournment.

Bill-checking--All our legislators would like to see that every bill is accurate before it is sent to the governor for signature. With the last-minute glut of legislation at the end of the session, typographical errors are still made in engrossment. Some felt that a check by the Legislative Council before the third reading might be helpful. But the major criticism pertains to amendments from the floor. Often, a handwritten amendment is given to the presiding officer, read once, explained by its author, and a vote on it called for immediately. One member suggests that no floor amendments be allowed, another that no vote be taken until the amendment is in print and distributed, another that a projector be utilized, or a Xerox copier be available on the floor so that every member may see and study the amendment before a vote.

Committees:

Standing committees--All but two legislators look forward to a reduction of House committees from 44 to 25, though two think the cut is too drastic. One senator and one representative would like to see the number of senate committees reduced from 25 to 16 or 17. One representative suggested that many committees were too large, and another legislator felt that senators especially had too many committee assignments. Another representative pointed out that some committees are overworked while others do nothing. Still another suggested better defined areas of subject matter. One proposed that legislators serving on tax and revenue committees receive no additional committee assignments. Senator Mauzy explained that the Senate was originally set up with 27 committee chairmanships and 4 places on the finance conference committee--31 spots, one plum for each senator.

Five legislators thought it advantageous to set up parallel committees in the two houses and eight approved of joint hearings at least on major bills. Those who opposed joint hearings felt that the advantages of bicameralism would be reduced, that the senate might monopolize the hearings, that each house should be allowed to pursue the facets of the bill that most interested it, or that the scheduling would be too difficult. One man mentioned that, for the sake of the public, they often scheduled hearings on the same day in the two houses. One pointed out that poorly coordinated hearing schedules benefit the professional lobbyists who are on the spot all the time but handicap the interested citizen who would like to participate.

Most of the legislators wanted to see more staff for committees. One suggested a lawyer as director, a permanent secretary, a floating pool of secretaries plus interne help. Another emphasized that committees need staff operating all year instead of just during sessions. Two-thirds of the delegation believed that better records should be kept by committees. Several pointed out the lack of space for committees to meet, (five rooms for twenty-five committees).

Bill referral--As long as the presiding officer has control of the rules committee, our legislators see no advantage to bill referral by rules rather than by the Lt. Governor or Speaker.

Subcommittees--About half the delegation want regular subcommittees to work within certain areas of a committee (e.g. elementary, higher education). Others feel the chairman should decide how he wants to handle his committee. Sen. Harris cited that one of his House Committees in the 58th legislature had three regular subcommittees, 1) to handle controversial bills, 2) to put them in the deep freeze, 3) to refer them out as fast as possible. One legislator wants to give subcommittees the power of subpoena.

Conference committees--All agree that conference coms. should work only within limits of the two bills being considered and that nothing not already in one or the other bill should be added.

Interim committees--If there are unlimited annual sessions, interim committees will be obsolete. In the meantime, some felt that standing committees with permanent staff could do this kind of research. Others believed that smaller interim committees, using qualified lay citizens as well as legislators, are more effective.

Aids to Legislators:

Facilities--Most of the legislators believe that plans to move executive and judiciary offices out of the capitol will give them adequate office space. One would prefer an office building for legislators. Two representatives felt that, in addition, office space for legislators should be provided in county court houses in their home districts. California already does this.

Staff--Seven legislators are satisfied with their present personal staff. The rest want an executive assistant for research, plus more clerical and secretarial help. It was pointed out by several that urban representatives running at large need extra staff to cope with communications from their more numerous constituents.

Research--Seven legislators find research and bill drafting facilities adequate, but the rest want the Legislative Council increased substantially in size to offer more of both services. One representative emphasized that more extensive research facilities, either through the Legislative Council, or his personal staff, would reduce his dependence on the lobby for information. Another suggested that more use of the University of Texas library, and students, would enlarge research facilities.

Bill analysis--All of the representatives considered this service essential. Some were satisfied with the present system, but some felt that the Legislative Council could probably make a better more objective analysis than the author or the committee clerk or interne now responsible for this service. Two senators reported that they pool their own staff resources with those of several other senators and share the resulting bill analysis. Apparently they prefer to do their own analyses than to turn it over to the Council. One representative mentioned that the Dallas delegation to the House had a definite advantage in this area for they, as a group, had representation on every active committee and they divided up the responsibility for analyzing and checking bills and exchanged this information.

Orientation--The Senators do not consider formal orientation necessary. The few new senators without prior experience in the legislative process are quickly oriented by the senior senators. Representatives, however, believed that the Orientation Program was very helpful. One freshman found the present program discouraging rather than challenging. Nearly all representatives made good suggestions for improving the system.

Internes--Several legislators have had little or no contact with internes and are unfamiliar with the program, but nearly all those who have worked with them are very enthusiastic about the program. Whether or not the State will continue it when Ford Foundation money runs out is questionable. One representative thinks another foundation could be interested; another suggests that the University of Texas take over the program.

Computers--No general consensus emerged from the question on electronic aids. Several individual comments brought out their usefulness in preparation of legislation on taxation and appropriations, redistricting, urban problems, etc.

The Governor's Power over the Legislature: Several legislators believe that the Governor's powers should be increased. Most of their suggestions concern reorganization of the executive branch, which is outside the province of our present study of the Legislature.

Vetoes--Many Dallas legislators are not in sympathy with the Governor's veto power after adjournment but they are not sure how best to modify the situation. Some feel strongly that he should have this power. About half the delegation like the line-item veto for the appropriation bill, and almost half want to see the Governor also empowered to reduce items. Nobody wants to enable him to increase any appropriation.

Dual Budget System--In this area, our legislators are about evenly divided. The pros point out the check and balance advantage of two budget boards; the cons feel that more cooperation would involve less duplication of effort.

Special Sessions--One-third of our legislators believe that, until annual unlimited sessions are adopted, there should be some mechanism for the legislature to call itself into special session should the Governor refuse their request. This should require a large majority of the legislators. A smaller number of legislators wonder whether they should be enabled to introduce subject matter not in the Governor's call, again only with the support of a large majority (4/5 perhaps) of the Legislature supporting the issue at stake.

The Lobby: Lobby regulation, according to all the legislators, is a very difficult problem. Some are defeatist about producing effective legislation in this area, though one legislator will push for "comprehensive effective legislation with real teeth in it"--even stricter than federal legislation which is better than the existing laws in Texas. When asked whether the present lobby laws are being complied with, answers were evenly divided between yes and no with several who couldn't even hazard a guess. They were evenly divided also on whether it is worth requiring lobbyists to declare their interim expenses and campaign contributions to candidates. (One legislator pointed out that many contributions are in the form of secretarial help, etc. instead of money.) There is almost complete unanimity in disapproval of a lobbyist who declares that he represents a law firm but does not mention the firm's client who pays the bills, of a legislator who testifies before committees or agencies without declaring that he is on a retainer, of the law firm which abuses the privilege of postponing cases by using a legislator's name when he's not involved in the case. The last abuse could be corrected by leaving postponement to the discretion of the Judge involved.

Many legislators believe it is easier to tighten the code of ethics and conflict of interest requirements for legislators than to control the lobby. Only four men feel that legislators should disclose their incomes, though more are willing to do this if it is required. All except three feel that they should be required to declare campaign contributions received prior to formal announcement of their intention to run for office.

Every single legislator emphasized the necessity of the "third house" in the legislative process and all find the information supplied by the lobbyists essential to their decision-making. They stressed that, as in all cross sections of people, there are honest, ethical lobbyists and legislators and also dishonest and unethical lobbyists and legislators.

Comments ran the gamut between "Lobbyists control the majority of votes in the legislature.", and "Lobby coercion is vastly overrated". One comment was that the whole present legislative process is geared to the advantage of the lobby and that it is they who will fight any kind of reform in the legislature.

Unit Leaders Discussion Guide

State Item I Phase II

Legislature Study Second Meeting, Dec. 13, 14

7 min. Announcements

3 min. Introduction:

Unit Leader: Repeat introduction on discussion guide from last meeting of Legislature Study. Material to cover in this meeting is about 1) Aids to legislators 2) Influence of the Governor on the Legislature and 3) the Lobby.

30 min. 1) Aids to the Legislator

Unit Leader: (Read question 1 on discussion sheet.) This item breaks down into the following areas.

- a. Facilities.
- b. Staff
- c. Research
- d. Internes
- e. Orientation
- f. Bill drafting and analyses
- g. Electronic aids
- h. Current information and statute retrieval
- i. Budget information and supervision

Resource Person: give answers on present status in each area as needed, and allow discussion on each sub head before going on to the next. Where necessary discuss Senate and House separately.

