

2005

Exploring committee outliers in a weak party state legislature: the Louisiana House, 2000-2003

Trisha Mari Sandahl

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sandahl, Trisha Mari, "Exploring committee outliers in a weak party state legislature: the Louisiana House, 2000-2003" (2005). *LSU Master's Theses*. 1824.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/1824

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Master's Theses by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

EXPLORING COMMITTEE OUTLIERS IN A
WEAK PARTY STATE LEGISLATURE:
THE LOUISIANA HOUSE, 2000-2003

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

in

The Department of Political Science

by
Trisha Mari Sandahl
B.S., Spring Hill College, 2000
May, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	5
Distributive Theory.....	5
Informational Theory.....	8
Major Party Cartel Theory.....	14
3 EVALUATION OF EXISTING LITERATURE.....	19
4 HYPOTHESES.....	22
5 METHOD.....	27
6 RESULTS.....	30
Testing the Distributive and Informational Theory.....	31
Testing the Major Party Cartel Theory.....	36
7 CONCLUSION.....	58
REFERENCES.....	62
APPENDIX	
A SUPPLEMENTARY DATA.....	64
B. VARIABLE INFORMATION.....	100
VITA.....	139

ABSTRACT

Studies on the role of committees in legislatures have focused primarily on the U.S. Congress. In this study I expand on these studies by determining whether or not the distributive, informational, or major party cartel theory used to explain the role of committees at the national level can be extended to the state level; i.e. the Louisiana house legislature. Hypotheses are tested by using roll call votes in the Louisiana House for the years 2000-2003. This study finds substantial support for the informational theory and minimal support for the distributive and major party cartel theories in the Louisiana House legislature.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

As of late, numerous studies have explored the extent to which congressional committees look like the membership of the whole chamber. While this in and of itself poses an interesting question, it only skims the surface. This link between committee and chamber membership has substantial implications for theories of legislative organization and committee power. The earliest studies of congressional committees began with what has been termed distributional theories. These theories claim that legislators self-select onto committees that will maximize their own self interest. Because members self-select onto committees, this theory argues that committee members will hold views unrepresentative of those of the whole legislature (Cox and McCubbins, 1993). These committee members are known as “preference outliers.”

The distributional theory first came under attack in the 1990s, beginning with Krehbiel’s book, “Information and Legislative Organization,” where he laid out an informational theory of congressional organization. Cox and McCubbins later contributed to this debate by laying out the foundation for their majority party cartel theory.

The view of committees in the distributive theory differs widely from those held in the informational and major party cartel theories. Committees in the informational theory are composed of a heterogeneous membership. Their members’ main goals are to develop expertise of specific policy areas. Committees in the informational theory are seen as tools used by legislators to select policies in the best interest of the whole legislature (Krehbiel, 1991). In this theory committee members will represent the views

of the whole legislature. Committees under this theory will not contain members who are preference outliers.

In contrast, committees in the major party cartel theory are not seen as agents of the whole legislature but agents of the majority party. Their main goal is to pass legislation favorable to the majority party. Under this theory, committee members will represent the views of their whole party. In other words, Democrat (and similarly, Republican) members of committees will represent the views of Democrats (Republicans) as a whole. Under this theory, committees will contain members' representative of the views of their respective party and not the views of the whole legislature.

Because preference outliers are the cornerstone of the distributional, informational, and major party cartel theories, it is important to take a moment to define preference outliers. Krehbiel claims there are three different types of preference outliers: the classical homogeneous high demand outlier, the bipolar outlier, and the interest, or high salience, outlier.

First, the classical-homogenous high demand outlier claims that committee and chamber's medians and means are different. The greater the difference between the mean (median) of the chamber and the committee, the greater the likelihood the committee is a classical homogenous outlier. Committees representative of this type of outlier are composed of members who not only have a direct interest, but benefit as well, from the policies enacted under a specific committee's jurisdiction. Krehbiel claims one way to test for this type of preference outlier committee is by comparing means (median) positions of committee members to the median positions of the whole. If these positions

are not the same, then we know the committee in question is a preference outlier committee.

Second, committees under the bipolar outlier theory contain members representing views on separate ends of the policy spectrum. Members of committees do not represent median views on the policy spectrum. For example, a committee may be composed of members who are strong advocates of civil rights and others who are strong advocates of law-and-order measures. These two types of members may express divergent policy stances.

Third, an intense-interest, or high-salience, outlier committee is one in which the members have a high interest in the policies enacted under that specific committee, possibly because its policies are of particular interest to their constituents. Basically, legislators choose to become members of these committees to represent their constituent's interests. (Krehbiel, 1990 and 1991).

For the purposes of this study, preference outlying committees will be those committees composed of members who represent mean (median) views divergent from the mean (median) views of the whole legislature or their party.

As of now, little is known about preference outliers at the state level. The purpose of this thesis is to ascertain the level of support for the distributive, informational, and major party cartel theories by looking at one single state legislature, the Louisiana House of Representatives. The intent of this thesis is to determine whether or not standing committees in the Louisiana House are composed of members unrepresentative of the views of the whole.

This study begins by summarizing existing literature on the role of committees in the legislative process. This literature is based on three theories: distributive, informational, and major party cartel. I then seek to determine which, if any, one of these theories can be used to explain the role of standing committees in the Louisiana House. Data for this study was obtained from roll call votes obtained from the Louisiana House Legislative digest for the years 2000-2003. These roll call votes are used to test whether the distributive, informational, or major party cartel theory can be used to explain the role of committees in the Louisiana House.

This study's importance resides in the fact that if either the distributive, informational, or major party cartel theories are found to be true, then they can have substantial implications on the role of committees in the legislative process. If committees are found to contain members unrepresentative of the views of the whole, then one could arguably claim that legislative committees contain substantial power. This power includes, but is not limited to, agenda setting (i.e., determining which policies make it to the floor to be voted on by the whole and which do not). Arguably, committees unrepresentative of the views of the whole go against the very fiber of a democratic nation.

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As mentioned previously, three main theories have arisen to explain the role of committees in the legislative process; the distributive theory, informational theory, and major party cartel theory. Committees in the distributive theory are composed of homogenous membership; i.e. members of committees represent different views from the legislature. A legislator's main goal in this theory is to maximize his or her own self-interest by self-selecting onto a committee with jurisdiction over specific policies areas (Cox and McCubbins, 1993).

Distributive Theory

Scholars exploring the composition of congressional committee memberships in the U.S. legislature have found support for either part or all of the distributive theory (Weingast and Marshall (1988) and Kenneth Shepsle (1978)).

Kenneth Shepsle (1978) looks at committee assignments in the U.S. legislature by evaluating freshman committee request for the 86th through 93rd Congress. Shepsle proposes two hypotheses: first, that freshman legislators tend to make committee requests based on the characteristics of their constituencies, and second that those legislators request for committee assignments are often granted (Krehbiel, 1990). He tests these propositions by comparing freshman constituency characteristics to their committee requests. Shepsle finds support for the claim that legislators' self-select onto committees (Shepsle, 1978). He also finds the geographic characteristics of a legislators' constituency plays a role in their committee selection (Krehbiel, 1991). Hence, committees are composed of legislators who are preference outliers.

Weingast and Marshall (1988) add support for the distributive theory by proposing a theory of legislative institutions similar to firm and contractual institutions. The theory of the firm looks at the costs associated with trade. It claims that these costs can be reduced. Weingast and Marshall extend the premises underlying the theory of the firm to legislatures. They use this theory to develop three assumptions. First, legislators wish to pass legislation that is “politically relevant” to their constituents. Political relevant legislation according to these authors is legislation of extreme interest to a section of constituents in their district. These constituents have large incentives to vote according to how their interests are handled by their legislator. This can affect whether or not legislators are reelected.

Second, political parties do not affect how legislators act. One reason cited by Weingast and Marshall for this is the fact that parties no longer control whether or not legislators obtained positions of power, or disperse legislative benefits to legislatures for following their party’s wishes. Weingast and Marshall claim that because these parties no longer hold these powers; they no longer constrain legislator’s behaviors.

Third, legislators require a majority of the vote to get their bills passed. Since legislators need the help of other legislators to pass legislation important to their constituents, they reside to log rolling, or vote trading. One problem associated with logrolling is the ability of legislators to withdraw their support.

Weingast and Marshall claim that the following three conditions define the legislative committee system: jurisdictional system, seniority system, and bidding mechanism for committee seats. First, Weingast and Marshall claim that the jurisdictional system of committees allows them to have sole rights over a specific policy area. These

committees are the only ones who have the ability to alter a bill brought before them for consideration. Second, under the seniority system, legislators can not be removed from their committee seats. They also can not be denied chairmanship of a committee if they are next in line for it. Third, the bidding mechanism for vacant committee seats is the process by which these seats are assigned to legislators. Under this condition Weingast and Marshall claim that legislators, in order to increase their chances of reelection, will self-select onto committees that represent the interest of their constituencies (Weingast and Marshall, 1988).

Weingast and Marshall test their model of legislative organization by stating the following three propositions: “the assignment process operates as a self-selection mechanism, committees are not representative of the entire legislature but are composed of “preference outliers,” or those who value the position most lightly, and that committee members receive the disproportionate share of the benefits from programs within their jurisdiction” (Weingast and Marshall, 1988). Weingast and Marshall look at self-selection on committees by citing Shepsle’s (1978) work. They also use interest group scores to measure member preferences and committee jurisdictions. These interest group scores include AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education (COPE), which measure pro- and anti-labor congressmen, American Security Council’s National Security Index (NSI) which measures those who advocate a strong national defense while also measuring foreign aid opponents.

Weingast and Marshall use these interest groups ratings to measure whether or not the 1978 U.S. house legislature contains committee members unrepresentative of the views of the whole house; i.e. whether or not they are preference outliers. They look at

the following committees: Armed Services, International Relations: International Economic Policy and Trade Subcommittee, Interstate Commerce: Consumer Protection and Finance Subcommittee, Education and Labor: Economic Opportunity Subcommittee, and Environmental subcommittees. They claim that committees will contain members who seek the most benefits from them. They expect to find that interest group ratings measuring issues under the jurisdiction of committees should be higher for committee members than that of the whole legislature (Weingast and Marshall, 1988).

They found that defense, foreign aid, consumer protection, labor, and environment committees all contain committee members whose preferences differ from the preferences of the whole house. Committee members were found to contain higher interest scores than the whole house, meaning committee members were highly interested in policies these interest scores measure. Since only interest scores that directly measured the policies enacted under each committee's jurisdiction are used, one can claim that committee members on these committees are highly interested in the policies enacted under each committee's jurisdiction. Weingast and Marshall claim these findings, along with previous data, help to show that legislators choose committees which will benefit their constituencies. These committees are also composed of legislators who are strong supporters of policies found in their jurisdiction (Weingast and Marshall, 1988).

Informational Theory

The informational theory claims that committee members represent the views of the entire legislature. Informational theorists believe that members join committees not only to gain information, but to benefit the entire legislature. According to the

informational theory, members in committees are privileged to specialized knowledge that non committee members are not (Groseclose, pg. 444-445). Under the informational theory, committees are composed of heterogeneous membership, i.e. they are not composed of preference outliers.

Scholars have found support for the informational theory (Krehbiel, 1991). Krehbiel seeks support for the informational theory by evaluating data obtained from the 96-99th Congress in the U.S. House of Representatives and the 99th Congresses in the Senate. Krehbiel proposes that if the distributive theory holds true, then one would expect to find legislators who rank high on a particular interest groups rating seeking committee assignments representative of those interests. Krehbiel uses interest group ratings to test this proposition. Although Krehbiel uses several different interest group ratings, this paper will focus on the results he found using two interest group ratings: the American Conservative Union (ACU), and the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA). These ratings show legislators support for particular policies (Krehbiel, 1990).

Krehbiel begins by comparing the difference in means and difference in medians of standing committee members policy positions compared to the policy positions held by the whole House in the 99th Congress of the U.S. House of Representatives. Krehbiel uses the difference in means test to find out what standing committees in the House were composed of outliers. He does not find a significant number of preference outliers (i.e. committees composed of members who preferences differ from the whole house). He uses the difference in median test to determine if the House standing committees are composed of homogeneous members. Krehbiel proposes that of all the standing committees in the House the most likely ones to contain preference outliers would be

issued-based (for example the agriculture, Interior, or public works committees).

Krehbiel using the ADA (Democratic Action) scores finds that most standing committees in the 99th Congress of the House did not contain members of different ideology means or medians from the House. He finds that out of all the committees, the “most significant conservative outlier are the Armed Services Committee.”

Krehbiel’s study finds preference outliers in the following five committees: Foreign Affairs, Education and Labor, Post Office and Civil Service, Armed Services and District of Columbia. The only prestigious committee out of the five stated above is the Armed Services committee. Committees whose members are found to mirror the preferences of the whole House are: Ways and Means, Budget, Appropriations, Agriculture, Public Works, and Energy and Commerce. Krehbiel finds that most of the standing committees in the 99th Congress House are composed of heterogeneous members. The only committee not found to be is the Armed Services Committee (Krehbiel, 1990).

Krehbiel also tests the committees for preference outliers by using the ASC (American Security Council) Scores. Krehbiel finds similar results with these scores as he did with the ADA score (Krehbiel, 1990). In order to see if these results are limited only to the 99th House Congress, Krehbiel takes one step further by looking at the 96th-99th House congresses and 99th Senate. He finds results similar to those found in the 99th House Congress (Krehbiel, 1990).

In summary, Krehbiel finds very little support for the distributive theory, the existence of homogenous committees (except for the Armed Services), or self selection (Krehbiel, 1991). He claims if self-selection is present on a particular committee, it does

not mean that committee will be unrepresentative of the whole (Krehbiel, 1991). Krehbiel goes on to conclude that the seniority system can be explained in a light consistent with the informational theory. First, the seniority system promotes specialization (Krehbiel, 1991). Second, the seniority system is not an absolute rule. There have been cases where legislators have been removed from committees, regardless of their seniority. Having said all of this, Krehbiel believes one should use the distributive and informational theories to explain the role of committees in the legislative system.

Oberby and Kazee (2000) look to see if the informational and partisan theories can be extended to state legislatures. They suggest that if the informational theory holds true, then committee members should represent the views of the whole chamber. They further propose that if the major party cartel theory holds true, then Democrat (or Republican) committee members should represent the views of the Democrat (or Republican) members of the whole chamber and vice versa. They test these two propositions by using surveys, roll call votes, and constituency characteristics for the following twelve state house legislatures: Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, Virginia, and Washington. They measure legislator preferences by using interest group ratings. These ratings are different for each state. They use the State Yellow book to obtain legislator party affiliation and committee assignments.

Overby and Kazee begin their study of preference outliers by first looking to see if control committees are less likely than noncontrol committees to be preference outliers. They do this by first dividing committees into two groups: the control (Ways and Means, Appropriations, and Rules) and non-control groups. They then employ a difference of

means test to measure whether members on control or non-control committees are more likely to represent the views of the whole chamber. Based on data from Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Louisiana, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, and Washington, they find that in none of these eight states did a control committee contain outliers. They also find no preference outliers at all in either control or non-control committees for six (Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, North Carolina, Ohio, and Washington) of these eight states. Overby and Kazee find for New York only two non-control preference outlier committees, and for Louisiana only three non-control preference outlier committees are discovered (Overby and Kazee, 2000).

They find that committee specialization, legislative professionalization, and region do not increase the likelihood of preference outliers on committees. Overby and Kazee do find slightly more evidence showing committee members of a specific party differed from their party delegation in the whole chamber. However, this evidence is so small that it is an exception to the rule, not the norm. Overby and Kazee also find in direct opposition to Maltzman's (1995) findings that committee delegation member outliers are more prevalent on non-control committees than control committees.

Overby and Kazee go a step further to find preference outliers by measuring legislator's preferences a second way through "modified roll call" measures. For this test they look at Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia. Modified roll call votes are created for Mississippi and Virginia by using both legislator's roll call votes and their performance on surveys. For South Carolina, modified roll call votes are based on roll call votes and other types of legislative activities (such as bill sponsorship). Modified roll call votes differ from unmodified roll call votes because they take into consideration

non-roll call activities. Overby and Kazee test for preference outliers by looking at committee membership preferences compared to the preferences of the whole chamber and by comparing committee Democrat and Republican preferences compared to the preferences of their caucuses. They find slightly more preference outlier committees with the modified roll call votes as opposed to the unmodified roll call votes (Overby and Kazee, 2000).

However, preference outlying committees appear to be exception to the rule rather than the case. Overby and Kazee find no preference outlying committees on any of the control committees in these three states. Lastly, they find slight evidence for the major party cartel theory by finding a few preference outliers among Democrat and Republican committee members as compared to their whole party. However, as before this appears to be an expectation to the case rather than the rule (Overby and Kazee, 2000).

Overby and Kazee test for preference outliers measures legislator's preferences by looking at constituency characteristics. They perform this test only on South Carolina by using BIPEC scores. Overby and Kazee find similar results with this measure as they did with the unmodified roll call votes. The only outlier committees found using this test were: Military, Medical, and Public and Municipal Affairs committees. Overby and Kazee's last test for preference outliers is performed by measuring legislators' preferences through surveys. To perform this test the authors look at Kentucky using the KY Forward evaluations for the year 1994. The KY Forward survey "asked respondents to rate each legislator's overall performance on matters of importance to the respondent's industry, which allows assessments not only of floor voting behavior, but the totality of each member's performance, including, for instance, bill sponsorship and cosponsorship,

committee activity, and member-to-member lobbying activity.” They find only that the only committee outlier using this measure is the Banking and Insurance Committee.

In summary, all four measures of legislative preferences (roll call votes, modified roll call votes, constituency characteristics, and survey based measures) produced the same conclusion, which is that committee outliers are rare. They also find that the prevalence of committee outliers is slightly, if at all, affected by the strength of either state party caucus. Overby and Kazee conclude by stating that out of all the theories, they look at the informational theory fares the best (Overby and Kazee, 2000).

Major Party Cartel Theory

Committees in the major party cartel theory are not seen as agents of the whole legislature but agents of the majority party. Their main goal is to pass legislation favorable to the majority party. The majority party has the ability to control membership on committees by determining how many members a committee will have and how many of those members will represent the majority party (Cox and McCubbins, 1993). Cox and McCubbins claim that parties in the legislative system are part of what they term the legislative cartel. The main goal of legislative parties according to Cox and McCubbins is to not only take control of the rule making power of the House but to control the legislative agenda. Legislative parties use this power to grant their party members rights that allow them added advantages in legislative trading (legislators have advantages over other legislators which helps them to get their bills passed). One such advantage is the right to control who obtains committee chairs (Cox and McCubbins, 1993). Under this theory committees will contain preference outliers. That is Democrat (Republican)

committee members will represent the views of the Democratic (Republican) party and not the views of the whole.

Cox and McCubbins test the major party cartel theory by using ADA scores to determine whether or not committee party members represent the views of their whole party. They look at Republican and Democrat committee members for the Eighty-Seventh through Ninety-Seventh Congresses in the: Agriculture, Appropriations, Armed Services, Banking, Commerce, District of Columbia, Education and Labor, Foreign affairs, Government Operations, House administration, Interior, Judiciary, Merchant Marine, Post Office, Public Works, Rules, Science, Veterans, and Ways and Means committees. Cox and McCubbin claim that, if committee members represent the views of their whole party, then one can expect to find Democrat committee members mean ADA scores similar to those of the whole Democratic Party. The same hypothesis holds true for Republican committee members.

After looking at the 87th to 97th Congresses, Cox and McCubbin find that Democrat committee members represent views consistent with their whole party most of the time. They claim the following committees contain Democrat members unrepresentative of the whole Democratic Party: the Public Works, Government Operations, Veteran's Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Judiciary, Banking, Armed Services, Education and Labor, Agriculture, and District of Columbia. Yet even for these committees, the Public Works committee is found to contain Democratic members unrepresentative of their whole party in only one of the Congresses, the Government Operations in only two, and Veteran's Affairs in only four. They find Democrat committee members unrepresentative of the views of the whole Democratic Party in the

Foreign Affairs, Judiciary, and Banking committees only occasionally. They also find in nearly half of the Congresses studied that the Agriculture and District of Columbia committees contained Democrat members unrepresentative of the views of the whole Democratic Party.

Republican committee members are found to represent views consistent with the Republican Party most of the time. Looking in the 87th to 97th congresses, Cox and McCubbins find some exceptions to this claim. First, Republican members on the Ways and Means committee are found to be more conservative than the whole Republican Party in seven of the eleven Congresses studied. Second, Republican members tended to be more conservative than the whole Republican Party on the Public Works committee. Third, in three of the eleven Congresses studied, Republican members on the Rules, Commerce, and Government Operations committees are found to represent views unrepresentative of the views of their whole party.

Rather than relying on only a difference of means test using ADA scores to compare the views of committee members to their whole party, Cox and McCubbins decide to run a median test using Poole and Rosenthal's nominate scores. This test is conducted on data from the 80th to 100th Congresses. They find results similar to those obtained using ADA scores. Two main differences between the ADA mean test and Nominat median test is in regards to the Appropriations and Banking committees. On these two committees, Democrats are found to be more unrepresentative using the ADA scores as opposed to the nominate scores.

Cox and McCubbin conclude their book by laying out the following claim: congressional parties take control over the rule-making powers of the House by giving

their members powers to achieve the most benefits they can for their party. These parties' main desires are to take over control of the legislative agenda (Cox and McCubbins, 1993).

Aldrich and Rhode (2000) seek to explain the role of preference outliers in the U.S. legislature by looking at the U.S. Appropriations Committee. They find, in accordance with the major party cartel theory, that Republicans in the U.S. House do in fact give their party leaders greater powers on issues that unite the party. They also find the Republican majority leader was able to effectively influence Republican committee members on the U.S. Appropriations Committee (Aldrich and Rhode, 2000).

Maltzman and Smith (1994) in their study look at three House committees: Agriculture, Appropriations, and Energy and Commerce. They hypothesize that committee members who reside on committees with jurisdiction over salient issues will more likely mirror the views of their party than those who occupy seats on committees with jurisdiction over non-salient issues. To test this hypothesis Maltzman and Smith begin by measuring committee member preferences on committee jurisdiction issues. They claim that interest group ratings and the Poole and Rosenthal's scores are not appropriate to use in this study. They claim measures of committee preferences do not measure "jurisdiction-specific" issues. They use data from roll call votes on "contested amendments from the 94th, 96th, 98th, and 100th Congress." One way they measure preferences of committee members is by looking at how often committee majority members vote differently from the House majority.

Maltzman and Smith find support for their hypothesis in the Agricultural committee, where less salient issues are often discussed, and the Appropriations

committee where committee members express views divergent from the floor members. They did not find support for their hypothesis in the Energy and Commerce, which traditionally deals with more salient issues. In conclusion, they find that out of all the committees examined, the Agricultural committee is the most likely to express views divergent from the majority on the House floor (Maltzman and Smith, 1994).

CHAPTER 3 EVALUATION OF EXISTING LITERATURE

After evaluating several scholarly studies on the distributive, informational, and major party cartel theory, I believe that the data mostly supports the informational and major party cartel theory. Shepsle's study (1978) raises several questions. First, he claims to show that members self-select onto committees by comparing freshman constituency characteristics to their committee request. But Shepsle only looks at the formal request of legislators, and not informal committee requests made by freshman members. I argue that Shepsle does not take into account legislators who ask for their request through talking with other members or by feeling out the field before making their request. Freshmen legislators may choose not to formally request committee assignments they do not feel they will be granted. Munger (1988) and Jewell and Chihung (1974) raise concerns about Shepsle's (1978) study. Munger (1988) claims there is no way to determine how frequently freshmen committee members request committee assignments in the best interest of their constituencies (Krehbiel, 1990). Jewell and Chihung (1974) find that freshmen committee members are usually not granted the committee request they ask for or membership on the most highly sought committees (Krehbiel 1990).