20 min. 2) Powers of the Governor

Unit Leader: (Read question 2 on discussion sheet.) This item breaks down into the following areas:

- a. Veto Power - during session, after session - pocket veto. Line item veto in appropriation bill, no power to reduce items, (33 states give Gov. line item veto, 8 give none, 3 give limited line item veto, 5 give power to reduce items.) 4 states have veto session to consider bills vetoed after regular session.
- b. Budgetary power - is dual budget system in Texas redundant?
- c. Special sessions - all 50 states give Gov. power to call special sessions. 11 states also empower legislature to call a special session. Texas limits subject matter to what the Gov. wants considered.
- d. Messages
- e. Informal powers

Resource Person: Throw in the necessary facts as discussion develops in each area.

20 min. 3) The Lobby

Unit Leader: (Read question 3 on discussion sheet.) Develop the discussion to cover the following areas.

- a. Regulation (trend toward non-compliance)
- b. Interim expenses of lobbyists not reportable
- c. Campaign contributions of lobbyists not reported
- d. Intermediary dodges

- e. Retainers - legislators testifying before committees
- f. Postponement of cases privileged
- g. Legislators disclose income & business interests?
- h. Legislators disclose campaign contributions before as well as after announcement?
- i. Registration fees - Texas charges none; Georgia charges \$250, etc.
- j. Lack of enforcement of present laws

Introduction: 3 min.

10 min. Recorder

Unit Leader: Repeat introduction on discussion guide from last meeting. (Aids to legislators to cover in this meeting is about 1) Aids to legislators 2) Influence of the Governor on the Legislature and 3) the lobby.

30 min. 1) Aids to the legislator

Unit Leader: (Read question 1 on discussion sheet.) This item breaks down into the following areas:

- a. Facilities
- b. Staff
- c. Research
- d. Interns
- e. Orientation
- f. Bill drafting and analysis
- g. Electronic aids
- h. Current information and statute retrieval
- i. Budget information and supervision

Resource Person: Give answers on present status in each area as needed, and allow discussion on each sub-head before going on to the next. Where necessary discuss Senate and House separately.

20 min. 2) Powers of the Governor

Unit Leader: (Read question 2 on discussion sheet.) This item breaks down into the following areas:

- a. Veto Power - during session, after session - pocket veto, line item veto in appropriation bill, no power to reduce items, (33) states give Gov. line item veto, 8 give none, 3 give limited line item veto, 2 give power to reduce items, 4 states have veto session to consider bills vetoed after regular session.
- b. Budgetary power - is dual budget system in Texas redundant?
- c. Special sessions - all 50 states give Gov. power to call special sessions. 11 states also empower legislature to call a special session. Texas limits subject matter to what the Gov. wants considered.
- d. Messages
- e. Informal powers

Resource Person: Throw in the necessary facts as discussion develops in each area.

20 min. 3) The Lobby

Unit Leader: (Read question 3 on discussion sheet.) Develop the discussion to cover the following areas:

- a. Regulation (tend toward non-compliance)
- b. Inform expenses of lobbyists not reportable
- c. Campaign contributions of lobbyists not reported
- d. Intermediary dodges

State Item I Phase II
Legislature Study

Discussion Questions for 2nd Meeting, Dec. 13, 14

1. Do you feel legislators have adequate aids for informed decision making? If yes, what are the strengths of the present system? If no, what would you change?

2. Do you feel the Governor's influence on the legislature is too great? too small? Just right? What changes would you recommend?

3. Should there be any changes in our Lobby Laws in Texas? If not, why not? If so, what?

MAJOR CHANGES IN RULES OF TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
60th Legislature (1967)

1. Reorganization of the House's 43 standing committees into only 25 committees, with shuffling of committee responsibilities to more evenly spread the work.
2. Adoption of a modified seniority system whereby members appointed to committees will retain this membership as long as they desire.
3. Creation of a new office of administrative officer of the House, appointed by the speaker, to supervise all House employees.
4. Assignment to the Rules Committee of legislative traffic control similar to that of the House Rules Committee in Congress and the creation of seven different House calendars, with priority listing, for consideration of legislation.
5. Requirement of a standardized form for printing all legislation to make it easier for lawmakers to understand how existing legislation is to be changed.
6. Changes in the printing system to require that all bills except local bills are printed and distributed upon introduction (before public hearings) and printed again (if changes are made) at each of five other stages of the legislative process.
7. Provision of year-round staffs for all major committees and year-round operation of the standing committees to do work now done by various interim committees appointed to make special studies.
8. A requirement that each piece of legislation reported out of committee be accompanied by a staff analysis explaining what it would do.
9. Provision of a 'motion to limit amendments', which would require seconding by 26 members, as a means of ending delaying tactics. It would not cut off debate but would limit it to amendments then pending or on the speaker's desk.

CALENDARS

Emergency Calendar - all bills submitted as emergency matter by the governor; revenue and tax bills, general appropriations bill; and others deemed to demand immediate action.

Major State Calendar - all bills of state-wide effect which establish or change state policy in major fields.

Constitutional Amendments Calendar - all joint resolutions proposing amendments to Texas Constitution and those proposing ratification of amendments to U.S. Constitution.

General State Calendar - all bills of state-wide effect which establish or change state law in minor fields.

Area Calendar - bills which apply to more than one county but are not state-wide in legal effect.

Local Calendar - bills which apply to only one county named in the bill.

Consent Calendar - bills on which there is general agreement and probably no opposition.

* * * *

SUGGESTIONS ON IMPROVING STATE GOVERNMENTS FROM THE 20TH SESSION OF THE NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE

AT SAN ANTONIO, SEPT. 27-SEPT. 30, '67

By Mrs. Bobby Graham, Chairman, Legislative Study

In 1947 the Council of State Governments sponsored the first National Legislative Conference. There were 60 to 70 delegates then in contrast to 1625 this year from every state, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Samoa and Guam. Attendance indicates growth of interest in modernizing state legislatures. Reports, manuals, handbooks, workshops and 'bull sessions' have resulted in tremendous increase in the number of states which provide needed professional services for legislators, annual sessions, improved compensation, pre-session orientation, legislative manuals, internal programs, fiscal summaries, bill and law summaries, bill drafting manuals, improved bill printing procedures, streamlined journal printing methods, loose leaf code printing processes, streamlining of standing committees, periodic revision of legislative rules and procedures, better physical facilities and many other improvements.

over

President Thomas Graham of Missouri set the Conference theme as "The States as Innovators and Experimenters." He believes that "when the states fail to fulfill their roles, are not responsive to the people and their problems, are not laboratories of experimentation, then the federal government moves into the vacuum."

John Ben Shepperd, former Texas Atty. Gen., gave the keynote address. He warned legislators that "state governments cannot survive unless they assume their rightful responsibilities and modernize their machinery. ...State officials must display great courage if they are to strengthen the role of the states."

Thomas Laverne of Rochester spoke on the expanding urban areas. The questions of metro-area legislation and councils of government involving many counties were discussed. (The glut of special local bills in legislatures occurs in other states as well as Texas.)

Sen. Robert Knowles of Wisconsin spoke on "Modernizing Legislative Procedures." He admitted the biggest obstacle is within the legislature. As Pogo said, "We've met the enemy and he's us!" The reason the legislature has not modernized as fast as business and universities is that the legislature is not in competition. Data processing companies have spent millions researching legislative process, but the longer we serve the more resistant to change we become. Wisconsin sent eight legislators on a tour of other legislatures, to bring back ideas. They got an outside professional, Paul Mason, to make suggestions. Wisconsin saved three times his large fee in several months. The Eagleton Institute of Rutgers is doing studies of several legislatures. The Citizens Conference will help to build public support for Constitutional changes. California raised the salaries of legislators from 6 to 16 thousand in one jump with a two to one vote of the people with the help of news media and public support. If the Legislature does not want to become a federal pipe line it must gain co-equal status with the executive and with the federal government. To do this, it must reform.

Albert Jenner, Senior Counsel for the Warren Commission, spoke on the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. Each state legislature has made an appropriation for the past 75 years to support this research body. As society becomes more mobile there is greater need for uniform laws. They worked first on criminal laws, more recently on Water pollution laws. Their Commercial Code has been adopted by all but one of the 50 states. They are now working on a uniform Consumer Credit Code and uniform marriage, divorce and child custody acts, which will be offered to 1971 sessions. The group also develops model acts which may be amended by each state.

The Committee on Legislative Rules has provided a handbook for Legislative Committees (1962), handbook for presiding officers (1965), Procedures and Safeguards, a code for investigating committees (1957). The membership approved next a handbook on standing committees.

STATE ITEM I - TEXAS LEGISLATURE STUDY PHASE II

In order to complete this study and come to meaningful consensus in only two Unit meetings, the material above and the Facts and Issues on the Framework and the Functioning, should be studied before our first meeting, and the State material on Aids, the Governor and the Lobby plus the December VOTER insert, before our second meeting.

There is a nationwide movement now toward both Constitutional and Legislative reform. Our consensus, followed by public education and lobbying, can be instrumental in making Texas State Government stronger and more efficient.

Unit Leaders Discussion Guide

State Item I Phase II

Legislature Study First Meeting, Nov. 29, 30

7 min. Announcements: Sell last 3 Facts & Issues on Aids, Gov., Lobby

3 min. Introduction:

Unit Leader: The title of the 2 year study adopted in 1966 at State Convention is "Evaluation of the Organization and Functioning of the Texas Legislature." Phase I, the 1st year was a study of the legislature as it is with the 60th session as a laboratory. Phase II, this year, we have already had two general meetings with six of our legislators to hear their comments and criticisms of the 60th session (Sens. Mauzy & Hall, Reps. Clark, Stroud, Ratcliff, Moore). We have 2 Unit meetings now in which to compare the Texas Legislature with those of other states, and to evaluate changes which have been proposed to increase efficiency and improve the legislative product. We will be taking an emerging consensus in order to act on our convictions at the State level.

Resource Person: There are six major areas we plan to cover in these two meetings. 1) Structure, 2) Procedure, 3) Committees, 4) Aids to Legislators, 5) Influence of the Governor on the Legislature and 6) the Lobby. We'll cover the first three today and postpone all discussion in the last three areas until December. We hope you've all read Texas Fact & Issue.

25 min. 1) Structure of the Legislature

Unit Leader: (Read question 1 on discussion sheet.) We will want to consider and evaluate the following:

- a. Bicameral vs. unicameral
- b. Size of each house
- c. Term of office
- d. Qualifications
- e. Salary
- f. Expenses
- g. Sessions
- h. Methods of election
- i. Lt. Gov. vs. President Pro Tem

Lets take them one at a time and discuss the Senate and House separately where necessary.

Resource Person: (Have Texas Legislative Fact Sheet handy for reference.)

- a. Unicameralism: Nebraska only. Pros and cons
- b. Size: Use graph sheet #1 for comparisons. What ratio Senate to House?
- c. Length of Terms: See comparative dope on graph. Pros and cons.
- d. Qualifications: House age 21-25; Senate 21-30. Two states disqualify ministers.
- e. Salaries: Use graph sheet #2 for visual aid in comparison.
- f. Expenses: Office, transportation, interim.
- g. Sessions: How full time is your legislator? Annual? Unlimited? Unspecified as to subject?
- h. Single member Districts in House vs. delegation like Dallas County? Stagger elections to off years to separate National and State issues?
- i. Lt. Governor vs. President Pro Tem: 40 states elect Lt. Gov.; 10 states Senate elects president.

25 min. 2) Procedure in the Legislature

Unit Leader: (Read question 2 on discussion sheet.) We will need to consider the following areas:

- a. Rules.
- b. Power of the Speaker and Lt. Gov.
- c. Legislative load.
- d. Checking bills for form before final passage.

Resource Person: Give a quick review of how a bill becomes a law (use chart for visual aid) showing powers of presiding officers, and road-blocks to passage.

- a. Discuss briefly new House rules which may or may not be adopted again next year.
- b. Power of presiding officers can be changed by rules changes.
- c. Legislative load - glut of local special & private bills - perhaps solved by more autonomy at local level of gov't. (Metropolitan Area Bills) Special bill passed for benefit of Ben Barnes.
- d. Errors slip into format of bill, Gov. often has to veto bills for unconstitutionality.

20 min. 3) Committee System

Unit Leader: (Read question 3 on discussion sheet.) Guide the discussion through the following areas:

- a. Standing committees - number of, size of, appointment to and seniority, parallel in house and senate?
- b. Subcommittees.
- c. Staff for research and record keeping.
- d. Hearings, Joint? Scheduled further ahead? Open?
- e. Bill referral, by rule? burial?
- f. Conference committees, rules of operation.
- g. Interim committees.

Resource Person: Use visual aid on number of committees for comparison with other states. Answer questions as they come up in the course of discussion.

10 min. Recorder-

State Item I Phase II
Legislature Study

Discussion Questions for 1st Meeting, Nov. 29, 30

1. What changes, if any, would you recommend in the Structure of the Texas House?
Senate?
2. What procedural changes, if any, would you make in the House? in the Senate?
3. What changes, if any, do you feel would improve the functioning of legislative
committees?

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF DALLAS

SPECIAL SUMMER MEETING

The League Committee on the Texas Legislature invites you and your guests to hear--

Senator Oscar Mauzy

Representative James Stroud

Representative James Clark, Jr.

Topic: The Texas Legislative System--
How Well Is It Functioning?
What Can We Learn From the Recent Session?

Time: Friday, July 7--
9:45 Coffee
10:15 Talks
10:45 Questions

Place: Home of Mrs. Laurence Perrine, 7616 Royal Place
(Off Royal Lane near Central Expressway)

BRING PROSPECTIVE LEAGUE MEMBERS to learn about one of our most interesting study items. And bring your questions about how our Legislature works to the men who have just been there.

NOTICES: No meeting of Legislature Committee on July 20.

July 6 - 10:00 a.m. Health Committee, League Conference Room
July 6 - 10:00 a.m. China Committee, Mrs. Macdonald's home
July 10- 10:00 a.m. Public Relations Meeting, Conference Room
July 11- 10:30 a.m. Speakeasy, Mrs. Reynold's home
July 14- 10:00 a.m. Human Resources Committee, Conference Room

LETTERS TO CONGRESS:

The time is now to write on Foreign Aid and Economic Opportunity Act legislation. See recent NATIONAL VOTER for League position.

REPORT ON THE GO-SEE-TOUR OF
THE TEXAS LEGISLATURE, APRIL 19, 1967

The purpose of our Tour was to enlarge our knowledge of the legislature by experiencing the action and excitement of a legislative session and by talking to those involved. The fast, changing pace of a legislative session was epitomized by the Governor's sudden request to address the Legislature and the resulting shift of committee meetings. (The TCR hearing scheduled in the House State Affairs Com. for 7:30 PM, April 19, was reportedly changed to 8:00 AM, April 20, and then held at 8:00 AM, April 19.) The scurrying to get tickets for the Governor's address was typical too. A second purpose was to let our legislators know that we do carefully study an issue before coming to consensus.

During preparations for the Tour the committee learned that results came much easier and more quickly when contacting the legislators personally or by phone rather than by letter. We received good cooperation from all those who met with us.

Our first interview was with House Speaker Ben Barnes. He predicted that the House would pass a constitutional revision bill this session. He said the Lt. Gov. and the Speaker hold the two most powerful positions in the state. He felt this was wrong. He opposed the use of "free" conference committees. Texas is the only state with this rule. The House has changed its rules to limit the conference com. to adjusting the difference between the House and Senate versions. The Senate has not. The first real test of these rules will probably be on the Appropriations Bill. Conference com. will be open to the press.

Barnes said Com. Chairmen are chosen on the basis of ability, experience (seniority) and loyalty to the Speaker. The Rules Com. has been given power to call up bills for floor debate according to their importance rather than by their number of introduction. This usually means the controversial bills. These new powers for the Rules Com. diminish the Speaker's power in relation to the calendar.

Before and after hearing Speaker Barnes we observed the House in session. SB 438 on milk testing, SB 148 on temporary water permits, SB 33 on women's property rights and SB 214 on prepaid funeral service were considered and passed. There was considerable activity on the floor, but you could follow the action because of the microphones and the Representatives seemed to know what was going on.

At 11:30 we met Mr. Terrell Blodgett, one of the Governor's 4 Administrative Assistants. He stressed the urgency of reform in state government by quoting Gov. Connally "I personally think the next ten years will see our states become a viable part of a Federal-state-local triumvirate, or be absorbed in a meaningless jumble of non-states."

Mr. Blodgett talked about the tools the Gov. can use to get his legislative program enacted. He said the Gov. chooses 30 to 40 major issues to make up his program and then begins by seeking to include them in his party's platform. He presents his plans to the legislature in his special messages. This year he has delivered three, the State of the State to open the session, the Tax Message and the 100 Days Message. Other formal tools mentioned were the veto, or threat of it, and special sessions. The Gov. daily has from 10 to 15 meetings with legislators and members of the public. The Gov's position as a focal point for interest on the issues in his program is one of his most important informal tools. The Gov. can use appointments to the many special boards to influence legislators because people from their districts may want the appointments. In six years the Gov. can appoint almost all board members. Calling a special session is risky for the Gov. because it is hard to keep it limited to the issues the Gov. has included. There is pressure to include other issues in order to gain support for the Gov's proposals. The courts have validated bills passed at special sessions, but not included in the Gov's call. The Gov's office does work with sponsors of legislation it favors, helping draft bills acceptable to both parties. Sometimes he seeks sponsors for his legislation. Mr. Blodgett pointed out the long hours legislators and the Gov. put in and their great need for additional staff. Mr. Blodgett said constitutional revision was one of the major planks in the Gov's platform. He is especially for 1) a cabinet system of administration, 2) 4 year terms for officials elected state wide, 3) annual legislative sessions, 4) greater flexibility for cities and counties. The Gov. would accept a convention plan with less

than the proposed 450 members. He probably over-reacted to charges he would control a small convention. The Gov. favors annual registration.