The use of interest score ratings in Krehbiel's study (Krehbiel, 1991) can be problematic. First, these scores are often compiled from lobbying groups who have an interest at stake. Second, interest group ratings are often used by researchers to measure ideology. Fowler (1982) claims this use of interest group ratings can lead to difficulties. She states that interest groups do not compile their information with the purpose of measuring ideology, but with the intent to separate individuals supportive of a particular

cause from individuals who are not. This intent may cloud the separation by interest group rating of conservatives from liberal individuals (Cox and McCubbins, 1993).

Third, interest group ratings broad in nature such as the American Democratic (ADA) (used by Krehbiel in his study) and Americans for Constitutional Action (ACA) can cause further problems. Cox and McCubbins claim these scores look at controversial but nonpartisan issues. They claim that while partisan issues would separate Republicans from Democrats, these scores are more interested in separating Republicans who support the controversial issue being looked at from Republican who do not. The same holds for Democrats. The main purpose of the scores is to find individuals supportive of their cause. They care little if these individuals are Republicans or Democrats. Cox and McCubbins claim, “The question arises to whether the ACA and ADA scores are based on too many nonpartisan issues-proportionally more than occur in Congress. If they are so based, then they will provide a picture of Congress that is misleading nonpartisan. If we believe that salient ideological divisions lie along party lines, then using these ratings as general measures of ideology will be problematic” (Cox and McCubbins, 1993).

One of the strongest criticisms against Krehbiel’s use of interest group rating comes from Hall and Groffman in 1990. They claim that “roll call based interest group measures are biased toward producing null results because they are not well-tailored to the jurisdiction-specific hypotheses being tested” and because deference to committee members could result in “nonmember voting patterns that mirror committee voting pattern” (Overby and Kazee, 2000). I agree with the criticisms of Fowler and Cox and McCubbins. Further, I believe that Krehbiel's over reliance on interest group scores in his 1990 study is problematic. I do not believe that scholars should solely rely on interest

group scores to interpret their results. Having said this I also believe that interest group ratings have value and are a viable tool for scholars to use in their studies. I think that Krehbiel's study would have benefited from the use of a combination of interest group scores along with nominate scores (such as those created by Poole and Rosenthal).

In summary, I argue that Shepsle's study on freshman committee assignments, and Krehbiel's use of interest group scores are problematic. I argue that Shepsle does not take into account freshman legislators who do not formally request committee assignments. I also argue that the use of interest group scores can be problematic. Some of these problems discussed include: the fact that they are usually based on a small amount of roll call votes, and that they are usually used to find legislators who support a specific cause not to find issues that separate democrats from republicans. Cox and McCubbins claim: "if we believe that salient ideological divisions lie along party lines, then using these ratings as general measures of ideology will be problematic" (Cox and McCubbins, 1993).

CHAPTER 4 HYPOTHESES

In the remaining part of this paper I will focus on testing whether or not the distributive, informational, or major party cartel theory holds true for the Louisiana House legislature. I begin by offering a brief overview of each theory. I then move to testing my hypothesis associated with each of these theories. These hypotheses are tested using Poole and Rosenthal nominate scores created from roll call data from the Louisiana House of Representatives for the year 2000-2003. Preference outliers in this study are measured by comparing the difference of median (means) of committee members to the difference of median (means) of the whole legislature. If median (mean) of committee members are found to be different from the median (mean) of the whole legislator, then this study will have found support for the existence of preference outliers in the Louisiana House legislature. I report results using both the difference of means and difference of medians test. I do so with the knowledge that the most appropriate measure of preference outliers is not a difference of means test but a difference of medians test. Furthermore, convention of the literature is that researchers use the difference of medians test to test for preference outliers. The reason I choose to use both the median and mean test in this study is because I wanted to use more than one avenue to measure for preference outliers in the Louisiana House of Representatives. I also wished to compare the results found using the difference of medians test to those found using the difference of means tests for preference outliers in the Louisiana House of Representatives.

The distributive theory claims that legislative committee members do not represent the views of the whole legislative chamber. This belief resides in, but is not limited to, the following tenets: first, legislators' seek to maximize their own self-interest

by self-selecting onto committees beneficial to themselves. This self-selection leads to committees composed of members unrepresentative of the views of the entire chamber. According to the distributive theory unrepresentative committees produce unrepresentative policies, or policies that do not reflect the views of the whole chamber. Committee members are able to pass unrepresentative policies on the chamber floor by log rolling. In log rolling, legislators' vote to pass legislation that is not in their own best interest to increase the chances of getting their legislation beneficial to themselves passed (Krehbiel, 1991). If the distributive theory holds true, then one would expect to find that members of committees vote differently on bills than the whole chamber, i.e. preference outliers.

Committees in the informational theory world are seen as agents of the legislature as a whole. Individuals tend to gravitate to committees that deal with issues with which they have prior experience. For example, a lawyer would attempt to gain a seat on the judiciary committee. Two key components of the informational theory are uncertainty and majoritarianism. In the informational theory, legislators' main goal is expertise. Committees are seen as information providers to the legislators. Expertise decreases the amount of uncertainty associated with policy and its outcome. Legislators depend on the expertise of committees to tell them what policies will produce what outcomes (Krehbiel, 1991).

According to the informational theory, committees dominated by preference outliers do not benefit the whole legislative chamber because they are likely to manipulate information to their advantage. This theory claims that when committees are composed of members who represent the diverse views of the whole legislature, then

accurate information is more likely to be dispersed from the committee to the whole.

One way committees under this theory attempt to get their bill passed on the floor is by withholding information. If committees feel they have a better chance of getting their bill passed on the floor by withholding expert information, they will, and vice versa.

Committees in the informational theory try to get legislators to pass bills that are in their best interest (legislators just don't know it) (Krehbiel, 1991).

In the informational theory, restrictive rules play a large role in the committee system. Open rules, those which allow the legislature to amend bills, greatly limit the influence of committees over legislation. The informational theory claims closed rules (not allowing the legislature to amend bills) increases the likelihood of committee specialization. This is because legislatures know that their bill has but one chance to be passed. Restrictive rules (closed rules) entice committees to share information they know with the rest of the legislature in order to get their bill passed. Restrictive rules will most often be used in heterogeneous committees. This is due to the fact that these types of committees are more likely than homogeneous committees to propose bills consistent with the views of the whole house. Open rules are more likely to be used for committees composed of homogeneous members. This way the floor can amend the bill.

Homogeneous committees are more likely to produce bills that represent their own self-interest (Krehbiel, 1991). If the informational theory holds true, one would expect to find that members of committees hold vote on bills similar to the way the whole legislature votes on them.

The major party cartel theory does not subscribe to the distributive theory's idea of "self selection." Committee member assignments in the major party cartel theory are

controlled by the majority party. Committees in the major party cartel theory are viewed as agents of the majority party. Their main purpose is to promote the policy interest of the majority party. The majority party passes legislation favorable to the majority by stacking assigned majority members to control committees (committees that directly affect the success of policy issues important to the majority, such as the Appropriations committee) (Cox and McCubbins (1993) and Aldrich and Battista, 2002).

According to the major party cartel theory, the majority party has key advantages over committees in the legislative process. They can set the rules of the legislature, and elect the Speaker of the House. The Speaker determines when a bill will be called to a vote on the floor. He or she can choose not to call a bill. The Speaker of the House exerts control over the rules committee. The rules (closed or open) committee decides what rules will accompany bills when they are voted on by the floor. Under open rules, legislatures can amend bills from committees that are unrepresentative of majority party preferences (Cox and McCubbins, 1993). The Speaker's powers also extend to controlling the number of seats a committee has, and which majority member is elected to what committee. Under the major party cartel theory, majority party legislators have an incentive not to go against the interest of the majority parties interest as refined by the Speaker. The speaker can prevent a majority legislator from obtaining a coveted position on a legislative committee they want. If the major party cartel theory holds true, then one would expect to find the party members in committees vote on bills similarly to the way their whole party votes.

Based on these theories this study wishes to tests the following set of hypothesis:
First, there will be a difference in the means (medians) of members of the Louisiana

House committees compared to those of the whole Louisiana House. The Distributive theory states that members of committees will represent different preferences than those of the whole chamber.

Second, members of committees in the Louisiana House legislature will represent the views of the whole legislature. The informational theory claims that members of committees will represent the views of the whole. Hypothesis two tests the null hypothesis of hypothesis one.

Third, Democrat (Republican) committee member preferences will differ from the Democratic Party (Republican Party) in the Louisiana House as a whole. The major party cartel theory claims that committee members will represent the views of their party.

Aldrich and Battista (2002) measure Louisiana legislator house preferences to determine whether or not parties in the Louisiana house legislature are polarized. Legislator preferences are determined by using Poole and Rosenthal's first undimensional nominates scores. Aldrich and Battista create these scores from the first 100-175 votes of the 1999 Louisiana house session. Using these scores Aldrich and Battista find that the Louisiana house legislature is composed of depolarized parties. Depolarized parties in this study are those where the minority and majority party do not hold highly divergent views from one another. Aldrich and Battista conclude that the Louisiana house legislature is dominated by one party (Aldrich and Battista, 2002). Since the Louisiana house legislature does not contain strong parties, the majority party cartel theory might not fare well in the Louisiana house.

CHAPTER 5 METHOD

These hypotheses are tested by using contested role call votes, or those with at least five legislators who vote contrary to the other legislators, from the Louisiana House of Representatives for the years 2000-2003. These roll call votes are used to determine whether or not members of standing committees in the Louisiana House of Representatives hold views consistent with the whole house. Data for this paper was obtained from the Louisiana House of Representatives Digest.

This study begins by creating W-nominate scores as done in the analysis of Poole and Rosenthal. These nominate scores are used to measure roll call ideology. “The Poole-Rosenthal scores range from a -1.00 (strong liberal) to +1.00 (strong conservative)” (Garand and Ardoin, 2003). The nominate scores created for this study are based on roll call votes from the Louisiana House legislature from 2000-2003. These scores will be used along with a difference of median (means) test to measure how closely Louisiana House committee preferences represent the views of the whole chamber. Nominate scores of committee members tells us how liberal or conservative a committee member is in relation to the rest of the legislative body. The difference of median (means) test tells us how far the committee member views are from the median (mean) views held by the whole Louisiana legislative house body. A median (mean) score for committee members is created by taking the average of how committee members voted on bills in the Louisiana House for the years 2000-2003. A median (mean) score for the whole chamber is achieved by taking the average of how the whole chamber voted on bills in the Louisiana House for the years 2000-2003.

Along with Poole and Rosenthal W-nominate scores for this study I also use Louisiana Association of Business and Industry (LABI) scores to measure how closely Louisiana House committee preferences represent the views of the whole chamber. LABI scores are based on a subset of roll call votes in which the LABI has taken a firm stance. These scores measure whether or not legislators vote favorably on bills that promote pro-business policy stances. Roll call votes are assigned point values depending on how important the bills they represent are to the business community (www.labi.org).

Hypotheses will be tested by testing the null hypothesis associated with each theory against the working hypothesis associated with each theory. Hypothesis one is tested by comparing the mean and median score of committee members to the mean and median score of the whole chamber. The mean scores tell us if committee members voted similarly to how the whole chamber voted on the bills used in this study. If the committee member did vote the same way as the whole chamber then that committee member is said to represent the views of the whole. If a majority of members on a specific committee are found to have voted in the same way as the whole chamber, then that committee is said to represent the views of the whole. If a majority of members on a specific committee are found not to have voted in the same way as the whole chamber then that committee is unrepresentative of the views of the whole chamber. If hypothesis one is found to be true then it will provide support against the distributive theory.

Hypothesis two tests the null hypothesis of hypothesis one. It does so by comparing the mean and median score of committee members to the mean and median score of the whole chamber. If a majority of members on a specific committee are found to have voted similarly to the whole house, then these committees will have found no

preference outliers in Louisiana House committees and support for the informational theory.

Hypothesis three is tested by splitting members by committee in two groups. For each standing committee in the Louisiana House for the years 2000-2003, I separate Republican and Democrat members. In order to test the major party cartel theory I look at the Democratic Party members in the 2000-2003 Louisiana House of Representatives. I compare the median (mean) score of Democrat committee members for a specific committee to the median (mean) score of the remaining Democrats not in the committee. If the Democrat committee member median (mean) scores are found to be similar to the median (mean) score of the whole house Democrat party then that committee is said to be composed of Democrat members representative of the views of their party. If hypothesis three is found to be true then support for the major party cartel theory is demonstrated.

CHAPTER 6 RESULTS

In this chapter I test the distributive, informational, and major party cartel theories. I do this by conducting both difference of mean and difference of median tests using data on membership in standing committees in the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana House. The importance of this study rests in its test of the distributive, informational, or major party cartel theories; if one or more of these theories generates support in the Louisiana House, this can have substantial implications for the role of committees in the legislative process in Louisiana. If committees are found to contain members who are unrepresentative of the views of the membership of the whole chamber, then one could arguably claim support for traditional distributional theories. This would suggest that legislative committees have substantial power, including, but not limited to, agenda setting (i.e., determining which policies make it to the floor to be voted on by the whole and which do not).

If the distributive theory is supported empirically I expect to find voting differences between committee and non-committee members in the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives. If the informational theory is supported I expect to find voting similarities between committee and non-committee members in the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives. If there is support for the major party cartel theory, I expect to find voting similarities between the roll-call behavior of Democrat committee members and non-committee members.

To look at preference outliers on a year by year basis is too cumbersome, so for the sake of brevity I focus on summary results reported in Table 1 through 4. The full results can be found in Appendix 1-36.

Testing the Distributive and Informational Theory

Turning to the Poole and Rosenthal W-nominate scores in Table 1, one can observe that there are only four cases out of sixty-eight where Louisiana House standing committees can be classified as preference outliers. The Ways and Means committee is responsible for three of these cases. Using LABI scores there are only six cases out of sixty-eight where Louisiana House standing committees are preference outliers, three of which are the Ways and Means committee. The results show there is no consistent pattern for preference outlier committees in the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana House legislature, except for the Ways and Means committee. The Civil Law (2002) committee is a preference outlier but does not show a consistent enough pattern to be considered a preference outlier.

Table 1 offers interesting results. Out of all the Louisiana House standing committees tested, the Ways and Means committee is the only committee to consistently demonstrate support for preference outlying committees. This can be explained in several ways. First, the Ways and Means committee has a consistent pattern of being staffed with more liberal members than other Louisiana house standing committees. Its members primarily deal with legislation focusing on such areas as writing tax bills, tax legislation, and other types of revenue policy areas.

Looking at results reported from conducting difference of median tests using Poole and Rosenthal W-Nominate scores in Table 2, I can see there are only eight cases out of sixty-eight where standing committees can be classified as statistically significant preference outliers. The Ways and Means committee is responsible for three of these

cases and the civil law committee two. Using LABI scores there are only eight cases out of sixty-eight where Louisiana House standing committees are statistically significant. The ways and means committee is responsible for four of these cases.

Table 1 and 2 offers several interesting results, two of which are the Ways and Means and Health and Welfare committees. By far the Ways and Means committee is the most statistically significant preference outlier committee in the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives. This committee is a preference outlier in thirteen out of sixteen cases (or 81 % of the time) in Tables 1 and 2.

Figures 6.1 through 6.4 add to the results found in Tables 1 and 2 for the Ways and Means committees, by showing the distribution of W-nominate scores for members and non-members of the Louisiana House Ways and Means Committee for the year 2000 through 2002. For 2000, Figure 6.1 shows that Ways and Mean committee member votes tend to be concentrated primarily towards the moderate to extreme liberal end of the liberal conservative continuum. Non-committee member votes appear to be evenly distributed along this liberal conservative continuum. For 2001, Figure 6.2 shows that Ways and Mean committee member votes tend to be concentrated primarily in the moderate liberal end of the liberal conservative continuum. Non-committee member votes appear to be concentrated more towards the moderate conservative end of the liberal conservative continuum. For 2002, Figure 6.3 shows that Ways and Mean more towards the moderate to extreme liberal end of the liberal conservative continuum committee members votes tend to be concentrated between the moderate conservative and moderate liberal end of the liberal conservative continuum. Non-committee member votes appear to be concentrated. For 2003, Figure 6.4 shows that committee and non-

Table 1. Difference of Means for the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives Poole and Rosenthal W Nominate scores and LABI scores

Louisiana House Standing Committee	Poole and Rosenthal W scores					LABI Scores					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	# of years committee is a preference outlier	2000	2001	2002	2003	# of years committee is a preference outlier	Cum LABI 2000-2003
Administration of Criminal Justice	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Agriculture	N	N	N	N	0	Y**	N	N	N	1	N
Appropriations	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Civil Law	N	N	Y**	N	1	Y**	N	N	N	1	Y**
Commerce	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Education	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Environment	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Health and Welfare	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Government Affairs	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Insurance	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Judiciary	N	Y*	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Labor	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Municipal	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Natural Resources	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Retirement	N	N	N	N	0	Y**	N	N	N	1	N
Transportation	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Ways and Means	Y***	Y***	Y**	N	3	Y***	Y***	Y**	N	3	Y***
# of committees in a given year that have significant differences	1	1	2	0	4	4	1	1	0	6	2
*p<.10											
**p<.05											
***p<.01											

Table 2. Difference of Medians for the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives Poole and Rosenthal W Nominate scores and LABI scores

Louisiana House Standing Committee	Poole and Rosenthal W scores					LABI					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	# of years committee is a preference outlier	2000	2001	2002	2003	# of years committee is a preference outlier	Cum LABI 2000-2003
Administration of Criminal Justice	N	Y**	N	N	1	N	N	N	N	0	N
Agriculture	N	N	Y*	N	0	Y***	N	N	N	1	N
Appropriations	N	N	Y*	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Civil Law	N	N	Y**	Y***	2	Y*	N	N	Y*	0	N
Commerce	N	Y*	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Education	N	Y*	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Environment	N	N	N	Y*	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Health and Welfare	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Government Affairs	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Insurance	N	N	N	N	0	Y**	N	N	N	1	N
Judiciary	N	Y**	N	N	1	N	N	N	N	0	N
Labor	Y*	Y*	N	N	0	N	N	N	Y**	1	N
Municipal	N	N	Y*	Y*	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Natural Resources	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Retirement	Y**	N	N	N	1	Y***	N	N	N	1	N
Transportation	N	Y*	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Ways and Means	Y***	Y***	Y***	N	3	Y***	Y**	Y***	Y**	4	Y***
# of committees in a given year that have significant differences	2	3	2	1	8	4	1	1	2	8	1
*p< .10											
**p< .05											
***p< .01											

committee members display similar patterns of roll-call behavior.

Figure 6.5 through 6.8 add to the results found in Table 1 and 2 for the Ways and Means committees by showing the distribution of LABI scores for members and non-committee members for the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana house Ways and Means committee. For 2000, Figure 6.5 shows that committee members tend to vote liberal while non-committee members vote more pro-business (conservative). Figure 6.6 (2001) and Figure 6.7 (2002) demonstrate results similar to Figure 6.5. For 2003, Figure 6.8 shows that committee and non-committee members on the Louisiana house Ways and Means committee vote primarily pro-business (conservative).

Figures 6.9 through 6.12 add to the results found in Table 1 and 2 for the Health and Welfare committees, by showing the distribution of W-nominate scores for members and non-members of the Louisiana Health and Welfare Committee for the year 2000 through 2003. These figures display results similar to Tables 1 and 2, which is that Health and Welfare committee members and non-committee members display similar patterns of roll call behavior.

Figures 6.13 through 6.16 add to the results found in Table 1 and 2 for the Health and Welfare committee, by showing the distribution of LABI scores for members and non-committee members for the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana Health and Welfare committee. These figures show results similar to tables 1 and 2, which is that Health and Welfare committee members display voting patterns similar to those of non-committee members.

Results in Tables 1 and 2 along with Figures 6.1 through 6.16 tend to lend most support to the informational theory. This support is shown but not limited to the:

Administration of Criminal Justice, Agriculture, Insurance, Judiciary, Labor, and Retirement committees. Support for the informational theory suggests that committee members of Louisiana house standing committees represent views consistent with those of the whole legislature. One reason the legislative chamber (or in this case the House Speaker) produces these types of committees is to provide unbiased information to the whole chamber. Turning to the distributive theory these tables offer little to no support. The only committee to show substantial support for the distributive theory is the Ways and Means committee. Even then the Ways and Means committee is not a committee I would say is a great example of the distributive theory. This committee is not one that readily distributes goodies (benefits) to its preference outlier members. The Civil Law committee comes in second offering minimal support. For all other committees there is little to no support for the distributive theory. For a description of the distribution for Poole and Rosenthal and LABI scores by party, please see the appendix.

Testing the Major Party Cartel Theory

In Tables 3 and 4, I explain whether or not the “Democrat” majority party cartel in the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives is using its powers to create committees that will do the bidding of the majority party. One way to do this is by stacking Louisiana House committees with members that will represent the full range of views in the majority party caucus. For 2000 through 2003, Table 3 looking at Poole and Rosenthal W-nominate scores demonstrates there are only eight cases out of sixty-eight where Louisiana standing committees show support for the major party cartel theory. Interestingly the Ways and Means committee is responsible for only one of these eight cases. The Natural Resource committee is responsible for two of these cases. For 2000




Figure 6.1 Distribution of W-nominate scores for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Ways and Means Committee, 2000




Figure 6.2 Distribution of W-nominate scores for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Ways and Means Committee, 2001




Figure 6.3 Distribution of W-nominate scores for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Ways and Means Committee, 2002




Figure 6.4 Distribution of W-nominate scores for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Ways and Means Committee, 2003




Figure 6.5 Distribution of LABI scores for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Ways and Means Committee, 2000




Figure 6.6 Distribution of LABI for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Ways and Means Committee, 2001




Figure 6.7 Distribution of LABI for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Ways and Means Committee, 2002




Figure 6.8 Distribution of LABI for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Ways and Means Committee, 2003




Figure 6.9 Distribution of W-nominate scores for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Health and Welfare Committee, 2000




Figure 6.10 Distribution of W-nominate scores for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Health and Welfare Committee, 2001




Figure 6.11 Distribution of W-nominate scores for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Health and Welfare Committee, 2002




Figure 6.12 Distribution of W-nominate scores for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Health and Welfare Committee, 2003




Figure 6.13 Distribution of LABI scores for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Health and Welfare Committee, 2000




Figure 6.14 Distribution of LABI scores for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Health and Welfare Committee, 2001




Figure 6.15 Distribution of LABI scores for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Health and Welfare Committee, 2002




Figure 6.16 Distribution of LABI scores for members and nonmembers of the Louisiana House Health and Welfare Committee, 2003

through 2003, Table 3 looking at LABI demonstrates there are only four cases out of sixty-eight where Louisiana house standing committees show support for the major party cartel theory. The Government Affairs committee is responsible for two of these four cases.

For 2000 through 2003, Table 4 looking at Poole and Rosenthal W-nominate scores demonstrates there are only five cases out of sixty-eight where Louisiana house standing committees show support for the major party cartel theory. The Governmental Affairs committee is responsible for two of the cases. For 2000 through 2003, Table 4 using LABI scores shows there are only four cases out of eighty-eight that show support for the major party cartel theory. The Governmental Affairs committee is responsible for two of the four cases.