At 12:30 we were joined by 15 legislators for lunch. (List in the May VOTER.) The legislators were spread among the Leaguers giving us a chance to talk over lunch. This chance for exchange brought many favorable comments from the legislators, among them, "This is a much younger group than I thought!" Each Senator and Rep. spoke a few minutes. The atmosphere was informal and friendly. Most welcomed us and talked generally. Rep. Cory from Victoria, Chairman of State Affairs Com., does not approve of the new interim rules of the House. The change from 44 to 26 committees will cut out many experienced com. chairmen. He fears the com. will use their subpoena power to "meddle" rather than for constructive investigation. There should be only one investigative committee. He believes his TCR bill, HCR 34, is the only one that can pass. He does not support a convention fearing special interests would control it. (Only the LWV actively favors constitutional revision, and no one has opposed it.) He predicted that the test of the new Conference Com. rules will come over the Appropriations Bill.

Rep. Ratcliff mentioned juvenile crime and the new types of driver's licenses. He said there were funds in the House Appropriations Bill for a School of Social Work at Arlington. Rep. Blanton commented that it was ridiculous to have to amend the Constitution for so many trivial matters. Rep. Stroud said he was having difficulty advancing our voter registration bill, HB 671, again. Rep. Clark said activity on the floor of the House is not as chaotic as it appears. Sen. Mauzy said improving voter registration laws was the most critical business of this session. He has introduced our biennial registration bill (SB 436). Sen. Hall said he had opposed constitutional revision, but was beginning to change some of his views. Rep. Moore favored biennial registration.

After lunch we returned to the Capitol to observe the Senate in session. The lack of microphones made it difficult to follow. Sen Parkhouse was filibustering against HB 160 (McKissack) to allow checkoffs of union dues for city employees. House committees on Urban Affairs and Oil, Gas and Mining were meeting. Leaguers watched as proponents and opponents testified and were questioned by the legislators.

At 4:30 Leaguers gathered to hear John Potter, Assistant Director of the Legislative Council and Thomas M. Keel, Acting Director of the Legislative Budget Board explain their agencies. Robert Johnson, Director of the LC, was unable to come due to his additional responsibilities as House Parliamentarian. Mr. Potter said that the Legislative Council itself is made up of 5 Senators and 10 Representatives appointed by the presiding officers as an interim committee, (from the end of one session to the beginning of the next), and that his agency acted as their staff. He mentioned that he didn't want to get into a discussion of policy or politics, but he did oppose constitutional revision. The staff of the LC is 9 lawyers, 6 researchers (journalists and gov't. specialists) and 14 law students, plus clerical help. They draft 65% of legislation presented and have improved the form and clarity of bills. They are using modern computer techniques to speed printing of bills and to aid in reducing Texas' 180 codes to 26 basic codes. He was satisfied with the \$533,000 appropriation the Council received in 1966-67.

Mr. Keel said the Legislative Budget Bureau was composed of 5 Senators and 5 Representatives including the presiding officers and the Chairman of the Senate Finance and House Appropriations and Revenue and Taxations Committees. It is patterned after the conference com. He defended the dual budget system in Texas as a means of giving legislators another yardstick to judge appropriations requests. He said they cooperated with the Gov's Budget Office. He did not find the part played by the conference com. on appropriations or the existence of earmarked funds alarming. He cited several examples of spending proposals the LBB had originated because they would cut costs. One was the state's Adult Probation System, which has saved money by cutting the prison population. The LBB proposed budget for the state for 1968-69 is \$840 million while the Gov's is \$913 million.

Quiet time over box suppers on the capitol grounds.

All the Leaguers were able to hear the Gov's address thanks to the help of Reps. Blanton and Semos, Sen. Hall and all the Dallas delegation in securing tickets. The Gov. called for support of his program and action on the major issues. (Only 5 of the Gov's proposals had been passed by both houses on 5/7/67.) He proposed a one year appropriations bill in order to forestall taxation and then promised to call a special session in 1968 on appropriations and taxation.

HOUSE RULES CHANGES - 1967

Far reaching rules changes were proposed at the beginning of the session by a 5 member interim com. chaired by Rep. DeWitt Hale from Corpus Christi. They were passed 145-0.

Beginning next session there will be 26 rather than 44 standing committees. Members will be limited to 3 committees. A modified seniority system will allow members to remain on the same com. but will not control selection of chairmen. This is meant to insure continuity and expertise and some independence. The committees will operate year around studying problems in their field and preparing recommendations. (See Cory's comments.)

Bills altering existing statutes will be drawn to show old and new wording. An analysis of bills will be published before hearings. Bills will be reprinted each time changes are voted. The conference com. must make compromises germane to the issues being considered. A proposed joint rule would set up joint hearings on the appropriations bill. The Senate has not adopted this.

The House Rules Committee can set bills on the calendar according to their importance. A 2/3 vote during the first 76 days and a majority afterwards can instruct the com. to put a bill on the calendar. "Chubbing" (the practice of adding unlimited amendments in order to delay a bill) will be curbed by allowing 26 Representatives to limit the number of amendments that can be proposed.

History of SB 94-Brooks, HB 76-Rapp, Floyd OPEN MEETINGS

Background:

In 1949 Representative Preston Smith introduced HB 428 asking for open meetings of government agencies to no avail. In 1963 and 1965 Representative Chet Brooks introduced bills on open meetings. Both bills passed the House and were killed by Senate Committees. This year Senator Chet Brooks introduced SB 94 on open meetings in the Senate and Reps. Rapp and Floyd introduced an identical bill, HB 76 in the House. In March, Sen. Brooks stated that Lt. Gov. Preston Smith was "favorably inclined." When Sen. Mauzy amended the Dallas-Ft. Worth regional airport bill to provide for public meetings of its board, the Senate accepted the amendment without dissent, even from Sen. Parkhouse, author of the bill, and long an opponent of open meetings. So Brooks believed that this was the year to get his bill through the Senate.

Progress of the bill through House and Senate:

Following introduction of the bills, they were referred to the House and Senate State Affairs Committees.

4/19/67: House State Affairs Committee Hearing on HB 76; Rep. Rapp explained the bill and told of being thrown out of a School Board Meeting he tried to cover as a reporter

4/24/67: House State Affairs Committee reported HB 76 out for action. Between 4/3/67, the first date set for a hearing on SB 94, and 4/25/67 the Senate State Affairs Committee failed to hear, or postponed, or cancelled hearings on SB 94 six different times.

4/25/67: Lt. Gov. Smith recognized Sen. Brooks on Senate floor. Brooks moved that SB 94 be removed from State Affairs Committee and re-referred to the friendly Education Committee. The Senate voted unanimously to approve the motion.

4/27/67: Senate Education Committee Hearings on SB 94. Sen. Brooks explained the bill to committee members. With no further testimony the bill was approved and released for Senate action.

5/2/67: Senate passed 29-0, SB 94 amended by Sen. Berry to exempt government agencies not spending tax money. This would allow the Railroad Commission, Board of Insurance, Parks and Wildlife, and others supported by fees rather than taxes, to continue holding secret meetings. Immediately after passage of the bill, the Senate gave unanimous consent to Sen. Hardeman, Ch. of the unfriendly State Affairs Committee and a frequent target of the press, and Sen. Schwartz, long time champion of open meetings, to be shown as "co-authors" of the bill.

5/8/67: The House took up SB 94, amended it six times (one amendment knocked out Sen. Berry's amendment exempting non-tax money spending agencies) and passed the bill 144-3. One hour later the Senate, on a motion by Sen. Brooks that House changes be accepted, passed the bill 28-0. SB 94 has been sent to the Governor for signature.

Summary of SB 94 in its final form:

All meetings of governmental bodies (state agencies, county commissioners courts, city councils, zoning boards, school boards, etc.) conducting public business must be open to the public. The bill allows closed-door meetings on cases involving possible dismissal of a government employee unless he requests a public hearing, discussions of purchasing real estate and deliberations of grand juries. An amendment by Rep. Wayne exempts staff meetings of public agencies while dealing with internal organization but not with public policy. The State Senate may still have closed executive sessions.

Senator Parkhouse vented his spleen by remarking "I think it ought to be mandatory on the press to attend all meetings. It's a poor ax that doesn't cut both ways."

Senator Brooks commented that discussions at "lunch or coffee" meetings before regular sessions will not be affected by this bill. These gatherings are virtually impossible to control by law.

MORE ON OPEN MEETINGS

4/18/67: Sen. Schwartz received an award from the national professional journalism society, Sigma Delta Chi. The "Friend of Journalism" award cited him for his "fight for the right of the people of Texas to know the truth."

5/4/67: Sen. Schwartz announced that a majority of Senators were ready to co-sponsor a resolution changing the rules on the Senate's secret sessions. (The Senate now meets in closed-door executive sessions to consider confirmations of the Governor's appointments.)