Looking at the results found in Tables three and four there appears to be substantial support for the informational theory and minimal support for the major party cartel theory. This is shown due to the fact that most Louisiana house standing committees used to test the major party cartel theory are not statistically significant.

Results for Tables 3 and 4 offer little support for the major party cartel theory. Some committees appear to be affected more than others such as the: Natural Resources, Government Affairs, and Municipal committees. Memberships on these committees appear to offer some support for the major party cartel theory.

This study's findings of support for the informational theory can be explained in several ways. First, the Louisiana House of Representatives is a weak party legislature. It is composed of various diverse groups of legislatures who in this author's opinion create diverse committees. The Ways and Means committee is the only committee found

to support the distributive theory. It can be argued that members on this committee represent views unrepresentative of the views of the whole. Substantial support is found for the informational theory. Members of these committees represent views representative of the whole legislature. There is no substantial support for the major party cartel theory. Therefore; it can be argued that members on the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana house committees do not only represent the views of the major party cartel (“Democrat”).

Table 3. Summary of Results found when testing the Major Party Cartel Theory using the difference of means for the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives Poole and Rosenthal W Nominate scores and LABI scores

Louisiana House Standing Committee	Poole and Rosenthal W scores					LABI					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	# of years committee is a preference outlier	2000	2001	2002	2003	# of years committee is a preference outlier	Cum LABI 2000-2003
Administration of Criminal Justice	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Agriculture	N	Y**	N	N	1	N	N	N	N	0	N
Appropriations	Y**	N	N	N	1	N	N	N	N	0	N
Civil Law	N	N	Y***	N	1	N	N	N	N	0	N
Commerce	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Education	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Environment	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Health and Welfare	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Government Affairs	N	Y***	N	N	1	N	Y**	Y**	N	2	Y**
Insurance	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Judiciary	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Labor	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	Y**	N	1	N
Municipal	N	N	N	Y**	1	N	N	N	N	0	N
Natural Resources	Y**	N	Y**	N	2	N	N	N	N	0	N
Retirement	N	N	N	N	0	Y**	N	N	N	1	N
Transportation	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Ways and Means	Y**	N	N	N	1	N	N	N	N	0	N
# of committees in a given year that have significant differences	3	2	2	1	8	1	1	2	0	4	1
*p<.10											
**p<.05											
***p<.01											

Table 4. Summary of Results found when testing the Major Party Cartel Theory using the difference of medians for the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives Poole and Rosenthal W Nominate scores and LABI scores

Louisiana House Standing Committee	Poole and Rosenthal W scores					LABI					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	# of years committee is a preference outlier	2000	2001	2002	2003	# of years committee is a preference outlier	Cum LABI 2000-2003
Administration of Criminal Justice	Y**	N	N	N	1	N	N	N	N	0	Y**
Agriculture	N	Y***	N	N	1	Y***	N	N	N	1	N
Appropriations	N	Y*	N	N	0	N	Y*	Y*	N	0	N
Civil Law	N	N	Y**	N	1	N	N	N	N	0	N
Commerce	Y*	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Education	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Environment	N	N	N	Y*	0	N	N	N	N	0	Y*
Health and Welfare	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	Y*
Government Affairs	Y**	Y**	N	N	2	N	Y***	Y***	N	2	Y***
Insurance	N	Y	N	N	0	N	Y	N	N	0	N
Judiciary	N	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Labor	N	N	N	N	0	N	Y	Y*	N	0	N
Municipal	Y*	Y*	N	Y*	0	N	Y*	Y*	N	0	N
Natural Resources	N	N	Y*	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	N
Retirement	N	N	N	N	0	Y*	N	N	N	0	N
Transportation	N	N	N	N	0	Y*	Y**	N	N	1	N
Ways and Means	Y*	N	N	N	0	N	N	N	N	0	Y*
# of committees in a given year that have significant differences	2	2	1	0	5	1	2	1	0	4	2
*p<.10											
**p<.05											
***p<.01											

Table 5. Summary of Results for the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana House for Representatives

Louisiana house standing committees	Distributive	Informational	Major Party Cartel
Administration of Criminal Justice	N	Y	N
Agriculture	N	Y	MIXED
Appropriations	N	Y	N
Civil Law	MIXED	MIXED	N
Commerce	N	Y	N
Education	N	Y	N
Environment	N	Y	N
Health and Welfare	N	Y	N
Government Affairs	N	Y	MIXED
Insurance	N	Y	N
Judiciary	N	Y	N
Labor	N	Y	N
Municipal	N	Y	MIXED
Natural Resources	N	Y	MIXED
Retirement	MIXED	Y	N
Transportation	N	Y	N
Ways and Means	Y	N	N

CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION

Studies on the role of committees in legislatures have focused primarily on the U.S. Congress. While these studies have used the distributive, informational, and major party cartel theories to explain the role of committees at the national level, few have done so at the state level. Because research is so limited at the state level in this study I extend these theories to the 2000 to 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives. This study was able to expand the distributive, informational, and major party cartel theories to the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives through the creation of Poole and Rosenthal W-nominate scores and the use of LABI scores.

While other studies have examined at the role of preference outliers in the Louisiana House of Representatives; none have done so to the extent of this analysis. Contrary to this study Overby and Kazee (2000) extended the distributive, informational, and major party cartel theories to the Louisiana House of Representatives by only conducting difference of means tests using LABI (Louisiana Association of Business and Industry) scores. They found that none of Louisiana's control committees contain preference outliers.

The use of LABI scores as a measure to test the distributive, informational, and major party cartel theories has not been met without resistance. Scholars have long debated whether or not the use of interest group scores is a proper measure to conduct statistical tests. Fowler (1982) claims the use of interest group ratings can lead to difficulties. She states that interest groups do not compile their information with the purpose of measuring ideology, but with the intent to separate individuals supportive of a particular cause from individuals who are not. This intent may cloud the separation by

interest group rating of conservatives from liberal individuals (Cox and McCubbins, 1993).

Snyder (1992) states that interest groups' scores often produce artificial extremism in the distribution of scores for legislators. In other words, moderately right and moderately left legislators will often receive higher ratings than their actual ideal point. This is due to the fact that the roll calls selected for inclusion in interest group ratings are often controversial issues that generate greater levels of polarization. One affect of artificial extremism is that it leads to the underestimation of the effects of ideology on legislators' voting behavior, due to the fact that moderate members of Congress may appear to hold more extreme voting patterns then they actually do. Snyder claims that artificial extremism causes several problems for studies testing to see if congressional committee members represent the views of their whole legislature. One of these problems is that artificial extremism of interest group scores could create a bias towards accepting the null hypothesis that committees are not preference outliers. In other words committee and non-committee members represent similar views. Another problem is that instead of leading to the under-estimation of the differences between committee and non committee member preferences, artificial extremism of interest group scores could lead to the over estimation of these preferences (Synder, 1992).

Considering the potential problems associated with interest group ratings this study believes the use of LABI scores along with Poole and Rosenthal W-nominate scores provide an appropriate measure for testing the distributive, informational, and major party cartel theory. Using difference of mean and median tests this study uses these two measures to test the distributive, informational, and major party cartel theories.

These tests provide substantial support for the informational theory and minimal support for the distributive and major party cartel theories. The Ways and Means committee is the only committee found to demonstrate substantial support for the distributive theory; hence one can reject hypothesis one. Since there is no substantial support for the major party cartel theory in any of the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana House standing committees, I can reject Hypothesis two. The only hypothesis I can not rejected is hypothesis one which tests the informational theory.

These results have significant implications for the role of committees in the Louisiana House legislative process. They show that Louisiana House standing committees by and large are representative of the views of the whole legislature. One possible reason for this finding resides in the fact that the full chamber (or in this study the House Speaker) wants to create committees that will provide unbiased information to the whole. The lack of support for the major party cartel theory can be explained by the fact that both the Speaker of the House and the majority party are “Democrat.” The House Speaker appears to have assigned members to Louisiana house committees that would represent the views of the whole legislature not the majority party.

The importance of this study resides in the fact that if either the distributive or major party cartel theories were found to be true, they could have had substantial implications on the role of committees in the legislative process. If Louisiana House standing committees were found to contain members unrepresentative of the views of the whole, one could have plausibly claimed that Louisiana house legislative committees do not represent the interests of the whole legislature. This finding would go against the very fiber of a democratic nation. Having shown support for the informational theory

with minimal support for the distributive and major party cartel theory, this study adds support to the theory that Louisiana House standing committees do in fact represent the views of the whole legislature.

This study poses many possibilities for future research such as do the findings of this study only hold true for the 2000 through 2003 Louisiana House legislature or can they be extended to other Louisiana House sessions? Also would one expect different results if the major party in the Louisiana House of Representatives and the governor of Louisiana were from the same party. Furthermore what if the Louisiana House of Representatives was Republican instead of Democrat as in this study?

REFERENCES

- Aldrich, James H. and James Coleman Battista, "Conditional Party Government in the States," *American Journal of Political Science* (January 2002: 164-172).
- Aldrich, John H. and David Rhode, "The Republican Revolution and the House Appropriations Committee," *The Journal of Politics* (February 2000: 1-33).
- Ardoin, Philip and James C. Garand, "Measuring Constituency Ideology in U.S. House Districts: A Top-Down Simulation Approach," *Journal of Politics* (November 2003: 1165-89).
- Committee assignment data is available in public sources.
- Cox and McCubbins. 1993. *Legislative Leviathan*. Oxford, England: University of California Press.
- Fowler, Linda, "How Interest Groups Select Issues for Rating Voting Records of Members of the U.S. Congress," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* (August 1982: 3:401-14).
- Groseclose, Tim, "Testing Committee Composition Hypotheses for the U.S. Congress," *Journal of Politics* (May 1994: 440-58).
- Jewell, Malcolm E. and Chu Chi-hung, "Membership Movement and Committee Attractiveness in the U.S. House of Representatives, 1963-1971," *Midwest Journal of Political Science* (May 1974: 433-41).
- Krehbiel, Keith, "Are Congressional Committees Composed of Preference Outliers?," *The American Political Science Review* (March 1990: 84: 149-163).
- Krehbiel, Keith 1991. *Information and Legislative Organization*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Louisiana Association of Business and Industry at www.labi.org
- Louisiana House of Representatives Personal Page at www.house.legis.state.la.us
- Maltzman, Forrest and Steven Smith, "Principals, Goals, Dimensionality, and Congressional Committees," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* (November 1994: 457-476).
- Maltzman, Forrest, "Meeting Competing Demands: Committee Performance in the Postreform House," *American Journal of Political Science* (August 1995: 39: 653-82).
- Munger, Michael C, "Allocation of Desirable Committee Assignments: Extended Queues versus Committee Expansion," *American Journal of Political Science* (May 1998: 32: 317-44).

Overby, L. Marvin and Thomas Kazez, "Outlying Committees in the Statehouse: An Examination of the Prevalence of Committee Outliers in State Legislatures," *The Journal of Politics* (August 2000: 701-728).

Shepsle, Kenneth A. 1978. *The Giant Jigsaw Puzzle*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Snyder, James M, "Artificial Extremism in Interest Group Ratings," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* (August 1992: 319-345).

Weingast, Barry R. and William Marshall, "The Industrial Organization of Congress; or, Why Legislatures, Like Firms, Are Not Organized as Markets" *The Journal of Political Economy* (February 1988:132-63).

APPENDIX A SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Table A.1 Difference of Means for the 2000 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal w scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2000				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	-.0617 (N=13)	-.1981 (N=92)	-.1364	-.762
Agriculture	-.2639 (N=17)	-.1653 (N=88)	.0986	.615
Appropriations	-.0603 (N=19)	-.2080 (N=86)	-.1477	-.966
Civil Law	-.0144 (N=12)	-.2028 (N=93)	-.1883	-1.018
Commerce	-.1922 (N=17)	-.1791 (N=88)	.0131	.081
Education	-.1246 (N=17)	-.1922 (N=88)	-.0676	-.421
Environment	-.0313 (N=13)	-.2024 (N=92)	-.1711	-.957
Health and Welfare	-.2355 (N=17)	-.1707 (N=88)	.0648	.404
Government Affairs	-.0545 (N=15)	-.2023 (N=90)	-.1478	-.878
Insurance	-.1559 (N=15)	-.1855 (N=90)	-.0296	-.175
Judiciary	-.2077 (N=14)	-.1772 (N=91)	.0306	.176
Labor	-.0035 (N=16)	-.2132 (N=89)	-.2097	-1.284
Municipal	-.1986 (N=14)	-.1786 (N=91)	.0200	.115
Natural Resources	-.0444 (N=15)	-.2040 (N=90)	-.1596	-.949
Retirement	.1441 (N=10)	-.2155 (N=95)	-.3596	-1.813
Transportation	-.0984 (N=14)	.1940 (N=91)	-.0955	-.550
Ways and Means	-.6272 (N=19)	-.0827 (N=86)	.5444	3.782***
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.2 Difference of Means for the 2001 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal w scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2001				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	-.1109 (N=11)	.1021 (N=94)	.2130	1.303
Agriculture	.1165 (N=17)	.0727 (N=88)	-.0439	-.320
Appropriations	.0931 (N=19)	.0768 (N=86)	-.0163	-.124
Civil Law	.3028 (N=10)	.0563 (N=95)	-.2465	-1.448
Commerce	.0269 (N=17)	.0900 (N=88)	.0631	.461
Education	.2381 (N=17)	.0492 (N=88)	-.1889	-1.392
Environment	.2264 (N=13)	.0591 (N=92)	-.1673	-1.098
Health and Welfare	.0138 (N=17)	.0925 (N=88)	.0787	.575
Government Affairs	.0738 (N=15)	.0808 (N=90)	.0070	.048
Insurance	.2372 (N=16)	.0515 (N=89)	-.1857	-1.334
Judiciary	-.1815 (N=13)	.1167 (N=92)	.2981	1.982*
Labor	.2888 (N=17)	.0394 (N=88)	-.2494	-1.850
Municipal	.0891 (N=12)	.0786 (N=93)	-.0105	-.066
Natural Resources	.1140 (N=15)	.0741 (N=90)	-.0399	-.277
Retirement	.2182 (N=11)	.0636 (N=94)	-.1546	-.942
Transportation	.1649 (N=16)	.0645 (N=89)	-.1005	-.717
Ways and Means	-.3094 (N=18)	.1603 (N=87)	.4697	3.737***
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.3 Difference of Means for the 2002 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal w scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2002				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	-.1195 (N=11)	-.2499 (N=94)	-.1304	-.999
Agriculture	-.1711 (N=17)	-.2489 (N=88)	-.0777	-.715
Appropriations	-.1181 (N=19)	-.2624 (N=86)	-.1443	-1.395
Civil Law	-.5809 (N=8)	-.2079 (N=97)	.3730	2.539**
Commerce	-.1862 (N=16)	-.2453 (N=89)	-.0591	-.529
Education	-.2602 (N=18)	-.2313 (N=87)	.0289	.271
Environment	-.2826 (N=14)	-.2291 (N=91)	.0535	.453
Health and Welfare	-.1954 (N=17)	-.2442 (N=88)	-.0488	-.447
Government Affairs	-.2789 (N=15)	-.2292 (N=90)	.0498	.434
Insurance	-.3676 (N=17)	-.2109 (N=88)	.1567	1.452
Judiciary	-.2463 (N=12)	-.2350 (N=93)	.0114	.090
Labor	-.3388 (N=16)	-.2178 (N=89)	.1210	1.088
Municipal	-.2904 (N=14)	-.2280 (N=91)	.0624	.529
Natural Resources	-.3763 (N=15)	-.2129 (N=90)	.1633	1.437
Retirement	-.3045 (N=11)	-.2283 (N=94)	.0763	.582
Transportation	-.3016 (N=18)	-.2228 (N=87)	.0789	.742
Ways and Means	-.0186 (N=18)	-.2813 (N=87)	-.2628	-2.541**
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.4 Difference of Means for the 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal w scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2003				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee Member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	-.0759 (N=11)	-.2550 (N=94)	-.1791	-1.378
Agriculture	-.2052 (N=17)	-.2423 (N=88)	-.0371	-.340
Appropriations	-.1177 (N=19)	-.2625 (N=86)	-.1447	-1.400
Civil Law	-.4713 (N=10)	-.2115 (N=95)	.2598	1.932
Commerce	-.3629 (N=15)	-.2152 (N=90)	.1477	1.297
Education	-.3598 (N=17)	-.2124 (N=88)	.1474	1.364
Environment	-.1017 (N=14)	-.2570 (N=91)	-.1533	-1.325
Health and Welfare	-.2521 (N=16)	-.2334 (N=89)	.0187	.167
Government Affairs	-.0597 (N=15)	-.2657 (N=90)	-.2060	-1.823
Insurance	-.3564 (N=17)	-.2131 (N=88)	.1433	1.325
Judiciary	-.1882 (N=12)	-.2425 (N=93)	-.0542	-.430
Labor	-.3344 (N=16)	-.2186 (N=89)	.1157	1.041
Municipal	-.3474 (N=14)	-.2192 (N=91)	.1282	1.091
Natural Resources	-.2389 (N=17)	-.2358 (N=88)	.0031	.029
Retirement	-.3197 (N=11)	-.2265 (N=94)	.0932	.712
Transportation	-.2870 (N=18)	-.2258 (N=87)	.0612	.575
Ways and Means	-.2525 (N=17)	-.2331 (N=88)	.0193	.177
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.5 Difference of Means for the 2000 Louisiana House of Representatives created from LABI scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2000				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	43.0769 (N=13)	43.5543 (N=92)	.4774	.054
Agriculture	26.8824 (N=17)	46.7045 (N=88)	19.8222	2.587**
Appropriations	42.4737 (N=19)	43.7209 (N=86)	1.2472	.165
Civil Law	60.5833 (N=12)	41.2903 (N=93)	-19.2930	-2.155**
Commerce	43.3529 (N=17)	43.5227 (N=88)	.1698	.021
Education	45.1765 (N=17)	43.1705 (N=88)	-2.0060	-.254
Environment	50.9231 (N=13)	42.4457 (N=92)	-8.4774	-.963
Health and Welfare	44.2353 (N=17)	43.3523 (N=88)	-.8830	-.112
Government Affairs	50.6667 (N=15)	42.3000 (N=90)	-8.3667	-1.010
Insurance	51.6000 (N=15)	42.1444 (N=90)	-9.4556	-1.143
Judiciary	45.4286 (N=14)	43.1978 (N=91)	-2.2308	-.260
Labor	54.1875 (N=16)	41.5730 (N=89)	-12.6145	-1.575
Municipal	41.0714 (N=14)	43.8681 (N=91)	2.7967	.327
Natural Resources	46.2667 (N=15)	43.0333 (N=90)	-3.2333	-.389
Retirement	62.3000 (N=10)	41.5158 (N=95)	-20.7842	-2.141**
Transportation	44.0714 (N=14)	43.4066 (N=91)	-.6648	-.078
Ways and Means	27.5263 (N=19)	47.0233 (N=86)	19.4969	2.665***
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.6 Difference of Means for the 2001 Louisiana House of Representatives created from LABI scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2001				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee Member	Non Committee member	Mean difference	t
Administration of Criminal Justice	57.7273 (N=11)	63.0638 (N=94)	5.3366	.544
Agriculture	61.1176 (N=17)	62.7727 (N=88)	1.6551	.203
Appropriations	66.7368 (N=19)	61.5698 (N=86)	-5.1671	-.662
Civil Law	76.4000 (N=10)	61.0421 (N=95)	-15.3579	-1.514
Commerce	55.1765 (N=17)	63.9205 (N=88)	8.7440	1.076
Education	67.4706 (N=17)	61.5455 (N=88)	-5.9251	-.727
Environment	69.7692 (N=13)	61.4783 (N=92)	-8.2910	-.911
Health and Welfare	56.4118 (N=17)	63.6818 (N=88)	7.2701	.893
Government Affairs	64.2000 (N=15)	62.2222 (N=90)	-1.9778	-.230
Insurance	72.1250 (N=16)	60.7753 (N=89)	-11.3497	-1.367
Judiciary	58.4615 (N=13)	63.0761 (N=92)	4.6145	.506
Labor	65.7059 (N=17)	61.8864 (N=88)	-3.8195	-.468
Municipal	59.9167 (N=12)	62.8387 (N=93)	2.9220	.309
Natural Resources	59.4667 (N=15)	63.0111 (N=90)	3.5444	.412
Retirement	70.9091 (N=11)	61.5213 (N=94)	-9.3878	-.959
Transportation	61.3750 (N=16)	62.7079 (N=89)	1.3329	.159
Ways and Means	42.8333 (N=18)	66.5747 (N=87)	23.7414	3.109***
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.7 Difference of Means for the 2002 Louisiana House of Representatives created from LABI scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2002				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	59.1818 (N=11)	63.0430 (N=93)	3.8612	.405
Agriculture	59.7059 (N=17)	63.2069 (N=87)	3.5010	.442
Appropriations	65.6842 (N=19)	61.9529 (N=85)	-3.7313	-.492
Civil Law	74.6250 (N=8)	61.6354 (N=96)	-12.9896	-1.188
Commerce	58.7500 (N=16)	63.3409 (N=88)	4.5909	.565
Education	66.0000 (N=17)	61.9770 (N=87)	-4.0230	-.508
Environment	67.6923 (N=13)	61.9121 (N=91)	-5.7802	-.653
Health and Welfare	55.7647 (N=17)	63.9770 (N=87)	8.2123	1.040
Government Affairs	62.7333 (N=15)	62.6180 (N=89)	-.1154	-.014
Insurance	69.4118 (N=17)	61.3103 (N=87)	-8.1014	-1.026
Judiciary	63.6667 (N=12)	62.5000 (N=92)	-1.1667	-.127
Labor	64.3125 (N=16)	62.3295 (N=88)	-1.9830	-.244
Municipal	62.2308 (N=13)	62.6923 (N=91)	.4615	.052
Natural Resources	66.2000 (N=15)	62.0337 (N=89)	-4.1663	-.499
Retirement	70.8182 (N=11)	61.6667 (N=93)	-9.1515	-.964
Transportation	66.0556 (N=18)	61.9186 (N=86)	-4.1370	-.534
Ways and Means	40.8889 (N=18)	67.1860 (N=86)	26.2972	3.600**
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.8 Difference of Means for the 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives created from LABI scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2003				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee Member	Non Committee member	Mean difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	63.3636 (N=11)	67.8085 (N=94)	4.4449	.695
Agriculture	67.0588 (N=17)	67.3977 (N=88)	.3389	.064
Appropriations	61.2632 (N=19)	68.6860 (N=86)	7.4229	1.470
Civil Law	78.5000 (N=10)	66,1684 (N=95)	-12.3316	-1.875
Commerce	71.1333 (N=15)	66.7111 (N=90)	-4.4222	-.790
Education	70.3529 (N=17)	66,7614 (N=88)	-3.5916	-.675
Environment	68.9286 (N=14)	67.0989 (N=91)	-1.8297	-.317
Health and Welfare	63.1875 (N=16)	68.0899 (N=89)	4.9024	.901
Government Affairs	67.8000 (N=15)	67.2667 (N=90)	-.5333	-.095
Insurance	72.7059 (N=17)	66.3068 (N=88)	-6.3991	-1.209
Judiciary	64.0833 (N=12)	67.7634 (N=93)	3.6801	.597
Labor	71.6875 (N=16)	66.5618 (N=89)	-5.1257	-.942
Municipal	68.5714 (N=14)	67.1538 (N=91)	-1.4176	-.245
Natural Resources	66.7059 (N=17)	67.4659 (N=88)	.7600	.143
Retirement	64.9091 (N=11)	67.6277 (N=94)	2.7186	.424
Transportation	65.8333 (N=18)	67.6552 (N=87)	1.8218	.350
Ways and Means	61.4706 (N=17)	68.4773 (N=88)	7.0067	1.325
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.9 Difference of Means for 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives created from 2000-2003 cumulative LABI scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2003				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	55.1818 (N=11)	60.3298 (N=94)	5.1480	.657
Agriculture	57.6471 (N=17)	60.2045 (N=88)	2.5575	.392
Appropriations	56.4211 (N=19)	60.5349 (N=86)	4.1138	.660
Civil Law	75.0000 (N=10)	58.1895 (N=95)	-16.8105	-2.095**
Commerce	61.5333 (N=15)	59.5000 (N=90)	-2.0333	-.296
Education	63.1176 (N=17)	59.1477 (N=88)	-3.9699	-.609
Environment	66.2143 (N=14)	58.8022 (N=91)	-7.4121	-1.053
Health and Welfare	54.6250 (N=16)	60.7191 (N=89)	6.0941	.914
Government Affairs	60.0667 (N=15)	59.7444 (N=90)	-.3222	-.047
Insurance	66.8824 (N=17)	58.4205 (N=88)	-8.4619	-1.307
Judiciary	55.3333 (N=12)	60.3656 (N=93)	5.0323	.667
Labor	65.3125 (N=16)	58.7978 (N=89)	-6.5147	-.978
Municipal	60.2857 (N=14)	59.7143 (N=91)	-.5714	-.081
Natural Resources	64.6471 (N=17)	58.8523 (N=88)	-5.7948	-.891
Retirement	66.1818 (N=11)	59.0426 (N=94)	-7.1393	-.913
Transportation	62.0556 (N=18)	59.3218 (N=87)	-2.7337	-.429
Ways and Means	40.8235 (N=17)	63.4545 (N=88)	22.6310	3.689***
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.10 Difference of Medians for the 2000 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal's W scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2000				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	62% (N=13)	48% (N=92)	.8568	.355
Agriculture	41% (N=17)	51% (N=88)	.5654	.452
Appropriations	63% (N=19)	47% (N=86)	1.7250	.189
Civil Law	58% (N=12)	48% (N=93)	.4206	.517
Commerce	47% (N=17)	50% (N=88)	.0493	.824
Education	53% (N=17)	49% (N=88)	.0948	.758
Environment	54% (N=13)	49% (N=92)	.1109	.739
Health and Welfare	41% (N=17)	51% (N=88)	.5654	.452
Government Affairs	60% (N=15)	48% (N=90)	.7683	.381
Insurance	60% (N=15)	48% (N=90)	.7683	.381
Judiciary	50% (N=14)	49% (N=91)	.0015	.969
Labor	69% (N=16)	46% (N=89)	2.7913	.095*
Municipal	36% (N=14)	52% (N=91)	1.2323	.267
Natural Resources	60% (N=15)	48% (N=90)	.7683	.381
Retirement	80% (N=10)	46% (N=95)	4.1066	.043**
Transportation	57% (N=14)	48% (N=91)	.3751	.540
Ways and Means	16% (N=19)	57% (N=86)	10.5606	.001***
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.11 Difference of Medians for the 2001 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal's W scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2001				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	18% (N=11)	53% (N=94)	4.8284	.028**
Agriculture	53% (N=17)	49% (N=88)	.0948	.758
Appropriations	63% (N=19)	47% (N=86)	1.7250	.189
Civil Law	70% (N=10)	47% (N=95)	1.8538	.173
Commerce	29% (N=17)	53% (N=88)	3.2822	.070*
Education	71% (N=17)	45% (N=88)	3.6004	.058*
Environment	62% (N=13)	48% (N=92)	.8568	.355
Health and Welfare	53% (N=17)	49% (N=88)	.0948	.758
Government Affairs	53% (N=15)	49% (N=90)	.1016	.750
Insurance	63% (N=16)	47% (N=89)	1.2715	.259
Judiciary	23% (N=13)	53% (N=92)	4.1514	.042**
Labor	71% (N=17)	45% (N=88)	3.6004	.058*
Municipal	58% (N=12)	48% (N=93)	.4206	.517
Natural Resources	47% (N=15)	50% (N=90)	.0571	.811
Retirement	64% (N=11)	48% (N=94)	.9790	.322
Transportation	69% (N=16)	46% (N=89)	2.7913	.095*
Ways and Means	6% (N=18)	59% (N=87)	16.8004	.000***
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.12 Difference of Medians for the 2002 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal's W scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2002				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	55% (N=11)	49% (N=94)	.1239	.725
Agriculture	71% (N=17)	45% (N=88)	3.6004	.058*
Appropriations	68% (N=19)	45% (N=86)	3.3139	.069*
Civil Law	13% (N=8)	53% (N=97)	4.7486	.029**
Commerce	38% (N=16)	52% (N=89)	1.0917	.296
Education	50% (N=18)	49% (N=87)	.0020	.965
Environment	50% (N=14)	49% (N=91)	.0015	.969
Health and Welfare	47% (N=17)	50% (N=88)	.0493	.824
Government Affairs	33% (N=15)	52% (N=90)	1.8351	.176
Insurance	35% (N=17)	52% (N=88)	1.6430	.200
Judiciary	42% (N=12)	51% (N=93)	.3346	.563
Labor	38% (N=16)	52% (N=89)	1.0917	.296
Municipal	29% (N=14)	53% (N=91)	2.8369	.092*
Natural Resources	47% (N=15)	50% (N=90)	.0571	.811
Retirement	55% (N=11)	49% (N=94)	.1239	.725
Transportation	39% (N=18)	52% (N=87)	.9829	.321
Ways and Means	83% (N=18)	43% (N=87)	9.9339	.002***
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.13 Difference of Medians for the 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal's W scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2003				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	45% (N=11)	50% (N=94)	.0814	.775
Agriculture	53% (N=17)	49% (N=88)	.0948	.758
Appropriations	58% (N=19)	48% (N=86)	.6503	.420
Civil Law	10% (N=10)	54% (N=95)	6.9069	.009***
Commerce	40% (N=15)	51% (N=90)	.6350	.426
Education	41% (N=17)	51% (N=88)	.5654	.452
Environment	71% (N=14)	46% (N=91)	3.1006	.078*
Health and Welfare	50% (N=16)	49% (N=89)	.0017	.967
Government Affairs	53% (N=15)	49% (N=90)	.1016	.750
Insurance	53% (N=17)	49% (N=88)	.0948	.758
Judiciary	58% (N=12)	48% (N=93)	.4206	.517
Labor	31% (N=16)	53% (N=89)	2.5216	.112
Municipal	29% (N=14)	53% (N=91)	2.8369	.092*
Natural Resources	47% (N=17)	50% (N=88)	.0493	.824
Retirement	55% (N=11)	49% (N=94)	.1239	.725
Transportation	39% (N=18)	52% (N=87)	.9829	.321
Ways and Means	47% (N=17)	50% (N=88)	.0493	.824
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.14 Difference of Medians for the 2000 Louisiana House of Representatives created from LABI scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2000				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	46% (N=13)	50% (N=92)	.0674	.795
Agriculture	18% (N=17)	56% (N=88)	8.2452	.004***
Appropriations	53% (N=19)	49% (N=86)	.0896	.765
Civil Law	75% (N=12)	46% (N=93)	3.5177	.061*
Commerce	53% (N=17)	49% (N=88)	.0948	.758
Education	53% (N=17)	49% (N=88)	.0948	.758
Environment	54% (N=13)	49% (N=92)	.1109	.739
Health and Welfare	41% (N=17)	51% (N=88)	.5654	.452
Government Affairs	67% (N=15)	47% (N=90)	2.0573	.151
Insurance	73% (N=15)	46% (N=90)	3.9686	.046**
Judiciary	50% (N=14)	49% (N=91)	.0015	.969
Labor	63% (N=16)	47% (N=89)	1.2715	.259
Municipal	43% (N=14)	51% (N=91)	.2872	.592
Natural Resources	40% (N=15)	51% (N=90)	.6350	.426
Retirement	90% (N=10)	45% (N=95)	7.2438	.007***
Transportation	50% (N=14)	49% (N=91)	.0015	.969
Ways and Means	16% (N=19)	57% (N=86)	10.5606	.001***
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.15 Difference of Medians for the 2001 Louisiana House of Representatives created from LABI scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2001				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	36% (N=11)	51% (N=94)	.8513	.356
Agriculture	47% (N=17)	50% (N=88)	.0493	.824
Appropriations	53% (N=19)	49% (N=86)	.0896	.765
Civil Law	70% (N=10)	47% (N=95)	1.8538	.173
Commerce	35% (N=17)	52% (N=88)	1.6430	.200
Education	59% (N=17)	48% (N=88)	.7018	.402
Environment	69% (N=13)	47% (N=92)	2.3051	.129
Health and Welfare	47% (N=17)	50% (N=88)	.0493	.824
Government Affairs	53% (N=15)	49% (N=90)	.1016	.750
Insurance	56% (N=16)	48% (N=89)	.3416	.559
Judiciary	46% (N=13)	50% (N=92)	.0674	.795
Labor	59% (N=17)	48% (N=88)	.7018	.402
Municipal	42% (N=12)	51% (N=93)	.3346	.563
Natural Resources	47% (N=15)	50% (N=90)	.0571	.811
Retirement	64% (N=11)	48% (N=94)	.9790	.322
Transportation	44% (N=16)	51% (N=89)	.2517	.616
Ways and Means	22% (N=18)	55% (N=87)	6.4777	.011**
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.16 Difference of Medians for the 2002 Louisiana House of Representatives created from LABI scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2002				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	36% (N=11)	52% (N=93)	.9150	.339
Agriculture	41% (N=17)	52% (N=87)	.6329	.426
Appropriations	53% (N=19)	49% (N=85)	.0644	.800
Civil Law	63% (N=8)	49% (N=96)	.5417	.462
Commerce	38% (N=16)	52% (N=88)	1.1818	.277
Education	59% (N=17)	48% (N=87)	.6329	.426
Environment	69% (N=13)	47% (N=91)	2.1978	.138
Health and Welfare	41% (N=17)	52% (N=87)	.6329	.426
Government Affairs	53% (N=15)	49% (N=89)	.0779	.780
Insurance	59% (N=17)	48% (N=87)	.6329	.426
Judiciary	50% (N=12)	50% (N=92)	.0000	1.000
Labor	56% (N=16)	49% (N=88)	.2955	.587
Municipal	62% (N=13)	48% (N=91)	.7912	.374
Natural Resources	60% (N=15)	48% (N=89)	.7011	.402
Retirement	64% (N=11)	48% (N=93)	.9150	.339
Transportation	61% (N=18)	48% (N=86)	1.0749	.300
Ways and Means	11% (N=18)	58% (N=86)	13.1680	.000***
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.17 Difference of Medians for the 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives created from LABI scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2003				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	9% (N=11)	29% (N=94)	1.9409	.164
Agriculture	29% (N=17)	26% (N=88)	.0782	.780
Appropriations	21% (N=19)	28% (N=86)	.3739	.541
Civil Law	50% (N=10)	24% (N=95)	3.0772	.079*
Commerce	33% (N=15)	26% (N=90)	.3977	.528
Education	35% (N=17)	25% (N=88)	.7721	.380
Environment	21% (N=14)	27% (N=91)	.2266	.634
Health and Welfare	25% (N=16)	27% (N=89)	.0268	.870
Government Affairs	33% (N=15)	26% (N=90)	.3977	.528
Insurance	29% (N=17)	26% (N=88)	.0782	.780
Judiciary	25% (N=12)	27% (N=93)	.0192	.890
Labor	50% (N=16)	22% (N=89)	5.2554	.022**
Municipal	21% (N=14)	27% (N=91)	.2266	.634
Natural Resources	24% (N=17)	27% (N=88)	.1021	.749
Retirement	18% (N=11)	28% (N=94)	.4523	.501
Transportation	33% (N=18)	25% (N=87)	.4937	.482
Ways and Means	6% (N=17)	31% (N=88)	4.4808	.034**
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.18 Difference of Medians for the 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives created from cumulative 2000-2003 LABI scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees

2003				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	27% (N=11)	52% (N=94)	2.4336	.119
Agriculture	47% (N=17)	50% (N=88)	.0493	.824
Appropriations	42% (N=19)	51% (N=86)	.5107	.475
Civil Law	70% (N=10)	47% (N=95)	1.8538	.173
Commerce	47% (N=15)	50% (N=90)	.0571	.811
Education	59% (N=17)	48% (N=88)	.7018	.402
Environment	64% (N=14)	47% (N=91)	1.4082	.235
Health and Welfare	38% (N=16)	52% (N=89)	1.0917	.296
Government Affairs	53% (N=15)	49% (N=90)	.1016	.750
Insurance	59% (N=17)	48% (N=88)	.7018	.402
Judiciary	42% (N=12)	51% (N=93)	.3346	.563
Labor	63% (N=16)	47% (N=89)	1.2715	.259
Municipal	57% (N=14)	48% (N=91)	.3751	.540
Natural Resources	65% (N=17)	47% (N=88)	1.8703	.171
Retirement	64% (N=11)	48% (N=94)	.9790	.322
Transportation	61% (N=18)	47% (N=87)	1.1668	.280
Ways and Means	12% (N=17)	57% (N=88)	11.5691	.001***
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.19 Difference of Means for the 2000 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal score and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2000				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	-.1760909 (N=11)	-.470254 (N=63)	-.2941631	-1.8952
Agriculture	-.3569333 (N=15)	-.4442203 (N=59)	-.087287	-0.6219
Appropriations	-.1812667 (N=15)	-.4888814 (N=59)	-.3076147	-2.2621**
Civil Law	-.305 (N=6)	-.43725 (N=68)	-.13225	-0.6398
Commerce	-.3957857 (N=14)	-.4337 (N=60)	-.0379143	-0.2626
Education	-.45 (N=9)	-.4232769 (N=65)	.0267231	0.1544
Environment	-.2685 (N=8)	-.4456818 (N=66)	-.1771818	-0.9789
Health and Welfare	-.4801538 (N=13)	-.4150984 (N=61)	.0650555	0.4381
Government Affairs	-.6808571 (N=7)	-.3999552 (N=67)	.2809019	1.4748
Insurance	-.5105555 (N=9)	-.4148923 (N=65)	.0956632	0.5538
Judiciary	-.3703636 (N=11)	-.4363333 (N=63)	-.0659697	-0.4153
Labor	-.48375 (N=8)	-.4195909 (N=66)	.0641591	0.3524
Municipal	-.5958889 (N=9)	-.4030769 (N=65)	.192812	1.1236
Natural Resources	-.1683077 (N=13)	-.4815574 (N=61)	-.3132497	-2.1750**
Retirement	-.0672 (N=5)	-.4525652 (N=69)	-.3853652	-1.7454
Transportation	-.51275 (N=8)	-.4160758 (N=66)	.0966742	0.5316
Ways and Means	-.6271579 (N=19)	-.3572182 (N=55)	.2699397	2.1501**
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.20 Difference of Means for the 2001 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal score and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2001				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	-.1465 (N=10)	-.1648387 (N=62)	-.0183387	-0.1269
Agriculture	.0632667 (N=15)	-.2216491 (N=57)	-.2849158	-2.4082**
Appropriations	-.0244375 (N=16)	-.2016786 (N=56)	-.1772411	-1.4972
Civil Law	-.0058 (N=5)	-.1739701 (N=67)	-.1681702	-0.8595
Commerce	-.1632308 (N=13)	-.1620847 (N=59)	.001146	0.0088
Education	-.1115556 (N=9)	-.1695397 (N=63)	-.0579841	-0.3839
Environment	-.01725 (N=8)	-.1804219 (N=64)	-.1631719	-1.0334
Health and Welfare	-.1947692 (N=13)	-.1551356 (N=59)	.0396336	0.3051
Government Affairs	-.5582857 (N=7)	-.1196462 (N=65)	.4386396	2.7344***
Insurance	-.117875 (N=8)	-.1678437 (N=64)	-.0499688	-0.3143
Judiciary	-.3407273 (N=11)	-.1301148 (N=61)	.2106125	1.5410
Labor	-.199875 (N=8)	-.1575937 (N=64)	.0422812	0.2659
Municipal	-.4231667 (N=6)	-.1385758 (N=66)	.2845909	1.6017
Natural Resources	-.0021667 (N=12)	-.1943167 (N=60)	-.19215	-1.4537
Retirement	-.1171667 (N=6)	-.1663939 (N=66)	-.0492273	-0.2723
Transportation	-.3705714 (N=7)	-.1398615 (N=65)	.2307099	1.3857
Ways and Means	-.3093889 (N=18)	-.1132593 (N=54)	.1961296	1.7347
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.21 Difference of Means for the 2002 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal score and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2002				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	-.085 (N=10)	-.0714516 (N=62)	.0135484	0.1070
Agriculture	-.1220667 (N=15)	-.0605088 (N=57)	.0615579	0.5724
Appropriations	-.0321875 (N=16)	-.0850893 (N=56)	-.0529018	-0.5033
Civil Law	-.55825 (N=4)	-.0448088 (N=68)	.5134412	2.8366***
Commerce	-.0198333 (N=12)	-.0840333 (N=60)	-.0642	-0.5477
Education	-.0207 (N=10)	-.0818226 (N=62)	-.0611226	-0.4836
Environment	-.1134444 (N=9)	-.0676032 (N=63)	.0458413	0.3466
Health and Welfare	-.0603846 (N=13)	-.0761864 (N=59)	-.0158018	-0.1389
Government Affairs	.1568571 (N=7)	-.0981231 (N=65)	-.2549802	-1.7634
Insurance	-.2245556 (N=9)	-.0517302 (N=63)	.1728254	1.3217
Judiciary	-.1426667 (N=9)	-.0634286 (N=63)	.0792381	0.6001
Labor	.1167143 (N=7)	-.0938 (N=65)	-.2105143	-1.4457
Municipal	.0102857 (N=7)	-.0823385 (N=65)	-.0926242	-0.6286
Natural Resources	-.2736667 (N=12)	-.0332667 (N=60)	.2404	2.1105**
Retirement	-.1314286 (N=7)	-.0670769 (N=65)	.0643517	0.4361
Transportation	-.027375 (N=8)	-.0790781 (N=64)	-.0517031	-0.3715
Ways and Means	-.0185556 (N=18)	-.0915926 (N=54)	-.073037	-0.7251
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.22 Difference of Means for the 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal score and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2003				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	-.0372 (N=10)	-.205 (N=61)	-.1678	-1.1880
Agriculture	-.1683571 (N=14)	-.1845614 (N=57)	-.0162043	-0.1299
Appropriations	-.0739375 (N=16)	-.2126182 (N=55)	-.1386807	-1.1791
Civil Law	-.327 (N=5)	-.1703333 (N=66)	.1566667	0.8114
Commerce	-.3156364 (N=11)	-.15675 (N=60)	.1588864	1.1697
Education	-.3227778 (N=9)	-.1608387 (N=62)	.1619391	1.0948
Environment	.0395556 (N=9)	-.2134355 (N=62)	-.252991	-1.7323
Health and Welfare	-.1835 (N=12)	-.1809322 (N=59)	.0025678	0.0194
Government Affairs	-.0277143 (N=7)	-.1981719 (N=64)	-.1704576	-1.0316
Insurance	-.2362222 (N=9)	-.1734032 (N=62)	.062819	0.4216
Judiciary	-.0772222 (N=9)	-.1964839 (N=62)	-.1192616	-0.8031
Labor	-.0857143 (N=7)	-.1918281 (N=64)	-.1061138	-0.6392
Municipal	-.4801429 (N=7)	-.1486875 (N=64)	.3314554	2.0505**
Natural Resources	-.2293846 (N=13)	-.1706034 (N=58)	.0587812	0.4587
Retirement	-.3371429 (N=7)	-.1643281 (N=64)	.1728147	1.0461
Transportation	-.40225 (N=8)	-.1533175 (N=63)	.2489325	1.6155
Ways and Means	-.2524706 (N=17)	-.1589815 (N=54)	.0934891	0.8076
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.23 Difference of Means for the 2000 Louisiana House of Representatives created from LABI and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2000				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	38.36364 (N=11)	32.33333 (N=63)	-6.030303	-0.6952
Agriculture	22.26667 (N=15)	36.01695 (N=59)	13.75028	1.8263
Appropriations	33.8 (N=15)	33.08475 (N=59)	-.7152542	-0.0929
Civil Law	51.66667 (N=6)	31.60294 (N=68)	-20.06373	-1.8086
Commerce	37.57143 (N=14)	32.21667 (N=60)	-5.354762	-0.6796
Education	29.11111 (N=9)	33.8 (N=65)	4.688889	0.4958
Environment	41.75 (N=8)	32.19697 (N=66)	-9.55303	-0.9643
Health and Welfare	33 (N=13)	33.27869 (N=61)	.2786885	0.0343
Government Affairs	33.71429 (N=7)	33.1791 (N=67)	-.5351812	-0.0506
Insurance	36.66667 (N=9)	32.75385 (N=65)	-3.912821	-0.4136
Judiciary	38.63636 (N=11)	32.28571 (N=63)	-6.350649	-0.7324
Labor	30.5 (N=8)	33.56061 (N=66)	3.060606	0.3072
Municipal	23.88889 (N=9)	34.52308 (N=65)	10.63419	1.1326
Natural Resources	43.92308 (N=13)	30.95082 (N=61)	-12.97226	-1.6234
Retirement	57.8 (N=5)	31.44928 (N=69)	-26.35072	-2.2074**
Transportation	18.625 (N=8)	35 (N=66)	16.375	1.6740
Ways and Means	27.52632 (N=19)	35.2 (N=55)	7.673684	1.0916
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.24 Difference of Means for the 2001 Louisiana House of Representatives created from LABI and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2001				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	54.7 (N=10)	48.80645 (N=62)	-5.893548	-0.6140
Agriculture	57.4 (N=15)	47.57895 (N=57)	-9.821053	-1.2107
Appropriations	60.875 (N=16)	46.41071 (N=56)	-14.46429	-1.8502
Civil Law	55.2 (N=5)	49.20896 (N=67)	-5.991045	-0.4582
Commerce	44.38462 (N=13)	50.77966 (N=59)	6.395046	0.7419
Education	45.88889 (N=9)	50.15873 (N=63)	4.269841	0.4248
Environment	60.375 (N=8)	48.28125 (N=64)	-12.09375	-1.1526
Health and Welfare	46.30769 (N=13)	50.35593 (N=59)	4.04824	0.4685
Government Affairs	27.28571 (N=7)	52.03077 (N=65)	24.74505	2.2829**
Insurance	60 (N=8)	48.32813 (N=64)	-11.67188	-1.1117
Judiciary	51.54545 (N=11)	49.27869 (N=61)	-2.266766	-0.2451
Labor	33.875 (N=8)	51.59375 (N=64)	17.71875	1.7074
Municipal	34.33333 (N=6)	51.01515 (N=66)	16.68182	1.4045
Natural Resources	52.25 (N=12)	49.1 (N=60)	-3.15	-0.3530
Retirement	58 (N=6)	48.86364 (N=66)	-9.136364	-0.7618
Transportation	31.28571 (N=7)	51.6 (N=65)	20.31429	1.8518
Ways and Means	42.83333 (N=18)	51.88889 (N=54)	9.055556	1.1899
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.25 Difference of Means for the 2002 Louisiana House of Representatives created from LABI and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2002				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	56.4 (N=10)	49.03279 (N=61)	-7.367213	-0.7890
Agriculture	55.73333 (N=15)	48.55357 (N=56)	-7.179762	-0.9036
Appropriations	60.125 (N=16)	47.14545 (N=55)	-12.97955	-1.6964
Civil Law	54.25 (N=4)	49.8209 (N=67)	-4.429104	-0.3132
Commerce	48.33333 (N=12)	50.42373 (N=59)	2.090395	0.2402
Education	44.77778 (N=9)	50.83871 (N=62)	6.060932	0.6198
Environment	55.375 (N=8)	49.39683 (N=63)	-5.978175	-0.5808
Health and Welfare	45.38462 (N=13)	51.12069 (N=58)	5.736074	0.6822
Government Affairs	26.42857 (N=7)	52.65625 (N=64)	26.22768	2.5028**
Insurance	56.55556 (N=9)	49.12903 (N=62)	-7.426523	-0.7605
Judiciary	54.22222 (N=9)	49.46774 (N=62)	-4.75448	-0.4857
Labor	27.42857 (N=7)	52.54688 (N=64)	25.1183	2.3880**
Municipal	33.33333 (N=6)	51.61538 (N=65)	18.28205	1.5867
Natural Resources	60.08333 (N=12)	48.0339 (N=59)	-12.04944	-1.4037
Retirement	64.42857 (N=7)	48.5 (N=64)	-15.92857	-1.4783
Transportation	42.75 (N=8)	51 (N=63)	8.25	0.8033
Ways and Means	40.88889 (N=18)	53.18868 (N=53)	12.29979	1.6729
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.26 Difference of Means for the 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives created from LABI and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2003				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	63.9 (N=10)	60.06557 (N=61)	-3.834426	-0.5790
Agriculture	62.92857 (N=14)	60.03509 (N=57)	-2.893484	-0.4994
Appropriations	56.6875 (N=16)	61.74545 (N=55)	5.057955	0.9207
Civil Law	68.4 (N=5)	60.01515 (N=66)	-8.384848	-0.9349
Commerce	64.54545 (N=11)	59.88333 (N=60)	-4.662121	-0.7333
Education	55.55556 (N=9)	61.33871 (N=62)	5.783154	0.8374
Environment	62.88889 (N=9)	60.27419 (N=62)	-2.614695	-0.3771
Health and Welfare	58.66667 (N=12)	61 (N=59)	2.333333	0.3791
Government Affairs	49 (N=7)	61.875 (N=64)	12.875	1.6964
Insurance	66.11111 (N=9)	59.80645 (N=62)	-6.304659	-0.9138
Judiciary	57.22222 (N=9)	61.09677 (N=62)	3.874552	0.5595
Labor	51.28571 (N=7)	61.625 (N=64)	10.33929	1.3523
Municipal	58 (N=7)	60.89063 (N=64)	2.890625	0.3735
Natural Resources	64.15385 (N=13)	59.81034 (N=58)	-4.343501	-0.7302
Retirement	61.57143 (N=7)	60.5 (N=64)	-1.071429	-0.1383
Transportation	50.125 (N=8)	61.93651 (N=63)	11.81151	1.6488
Ways and Means	61.47059 (N=17)	60.33333 (N=54)	-1.137255	-0.2102
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.27 Difference of Means for the 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives created from cumulative 2000-2003 LABI scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2003				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	Committee member	Non Committee member	Mean Difference	T
Administration of Criminal Justice	53.9 (N=10)	47.98361 (N=61)	-5.916393	-0.7964
Agriculture	51.92857 (N=14)	48.05263 (N=57)	-3.87594	-0.5956
Appropriations	50.8125 (N=16)	48.23636 (N=55)	-2.576136	-0.4151
Civil Law	62.4 (N=5)	47.78788 (N=66)	-14.61212	-1.4623
Commerce	52.36364 (N=11)	48.16667 (N=60)	-4.19697	-0.5864
Education	45.66667 (N=9)	49.27419 (N=62)	3.607527	0.4631
Environment	57.88889 (N=9)	47.5 (N=62)	-10.38889	-1.3489
Health and Welfare	44.66667 (N=12)	49.66102 (N=59)	4.99435	0.7237
Government Affairs	31.28571 (N=7)	50.73438 (N=64)	19.44866	2.3187**
Insurance	54.77778 (N=9)	47.95161 (N=62)	-6.826165	-0.8797
Judiciary	47.11111 (N=9)	49.06452 (N=62)	1.953405	0.2505
Labor	35.14286 (N=7)	50.3125 (N=64)	15.16964	1.7816
Municipal	39.57143 (N=7)	49.82813 (N=64)	10.2567	1.1898
Natural Resources	58.69231 (N=13)	46.60345 (N=58)	-12.08886	-1.8448
Retirement	60.71429 (N=7)	47.51563 (N=64)	-13.19866	-1.5415
Transportation	38.625 (N=8)	50.11111 (N=63)	11.48611	1.4193
Ways and Means	40.82353 (N=17)	51.33333 (N=54)	10.5098	1.7662
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.28 Difference of Medians for the 2000 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal W nominate scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2000				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	82% (N=11)	44% (N=63)	5.2323	0.022**
Agriculture	67% (N=15)	46% (N=59)	2.0904	0.148
Appropriations	67% (N=15)	46% (N=59)	2.0904	0.148
Civil Law	50% (N=6)	50% (N=68)	0.0000	1.000
Commerce	71% (N=14)	45% (N=60)	3.1714	0.075*
Education	44% (N=9)	51% (N=65)	0.1265	0.722
Environment	50% (N=8)	50% (N=66)	0.0000	1.000
Health and Welfare	62% (N=13)	48% (N=61)	0.8398	0.359
Government Affairs	14% (N=7)	54% (N=67)	3.9446	0.047**
Insurance	33% (N=9)	52% (N=65)	1.1385	0.286
Judiciary	45% (N=11)	51% (N=63)	0.1068	0.744
Labor	50% (N=8)	50% (N=66)	0.0000	1.000
Municipal	22% (N=9)	54% (N=65)	3.1624	0.075*
Natural Resources	62% (N=13)	48% (N=61)	0.8398	0.359
Retirement	80% (N=5)	48% (N=69)	1.9304	0.165
Transportation	38% (N=8)	52% (N=66)	0.5606	0.454
Ways and Means	32% (N=19)	56% (N=55)	3.4699	0.062*
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.29 Difference of Medians for the 2001 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal W nominate scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2001				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	50% (N=10)	50% (N=62)	0.0000	1.000
Agriculture	80% (N=15)	42% (N=57)	6.8211	0.009***
Appropriations	69% (N=16)	45% (N=56)	2.8929	0.089*
Civil Law	80% (N=5)	48% (N=67)	1.9343	0.164
Commerce	46% (N=13)	51% (N=59)	0.0939	0.759
Education	56% (N=9)	49% (N=63)	0.1270	0.722
Environment	63% (N=8)	48% (N=64)	0.5625	0.453
Health and Welfare	54% (N=13)	49% (N=59)	0.0939	0.759
Government Affairs	14% (N=7)	54% (N=65)	3.9560	0.047**
Insurance	75% (N=8)	47% (N=64)	2.2500	.134
Judiciary	36% (N=11)	52% (N=61)	0.9657	0.326
Labor	50% (N=8)	50% (N=64)	0.0000	1.000
Municipal	17% (N=6)	53% (N=66)	2.9091	0.088*
Natural Resources	58% (N=12)	48% (N=60)	0.4000	0.527
Retirement	50% (N=6)	50% (N=66)	0.0000	1.000
Transportation	29% (N=7)	52% (N=65)	1.4242	0.233
Ways and Means	33% (N=18)	56% (N=54)	2.6667	0.102
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.30 Difference of Medians for the 2002 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal W nominate scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2002				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	60% (N=10)	48% (N=62)	0.4645	0.496
Agriculture	53% (N=15)	49% (N=57)	0.0842	0.772
Appropriations	44% (N=16)	52% (N=56)	0.3214	0.571
Civil Law	0% (N=4)	53% (N=68)	4.2353	0.040**
Commerce	42% (N=12)	52% (N=60)	0.4000	0.527
Education	70% (N=10)	47% (N=62)	1.8581	0.173
Environment	67% (N=9)	48% (N=63)	1.1429	0.285
Health and Welfare	54% (N=13)	49% (N=59)	0.0939	0.759
Government Affairs	57% (N=7)	49% (N=65)	0.1582	0.691
Insurance	33% (N=9)	52% (N=63)	1.1429	0.285
Judiciary	33% (N=9)	52% (N=63)	1.1429	0.285
Labor	71% (N=7)	48% (N=65)	1.4242	0.233
Municipal	57% (N=7)	49% (N=65)	0.1582	0.691
Natural Resources	25% (N=12)	55% (N=60)	3.6000	0.058*
Retirement	29% (N=7)	52% (N=65)	1.4242	0.233
Transportation	50% (N=8)	50% (N=64)	0.0000	1.000
Ways and Means	61% (N=18)	46% (N=54)	1.1852	0.276
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.31 Difference of Medians for the 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives created from Poole and Rosenthal W nominate scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2003				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	50% (N=10)	49% (N=61)	0.0023	0.962
Agriculture	57% (N=14)	47% (N=57)	0.4296	0.512
Appropriations	63% (N=16)	45% (N=55)	1.4407	0.230
Civil Law	20% (N=5)	52% (N=66)	1.8469	0.174
Commerce	36% (N=11)	52% (N=60)	0.8709	0.351
Education	44% (N=9)	50% (N=62)	0.0970	0.755
Environment	78% (N=9)	45% (N=62)	3.3450	0.067*
Health and Welfare	58% (N=12)	47% (N=59)	0.4719	0.492
Government Affairs	43% (N=7)	50% (N=64)	0.1288	0.720
Insurance	44% (N=9)	50% (N=62)	0.0970	0.755
Judiciary	56% (N=9)	48% (N=62)	0.1616	0.688
Labor	43% (N=7)	50% (N=64)	0.1288	0.720
Municipal	14% (N=7)	53% (N=64)	3.8081	0.051*
Natural Resources	46% (N=13)	50% (N=58)	0.0629	0.802
Retirement	57% (N=7)	48% (N=64)	0.1913	0.662
Transportation	25% (N=8)	52% (N=63)	2.1292	0.145
Ways and Means	41% (N=17)	52% (N=54)	0.5895	0.443
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.32 Difference of Medians for the 2000 Louisiana House of Representatives created LABI Scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2000				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	45% (N=11)	40% (N=63)	0.1294	0.719
Agriculture	7% (N=15)	49% (N=59)	8.9555	0.003***
Appropriations	47% (N=15)	39% (N=59)	0.2929	0.588
Civil Law	50% (N=6)	40% (N=68)	0.2424	0.622
Commerce	50% (N=14)	38% (N=60)	0.6410	0.423
Education	44% (N=9)	40% (N=65)	0.0648	0.799
Environment	50% (N=8)	39% (N=66)	0.3330	0.564
Health and Welfare	38% (N=13)	41% (N=61)	0.0283	0.866
Government Affairs	57% (N=7)	39% (N=67)	0.8841	0.347
Insurance	56% (N=9)	38% (N=65)	0.9583	0.328
Judiciary	45% (N=11)	40% (N=63)	0.1294	0.719
Labor	38% (N=8)	41% (N=66)	0.0344	0.853
Municipal	33% (N=9)	42% (N=65)	0.2208	0.638
Natural Resources	31% (N=13)	43% (N=61)	0.6247	0.429
Retirement	80% (N=5)	38% (N=69)	3.4637	0.063*
Transportation	13% (N=8)	44% (N=66)	2.9258	0.087*
Ways and Means	37% (N=19)	42% (N=55)	0.1451	0.703
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.33 Difference of Medians for the 2001 Louisiana House of Representatives created LABI Scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2001				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	70% (N=10)	47% (N=62)	1.8581	0.173
Agriculture	60% (N=15)	47% (N=57)	0.7579	0.384
Appropriations	69% (N=16)	45% (N=56)	2.8929	0.089*
Civil Law	60% (N=5)	49% (N=67)	0.2149	0.643
Commerce	46% (N=13)	51% (N=59)	0.0939	0.759
Education	44% (N=9)	51% (N=63)	0.1270	0.722
Environment	63% (N=8)	48% (N=64)	0.5625	0.453
Health and Welfare	38% (N=13)	53% (N=59)	0.8449	0.358
Government Affairs	0 % (N=7)	55% (N=65)	7.7538	0.005***
Insurance	75% (N=8)	47% (N=64)	2.2500	0.134
Judiciary	55% (N=11)	49% (N=61)	0.1073	0.743
Labor	25% (N=8)	53% (N=64)	2.2500	0.134
Municipal	17% (N=6)	53% (N=66)	2.9091	0.088*
Natural Resources	50% (N=12)	50% (N=60)	0.0000	1.000
Retirement	67% (N=6)	48% (N=66)	0.7273	0.394
Transportation	14% (N=7)	54% (N=65)	3.9560	0.047**
Ways and Means	39% (N=18)	54% (N=54)	1.1852	0.276
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.34 Difference of Medians for the 2002 Louisiana House of Representatives created LABI Scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2002				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	70% (N=10)	46% (N=61)	1.9961	0.158
Agriculture	53% (N=15)	48% (N=56)	0.1240	0.725
Appropriations	69% (N=16)	44% (N=55)	3.1274	0.077*
Civil Law	50% (N=4)	49% (N=67)	0.0008	0.977
Commerce	42% (N=12)	51% (N=59)	0.3363	0.562
Education	44% (N=9)	50% (N=62)	0.0970	0.755
Environment	63% (N=8)	48% (N=63)	0.6289	0.428
Health and Welfare	38% (N=13)	52% (N=58)	0.7473	0.387
Government Affairs	0% (N=7)	55% (N=64)	7.5499	0.006***
Insurance	67% (N=9)	47% (N=62)	1.2442	0.265
Judiciary	56% (N=9)	48% (N=62)	0.1616	0.688
Labor	14% (N=7)	53% (N=64)	3.8081	0.051*
Municipal	17% (N=6)	52% (N=65)	2.7916	0.095*
Natural Resources	58% (N=12)	47% (N=59)	0.4719	0.492
Retirement	57% (N=7)	48% (N=64)	0.1913	0.662
Transportation	25% (N=8)	52% (N=63)	2.1292	0.145
Ways and Means	44% (N=18)	51% (N=53)	0.2271	0.634
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.35 Difference of Medians for the 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives created LABI Scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2003				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	50% (N=10)	41% (N=61)	0.2863	0.593
Agriculture	36% (N=14)	44% (N=57)	0.3056	0.580
Appropriations	44% (N=16)	42% (N=55)	0.0190	0.890
Civil Law	60% (N=5)	41% (N=66)	0.6943	0.405
Commerce	36% (N=11)	43% (N=60)	0.1851	0.667
Education	33% (N=9)	44% (N=62)	0.3361	0.562
Environment	33% (N=9)	44% (N=62)	0.3361	0.562
Health and Welfare	42% (N=12)	42% (N=59)	0.0020	0.964
Government Affairs	29% (N=7)	44% (N=64)	0.5958	0.440
Insurance	56% (N=9)	40% (N=62)	0.7474	0.387
Judiciary	33% (N=9)	44% (N=62)	0.3361	0.562
Labor	43% (N=7)	42% (N=64)	0.0012	0.973
Municipal	43% (N=7)	42% (N=64)	0.0012	0.973
Natural Resources	54% (N=13)	40% (N=58)	0.8765	0.349
Retirement	57% (N=7)	41% (N=64)	0.7056	0.401
Transportation	25% (N=8)	44% (N=63)	1.1000	0.294
Ways and Means	47% (N=17)	41% (N=54)	0.2115	0.646
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