5/10/67: Sen. Schwartz won permission in the Senate to introduce a proposed amendment to the Constitution to prohibit closed-door sessions of the Senate. To submit a proposal this late in the session requires a 4/5 vote to suspend the rules. The first vote was 19-6. The second vote, following a bit of pressure by Sen. Schwartz on his colleagues, was 26-1. The only negative vote was Sen. Hardeman's! (Wonder where was Sen. Parkhouse?)

History of TCR Bills - 60th Legislature

Background:

In January 1967, Gov. Connally put Revision of the Texas Constitution at the top of his legislative program. In addition to the bills proposed by the Governor, numerous others on TCR were introduced. In this study we will follow only those that affect LWV position or that are still alive.

Summary of Governor's Bills--Constitutional Commission-Constitutional Convention--HB 371 Pendleton et al., SB 160 Hightower:

These bills would establish a 25 member Constitutional Revision Commission with power to undertake research and act as a staff at the Convention. At the November 1967 general election, the voters would approve or reject the call for a constitutional convention and vote on delegates to it, 450 in all, 3 from each Representative's district. Assembling in June 1968, the Convention would have to complete its labors by December 1969. A new Constitution or other proposals would be submitted directly to voters for approval or rejection at a general November election. (These bills were given full support by the League of Women Voters).

Fate of the Governor's bills: both have apparently died. SB 160 was referred to State Affairs Committee. Hearings were held 4/17/67. Ch. Hardeman broke a tie--committee voted 8-7 to send to subcommittee--no action on this bill to date. HB 371 was referred to House State Affairs Committee. Hearings held on short notice 4/19/67--no witnesses--referred to subcommittee Ch. Jungmichel, Cory, Pendleton with recommendation to write compromise bill between HCR 34-Cory, and HB 371. HB 371 died in subcommittee.

Other TCR Bills--In the Senate:

SB 173 Schwartz--45 man commission, 15 appointed by Gov.; 15 by Lt. Gov., (5 of whom must be Senators); 15 by the Speaker, (5 of whom must be Representatives); to analyze the LC's final report authorized in 1957 and completed in 1961, to submit to next Legislature (1969) recommendations to eliminate deadwood and ambiguities and to recommend substantive changes and constitutional revision to the people. Referred to Senate State Affairs Committee Hearings 4/17/67. Ch. Hardeman broke tie and committee sent SB 173 to subcommittee along with the Governor's bill. Hardeman never even appointed a subcommittee! On May 3 Sen. Schwartz moved to bring his bill out of subcommittee and won 7-3, Hardeman, Parkhouse and Watson dissenting, and by the same vote it was reported out of committee favorably and brought to the floor for debate. (The League of Women Voters can support this bill for the Commission is limited to research and recommendations, and the procedure for drawing up the Constitution is left open.) Sen. Schwartz says he will rewrite or amend his bill before it comes to a vote, and he will confer with LWV in regard to our recommendations.

In the House:

HCR 34-Cory--See Dallas VOTER, May 1967, p. 5 for summary of bill.

Referred to State Affairs Committee.

4/19/67:referred to subcommittee along with HB 160.

4/25/67:reported out of committee favorably after compromise to broader based commission.

5/1/67:passed House by voice vote.

(This bill is not League supported - Commission revises Constitution, submits it first to legislature then if acceptable, to the people.)

Fate of these bills -?Influential people--

Governor: for TCR by Convention.

Lt. Gov.: "not a vital issue", "go slow"--for TCR by Commission--won't push.

Speaker: for TCR by Commission--will push it--for Virginia Plan (Commission of 20 men, 5 appointed by Governor, 5 by Speaker, 5 by Lt. Governor, 5 by Chief Justice; submit Constitution first to Legislature, then to the people.)

Ch. Hardeman: "These bills have no merit", "amend it, yes; scrap it, no."

Ch. Cory: for TCR by Commission--Convention would take too long and be composed of millionaires, morons or representatives of pressure groups.

Should SB 173 pass the Senate, then a conference committee on TCR will be necessary for HCR 34 is not identical to it.

5/7/67: Rep. Cory has just introduced a House bill to appropriate \$50,000 for expenses of a Commission.

5/12/67: The House passed a constitutional amendment providing that the Legislature may by 2/3 vote propose a revision of the Constitution (all or part). The revision would be voted on as one question in an election.

60th LegislatureHistory of Metropolitan Area BillsBackground:

In April 1965 Gov. Connally asked the Texas Research League to study the service structures of the local governmental units comprising the Metropolitan Areas of Texas to determine appropriate steps at state and local levels to modernize and improve administration, planning and financing of essential public services. (Metropolitan Dallas has 250 local governments!)

In January 1967, the Governor urged the Legislature to put six proposals by the Texas Research League into law.

On Feb. 10, 1967: Don Kennard and Reps. John Wright and Tommy Strannon sponsored six bills, HJR 32, SJR 12; HJR 33, SJR 18; both constitutional amendments, one for optional plans for county government, the other on establishing Urban Counties--also, HB 460, SB 229; HB 461, SB 230; HB 462, SB 228; HB 463, SB 227. (See Dallas VOTER, May, p. 3 for summaries of these bills.)

On March 30, 1967: Gov. Connally compromised with 200 members of the Texas county commissioners, dropping the two amendments for now, if they would go along with the other bills. In spite of 41 amendments to these bills, the county commissioners are against all but HB 460 and SB 229 (County Land Use).

Progress of Bills:

The 4 senate bills were referred to Counties, Cities and Towns Committee Ch. Sen. Hall, member Sen. Wade. Hearings, 4/11/67. LWV testified for all 4 bills. Referred to subcommittee--no action so far.

HB 460 was referred to Counties Committee, Ch. Clayton, Reps. Moore, Semos, Wright, members. Hearings, 4/13/67. Mrs. Lancaster of LWV testified in favor--no action so far.

HB 461, 462, 463 were referred to State Affairs Committee, Ch. Cory, Reps. Clark, Lockridge, members. Hearings, 4/10/67. Mrs. May of LWV testified in favor of all 3 bills. Sent to subcommittee--no action so far.

Opposition to all but HB 460, SB 229--"officials" from Dallas, Jefferson and Harris Counties; Highland Park City Council; Greater Dallas League of Municipalities; Judge Sterrett, (chairman group of county judges and commissioners from metropolitan areas in Texas.)

Support: The Governor of Texas; League of Women Voters; Texas Research League (the TRL does not lobby); many county and city officials from other parts of Texas, some who are officers of Councils of Governments or Regional Planning Commissions--Arlington Mayor Vandergriff, past president of North Central Texas C.O.G.

Influential People in Legislature:

Lt. Gov. _____

Speaker _____

Chairman Hall would go along with the judges' decision. _____

Cory _____

Clayton _____

On May 12 the House passed a constitutional amendment to let local governments in Tarrant and El Paso Counties consolidate certain services as recommended by the Texas Research League. If HB 461, SB 230 were passed this kind of local problem solving by constitutional amendment could be avoided!

THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS - 1967

Every program instituted by the state must pass two hurdles in the legislature. First it must be authorized and then money must be appropriated to implement the program and the size of the appropriation can determine the effectiveness of the program. Of course, the size of the appropriations bill determines the amount of taxation necessary. In 1942 Texas amended its constitution to require the comptroller to certify whether the tax structure for the state would yield sufficient revenue to cover the appropriations. These two imperatives make the appropriations bill one of the most important passed each session.

This session several other factors have added to the drama surrounding the appropriations bill. Gov. Connally committed himself in the fall to many reforms in order to make the state a more viable partner in the federal-state-local set up. This entailed new money for state salary increases, mental health-mental retardation, education, water and air pollution control, regional planning, etc. The political rivalry between Lt. Gov. Smith and Gov. Connally makes them likely opponents for Gov. in 1968. Partly as a result Smith pledged himself to economy in spending and no new taxes. Speaker Barnes favored most of Connally's proposals. The third factor results from the harsh treatment Connally's proposals got in conference com. last session. At one point the conference com. had added \$32 mil. not included in either version of the bill. This session the House changed its rules to limit its conferees to adjusting the differences between the two bills. The Senate did not and the possibility remains that a confrontation on a major bill would be disastrous.

Connally proposed a \$4.6 bil. budget for 1968-69, not including the \$7 mil. for emergency items and a teacher pay raise. This was 46% above current spending from general revenue. Nevertheless, he cut requests from state agencies by half. \$2.6 bil. for education made up almost half his budget. Average 20% raises for state employees used \$75 mil. \$971 mil. would come from the general revenue fund, the remainder from earmarked funds. Connally's proposals would require \$144 mil. in new taxes. The Legislative Budget Board proposed to spend \$840 mil. from general revenue. Both budgets were referred to com., Senate - Finance, Aikin, Chairman; House - Appropriations, Heatly, Chairman.

The Senate com. wrote a bill closely following the LBB proposals while the House com. favored Connally's program. Partly because of Smith's opposition to new taxes Connally's tax program was in deep trouble by early April and very few other major bills had passed. The Senate appropriations bill was ready for floor debate, but the House bill was still in com. Parnes said they were writing it carefully to avoid any need for the conference com. to rewrite it.