Table A.36 Difference of Medians for the 2003 Louisiana House of Representatives created from cumulative 2000-2003 LABI scores and membership on Louisiana House standing committees to test the Major Party Cartel Theory

2003				
Louisiana House Standing Committee	% Committee members above median	% Non Committee members above median	Chi-square for Median Difference	Prob-value
Administration of Criminal Justice	80% (N=10)	43% (N=61)	4.8097	0.028**
Agriculture	64% (N=14)	44% (N=57)	1.8791	0.170
Appropriations	63% (N=16)	44% (N=55)	1.7673	0.184
Civil Law	60% (N=5)	47% (N=66)	0.3162	0.574
Commerce	45% (N=11)	48% (N=60)	0.0309	0.861
Education	56% (N=9)	47% (N=62)	0.2428	0.622
Environment	78% (N=9)	44% (N=62)	3.6899	0.055*
Health and Welfare	25% (N=12)	53% (N=59)	3.0312	0.082*
Government Affairs	0% (N=7)	53% (N=64)	7.1360	0.008***
Insurance	67% (N=9)	45% (N=62)	1.4565	0.227
Judiciary	44% (N=9)	48% (N=62)	0.0490	0.825
Labor	29% (N=7)	50% (N=64)	1.1610	0.281
Municipal	29% (N=7)	50% (N=64)	1.1610	0.281
Natural Resources	62% (N=13)	45% (N=58)	1.1884	0.276
Retirement	57% (N=7)	47% (N=64)	0.2666	0.606
Transportation	25% (N=8)	51% (N=63)	1.8925	0.169
Ways and Means	29% (N=17)	54% (N=54)	3.0573	0.080*
*= p<.10				
**= p<.05				
***=p<.01				

APPENDIX B VARIABLE INFORMATION

* Information on all bills was obtained from the Louisiana House of Representatives Personal Page at www.house.legis.state.la.us. This information was taken directly and without revision from the Louisiana legislative web site.

2000 House Journal

April 24, 2000- None

April 25, 2000- None

April 26, 2000- None

May 1, 2000- None

May 2, 2000- None

May 3, 2000- None

May 8, 2000- None

May 11, 2000- None

May 15, 2000- None

May 17, 2000- None

May 18, 2000- None

May 22, 2000- None

Var 1c- May 23, 2000- House bill no. 327. pg. 7-8. Rep Murray moved the final passage of the bill as amended. Yeas- 75, Nays- 21, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 2c- May 24, 2000- House bill no 221. Pg. 7-11. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 58, Nays- 42, Absent- 5. The House agreed to end consideration of amendments.

Var 3c- May 24, 2000- House bill no 221. Pg. 7-11. Rep. Johns moved the final passage of the bill, as amended. Yeas- 75, Nays- 25, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 4c- May 24, 2000- House bill no 271. pg. 12-13. Rep. Windhorst moved the final passage of the bill as amended. Yeas- 83, Nays- 16, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 5c- May 24, 2000- House bill no 313. pg. 13-14. Rep. Cazayoux moved the final passage of the bill as amended. Yeas- 94, Nays- 8, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 6c- May 25, 2000- House bill no 117. pg. 19-21. Final Passage of the Bill. Yeas- 64, Nays- 38, Absent- 3. Bill failed to pass.

Var 7c- May 25, 2000- House bill no 193. Final Passage of the Bill. Yeas- 87, Nays- 10, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 8c- May 25, 2000- House bill no 285. pg. 22-23. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Yeas- 61, Nays- 39, Absent- 5. The Bill failed to pass.

Var 9c- May 25, 2000- House bill no 117. pg. 23-24. Rep. Travis moved to suspend the rules to reconsider the vote by which House bill No. 117 failed to pass on the same legislative day. Rep. Perkins objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 79, Nays- 21, Absent- 5. The rules were suspended.

Var 10c- May 25, 2000- House bill no 117. pg. 24-25. Rep. Travis moved the final passage of the bill, as amended. Yeas- 79, Nays- 25, Absent- 1. Bill was finally passed.

Var 11c- May 26, 2000- House bill no 251. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 6-7. Yeas- 13, Nays- 85, Absent- 7. Bill failed to pass.

Var 12c- May 26, 2000- House bill no 180. Rep. Bowler moved the final passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 7-8. Yeas- 63, Nays- 38, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 13c- May 26, 2000- House bill no 299. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 9-10. Yeas- 71, Nays- 29, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 14c- May 26, 2000- House bill no 301. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 10-11. Yeas- 24, Nays- 72, Absent- 9. Bill failed to pass.

Var 15c- May 26, 2000- House Concurrent Resolution No. 39. Pg. 11-12. Rep. Schneider moved the adoption of the resolution. Rep. Travis objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 50, Nays- 43, Absent- 12. The resolution was adopted.

May 29, 2000- NONE

Var 16c- May 30, 2000- House bill no. 285. pg. 8-9. Rep. McMains moved the final passage of the bill as amended. Yeas- 55, Nays- 46, Absent- 4. Bill failed to pass.

Var 17c- May 31, 2000- Senate bill no 8. pg. 8- 10. Rep. Alario moved the final passage of the bill, as amended. Yeas- 88, Nays- 7, Absent- 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 18c- May 31, 2000- Senate bill no 74. pg. 10. Final Passage of the bill. Yeas- 72, Nays- 25, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 19c- May 31, 2000- House bill no 295. pg. 12- 14. Rep. Stelly moved the final passage of the bill as amended. Yeas- 73, Nays- 32, Absent- 0. Bill was finally passed.

Var 20c- May 31, 2000- House bill no 198. pg. 14. Rep. Hammett moved the final passage of the bill. Yeas- 69, Nays- 26, Absent- 10. Bill failed to pass.

Var 21- June 1, 2000- House bill No 5. pg. 8. Rep. Robert Carter moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 93, Nays- 10, Absent- 2. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 22- June 1, 2000- House bill no 39. Pg. 8-9. Rep. Green moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 96, Nays- 7, Absent- 2. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 23- June 1, 2000- House bill no 40. Pg. 9-10. Rep. Holden moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 93, Nays- 10, Absent- 2. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 24- June 1, 2000- House bill no 41. Pg. 10. Rep. Iles moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 94, Nays- 8, Absent- 3. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 25- June 1, 2000- House bill no 59. Pg. 10-11. Rep. Jack Smith moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 94, Nays- 8, Absent- 3. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 26- June 1, 2000- House bill no 221. Pg. 18-19. The chair ruled that the author could not withdraw the bill subsequent to a favorable vote to concur in the Senate amendments. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Yeas-31, Nays- 70, Absent- 4. The House refused to concur in the amendments proposed by the Senate.

Var 27- June 1, 2000- House bill no 254. Pg. 19-21. Rep. Daniel moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. Yeas- 92, Nays- 9, Absent- 4. The amendments proposed by the Senate were rejected.

Var 28- June 1, 2000- House bill no 266. Pg. 21. Rep. Daniel moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 95, Nays- 5, Absent- 5. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 29- June 1, 2000- House bill no 271. Pg. 22. Rep. Windhorst moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 90, Nays- 10, Absent- 5. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 30- June 1, 2000- House bill no 327. Pg. 23-24. Rep. Murray moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 77, Nays- 17, Absent- 11. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 31- June 1, 2000- House bill no 73. Pg. 24-25. Rep. Stelly moved to table the amendment. Rep. Windhorst objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 53, Nays- 41, Absent- 11. The amendments were tabled.

Var 32- June 1, 2000- House bill no 73. Pg. 25. Rep Daniel moved the final passage of the bill as amended. Yeas- 74, Nays- 26, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 33- June 2, 2000- House bill no 250. Pg. 4- 5. Rep. Montgomery moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 86, Nays- 12, Absent- 7. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

JUNE 4, 2000- NONE

Var 34- June 5, 2000- House bill no 117. pg. 5. Rep. DeWitt moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 82, Nays- 17, Absent- 6. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 35- June 6, 2000- Senate bill no. 13. pg. 4-5. Rep. Murray moved the final passage of the bill. Yeas- 69, Nays- 32, Absent- 4. The bill failed to pass.