Then on April 19, Gov. Connally spoke to a joint session proposing a one year appropriations bill in order to avoid new taxes now. He promised to call a special session in 1968 for appropriations and new taxes. He pointed out the uncertainty of planning 2 yrs. in advance, citing the surpluses new taxes had created the past two bienniums. April 23, Comp. Calvert predicted a \$400 mil. surplus this year. This allowed funding without taxes for one year. This took most of the steam out of Smith's no taxes argument. At the special session an estimated \$350 mil. from general revenue will be available. Approximately \$100 mil. in new taxes will be needed to continue proposed levels of spending. Connally forces feel Smith will be forced to go along or be labeled an "obstructionist". Of course, Connally will have to carry the burden for the tax increase.

The Finance and Appropriations Committees began revising their budgets for one year. The first week in May the Finance Com. reported out its bill calling for \$2.4 bil. It was immediately attacked by Connally and Rep. Heatly on the grounds that 14 programs were eliminated or under financed to save \$55 mil. for teacher's raises. Heatly compared the \$400 mil. increase for teachers in the past 15 years to the addition of no new mental health beds in 10 years. Sen. Aikin replied he was not taking orders on how to write the spending bill. May 8 the Senate passed its \$2.4 bil. bill including \$55.5 mil for teacher pay raises.

Connally forces in the House waited for the Senate bill to arrive, then on May 16 passed their own \$2.4 bil. bill as a substitute for the Senate measure. It provides more for mental health institutions, state agencies, air and water pollution control, higher education, law enforcement, and traffic regulation than the Senate measure. The House expects to find enough additional revenue to give the teachers a separate \$50 mil. pay raise.

Connally forces attempted to get the necessary 16 votes in the Senate to assure acceptance of the House amendments and eliminate the need for a conference com. However, on May 18, the vote was taken and only 9 voted for the House version. The vote cut across liberal-conservative lines. Hall, Wade, Mauzy, Wilson, Connally, Hazlewood, Moore, Schwartz, and Strong were the 9. An attempt was made by Strong to instruct the conferees to keep in certain "items where people are involved, mostly defenseless people who are unable to come down here and lobby for themselves". Smith ruled the attempt out of order. Many personal privilege speeches followed accusing Smith of being unfair, arbitrary and self-serving. Strong said. "It's hard to play the game when the rules are changed every day."

The Senate conferees are Sens. Aikin, Hardeman, Herring, Regan, and Word; the sub-com. that wrote the Senate bill. House conferees are Reps. Heatly, Pipkin, Mutchler, Slack, and Tommy Shannon. Sen. Hall predicted a deadlock would result on appropriations and a special session would be called shortly after the May 29 adjournment.

Watch your papers for developments after May 18 !

CONSUMER CREDIT CODE - HB. 452

The Texas Constitution limits lenders to 10% per year interest unless other limits are set by the legislature. In 1961 the legislature passed the Texas Regulatory Loan Act, popularly called the "loan-shark bill". It regulated loan companies and set their maximum rates of interest. They ranged from 320% for loans of \$100 or less to \$7/100 for \$1000 to \$1500 loans. In 1965 the legislature extended these interest rates and regulation to banks. The Gov. vetoed it and then asked the State Finance Commission to study and make recommendations in this field. They proposed, in the fall of 1966, a Consumer Credit Commission. It would regulate all types of lenders (loan companies, banks, savings and loan companies, credit unions, sales and consumer finance firms) and extend approximately the rates of the 1961 bill to them all. The bill was referred to the Senate Finance Com. and the House com. Both held hearings and reported the bill favorably.

Opponents, led by the Texas Consumer Assn., pointed out that 320% was the highest rate charged anywhere in the U.S. and that 46 states have top limits of 60% or less. They said the regulatory features gave consumers no new protections. The bank and finance lobby supported the bill. Gov. Connally said it would "prevent economic abuse of citizens unable to protect themselves..."

Opponents, lead by Rep. Quilliam, concentrated their efforts on lowering interest on loans under \$100 to 100%. On April 11 it was brought up for vote in the House. Rep. Quilliam succeeded in lowering the interest on under \$100 loans to \$240. All Dallas representatives voted against Quilliam except Stroud, who supported him, and Clark, who abstained. All other limiting amendments were defeated. The bill passed 128-17.

The Consumer Credit Code came up for 2nd reading in the Senate May 3. Senators Schwartz and Mauzy lost repeated attempts to lower rates and add "truth-in-lending" clauses. Parkhouse limited credit unions to 12% on all size loans. The bill passed 21-7. The Gov. signed the bill.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that the 23 Congressional districts in Texas vary too greatly in population and that they should be drawn as contiguous and compact as possible. According to the 1960 census, 416,500 should be the average district size. Fifteen districts vary more than 5% from the average. Ideas about the best plan for redistricting are as various as the political factions and geographical sections of Texas. A major objective in most bills was to avoid putting two incumbent congressmen in the same district. Charges and counter charges flew that conservative-Democrats were attempting to divide Republican and liberal-Democrat areas to keep them from controlling a district. Another point of disagreement was whether to use 1960 census figures or the more strongly urban 1965 population estimates.

At least three rival plans relating to Dallas Co. are supported by various House members. Dallas has more than enough population for two congressmen and not enough for 3 by the 1960 census. All plans would leave Pool, #3, and Cabell, #5, wholly within Dallas County. 1) The House Congressional and Legislative Districts Com., chaired by Mutscher, favored moving Teague's 6th district out of Dallas and Tarrant Co. and toward the Gulf coast. Purcell, #13, would retain his N Dallas constituency and Roberts, #4, would be given part of NE Dallas Co. 2) The Dallas del-

legation supports a plan to leave lines inside Dallas Co unchanged. This would allow Teague to continue to represent Dallas. This is favored by business leaders who value his position as Chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Com. However, his district would be a long J shape extending from Dallas to the Gulf and might be challenged in the courts. 3) Cahoon, Republican from Midland, and Richardson, liberal-Democrat from Ft. Worth, presented a plan to create a new #4 district to unite the excess population in Dallas and Tarrant Counties with Denton, Collin, Johnson, and Ellis Counties. Roberts lives in Collin County. Purcell and Burleson would be put in the same district and a new district would be created on the SE Texas coast with no incumbent.

May 16 the Senate passed a bill by Hall and Word essentially the same as the Dallas House delegations plan. The vote was 23-5, Hall and Parkhouse - for, Mausy and Wade - against. Mausy predicted the court would not accept it because the districts were not compact. Hall defended it because it keeps all congressmen in separate districts, has a maximum population variation of 5.3%. He said the courts would not strike it down this close to the 1970 census that will require redistricting again.

Rep. Mutscher said he still favors a more compact district for Teague, leaving him out of Dallas and Tarrant Counties. His com. is expected to report this bill soon.

Sources: Dallas Morning News, Dallas Times Herald, Texas Observer, Austin Report, and League of Women Voters Legislative Bulletins.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that the 19 Congressional districts in Texas very too greatly in population and that they should be drawn as compact and compact as possible. According to the 1970 census, 11,400 should be the average district size. Fifteen districts were more than 2% from the average. Ideas about the best plan for redistricting are as various as the political factions and geographical sections of Texas. A major objective in most bills was to avoid putting the incumbent congressmen in the same district. Changes and changes like that conservative - liberals were attempting to divide Republican and liberal-Democrat areas to keep them from controlling a district. Another point of disagreement was whether to use 1970 census figures or the more strongly urban 1965 population estimates.

At least three rival plans relating to Dallas Co. are supported by various House members. Dallas has more than enough population for two congressmen and not enough for 3 by the 1970 census. All plans would leave 1001, 2, and Cabello, 42, wholly within Dallas County. 1) The House Congressional and Legislative Districts Com., chaired by Mutscher, favored moving Teague's 1st district out of Dallas and Tarrant Co. and toward the Gulf coast. Purcell, 12, would retain his Dallas constituency and Roberts, 44, would be given part of El Paso Co. 2) The Dallas del-

BRIEFING MATERIAL -- GO-SEE-TOUR OF THE TEXAS LEGISLATURE

When watching the legislature in session, the "Ant Colony" atmosphere is most apparent. What happens on the floor of the chambers is a result of several things. Most important is the need of each legislator to personally contact other members to gain support in working his bills through the "road blocks" or critical procedural steps toward passage. Another reason for the apparent lack of attention to the matter at hand is that the actual debate on a bill has little effect on its chances. Since the debate is not recorded this is not a means of airing the issues involved for the public.

Bills may be drafted by anyone, but only a legislator can introduce them. The procedure in the House and the Senate vary only slightly. At the time of introduction, a bill is given a number (H.B.14, S.B.372), and read by title (1st reading). The presiding officer then refers the bill to a committee. He has considerable discretion in choosing a committee.

The Speaker of the House and the Lieutenant Governor in the Senate appoint all committees and designate their chairman. There are 44 standing committees in the House and 25 in the Senate. The true role of a committee is to consider and analyze bills, conduct hearings in order to get all sides of the issue, and after careful screening, report out to the floor only those which have merit. This is designed to weed out impractical and undesirable legislation, and prevent a flood of bills from swamping the two houses. In practice, this is not always the case. It has been the practice in recent years for the Senate committees to report out all bills for consideration by the whole Senate. The Lieutenant Governor may then weed out what he considers bad bills by refusing to let them be brought up for floor debate.

The committees' lack of staff limits their ability to study and analyze bills. The chairman has great power over the operation of his committee. He calls the committee meetings, sets the time and place for hearings, appoints the sub committees and sets the time for them to report. These powers can be used either to advance a bill or to kill it.

For the last eight years, the house has operated under an automatic rule that all bills go to a subcommittee for further study after a hearing. This subcommittee rule can be waived by 2/3's vote of the committee. The subcommittee works in private. A bill in subcommittee may not be reported out without the consent of the chairman. No records, other than listing names of those appearing as witnesses, are kept of committee or subcommittee meetings.

After a bill has been reported favorably by its committee, it must then be put on the calendar for debate. In both houses the presiding officer has considerable control over the calendar. When a bill is up for 2nd reading (floor debate and the possible addition of amendments), the presiding officer again has considerable control. He may or may not recognize members in floor debate and can rule on the germaneness of amendments.

Having passed 2nd reading a bill is, on a separate day, called up for 3rd reading by title only and a final vote. It is then sent to the other house, to go through the same procedure. If the second chamber amends the bill and the chamber which considered and passed the bill is unable to accept amendments of the other house, it may request a conference committee by a simple majority vote. If the other house by the same type of vote accepts the request, the Speaker appoints 5 house members, the Lieutenant Governor 5 Senators. It is usually the case that those named to the conference committee are the leading sponsors and majority supporters of the legislation in each house. It is stated in the rules that only the differences between the two versions of the bill may be adjusted. However, in practice over the last 10 years,

conference committees have deleted provisions previously accepted by both houses and added provisions both houses rejected or did not have before them. At times they have completely rewritten bills within the broad labels of their "Captions".

Though prohibited in the Constitution, riders are sometimes attached to conference committee reports. This is especially true of legislative riders attached to appropriations bills. This practice undermines the voting rights of other members and the item veto of the governor, which only extends to items in the appropriation bill and not to riders. Late in the session it gives the conference committee almost dictatorial power, as it is too late to refuse to pass or to veto appropriations for the next two two years. Conference committees have always worked in closed meetings with no records kept.

When the resultant bill from a conference committee is reported back to each house, it need not be printed. It can not be amended, only approved or disapproved. The rules of the House in the 60th Legislature have been strengthened with regard to the conference committee. It is again reiterated that the house members must keep adjustments to the germaneness of the bill.

The final version of the bill then goes to the Governor for his signature or veto. A 2/3's vote of both houses is required to override the governor's veto.

THE ROLE OF THE GOVERNOR IN LEGISLATION

All governors try to have their legislative programs enacted into law, for they realize that they will be judged strong or weak, not because of their administrative ability, but because of success or failure in their legislative undertakings. Some of a governor's influence in the legislature is based upon his constitutional powers of delivering messages to the legislature, calling special sessions, exercising the veto and making appointments to state offices.

Gubernatorial messages may or may not have much influence depending on the governor's popularity both with the public and the legislators. In any case, his plans for legislation are the only real plans presented and his proposals receive more comprehensive statewide news coverage generally than those of the legislators.

The governor may veto any bill. His veto may be overridden by 2/3 vote of each house, but this is seldom obtained. He has no item veto, except in the case of appropriations bills. The veto, or the threat of the use of it, is the governor's more important tool to encourage changes in a certain bill or to bring about the defeat of a bill.

Special sessions may be called only by the governor and, according to the constitution, only legislation presented by the governor may be considered. These "Governor's Sessions" are not desirable from the view of the legislators, because most of them are anxious to return to personal business that must be neglected during the regular session.

Success of a governor's program depends in very large measure upon the prestige, personality and political know-how of the chief executive. It is always to his advantage to be well-thought-of by the legislators.

TEXAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

A major frustration of a legislator is the lack of time and resources to discover all the facts pertinent to the hundred of bills he must vote on each session. In an effort to replace guesswork with facts the Legislative Council was established in 1949.

Fifteen legislators compose the Council, 10 from the House and 5 from the Senate. The Council with its regular research staff, headed by an executive director, functions as a general interim study committee with broad powers to make investigations of state agencies and offices, to gather information for the legislature and to prepare draft legislation based on its recommendations. Such topics as juvenile delinquency, wildlife management, lobby control and constitutional revision have been submitted to the Council by the legislature for research and recommendations.

Texas has no specific bill drafting agency for the use of the legislators, and the Council helps fill this need. Between 40 and 50 per cent of the House and Senate members call on the council staff for assistance during each regular session. Statutes are better drawn and in better form when based upon research by a capable staff, than are statutes based on hastily drawn bills.

The Council's usefulness is limited by inadequate staff and budget. If the budget for the Legislative Council cannot be enlarged, the legislature must limit the number of research projects submitted to the council and allot more time for research.

BUDGET MAKING

Texas has a system unique among the states in determining its biennial budget. Ordinarily, budget making is considered an executive function. However, in Texas the legislature in 1949 created the Legislative Budget Board, composed of the presiding officer and four members of each house. This board appoints a full time director who has a staff. Both the Governor and the Budget Board are required to submit budgets within five days after the opening of the legislative session. The Governor's Budget Office and the Legislative Budget Board cooperate to some extent. Nevertheless, in the end, the estimates are different, with the executive budget frequently including new spending programs, while the Budget Board limits proposals to their minimums, arriving at a lower budget figure. The Legislature is usually more inclined to adopt the budget prepared under its own direction.

One feature of the Texas financial administration has plagued both budget-making agencies. This is the fact that about 85% of the state revenues are earmarked for particular purposes and must be placed in special "untouchable" funds.

DEFINITIONS

Engrossment: after passage at 2nd reading a bill is printed with all changes and amendments made.

Enrollment: after final passage of both houses the final copy is printed.

Local & Uncontested calendar: those bills considered non-controversial to which there has been no objection voiced. Get streamlined movement through legislative process.

POSSIBLE QUESTIONS

SPEAKER AND/OR LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

1. How do you campaign for the speakership?
2. What changes are going to take place in the actions of conference committees?
3. Will legislative riders be allowed in the appropriations bill?
4. Will the conference committees be held to adjusting the differences in bills?
5. What criteria do you use in selecting committee chairmen?
6. What curbs are there on the powers of the presiding officers?
7. How do you decide which committee to send Bills to?
8. What is it in a particular bill that determines whether or not it is sent to the State Affairs Committee?

General

1. What caused the automatic subcommittee rule to be adopted by the house?
2. What is your feeling about holding annual legislative sessions?
3. Do you favor annual sessions?
4. Should the budget be biennial or annual?
5. What was the difference between the Governor's Budget proposal and the Legislative Budget Board's?
6. What is the cause and result of the end of season rush? Particularly on major legislation?
7. What is the present status of earmarked funds, and is there any chance of a change?
8. What is the most active group lobbying for or against a bill in your committee?
9. What do you consider your most important committee assignment and why?
10. What are the most active committees this session?
11. Are there concrete proposals at this time for a full-time bill drafting staff?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

1. How could the Legislative Council be used more effectively?
2. What have been the subjects of your recent studies?

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD

What criteria determine your budget proposal?

Dallas County Legislators and their Committee assignments

Ben Atwell	Revenue & Taxation (Chairman) Labor (Vice-chairman) Commerce & Manufactures Public Health	
Jack Blanton	Agriculture Parks & Wildlife Constitutional Amendments Mental Health & Retardation	Commerce & Manufactures
Wm. Braecklein	Aeronautics Appropriations Judiciary Penitentiaries	Public Lands & Buildings Military & Veterans Affairs
James Clark	Congressional & Legislative Districts House Administration Military & Veterans Affairs Motor Traffic State Affairs	
John Field	Banks & Banking (Chairman) Liquor Regulation Livestock & Stock Raising Common Carriers	
Joseph Lockridge	Education Mental Health & Retardation Penitentiaries Federal Relations State Affairs	
Dick McKissack	Congressional & Legislative Districts Liquor Regulation Oil, Gas, & Mining (Vice-chairman) Urban Affairs	
Griffith Moore	Constitutional Amendments Counties Examination of Controllers & Treasurers Accounts Military & Veterans Affairs Parks & Wildlife	
Sam Murphy	Examination of Controllers & Treasurers Accounts Highway & Roads Motor Traffic Oil, Gas, & Mining	Livestock & Stock Raising
Fred Orr	Banks & Banking Public Health Insurance	Aeronautics Enrolled bills
Joe Ratcliff	Appropriations Juvenile Crime & Delinquency Penitentiaries	Education School Districts