Var 36- June 6, 2000- Senate bill no 13. pg. 7. Rep. Murray moved to suspend the rules to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill no. 13 failed to pass on the same legislative day. Rep. Perkins objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 60, Nays- 36, Absent- 9. The House refused to suspend the rules.

Var 37- June 6, 2000- Senate Concurrent Resolution NO. 58. pg. 7-8. Rep. Crane moved the concurrence of the resolution. Yeas- 87, Nays- 16, Absent- 2. The resolution was concurred in.

Var 38- June 7, 2000- House bill no 299. pg. 6-7. Rep. Hammett moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 71, Nays- 33, Absent- 1. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 39- June 7, 2000- House bill no 240. pg. 13-15. As a substitute motion, Rep. Faucheux moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. Rep. Futrell objected. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Yeas- 56, Nays- 41, Absent- 8. The amendments proposed by the Senate were rejected.

Var 40- June 7, 2000- House bill no. 140. pg. 18-19. Rep. Alario moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 70, Nays- 32, Absent- 3. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 41- June 7, 2000- House bill no 221. pg. 19-22. Rep. Ansardi moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 80, Nays- 23, Absent- 2. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 42- June 7, 2000- House bill no 180. pg. 45-47. Rep. Bowler moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 91, Nays- 8, Absent- 6. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 43- June 7, 2000. House bill no. 295. pg. 60-62. Rep. Stelly moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 66, Nays- 32, Absent- 6. The amendments proposed by the Senate were not concurred in by the House.

Var 44- June 7, 2000. House bill no 295. pg. 64. Rep. Stelly moved to suspend the rules to take up and consider House bill no 295 at this time. Rep. Perkins objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 74, Nays- 25, Absent- 5. The rules were suspended.

Var 45- June 7, 2000. House bill no. 295. pg. 64- 66. Rep. Stelly moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 72, Nays- 30, Absent- 2. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Notes- House Rep. Travis resigned from the Louisiana House of Representatives on June 7, 2000 at 5:30 p.m. He did not vote in **Var 43-45**. (These bills were voted on after 5:30 on June 7, 2000). Therefore; there will be only 104 representatives for these 3 **Vars**.

2001 House Journal Notes

March 26, 2001- NONE

March 27, 2001- NONE

March 28, 2001- NONE

Var 1- March 29, 2001- House bill no. 629 pg. 20 and 21. Final Passage of the Bill. Yeas- 82 Nays- 7 Absent- 15 – Bill Passed

Var 2- April 2, 2001- HB 1401 pg. 14. Final Passage of the Bill – Yeas- 60 Nays- 40 absent 4- bill passed

Var3- April 3, 2001- HB19. Final Passage of the Bill – Yeas- 91, Nays- 5, Absent 8- Bill was passed

Var 4- April 4, 2001-HB 292. Final Passage of the Bill- pg. 25. Yeas- 82 Nays 10 absent 12- bill was passed

Var-5 April 4, 2001- HB 175. Final Passage of the Bill as Amended. Pg. 27-28. Yeas- 89 Nays- 6 , Absent – 9. Bill Passed.

Var 6- April 4, 2001- HB 195. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 28. Yeas- 45 Nays- 43 Absent 16, Failed to Pass.

Var 7- April 4, 2001- HB 196. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 29 Yeas- 85 Nays- 9 Absent 10. Bill was passed.

Var 8- April 4, 2001- HB 276. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg 30. Yeas- 87 Nays- 11 Absent- 6. Bill was passed.

Var 9- April 4, 2001- HB 628- Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 33 Yeas- 74 Nays- 25 Absent 5. Bill was passed.

Var 10- April 4, 2001- HB 1129- Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 35 Yeas- 89, Nays- 8, Absent 7. Bill was passed.

Var 11- April 4, 2001- HB 1536- Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 37. Yeas- 21, Nays 72, Absent 11. Bill failed to pass.

Var 12- April 4, 2001- HB 1781- Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 37-38. Yeas- 93, Nays 8, Absent 3. Bill was passed.

Var 13- April 4, 2001- HB 63- Final Passage of the Bill. Pg 38. Yeas- 64, Nays- 31, Absent 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 14- April 5, 2001- HB 243- Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 24. Yeas- 93, Nays- 6, Absent -5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 15- April 5, 2001- HB 1095- Final Passage of the Bill as amended, pg. 34. Yeas- 83, Nays- 12, Absent 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 16- April 5, 2001- HB 1170.. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 41-42. Yeas- 54, Nays- 38, Absent 12. Bill was finally passed.

Var 17- April 9, 2001- HB 84. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 15. Yeas- 85, Nays- 16, Absent 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 18- April 9, 2001- HB 980. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 33-34. Yeas- 74, Nays- 17, Absent 13. Bill was finally passed.

Var 19- April 10, 2001- HB 1719. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 31-32. Yeas- 84, Nays- 16, Absent 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 20- April 10, 2001- HB 641. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 36-37. Yeas- 80, Nays-16, Absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 21- April 10, 2001- HB 1634. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 40. Yeas- 89, Nays- 10, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 22- April 11, 2001- HB 168. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 35. Yeas- 81, Nays- 18, Absent-5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 23- April 11, 2001- HB 402. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 36-37. Yeas- 94, Nays- 6, Absent 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 24- April 11, 2001- HB 786. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 37-38. Yeas- 96, Nays- 5, Absent 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 25- April 17, 2001- HB 1703. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 28-29. Yeas- 72, Nays- 26, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 26- April 17, 2001- HB 1811. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 32. Yeas- 83, Nays- 7, Absent 14. Bill was finally passed.

Var 27- April 17, 2001- HB 93. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 33-34. Yeas- 76, Nays- 25, Absent 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 28- April 17, 2001- HB 173. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 36. Yeas- 18, Nays- 76, Absent 10. Bill failed to pass.

Var 29- April 17, 2001- HB 352. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 39. Yeas- 54, Nays- 39, Absent 11. Bill was finally passed.

Var 30- April 18, 2001. HB 450. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 26. Yeas- 87, Nays- 9, Absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 31- April 18, 2001- HB 576. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 28-29. Yeas- 83, Nays- 14, Absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 32- April 18, 2001. HB 761. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 30. Yeas- 56, Nays- 40, Absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 33- April 18, 2001. HB 900. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 35. Yeas- 45, Nays- 51, Absent-8. Bill failed to pass.

Var 34- April 18, 2001- HB 1002. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 39. Yeas- 90, Nays – 8, Absent -6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 35- April 18, 2001- HB 1349. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 41. Yeas- 97, Nays- 5, Absent 2. Bill was finally passed.

Var 36- April 18, 2001- HB 1352. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 42-43. Yeas- 94, Nays- 6, Absent 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 37- April 18, 2001- HB 1489. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 46. Yeas- 74, Nays- 21, Absent 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 38- April 18, 2001- HB 1560. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 48-49. Yeas- 40, Nays- 60, Absent 4. Bill failed to pass.

Var 39- April 19, 2001- HB 1295. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 32-33. Yeas- 75, Nays- 17, Absent 12. Bill was finally passed.

Var 40- April 19, 2001- HB 690. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 45-46. Yeas- 85, Nays- 10, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 41- April 19, 2001- HB 769. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 46. Yeas- 85, Nays- 8, Absent 11. Bill was finally passed.

Var 42- April 19, 2001- HB 814. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 46-48. Yeas- 71, Nays- 22, Absent 11. Bill was finally passed.

Var 43- April 19, 2001- HB 1106. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 54. Yeas- 81, Nays- 16, Absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 44- April 19, 2001- HB 1578. Recorded Vote. Pg. 58. Yeas-56, Nays- 35, Absent- 13. House agreed to table the bill.

Var 45- April 19, 2001- HB 1725. Recorded Vote. Pg. 62- 63. Yeas- 24, Nays- 56, Absent 24. House refused to recommit the bill to the Committee on Administration of Criminal Justice.

Var 46- April 19, 2001- HB 1725. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 64. Yeas- 69, Nays- 18, Absent 17. Bill was finally passed.

Var 47- April 20, 2001- HB 1461. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 21-22. Yeas- 91, Nays- 7, Absent 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 48- April 20, 2001- HB 268. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 27. Yeas- 94, Nays- 7, Absent 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 49- April 20, 2001- HB 357. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 28-29. Yeas- 87, Nays- 13, Absent 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 50- April 20, 2001- HB 583. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 30-31. Yeas- 39, Nays- 38, Absent- 27. Failed to pass.

Var 51- April 23, 2001- HB 81. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 21-22. Yeas- 55, Nays- 39, Absent 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 52- April 23, 2001- HB 1583. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 23-24. Yeas- 82, Nays- 12, Absent -10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 53- April 23, 2001- HB 1728. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 26. Yeas- 81, Nays- 15, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 54- April 23, 2001- HB 176. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 30-31. Yeas- 89, Nays- 5, Absent -10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 55- April 23, 2001- HB 548. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 31-32. Yeas- 88, Nays- 6, Absent 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 56- April 23, 2001- HB 652. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 32. Yeas- 68, Nays- 27, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 57- April 23, 2001- HB 677. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 32-33. Yeas- 84, Nays- 13, Absent -7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 58- April 23, 2001- HB 1201. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 35-36. Yeas- 86, Nays- 8, Absent- 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 59- April 23, 2001- HB 1207. Final Passage of the Bill, as amended. Pg. 36. Yeas- 80, Nays- 17, Absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 60- April 23, 2001- HB 1661. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 37-38. Yeas- 57, Nays- 35, Absent 12. Bill was finally adopted.

Var 61- April 24, 2001- HB 847. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 38. Yeas- 75, Nays- 23, Absent 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 62- April 24, 2001- HB 1339. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 40- 42. Yeas- 89, Nays- 8, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 63- April 24, 2001- HB 833. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 48-49. Yeas- 83, Nays- 16, Absent 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 64- April 24, 2001- HB 997. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 52. Yeas- 53, Nays- 42, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 65- April 25, 2001- HB 997. A record vote was ordered by the House. Pg. 40. Yeas- 31, Nays- 51, Absent 22. House refused to table the motion.

Var 66- April 25, 2001- HB 94. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 40-41. Yeas- 62, Nays- 31, Absent 11. Bill was finally passed.

Var 67- April 25, 2001- HB 291. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 42. Yeas- 21, Nays- 76, Absent- 7. Bill failed to pass.

Var 68- April 25, 2001- HB 1080. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 46. Yeas- 89, Nays- 9, Absent 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 69- April 25, 2001- HB 1747. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 53-54. Yeas- 81, Nays- 14, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 70- April 25, 2001- HB 1850. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 58-59. Yeas- 87, Nays- 9, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 71- April 25, 2001- HB 532. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 59. Yeas- 63, Nays- 33, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 72- April 26, 2001- HB 69. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 34. Yeas- 76, Nays- 25, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 73- April 26, 2001- HB 155. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 35-36. Yeas- 90, Nays- 6, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 74- April 26, 2001- HB 330. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 37. Yeas- 90, Nays- 9, Absent 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 75- April 26, 2001- HB 731. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 40-41. Yeas- 91, Nays- 5, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 76- April 26, 2001- HB 883. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 41. Yeas- 77, Nays- 21, Absent 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 77- April 26, 2001- HB 1049. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 43-44. Yeas- 90, Nays- 8, Absent 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 78- April 26, 2001- HB 1105. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 44-45. Yeas- 89, Nays- 8, Absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 79- April 30, 2001- HB 1591. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 19-20. Yeas- 35, Nays- 59, Absent- 10. Bill failed to pass.

Var 80- April 30, 2001- HB 331. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 27. Yeas- 93, Nays- 5, Absent-6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 81- April 30, 2001- HB 391. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 28-29. Yeas- 71, Nays- 23, Absent- 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 82- April 30, 2001- HB 745. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 31. Yeas- 91, Nays- 6, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 83- April 30, 2001- HB 776. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 31-32. Yeas- 72, Nays- 24, Absent -8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 84- April 30, 2001- HB 800. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 32. Yeas- 74, Nays- 20, Absent- 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 85- April 30, 2001- HB 907. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 34-35. Yeas- 45, Nays- 52, Absent- 7. Bill failed to pass.

Var 86- April 30, 2001- HB 1534. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 43-44. Yeas- 71, Nays- 23, Absent- 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 87- May 1, 2001- HB 1635. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 18-19. Yeas- 73, Nays- 21, Absent 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 88- May 1, 2001- HB 739. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 35. Yeas- 92, Nays- 5, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 89- May 1, 2001- HB 808. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg 37. Yeas- 89, Nays- 8, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 90- May 1, 2001- HB 813. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 38. Yeas- 88, Nays- 12, Absent 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 91- May 1, 2001- HB 1152. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 39. Yeas- 91, Nays- 7, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 92- May 1, 2001- HB 1841. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 46-47. Yeas- 90, Nays- 9, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 93- May 1, 2001- HB 2044. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 49-50. Yeas- 81, Nays- 20, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 94- May 1, 2001- HB 1285. A Recorded Vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 50. Yeas- 37, Nays- 59, Absent- 8. The House refused to order the committee to report the bill on Monday May 7, 2001.

Var 95- May 1, 2001- HB 133. A recorded vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 52-53. Yeas- 27, Nays- 64, Absent- 13. House refused to call the bill from the calendar.

Var 96- May 1, 2001- HB 670. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 53-54. Yeas- 89, Nays- 5, Absent- 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 97- May 1, 2001- HB 1779. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 54-55. Yeas- 88, Nays- 8, Absent- 8. Bill was finally adopted.

Var 98- May 1, 2001- HB 1740. A recorded vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 55-56. Yeas- 34, Nays- 58, Absent- 12. Amendments were rejected.

Var 99- May 1, 2001- HB 1740. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 56. Yeas- 61, Nays- 39, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 100- May 2, 2001- HB 359. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 24-25. Yeas- 76, Nays- 23, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 101- May 2, 2001- HB 472. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 26. Yeas- 25, Nays- 71, Absent- 8. Bill failed to pass.

Var 102- May 2, 2001- HB 602. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 27-28. Yeas- 94, Nays- 7, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 103- May 2, 2001- HB 1021. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 32-33. Yeas- 44, Nays- 53, Absent- 7. Bill failed to pass.

Var 104- May 3, 2001- HB 2025. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 41-42. Yeas- 95, Nays- 5, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 105- May 7, 2001- HB 787. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 25. Yeas- 91, Nays- 6, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 106- May 7, 2001- HB 1118. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 30. Yeas- 87, Nays- 11, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 107- May 7, 2001- HB 1381. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 34-35. Yeas- 57, Nays- 38, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 108- May 7, 2001- HB 1671. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 35-36. Yeas- 49, Nays- 52, Absent- 3. Bill failed to pass.

Var 109- May 7, 2001- HB 1866. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 41. Yeas- 51, Nays- 44, Absent- 9. Bill failed to pass.

Var 110- May 7, 2001- HB 1886. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 42. Yeas- 91, Nays- 5, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 111- May 7, 2001- HB 1905. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 42-43. Yeas- 69, Nays- 31, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 112- May 7, 2001- HB 1933. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 43-44. Yeas- 84, Nays- 12, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 113- May 7, 2001- HB 1517. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 46. Yeas- 90, Nays- 10, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 114- May 8, 2001 – HB 92. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 24-25. Yeas- 37, Nays- 51, Absent- 16. Bill failed to pass.

Var 115- May 8, 2001- HB 102. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 25-26. Yeas- 72, Nays- 21, Absent- 11. Bill was finally passed.

Var 116- May 8, 2001- HB 1093. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 33-34. Yeas- 76, Nays- 20, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 117- May 8, 2001- HB 1305. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 37-38. Yeas- 77, Nays- 18, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 118- May 8, 2001- HB 1608. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 41-42. Yeas- 29, Nays- 60, Absent- 15. Bill failed to pass.

Var 119- May 8, 2001- HB 1829. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 43. Yeas- 55, Nays- 35, Absent- 14. Bill was finally passed.

Var 120- May 8, 2001- HB 1800. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 47-48. Yeas- 87, Nays- 13, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 121- May 8, 2001- HB 1238. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 48-49. Yeas-92, Nays- 8, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 122- May 8, 2001- HB 452. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 51-52. Yeas- 49, Nays- 47, Absent- 8. Failed to pass.

Var 123- May 9, 2001- HB 1839. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 31-32. Yeas- 51, Nays- 33, Absent- 20. Failed to pass.

Var 124- May 9, 2001- HB 18. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 32. Yeas- 79, Nays- 11, Absent- 14. Bill was finally passed.

Var 125- May 9, 2001- Senate Bill 4. Final Passage of the Bill as amended .Pg. 33. Yeas- 92, Nays- 7, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 126- May 9, 2001- House bill 1674. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 42. Yeas- 52, Nays- 43, Absent-9. Failed to pass.

Var 127- May 9, 2001- House bill 1391. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 45. Yeas- 89, Nays- 6, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 128- May 9, 2001- House bill 1312. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 45-46. Yeas- 58, Nays- 39, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 129- May 9, 2001- House bill 1219. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 46-47. Yeas- 70, Nays- 27, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 130- May 9, 2001- House bill 1945. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 47. Yeas- 88, Nays- 6, Absent- 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 131- May 10, 2001- House bill 262. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 32-33. Yeas- 78, Nays- 23, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 132- May 10, 2001- House bill 275. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 33. Yeas- 91, Nays- 7, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 133- May 10, 2001- House bill 519. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 34-35. Yeas- 69, Nays- 19, Absent- 16. Bill failed to pass.

Var 134- May 10, 2001- House bill 519. A recorded vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 35-36. Yeas- 73, Nays- 19, Absent- 12. The rules were suspended.

Var 135- May 10, 2001- House bill 519. A recorded vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 36. Yeas- 73, Nays- 22, Absent- 9. The vote was reconsidered. Rep Crane moved the final passage of the bill as amended.

Var 136- May 10, 2001- House bill 519. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 36-37. Yeas- 70, Nays- 23, Absent- 11. Bill was finally passed.

Var 137- May 10, 2001- House bill 743. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 39. Yeas- 80, Nays- 16, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 138- May 10, 2001- House bill 1458. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 42. Yeas- 29, Nays- 54, Absent- 21. Bill failed to pass.

Var 139- May 10, 2001- House bill 1873. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 47-48. Yeas- 49, Nays- 43, Absent- 12. Failed to pass.

Var 140- May 10, 2001- House bill 1900. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 49-50. Yeas- 47, Nays- 40, Absent- 17. Failed to pass.

Var 141- May 10, 2001- House bill 1925. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 51-52. Yeas- 88, Nays- 13, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 142- May 14, 2001- House bill 190. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 24-25. Yeas- 47, Nays- 45, Absent- 12. Bill failed to pass.

Var 143- May 14, 2001- House bill 190. Move to reconsider the vote. A move to table the motion to reconsider the vote. Pg. 25. Yeas- 31, Nays- 53, Absent- 20. The House refused to table the motion. Motion to reconsider pending.

Var 144- May 14, 2001- House bill 762. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 26-27. Yeas- 73, Nays- 23, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 145- May 14, 2001- House bill 1178. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 28-29. Yeas- 76, Nays- 17, Absent- 11. Bill was finally passed.

Var 146- May 14, 2001- House bill 1261. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 29-30. Yeas- 75, Nays- 19, Absent- 10. (Digest wrong: correct yeas- 74, Nays- 20, absent-10). Bill was finally passed.

Var 147- May 14, 2001- House bill 1316. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 30. Yeas- 63, Nays- 34, Absent-7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 148- May 14, 2001- House bill 1563. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 31-32. Yeas- 68, Nays- 30, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 149- May 14, 2001- House bill 1828. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 35. Yeas- 61, Nays- 31, Absent- 12. Bill was finally passed.

Var 150- May 14, 2001- House bill 767. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 36-37. Yeas- 91, Nays- 7, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 151- May 14, 2001- House bill 1894. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 38-39. Yeas- 65, Nays- 29, Absent- 10. The House agreed to recommit the bill to the Committee on House and Governmental Affairs.

Var 152- May 16, 2001- House bill 1866. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 34-35. Yeas- 46, Nays- 47, Absent- 11. Bill failed to pass.

Var 153- May 16, 2001- House bill 1900. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 37-38. Yeas- 60, Nays- 36, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 154- May 16, 2001- House bill 1674. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 38-39. Yeas- 77, Nays- 21, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 155- May 16, 2001- House bill 1308. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 39-40. Yeas- 72, Nays- 25, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 156- May 16, 2001- House bill 1826. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 40-44. Yeas- 64, Nays- 32, Absent- 8. Bill failed to pass.

Var 157- May 17, 2001- House bill 1447. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 61-62. Yeas- 88, Nays- 12, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 158- May 17, 2001- House bill 1904. Final passage of the Bill. Pg. 63-64. Yeas- 70, Nays- 29, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 159- May 17, 2001- House bill 622. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 65-66. Yeas- 62, Nays- 35, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 160- May 17, 2001- House bill 2036. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 66-67. Yeas- 47, Nays- 45, Absent- 12. Failed to pass.

Var 161- May 17, 2001- House concurrent resolution NO. 111. The adoption of the resolution as amended. Pg. 67-68. Yeas- 84, Nays- 7, Absent- 13. The resolution was adopted.

Var 162- May 17, 2001- House resolution NO. 45. Adoption of the resolution. Pg. 69. Yeas- 87, Nays- 6, Absent- 11. Resolution was adopted.

Var 163- May 17, 2001- House resolution NO. 48. Pg. 69-70. Adoption of the resolution as amended. Yeas- 82, Nays- 16, Absent- 6. The resolution was adopted.

Var 164- May 21, 2001- House bill 46. Final passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 32-33. Yeas- 56, Nays- 32, Absent- 16. Bill was finally passed.

Var 165- May 21, 2001- Senate bill NO. 561. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 42. Yeas- 71, Nays- 17, Absent- 16. Bill was finally passed.

Var 166- May 21, 2001- House bill no. 2064. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 82-83. Yeas- 90, Nays- 6, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 167- May 21, 2001- House bill NO. 921. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 86-87. Yeas-89, Nays- 7, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 168- May 21, 2001- House bill no 1364. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 89-90. Yeas- 74, Nays- 23, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 169- May 23, 2001- Senate bill no 363. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 10. Yeas- 37, Nays- 55, Absent- 12. The House refused to order the committee to report the bill on Thursday May 31, 2001.

Var 170- May 23, 2001- House bill no 933. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 48. Yeas-80, Nays- 16, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 171- May 23, 2001- House bill no 1549. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 50. Yeas- 39, Nays- 54, Absent- 11. Bill failed to pass.

Var 172- May 23, 2001- House bill 1970. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 53-54. Yeas- 74, Nays- 24, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 173- May 23, 2001- Senate bill NO. 115. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 57. Yeas- 91, Nays- 10, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 174- May 23, 2001- Senate bill NO. 360. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 61. Yeas- 86, Nays- 6, Absent- 12. Bill was finally passed.

Var 175- May 23, 2001- Senate Bill NO. 465. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 61-62. Yeas- 86, Nays- 6, Absent- 12. Bill was finally passed.

Var 176- May 23, 2001- Senate Bill NO. 650. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 65-66. Yeas- 96, Nays- 6, Absent- 2. Bill was finally passed.

Var 177- May 23, 2001- Senate Bill NO. 928. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 67-68. Yeas- 86, Nays- 14, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 178- May 23, 2001- Senate bill NO. 1087. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 68-69. Yeas- 87, Nays- 13, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 179- May 23, 2001- Senate bill NO. 220. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 70. Yeas- 82, Nays- 17, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 180- May 23, 2001- Senate Bill NO 570. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 70-71. Yeas- 72, Nays- 27, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 181- May 23, 2001- Senate bill No 1058. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 73-74. Yeas- 93, Nays- 8, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 182- May 23, 2001- Senate bill NO 123. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 74. Yeas- 77, Nays- 22, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 183- May 23, 2001- Senate bill No. 148. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 74-75. Yeas- 73, Nays- 23, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 184- May 24, 2001- House bill NO. 1822. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 42. Yeas- 94, Nays- 5, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 185- May 24, 2001- House bill NO. 2068. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 47-49. Yeas- 54, Nays- 44, Absent- 6. Bill failed to pass.

Var 186- May 29, 2001- House bill NO. 1873. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 31-32. Yeas- 42, Nays- 46, Absent- 16. Bill failed to pass.

Var 187- May 29, 2001- House bill NO. 231. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 34-35. Yeas- 79, Nays- 22, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 188- May 30, 2001- House bill NO. 510. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 13. Yeas- 71, Nays- 16, Absent- 17. Bill was finally passed.

Var 189- May 30, 2001- House bill NO. 1397. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 16-17. Yeas- 40, Nays- 51, Absent- 13. Bill failed to pass.

Var 190- May 30, 2001- House bill NO 1312. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 18-19. Yeas- 36, Nays- 59, Absent- 9. The House refused to table the entire subject matter. The amendments were rejected.

Var 191- May 30, 2001- House bill NO 1312. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 19. Yeas- 51. Nays- 49. Absent- 4. Failed to pass.

Var 192- May 30, 2001- House bill No 1839. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 21-22. Yeas- 57, Nays- 36, Absent- 11. Bill was finally passed.

Var 193- May 30, 2001- House bill NO. 327. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 22. Yeas- 66, Nays- 26, Absent- 12. Bill failed to pass.

Var 194- May 31, 2001- House concurrent resolution NO. 149. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 16-17. Yeas- 59, Nays- 37, Absent- 8. The resolution was adopted.

Var 195- May 31, 2001- Senate bill NO. 20. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 18-19. Yeas- 87, Nays- 10, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 196- May 31, 2001- Senate bill NO 391. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 21-22. Yeas- 69, Nays- 26, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 197- May 31, 2001- Senate bill NO 393. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 22. Yeas- 95, Nays- 5, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 198- May 31, 2001- Senate bill NO. 45. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 26. Yeas- 73, Nays- 25, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 199- May 31, 2001- House bill NO. 2050. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 35-36. Yeas- 55, Nays- 44, Absent- 5. Bill failed to pass.

Var 200- May 31, 2001- House bill NO. 1164. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 36-37. Yeas- 64, Nays- 31, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 201- May 31, 2001- House bill NO. 310. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 37-38. Yeas- 49, Nays- 51, Absent- 4. Bill failed to pass.

Var 202- June 1, 2001- HB 332. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 25-26. Yeas- 54, Nays- 42, Absent- 8. Bill failed to pass.

Var 203- June 1, 2001- HB 1877. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 28-29. Yeas- 87, Nays- 15, Absent- 2. Bill was finally passed.

Var 204- June 1, 2001- HB 2013. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 29-31. Yeas- 85, Nays- 13, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 205- June 4, 2001- HB No. 139. Amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 23. Yeas- 69, Nays- 25, Absent- 10. Amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 206- June 4, 2001- HB NO. 485. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 32. Yeas- 95, Nays- 7, Absent- 2. Bill was finally passed.

Var 207- June 4, 2001- HB NO. 1987. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 36. Yeas- 97, Nays- 5, Absent- 2. Bill was finally passed.

Var 208- June 4, 2001- HB NO 2010. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 36-37. Yeas- 87, Nays- 6, Absent- 11. Bill was finally passed.

Var 209- June 4, 2001- HB NO 2075. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 37. Yeas- 60, Nays- 34, Absent- 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 210- June 4, 2001- HB 1042. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 37-38. Yeas- 55, Nays- 43, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 211- June 4, 2001- HB 2010. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 38-39. Yeas- 95, Nays- 5, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 212- June 4, 2001- HB NO 1474. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 40-41. Yeas- 57, Nays- 34, Absent- 13. The House agreed to call the bill from the calendar.

Var 213- June 4, 2001- HB NO 1474. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 41-42. Yeas- 63, Nays- 27, Absent- 14. Bill was finally passed.

Addition: Var-333. June 5, 2001- HB NO 387. Rep. Morrish moved the final passage of the bill. Pg . 28-29. Yeas- 92, Nays- 8, Absent- 4. The bill was finally passed.

Addition: Var 334. June 5, 2001- Senate bill no. 853. pg. 32-33. Final Passage of the Bill. Yeas- 72, Nays- 30, Absent- 2. Bill was finally passed.

Addition: Var 335. June 5, 2001- House bill no. 190. pg. 33-34. Rep. Odinet moved to call House bill no 190 from the calendar. Rep. Triche objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 40, Nays- 42, Absent- 22. The House refused to call the bill from the calendar.

Addition: Var 336. June 5, 2001- House bill no 2068. pg. 34. Rep. Landrieu moved the final passage of the bill. Yeas- 62, Nays- 35, Absent- 7. The bill failed to pass.

Addition: Var 337. June 5, 2001- House bill no 920. pg. 34-36. Rep. Cazayoux moved the adoption of the amendments. Rep. Green objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 60, Nays- 30, Absent- 14. The amendments were adopted.

Addition: Var 338. June 5, 2001- House bill no 920. pg. 36. Rep. Cazayoux moved the final passage of the bill as amended. Yeas- 55, Nays- 34, Absent- 15. Bill was finally passed.

Var 214- June 6, 2001- HB NO 1802. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 5-6. Yeas- 47, Nays- 49, Absent- 9. House refused to call the bill from the calendar.

Var 215- June 6, 2001- HB NO. 1654. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 33-34. Yeas- 67, Nays- 27, Absent- 11. Bill was finally passed.

Var 216- June 6, 2001- HB NO 327. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 34-35. Yeas- 51, Nays- 31, Absent- 23. Bill failed to pass.

Var 217- June 6, 2001- HB NO 815. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 35-36. Yeas- 49, Nays- 43, Absent- 13. Failed to pass.

Var 218- DELETED VAR FROM DATA SET.

Var 219- June 6, 2001- HB NO 610. The amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 39-40. Yeas- 90, Nays- 5, Absent-10. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 220- June 6, 2001- HB NO. 954. The amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 42-43. Yeas- 96, Nays- 5, Absent- 4. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 221- June 6, 2001- HB NO 1634. Rep. Bruce moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 47. Yeas- 94, Nays- 5, Absent- 6. The conference committee report was adopted.

Var 222- June 7, 2001- HB No 529. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 14-15. Yeas- 75, Nays- 23, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 223- June 7, 2001- Senate bill NO. 750. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 17-18. Yeas- 89, Nays- 7, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 224- June 7, 2001- Senate bill NO 1025. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 21. Yeas- 76, Nays- 26, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 225- June 7, 2001- Senate bill NO 1031. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 21-22. Yeas- 84, Nays- 9, Absent- 12. Bill was finally passed.

Var 226- June 7, 2001- Senate bill NO 1046. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 23-24. Yeas- 52, Nays- 46, Absent- 7. Failed to pass.

Var 227- June 7, 2001- Senate bill NO 1054. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 24-25. Yeas- 49. Nays- 47, Absent- 9. Failed to pass.

Var 228- June 7, 2001- Senate bill NO 36. Final Passage of the Bill. Pg. 27. Yeas- 92, Nays- 9, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 229- June 7, 2001- Senate bill NO 239. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 28-32. Yeas-59, Nays- 37, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 230- June 7, 2001- Senate bill NO 221. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 32. Yeas- 88, Nays- 12, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 231- June 7, 2001- House bill NO 815. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 33-34. Yeas- 65, Nays- 31, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 232- June 7, 2001- Senate bill NO. 503. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 34. Yeas- 81, Nays- 12, Absent- 12. Bill was finally passed.

Var 233- June 7, 2001- Senate bill NO. 726. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 38-39. Yeas- 45, Nays- 52, Absent- 8. Bill failed to pass.

Var 234- June 7, 2001- Senate bill NO 730. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 39. Yeas- 78, Nays- 19, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 235- June 7, 2001- Senate bill NO 764. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 41. Yeas- 86, Nays- 10, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 236- June 11, 2001- House bill NO. 81. Amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 10-11. Yeas- 80, Nays- 9, Absent- 16. Amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 237- June 11, 2001- House Bill NO 769. Amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 13-14. Yeas- 82, Nays- 5, Absent- 18. Amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 238- June 11, 2001- House bill NO 883. Rep. Bowler moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 14-15. Yeas- 40, Nays- 52, Absent- 13. The House refused to reject the amendments.

Var 239- June 11, 2001- House bill NO 883. Rep Riddle insisted on his motion that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. pg. 15. Yeas- 56, Nays- 31, Absent- 18. Amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 240- June 11, 2001- Senate bill NO 298. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 48. Yeas- 83, Nays- 12, Absent- 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 241- June 11, 2001- Senate bill NO 673. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 55-56. Yeas- 41, Nays- 62, Absent- 2. Bill failed to pass.

Var 242- June 11, 2001- Senate bill NO 918. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 58. Yeas- 71, Nays- 31, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 243- June 11, 2001- Senate bill NO 25. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 61-62. Yeas- 40, Nays- 60, Absent- 5. Bill failed to pass.

Var 244- June 11, 2001- Senate bill NO. 247. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 64. Yeas- 89, Nays- 13, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 245- June 11, 2001- Senate bill NO 280. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 64-65. Yeas- 42, Nays- 51, Absent- 12. Amendments were rejected.

Var 246- June 11, 2001- Senate bill NO 280. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 65. Yeas- 70, Nays- 25, Absent- 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 247- June 11, 2001- Senate bill NO 361. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 70-71. Yeas- 45, Nays- 38. Absent- 22. Failed to pass.

Var 248- June 12, 2001- House bill NO. 461. A substitute motion, Rep. Perkins moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 30-31. Yeas- 59, Nays- 34, Absent- 12. The amendments proposed by the Senate were rejected.

Var 249- June 12, 2001- House bill NO 1140. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 34-35. Yeas- 55, Nays- 43, Absent- 7. The amendments proposed by the Senate were rejected.

Var 250- June 12, 2001- House bill NO 1925. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 51-52. Yeas- 54, Nays- 46, Absent- 5. The amendments proposed by the Senate were rejected.

Var 251- June 12, 2001- Senate bill NO 1052. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 68-69. Yeas- 88, Nays- 11, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 252- June 12, 2001- Senate bill NO 50. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 69. Yeas- 88, Nays- 9, Absent- 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 253- June 12, 2001- Senate bill NO 512. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 71-72. Yeas- 96, Nays- 5, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 254- June 12, 2001- Senate bill NO 1037. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 86-87. Yeas- 49, Nays- 44, Absent- 12. Failed to pass.

Var 255- June 12, 2001- Senate bill NO 1000. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 87-90. Yeas- 93, Nays- 7, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 256- June 12, 2001- Senate bill No 1105. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 92- 93. Yeas- 80, Nays- 16, Absent- 9. Yeas-80, Nays- 16, Absent- 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 257- June 13, 2001- House bill NO 389. Rep. Scalise moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 12-15. Yeas- 25, Nays- 76, Absent- 4. The House refused to concur in the amendments proposed by the Senate.

Var 258- June 13, 2001- House bill NO 419. Rep. Erdey moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 15-16. Yeas- 84, Nays- 16, Absent- 5. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 259- June 13, 2001- House bill No 762. Rep. Martiny moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 17-18. Yeas- 77, Nays- 25, Absent- 3. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 260- June 13, 2001- Senate bill NO 730. Rep. Rodney Alexander moved to adopt the Conference committee Report. Pg. 57-58. Yeas- 93, Nays- 5, Absent- 7. The Conference committee report was adopted.

Var 261- June 13, 2001- Senate bill NO 532. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 59. Yeas- 83, Nays- 15, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 262- June 13, 2001- Senate bill NO 119. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. Pg. 60-61. Yeas- 92, Nays- 6, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 263- June 13, 2001- Senate bill NO 822. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 61-62. Yeas- 86, Nays- 12, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 264- June 13, 2001- Senate bill NO 1046. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 62-63. Yeas- 64, Nays- 36, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 265- June 13, 2001- Senate bill NO. 803. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 66. Yeas- 95, Nays- 5, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 266- June 13, 2001- Senate bill NO 949. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 66-67. Yeas- 41, Nays- 55, Absent- 9. Bill failed to pass.

Var 267- June 13, 2001- Senate bill NO 776. Rep Salter moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 67-68. Yeas- 98, Nays- 7, Absent- 0. The conference committee report was adopted.

Var 268- June 13, 2001- Senate bill NO 239. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 68-69. Yeas- 41, Nays- 53, Absent- 11. The House refused to recommit the bill to the Conference Committee.

Var 269- June 13, 2001- Senate bill NO 239. Rep. Martiny insisted on his motion to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 68-70. Yeas- 63, Nays- 38, Absent- 4. (Wrong in Digest, Correct: Yeas- 62, Nays- 38, Absent-3). The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 270- June 13, 2001- House bill NO 1565. Amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. Pg. 82-83. Yeas-90, Nays- 9, Absent- 6. The amendments proposed by the Senate were rejected.

Var 271- June 13, 2001- Senate bill NO 881. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 91. Yeas- 88, Nays- 14, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 272- June 13, 2001- Senate bill NO 230. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 93- 95. Yeas- 95, Nays- 7, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 273- June 14, 2001- House bill NO 81. Rep. Bruce moved to adopt the Conference committee Report. Pg. 10-11. Yeas- 55, Nays- 38, Absent- 12. The conference committee report was adopted.

Var 274- June 14, 2001- Senate bill NO. 221. As a substitute motion Rep. Bowler moved to recommit the bill to the Conference Committee. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 12-13. Yeas- 54, Nays- 43, Absent- 8. The House recommitted the bill to the Conference Committee.

Var 275- June 14, 2001- Senate bill NO 123. Vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 13-14. Yeas- 84, Nays- 20, Absent- 1. The House recommitted the bill to the Conference Committee.

Var276- June 14, 2001- House bill NO 743. Rep. Ansardi moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 23. Yeas- 84, Nays- 19, Absent- 2. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 277- June 14, 2001- House bill NO. 1565. As a substitute motion Rep. Salter moved to recommit the bill to the Conference Committee. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 41-42. Yeas- 48, Nays- 53, Absent- 4. The House refused to recommit the bill to the Conference Committee.

Var 278- June 14, 2001- House bill NO 1565. On motion of Rep. Triche and under a suspension of the rules, the above roll call vote was corrected to reflect him as voting yea. Rep. Leblanc insisted on his motion to adopt the conference committee report. Pg. 42-43. Yeas- 85, Nays- 17, absent- 3. The conference committee report was adopted.

Var 279- June 14, 2001- Senate bill No 409. Rep. Hutter moved the final passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 43-44. Yeas- 52, Nays- 47, Absent- 6. Failed to pass.

Var 280- June 14, 2001- Senate bill NO 361. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 45-47. Yeas- 52, Nays- 40, Absent- 13. The bill failed to pass.

Var 281- June 14, 2001- Senate bill NO. 1054. Final Passage of the bill Pg. 47. Yeas- 64, Nays- 29, Absent- 12. Bill was finally passed.

Var 282- June 14, 2001- Senate bill NO. 781. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 48. Yeas- 89, Nays- 16, Absent- 0. Bill was finally passed.

Var 283- June 14, 2001- Senate bill NO. 917. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 52. Yeas- 49, Nays- 46, Absent- 10. Bill failed to pass.

Var 284- June 14, 2001- Senate bill NO 1106. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 55. Yeas- 90, Nays- 13, Absent- 2. Bill was finally passed.

Var 285- June 14, 2001- Senate bill NO 98. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 55-56. Yeas- 35, Nays- 59, Absent- 11. Bill failed to pass.

Var 286- June 14, 2001- Senate bill NO 314. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 56-58. Yeas- 74, Nays- 27, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 287- June 14, 2001- Senate bill NO 442. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 58-59. Yeas- 77, Nays- 17, Absent- 11. Bill was finally passed.

Var 288- June 14, 2001- Senate bill NO 925. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 60. Yeas- 57, Nays- 42, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 289- June 14, 2001- Senate bill NO 929. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 61-62. Yeas- 61, Nays- 40, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 290- June 15, 2001- Senate bill NO 1107 (substitute for Senate bill NO. 972 by Senator Hainkel). Rep. Hebert moved that the bill be indefinitely postponed. Rep. Donelon objected. Pg. 3-4. Yeas- 23, Nays- 74, Absent- 8. The House refused to indefinitely postpone the bill.

Var 291- June 15, 2001- Senate bill NO 1107. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 4-5. Yeas- 76, Nays- 27, Absent- 2. Bill was finally passed.

Var 292- June 15, 2001- Senate bill NO 331. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 5-7. Yeas- 78, Nays- 23, Absent- 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 293- June 15, 2001- Senate bill NO 887. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 10. Yeas- 78, Nays- 7, Absent- 20. Bill was finally passed.

Var 294- June 15, 2001- Senate bill NO 619. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 16-17. Yeas- 48, Nays- 46, Absent- 11. Failed to pass.

Var 295- June 15, 2001- Senate bill NO 987. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 21. Yeas- 90, Nays- 12, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 296- June 15, 2001- Senate bill NO 514. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 22-23. Yeas- 80, Nays- 19, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 297- June 15, 2001- Senate bill NO 904. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 23-24. Yeas- 18, Nays- 76, Absent- 11. Bill failed to pass.

Var 298- June 15, 2001- House bill NO 18. Rep. Bruneau moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 25-26. Yeas- 86, Nays- 10, Absent- 9. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 299- June 15, 2001- House bill NO 1398. Rep. Devillier moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 53-54. Yeas- 97, Nays- 5, Absent- 3. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 300- June 15, 2001- House bill NO 2033. Rep. Hunter moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 71-72. Yeas- 96, Nays- 6, Absent- 3. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 301- June 15, 2001- House bill NO 2066. Rep. Landrieu moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 75-76. Yeas- 96, Nays- 5, Absent- 4.

Var 302- June 15, 2001- House bill NO 776. Rep. Townsend moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 79-80. Yeas- 69, Nays- 30, Absent- 6. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 303- June 15, 2001- House bill NO 1925. As a substitute motion Rep. Robert Carter moved to recommit the bill to the Conference Committee. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 85-86. Yeas- 52, Nays- 49, Absent- 4. The House recommitted the bill to the Conference Committee.

Var 304- June 15, 2001- Senate bill NO 892. As a substitute motion Rep. Romero moved to recommit the bill to the Conference Committee. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 93. Yeas- 90, Nays- 7, Absent- 8. The House agreed to recommit the bill to the Conference Committee.

Var 305- June 15, 2001- House bill NO 652. Rep. Hudson moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 103-104. Yeas- 89, Nays- 13, Absent- 3. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 306- June 17, 2001- House bill No 1828. As a substitute motion Rep. Strain moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. Rep. Townsend objected. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 26-27. Yeas- 33, Nays- 68, Absent- 4. The House refused to reject the amendments.

Var 307- June 17, 2001- House bill NO. 1828. Rep. Townsend insisted on his motion that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 26-27. Yeas- 83, Nays- 21, Absent- 1. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 308- June 17, 2001- House bill NO 2027. Rep. Downer moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 29- 31. Yeas- 89, Nays- 12, Absent- 4. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 309- June 17, 2001- House bill NO 1042. As a substitute motion Rep. Perkins moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. Rep. Wooton objected. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 34-35. Yeas- 59, Nays- 39, Absent- 7. The amendments proposed by the Senate were rejected.

Var 310- June 17, 2001- House bill NO 52. Rep. Bowler moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. Pg. 36-37. Yeas- 86, Nays- 10, Absent- 9. The amendments proposed by the Senate were rejected.

Var 311- June 17, 2001- House bill NO 243. Rep. Scalise moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 37-38. Yeas- 97, Nays- 5, Absent- 3. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 312- June 17, 2001- House bill NO 390. As a substitute motion Rep. Downer moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. Rep. Toomy objected. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 39-40. Yeas- 79, Nays- 23, Absent- 3. The amendments proposed by the Senate were rejected.

Var 313- June 17, 2001- House bill No 1563. As a substitute motion Rep. Perkins moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. Rep. Martiny objected. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 55-56. Yeas- 62, Nays- 39, Absent- 4. The amendments proposed by the Senate were rejected.

Var 314- June 17, 2001- House bill No 1654. Rep. Pinac moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 61. Yeas- 86, Nays- 14, Absent- 5. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 315- June 17, 2001- House bill NO. 1735. As a substitute motion, Rep. Riddle moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. Rep. Scalise objected. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 63-64. Yeas- 61, Nays- 41, Absent- 3. The amendments proposed by the Senate were rejected.

Var 316- June 17, 2001- Senate bill NO. 5. Rep. Downer moved that the bill be returned to the calendar. Rep. Bruneau objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 74-75. Yeas- 61, Nays- 35, Absent- 9. The House returned the bill to the calendar.

Var 317- June 18, 2001- Senate bill NO. 829. Rep. Crane moved the final passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 2-3. Yeas- 78, Nays- 19, Absent- 8. The chair declared the above bill was finally passed.

Var 318- June 18, 2001- House bill No 1905. Rep. Riddle moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 5-6. Yeas- 88, Nays- 10, Absent- 7. The conference committee report was adopted.

Var 319- June 18, 2001- House bill No. 1. Rep. Leblanc moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 11- 16. Yeas- 92, Nays- 12, Absent- 1. The Conference committee report was adopted.

Var 320- June 18, 2001- House bill NO. 1042. Rep. Wooton moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 30- 31. Yeas- 53, Nays- 45, Absent- 7. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 321- June 18, 2001- House bill NO 390. Rep. Toomy moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 32-33. Yeas- 94, Nays- 7, Absent- 4. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 322- June 18, 2001- House bill NO 953. Rep. Guillory moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 33-34. Yeas- 88, Nays- 10, Absent- 7. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 323- June 18, 2001- House bill NO 1178. As a substitute motion Rep. Hebert moved to recommit the bill to the Conference Committee. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 41-42. Yeas- 90, Nays- 12, Absent- 3. The House recommitted the bill to the Conference Committee.

Var 324- June 18, 2001- House Bill NO 2056. Rep. Scalise moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 43-44. Yeas- 92, Nays- 9, Absent- 4. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 325- June 18, 2001- House bill NO 2047. Rep Martiny moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 49-51. Yeas- 66, Nays- 28, Absent- 11. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 326- June 18, 2001- House bill NO 1917. As a substitute motion, Rep. Devillier moved to recommit the bill to the Conference Committee. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Pg. 51. Yeas- 37, Nays- 59, Absent- 9. The House refused to recommit the bill to the Conference Committee.