Chris Semos

Counties

Penitentiaries

Interstate Cooperation
Juvenile Crime & Delinquency
Privileges, Suffrage & Elections

J. W. Stroud

Common Carriers

Conservation & Reclamation
Highways & Roads
Privileges, Suffrage & Elections (Vice-chairman)
Representation before the Legislature

John Wright

Counties

Criminal Jurisprudence
Judicial Districts
Motor Traffic (Chairman)
Revenue & Taxation

Dallas County Senators and their Committee Assignments

George Parkhouse

Water Conservation (Chairman)

State Affairs

Rules (Vice-chairman)
Banking
Constitutional Amendments
Finance
Insurance
Oil & Gas
Public Health
Legislative, Congressional & Judicial Districts

Oscar Mauzy

Military & Veterans Affairs (Vice-chairman)

Nominations
Banking
Claims (Vice-chairman)
Constitutional Amendments
Education
Insurance
Legislative, Congressional & Judicial Districts

Jim Wade

Counties, Cities & Towns

Game & Fish (Vice-chairman)
Labor & Management Relations
Jurisprudence
Nominations
Privileges & Elections

March 17, 1967

Mrs. William E. Joor, President
League of Women Voters of Texas
1841 Bingle Road
Houston, Texas 77055

Dear Mrs. Joor:

The Dallas League of Women Voters is planning a Go-See-Tour of the Texas Legislature April 19. The Irving and possibly the Richardson Leagues expect to join us for the tour. At this point we expect at least 40 to 50 members to attend. We envision this trip as a chance not only to observe the legislature in session, but also to ask questions of the legislative leadership about the organization and functioning of the legislature. To this end we are asking permission to invite the following legislators to a luncheon at the Driskill Hotel: Lt. Gov. Smith; Sen. Aikin, Finance Chairman; Sen. Hardeman, Finance Vice Chairman and State Affairs Chairman; Sen. Creighton, State Affairs Vice Chairman; Speaker Barnes; Rep. Heatly, Appropriations Chairman; Rep. Pipkin, Appropriations Vice Chairman; Rep. Moyer, Revenue and Taxation Vice Chairman; Rep. Cory, State Affairs Chairman; and Rep. Jungmichel, State Affairs Vice Chairman. Rep. Atwell, Revenue and Taxation Chairman, is a member of the Dallas delegation. We, of course, intend to invite our own Senators and Representatives.

We will ask the Speaker, Lieutenant Governor and either the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the aforementioned committees to explain their duties and to answer questions. We think this type of exchange can add measurably to the League's knowledge of the legislature and to the legislative leaders' realization that we are seriously interested in understanding their roles.

We also hope to set up appointments with the Directors of the Legislative Budget Board and the Legislative Council at their offices. They can then explain the functioning of their agencies and answer questions.

Enclosed is a copy of the entire schedule for our Go-See-Tour. Also enclosed are extra copies of this letter to facilitate the circularization of the State Board.

Please let us know your answer to this request by March 27, as we must get our invitations in the mail. I hope that you find the prospect of such a Go-See-Tour as exciting as do we in the Dallas area.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Harvey
Mrs. James B. Harvey
Chairman, State Item I

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF DALLAS

THE DALLAS AREA LEAGUE'S
GO-SEE-TOUR of the TEXAS LEGISLATURE
"A LEGISLATIVE HAPPENING"

April 19, 1967

A.M.

6:30 - Leave Dallas

10:30 - Arrive Austin

10:30 - 12:30 - Observe Legislative Session

P.M.

1:00 - Luncheon, Driskill Hotel

3:00 - Observe Committee Meetings

4:00 - Legislative Budget Board

4:30 - Legislative Council

5:30 - Departure from Austin (Box Supper on Bus)

9:30 - Arrive Dallas

Office Copy

January 21, 1967

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF DALLAS

FOR: DALLAS MORNING NEWS

Mrs. Henry Lanz: Em 1-5165
Vice President

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

January 21, 1967

The members of the League of Women Voters of Dallas have timed their study of the Texas Legislature to coincide with the bi-annual session recently convened in Austin. Later in the spring, members and guests will board busses for the capitol to see for themselves what goes on in general sessions and committee meetings.

The League of Women Voters is a non-partisan organization open to all women citizens of voting age. It does not support candidates in any election. Its major purpose is to encourage political responsibility through active and informed participation of men and women in government at all levels.

Units meeting this week in various parts of the city to discuss the Texas Legislature are open to all interested women. For additional information visitors may call Mrs. W. A. Clark, LA 8-0690, or Mrs. Howard Ingram, Jr., DI 8-8648.

Meeting places are as follows:

Tuesday, 24 January	10 a.m.	Horseshoe Trail	Mrs. Edwin Siegel [REDACTED]
Wednesday, 25 January	9:45 a.m.	Webbs Chapel	Mrs. Winston Fournier [REDACTED]

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS (cont'd)

Wednesday, 25 January	10 a.m.	Kiest Park	Wynnewood State Bank
		Lakewood	Mrs. Walter Gill [REDACTED]
		White Rock	Mrs. Roy Chenault [REDACTED]
	7:45 p.m.	Selecman Hall	Selecman Hall, SMU
Thursday, 26 January	9:45 a.m.	Preston Hollow	Mrs. William Heroy, Jr. [REDACTED]
		Walnut Hill	Mrs. W. A. Clark [REDACTED]
		Midway Road	Mrs. Rosa May Davis [REDACTED]
		North Preston	Mrs. D. Arvanites [REDACTED]
		Oak Cliff Day	Mrs. T. J. Manton, Jr. [REDACTED]
		University Park	Mrs. Lloyd E. Gerry [REDACTED]
	7:45 p.m.	Oak Cliff Night	Mrs. Glyn Beesley [REDACTED]

State I - Texas legislature - Resource Committee

Texas legislature

✓ Chairman - Mrs. J. B. Harvey, [REDACTED]

HT - Mrs W. D. Rosenberg, [REDACTED]

KP - Mrs. H. D. Jarvis, [REDACTED]

X LW - Mrs. Robert Good^d, [REDACTED]

MR - Mrs. F. K. Allen, [REDACTED]

MR - Mrs. Olive Shapiro, [REDACTED]

NP - Mrs. M. T. Buhl, [REDACTED]

OCD - Mrs. W. P. Goode, [REDACTED]

OCN -

PH - Mrs. John Graham, [REDACTED]

SH - Mrs. E. C. Dillard, [REDACTED]

UP - Miss Agnes Kelleher, [REDACTED]

UP - Miss Margaret Kelleher, [REDACTED]

UP - Mrs. S. W. Geiser, [REDACTED]

UP - Mrs. Griffith Moore, [REDACTED]

X WH - Mrs. W. A. Clark, [REDACTED]

WH - Mrs. P. M. Williams, [REDACTED]

WC - Mrs. R. S. Lyle, [REDACTED]

WC - Mrs. H. S. Miller, [REDACTED]

WR - Mrs. E. R. Brownscombe, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
I--Mrs. D. B. Trumble, [REDACTED]



OTE

FOR

**Vote For
Constitutional
Amendment #5
on
November 5th**



What Will This Amendment Do?

Proposed Constitutional Amendment #5
will permit the legislature to:

- raise the pay of Texas Legislators from \$4,800 up to \$8,400 per year.
- extend the \$12 per diem expenses during the regular sessions from 120 days to the full 140 days of the regular session.
- allow 10¢ per mile for one round trip per month to the home district while the legislature is in session rather than the present allowance for only one round trip per session.

* * * * *

The League of Women Voters of Texas, after two years of study of the Texas Legislature, has agreed that adequate compensation for state legislators is a necessary step in improving state government.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF TEXAS
1841 Bingle Road
Houston, Texas 77055

REASONS To Vote For

1. It will raise the compensation to reflect the responsibility for a \$2.5 billion budget and the interests of 10 million Texans.
2. It will help the legislator be more independent of special interest groups who may seek to sway his vote by financial favors.
3. It will encourage more persons from various sectors of Texas life to represent our varied interests.
4. It will help to keep the experienced law-makers, who are needed to solve complex problems of state government.
5. It will relieve legislators of the pressure of having to make a living at another occupation enabling them to spend more time on state business.

FACTS ON THIS ISSUE

Serving in the Texas Legislature is a full-time job. Each senator represents about 300,000 voters. Each member of the house represents about 60,000 persons. Serving on study committees, speech-making, correspondence and contacts with constituents can take hours of a legislator's day between sessions.

By January 1967 ten states were paying more than the \$8,400 proposed in this amendment. Since then about six more have raised legislative compensation.

The Committee for Economic Development in a 1967 report recommended \$15,000 minimum and "at least \$25,000 annually" in the larger states. In 1965 Texas was 5th in population and 7th in total state expenditures.

The Citizens Conference on State Legislatures says states should be considering legislative salaries of \$20,000 to \$30,000 per year.

 **Vote For** 