Var 327- June 18, 2001- House bill NO 1917. Rep. McMains insisted on his motion to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 51-52. Yeas- 80, Nays- 20, Absent- 5. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 328- June 18, 2001- House bill NO. 1290. Rep. Swilling moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Pg. 57. Yeas- 74, Nays- 21, Absent- 10. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 329- June 18, 2001- House bill NO 1391. Rep. Stelly moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 59. Yeas- 85, Nays- 15, Absent- 5. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 330- June 18, 2001- House bill NO 1563. Rep. Martiny moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 61-62. Yeas- 56, Nays- 40, Absent- 9. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 331- June 18, 2001- House bill NO 2025. Rep. Landrieu moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 64-65. Yeas- 97, Nays- 5, Absent- 3. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 332- June 18, 2001- House bill NO. 52. Rep. Bowler moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Pg. 66. Yeas- 77, Nays- 19, Absent- 9. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

This session only had 104 members due to the resignation of Rep. Reggie Dupre, Jr. since the last session (assuming 2000) of the legislature. Damon J. Baldone was elected on June 2, 2001 to replace Dupre and was sworn in on June 6, 2001. Pg. 1-2. (Which accounts for the absence of a 105th member and its **Addition** starting June 6, 2001).

2002 House Journal Notes

April 29, 2002- None

April 30, 2002- None

May 1, 2002- None

May 7, 2002- None

May 8, 2002- None

May 14, 2002- None

May 15, 2002- None

May 20, 2002- None

Var 1-May 21, 2002- House bill no 114 pg. 69-70 yeas 97 nays 6 absent 2 Bill passed

Var 2-May 21, 2002- House bill no 258 pg. 72 yeas 96 nays 5 absent 4 Bill passed

Var 3- May 22, 2002- House bill no 174 pg. 7 & 8 yeas 49 absent 6. (Wrong in digest should be: Yeas- 50, Nays- 49, Absent-6.) Bill failed to pass

Var 4- May 22, 2002- House bill no 166 pg. 8 yeas 85 nays 15 absent 5 bill passed

Var 5-May 22, 2002- House bill no 167 pg. 8 & 9 yeas 94 nays 8 absent 3 bill passed

Var 6-May 22, 2002- House bill no 172 pg. 9 yeas 68 nays 32 absent 5 bill failed to pass

Var 7-May 22, 2002- House bill no 171 pg. 10. yeas 58 nays 42, Absent- 5. Final passage of the bill as amended.

Var 8-May 22, 2002- House bill no 169 pg. 10 & pg. 11 yeas 78 nays 23 absent 4 bill passed

Var 9-May 23, 2002- House bill no 157 pg. 16 yeas 85 nays 12 absent 8 bill passed

Var 10-May 23, 2002- House bill no 68 pg. 16 & 17 yeas 92 nays 9 absent 4 Final passage of the bill

Var 11-May 29, 2002- House bill no 244 pg. 20 & 21. yeas 76 nays 20 absent 9 Final Passage of the bill as amended.

Var 12- May 30, 2002- House bill no 100 pg. 10 & 11. Final Passage of the Bill as amended. yeas 49 nays 47, Absent 9 bill failed to pass

Var 13- May 30, 2002- House bill no ? pg. 19 yeas 41 nays 57 absent 7 bill failed to pass. Don't know the bill number for this **Var**.

Var 14- June 3, 2002 House bill no 256 pg. 11 & 12 yeas 28 nays 56 absent 21. (Wrong in digest should be: Yeas- 28, Nays- 57, Absent- 20). bill failed to pass

Var 15- June 3, 2002 House bill no 31 pg. 12 & 13 yeas 73 nays 29 absent 3. Final passage of the bill.

Var 16- June 3, 2002 House bill no 36 pg. 13 yeas 70 nays 31 , absent 4 Final passage of the bill

Var 17- June 4, 2002- House bill no 171 pg. 8 & 9 yeas 73 nays 31 absent 1 Final Passage of the bill as amended

Var 18- June 5, 2002- House bill no 100 pg. 6, 7, & 8 yeas 51 nays 48 absent 6 bill failed to pass

Var 19- June 5, 2002- House bill no 87 pg. 9 yeas 83 nays 16 absent 6 bill was read and adopted

Var 20- June 5, 2002- House bill no 175 pg. 10 & 11 yeas 72 nays 31 absent 2 bill passed

Var 21- June 5, 2002- House bill no 175 pg. 11 & 12 yeas 61 nays 38 absent 6 final passage of the bill

Var 22- June 10, 2002- Senate bill no 31 pg. 11 & 12 yeas 73 nays 29 absent 3 final passage of the bill as amended

Var 23- June 10, 2002- House bill no 157 pg. 21 & 22 yeas 84 nays 18 absent 3 proposed amendments passed

Var 24- June 10, 2002- House bill no 238 pg. 25 & 26 yeas 72 nays 29 absent 4 amendments proposed by the Senate were passed by the House.

Var 25- June 10, 2002- House bill no 171 pg. 26 & 27 yeas 72 nays 29 absent-4. absent concur in Senate amendments

Var 26- June 11, 2002- House bill no 169 pg. 30 & 31 yeas 53 nays 51 absent 1 Substitute motion

Var 27- June 11, 2002- Senate bill no 42 pg. 32 & 33 yeas 74 nays 26 absent 5 Final passage of the bill

Var 28- June 11, 2002- Senate bill no 60 pg. 34 & 35 yeas 90 nays 9 absent 6 Final passage of the bill

Var 29- June 11, 2002 Senate bill no 86 pg. 37 & 38 yeas 72 nays 31 absent 2 Passage of the bill

Var 30- June 11, 2002 House bill no 1 pg. 92 & 93 yeas 99 nays 6 absent 0 amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 31- June 12, 2002- House bill no 169 pg. 8 yeas 82 nays 23 absent 0 – move to adopt the conference committee report

Var 32- June 12, 2002- House bill no 244 pg. 20 yeas 73 nays 25 absent 7 – motion to adopt the conference committee report

2003 House Journal Notes

April 1, 2003- None
 April 2, 2003- None
 April 7, 2001- None
 April 8, 2003- None

Var 1- April 9, 2003 page 26 House bill No. 397 Final Passage of Bill Amended 83-yes 12-nays 10 absent

Var 2-April 10, 2003 pg. 36 House bill no. 1120 Final Passage of Bill and amend 59 yeas, 37 nays, and 9 absent

Var3- April 10, 2003 pg. 40 House Bill no. 1609 final Passage of Bill Yeas- 82 , Nays 15, and 8 Absent

Var 4- April 14, 2003 pg. 27 House Bill no 755 Final Passage of Bill as amended Yeas- 85 Nays- 15, and absent 5.

Var 5- April 14, 2003 pg. 28 House Bill no 757 Final Passage of Bill Yeas – 79, nays- 19, absent 7

ADDITION: Var 255- April 15, 2003. House bill no 779. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 29-31. Yeas- 75, Nays- 27, Absent- 3. Bill passed.

ADDITION: Var 256- April 15, 2003. House bill no 971. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 37. Yeas- 77, Nays- 23, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

ADDITION: Var 257- April 15, 2003. House bill no 1368. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 40-41. Yeas- 88, Nays- 11, Absent- 6. Bill was finally passed.

ADDITION: Var 258- April 15, 2003. House bill no 1396. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 41-42. Yeas- 85, Nays- 15, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

ADDITION: Var 259- April 15, 2003. House bill no 1398. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 42. Yeas- 80, Nays- 20, Absent- 5. Bill was finally passed.

ADDITION: Var 260- April 15, 2003. House bill no 1400. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 42-43. Yeas- 81, Nays- 17, Absent- 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 6- April 16, 2003 pg. 10 House Bill no 135 Final Passage of Bill as amended Yeas 12 Nays 70 Absent 23

Var 7- April 16, 2003 pg. 12 House Bill no 988 Final Passage of Bill as Amended Yeas Yeas 90 Nays 11 Absent 4

Var 8- April 22, 2003 pg. 31 House Bill no 1750 Final Passage of Bill as amended. Yeas- 76, Nays- 17, Absent- 12.

Var 9- April 22, 2003 pg. 35 House Bill no 1181 Final Passage of Bill yeas 95 nays 5 absent 5

Var 10- April 23, 2003 pg. 37 House Bill no 142 Final Passage of Bill as amended yeas 14 nays 88 absent 3

Var 11- April 23, 2003 pg. 38 House Bill no 233 Final Passage of Bill yeas 64 nays 24 absent 17

Var 12- April 23, 2003 pg. 41 House Bill no 464 Final Passage of Bill as amended yeas 84 nays 12 absent 9

Var 13- April 23, 2003 pg. 47 House Bill no 1009 Final Passage of Bill as amended yeas 82 nays 11 absent 12

Var 14- April 23, 2003 pg. 49 House Bill no 181 Final Passage of Bill as amended yeas 78 nays 18 absent 9

Var 15- April 23, 2003 pg. 50 House Bill no 664 Final Passage of Bill as amended yeas 88 nays 11 absent 6

Var 16-April 24, 2003 pg. 20 House bill no 22 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 88 nays 11 absent 6

Var 17- April 24, 2003 pg. 22 and pg. 23 House bill no 121 Final Passage of Bill as amended yeas 83 nays 17 absent 5

Var 18- April 24, 2003 pg. 34 House bill no 424 Final Passage of Bill yeas 95 nays 7 absent 3. (Wrong in digest should be: Yeas- 94, Nays- 8, Absent-3).

Var 19- April 24, 2003 pg. 36 and 37 House bill no 483 Final Passage of Bill yeas 58 nays 35 absent 12

Var 20- April 24, 2003 pg. 38 House Bill no 531 adoption of amendments , amendments rejected yeas 39 nays 44 absent 22

Var 21- April 24, 2003 pg. 38 and 39 house bill no 531 Final Passage of the 6bill yeas 65 nays 28 absent 12

Var 22- April 24, 2003 pg. 44 house bill no 428 Final Passage of the bill yeas 42 nays 54 absent 9. (Wrong in digest should be: Yeas- 42, Nays-55, Absent- 8).

Var 23- April 24, 2003 pg. 46 and 47 house bill no 886 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 92 nays 11 absent 2

Addition: Var 261- April 24, 2003. House bill No. 56. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 55-56. Yeas- 61, Nays- 32, Absent- 12. The House agreed to recommit the bill to the committee on Agriculture, Forestry, Aquaculture, and Rural Development.

Var 24- April 28, 2003 pg. 28 and 29 house bill no 1362 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 70 nays 31 absent 4

Var 25- April 28, 2003 pg. 30 and 31 house bill no 1402 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 64 nays 34 absent 7

Var 26- April 28, 2003 pg. 31 house bill no 1472 Final Passage of the bill yeas 66 nays 31 absent 8

Var 27- April 28, 2003 pg. 31 and 32 house bill no 1493 Final Passage of the bill yeas 71 nays 25 absent 9

Var 28- April 28, 2003 pg. 38-40 house bill no 1686 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 51 nays 42 absent 12

Var 29- April 28, 2003 pg. 42 and 43 house bill no 1789 Final Passage of the bill yeas 85 nays 14 absent 6

Var 30- April 28, 2003 pg. 46 house bill no 116 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 92 nays 9 absent 4

Var 31- April 28, 2003 pg. 49 and 50 house bill no 585 Final Passage of Bill as amended yeas 86 nays 11 absent 8

Var 32- April 28, 2003 pg. 53 house bill no 848 Final Passage of the bill yeas 57 nays 41 absent 7

Var 33- April 29, 2003 pg. 21 and 22 house bill no 1067 Final Passage of the bill yeas 86 nays 8 absent 11

ADDITION: Var 262- April 29, 2003. Senate bill no 710. Rep. Townsend moved the adoption of the amendments. Rep. Crane objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Pg. 29-30. Yeas- 65, Nays- 30, Absent- 10. The amendments were adopted.

ADDITION: Var 263- April 29, 2003. Senate bill NO 710. Final Passage of the bill as amended. Pg. 30-31. Yeas- 86, Nays- 16, Absent- 3. Bill was finally passed.

ADDITON: Var 264- April 29, 2003- Senate bill no 225. Final Passage of the bill. Pg. 31-32. Yeas- 81, Nays- 13, Absent- 11. Bill was finally passed.

Var 34- April 29, 2003 pg. 36 and 37 house bill no. 1178 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 95 nays 8 and absent 2

Var 35- April 29, 2003 pg. 44 and 45 house bill No. 1801 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 65 nays 20 absent 20
ADDITION: Var 265- April 30, 2003. House bill no 795. Pg. 45-46. Rep. Townsend moved the adoption of the amendments. Rep Martiny objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 26, Nays- 68, Absent- 11. The amendments were rejected.

Var 36- April 30, 2003 pg. 48 House bill 697 Final Passage of the bill yeas 87 nays 6 absent 12

Var 37- April 30, 2003 pg. 53 and 54 House Bill no. 1118 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 87 nays 15 absent 3

Var 38- April 30, 2003 pg. 54 House bill no. 1222 Final Passage of the bill yeas 40 nays 56 absent 9

Var 39- April 30, 2003 pg. 57 and 58 House bill no 1669 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 90 nays 5 absent 10

Var 40- April 30, 2003 pg. 61 House bill no 283 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 79 nays 18 absent 8

Var 41- April 30, 2003 pg. 63 and 64 House bill no 369 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 99 nays 5 absent 1

Var 42- April 30, 2003 pg. 64 and 65 House bill no 390 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 93 nays 6 absent 6

Var 43- May 1, 2003 pg. 14 and 15 House bill no 436 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 38 nays 50 absent 17

Var 44- May 1, 2003 pg. 16 and 17 House bill no 518 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 99 nays 5 absent 1

Var 45- May 1, 2003 pg. 18 and 19 House bill no 876 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 76 nays 15 absent 14

Var 46- May 1, 2003 pg. 22 and 23 House bill no 1825 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 86 nays 12 absent 7

Var 47- May 1, 2003 pg. 35 House bill no 933 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 23 nays 78 absent 4

Var 48- May 1, 2003 pg. 36 House bill no 940 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 84 nays 19 absent 2

Var 49- May 1, 2003 pg. 37 House bill no 943 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 70 nays 22 absent 13. (Wrong in digest should be: Yeas- 71, Nays- 22, Absent- 12). Bill was finally passed.

Var 50- May 5, 2003 pg. 28 and 29 House bill no 561 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 88 nays 8 absent 9

Var 51- May 5, 2003 pg. 36 House bill no 1605 Final Passage of the bill yeas 86 nays 13 absent 6

Var 52- May 5, 2003 pg. 37 House bill no 1732 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 61 nays 36 absent 8

Var 53- May 5, 2003 pg. 40 House bill no 1533 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 61 nays 38 absent 6

Var 54- May 5, 2003 pg. 40 and 41 House bill no 1652 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 62 nays 29 absent 14

Var 55- May 5, 2003 pg. 41 and 42 House bill no 1675 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 75 nays 24 absent 6

Var 56- May 5, 2003 pg. 42 House bill no 1696 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 75 nays 22 absent 8

Var 57- May 5, 2003 pg. 42 House bill no 1402 Final passage of the bill yeas 65 nays 35 absent 5

Var 58- May 6, 2003 pg. 13 House bill no 158 Final passage of the bill yeas 65 nays 31 absent 9

Var 59- May 6, 2003 pg. 13 and pg. 14 House bill no 162 Final Passage of the bill yeas 67 nays 30 absent 8

Var 60- May 6, 2003 pg. 14 House bill no 169 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 90 nays 5 absent 10

Var 61- May 6, 2003 pg. 16 House bill no 180 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 65 nays 37 absent 3

Var 62- May 6, 2003 pg. 17 House bill no 270 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 77 nays 24 absent 4

Var 63- May 6, 2003 pg. 18 House bill no 158 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 37 nays 61 absent 7

Var 64- May 6, 2003 pg. 20 House bill no 485 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 91 nays 7 absent 7

Var 65- May 6, 2003 pg. 23 House bill no 816 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 78 nays 24 absent 3

Var 66- May 6, 2003 House Bill no 1093 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 93 nays 5 absent 7

Var 67- May 7, 2003 pg. 31 and 32 House Bill no 1770 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 90 nays 13 absent 2

Var 68- May 7, 2003 pg. 32 and 33 House bill no 1640 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 72 nays 25 absent 8

Var 69- May 7, 2003 pg. 33 House Bill no 1849 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 72 nays 20 absent 13

Var 70- May 7, 2003 pg. 35 and 36 House Bill no 1472 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 80 nays 17 absent 8

Var 71- May 7, 2003 pg. 36 House bill no 1402 Final Passage of the bill yeas 73 nays 21 absent 11

Var 72- May 7, 2003 pg. 36 and 37 House bill no 1120 Final Passage of the bill yeas 83 nays 17 absent 5.

Var 73- May 7, 2003 pg. 37 House bill no 1523 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 75 nays 21 absent 9

Var 74- May 7, 2003 pg. 38-40 House bill no 1035 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 85 nays 16 absent 4.

ADDITION: Var 266- May 7, 2003. Pg. 45-46. Senate bill no 710. Rep. Crane moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 97, Nays- 7, Absent- 1. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 75- May 8, 2003 pg. 19 and 20 House bill no 147 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 71 nays 24 absent 10

Var 76- May 8, 2003 pg. 21 and 22 House bill no 208 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 21 nays 80 absent 4

Var 77- May 8, 2003 pg. 30 House bill no 714 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 87 nays 14 absent 4

Var 78- May 8, 2003 pg. 34 and 35 House bill no 1207 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 95 nays 6 absent 4

Var 79- May 8, 2003 pg. 35 and 36 House bill no 1251 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 44 nays 56 absent 5

Var 80- May 8, 2003 pg. 36 and 37 House bill no 1373 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 90 nays 11 absent 4

Var 81- May 8, 2003 pg. 37 and 38 House bill no 1374 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 89 nays 12 absent 4

Var 82- May 12, 2003 pg. 38 and 39 House bill no 1321 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 83 nays 12 absent 10

Var 83- May 12, 2003 pg. 39 House bill no 1476 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 94 nays 8 absent 3

Var 84- May 12, 2003 pg. 42 and 43 House bill no 1904 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 82 nays 16 absent 7

Var 85- May 12, 2003 pg. 45 House bill no 1965 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 69 nays 34 absent 2

Var 86- May 12, 2003 pg. 47 House bill no 864 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 92 nays 9 absent 4

Var 87- May 12, 2003 pg. 49-51 House bill no 1788 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 96 nays 6 absent 3

Var 88- May 12, 2003 pg. 51 and 52 House bill no 1686 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 83 nays 15 absent 7

Var 89- May 12, 2003 pg. 52 and 53 House bill no 946 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 39 nays 58 absent 8

Var 90- May 12, 2003 pg. 59 and 60 Senate bill no 779 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 83 nays 19 absent 3

Var 91- May 13, 2003 pg. 19 House bill no 261 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 42 nays 57 absent 6

Var 92- May 13, 2003 pg. 20 House bill no 591 Final Passage of the bill yeas 91 nays 7 absent 7

Var 93- May 13, 2003 pg. 29 House bill no 1306 Final Passage of the bill yeas 91 nays 6 absent 8

Var 94- May 13, 2003 pg. 36 House bill no 1662 Final Passage of the bill yeas 75 nays 24 absent 6

Var 95- May 13, 2003 pg. 43 House bill no 1890 Final Passage of the bill yeas 87 nays 7 absent 11

Var 96- May 14, 2003 pg. 16 House bill no 2000 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 47 nays 36 absent 22

ADDITION: Var 267- May 14, 2003 pg. 18- 19. House bill no 2011. Rep. Arnold moved the adoption of the amendments. Rep. Lancaster objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 32, Nays- 51, Absent- 22. The amendments were rejected.

Addition- Var 268- May 14, 2003. Pg. 19-21. House bill no 2011. Rep. Iles moved the adoption of the amendments. Rep. Lancaster objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 21, Nays- 56, Absent- 28. The amendments were rejected.

Var 97- May 14, 2003 pg. 22 House bill no 2011 Final Passage of the bill yeas 76 nays 19 absent 10

Addition- Var 269- May 14, 2003. Pg. 24-25. House bill no 249. Rep. Bowler moved the adoption of the amendments. Rep. Ansardi objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 31, Nays- 64, Absent- 10. The amendments were rejected.

Var 98- May 14, 2003 pg. 26 House bill no 1834 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 86 nays 6 absent 13

Addition- Var 270- May 15, 2003. Pg. 26. House bill no 19. Rep. Toomy moved the adoption of the amendments. Rep. Frith objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 33, Nays- 48, Absent- 24. The amendments were rejected.

Var 99- May 15, 2003 pg. 26 House bill no 19 Final Passage of the bill yeas 65 nays 15 absent 25

Var 100- May 15, 2003 pg. 27 House bill no 86 Final Passage of the bill yeas 68 nays 22 absent 15

Var 101- May 15, 2003 pg. 28 House bill no 370 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 91 nays 5 absent 9

Var 102- May 15, 2003 pg. 30 House bill no 662 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 88 nays 11 absent 6

Var 103- May 15, 2003 pg. 33 House bill no 1572 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 46 nays 47 absent 12

Var 104- May 15, 2003 pg. 36 House bill no 1907 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 89 nays 6 absent 10

Var 105- May 15, 2003 pg. 37 House bill no 2014 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 95 nays 5 absent 5

Var 106- May 19, 2003 pg. 33 House bill no 221 Final Passage of the bill yeas 94 nays 6 absent 5

Var 107- May 19, 2003 pg. 34 and 35 House bill no 262 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 51 nays 53 absent 1

Var 108- May 19, 2003 pg. 35 House bill no 278 Final Passage of the bill yeas 50 nays 51 absent 4

ADDITION: Var 271- May 19, 2003. Pg. 37. House bill no 439. Rep. McDonald moved that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations. Rep. Martiny objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 31, Nays- 60, Absent- 14. The House refused to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Var 109- May 19, 2003 pg. 37 House bill 439 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 71 nays 30 absent 4

Var 110- May 19, 2003 pg. 38 House bill no 494 Final Passage of the bill yeas 92 nays 8 absent 5

Var 111- May 19, 2003 pg. 38 and 39 House bill no 549 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 94 nays 9 absent 2

Var 112- May 19, 2003 pg. 39 and 40 House bill no 665 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 54 nays 47 absent 4

Var 113- May 19, 2003 pg. 44 and 45 House bill no 2016 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 52 nays 43 absent 10

Var 114- May 19, 2003 pg. 49 House bill no 1108 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 94 nays 5 absent 6

Var 115- May 19, 2003 pg. 52 House bill no 688 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 79 nays 18 absent 8

Var 116- May 20, 2003 pg. 28 House bill no 204 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 91 nays 6 absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 117- May 20, 2003 pg. 30 and 31 House bill no 232 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 93 nays 7 absent 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 118- May 20, 2003 pg. 32 House bill no 244 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 86 nays 9 absent 10

Var 119- May 20, 2003 pg. 35 House bill no 347 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 99 nays 5 absent 1

Var 120- May 20, 2003 pg. 36 House bill no 447 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 84 nays 18 absent 3

Var 121- May 20, 2003 pg. 37 House bill no 489 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 88 nays 14 absent 3

Var 122- May 20, 2003 pg. 37 House bill no 530 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 80 nays 18 absent 7

Var 123- May 20, 2003 pg. 40 and 41 House bill no 885 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 90 nays 7 absent 8

Var 124- May 20, 2003 pg. 52 House bill no 1726 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 91 nays 6 absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 125- May 20, 2003 pg. 55 House bill no 1862 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 97 nays 5 absent 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 126- May 21, 2003 pg. 42 House bill no 684 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 81 nays 18 absent 6

Var 127- May 21, 2003 pg. 53 and 54 House bill no 1756 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 83 nays 15 absent 7

Var 128- May 21, 2003 pg. 65 and 66 House bill no 361 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 33 nays 64 absent 8. Bill failed to pass.

Var 129- May 21, 2003 pg. 66 House bill no 106 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 95 nays 6 absent 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 130- May 22, 2003 pg. 29 House bill no 173 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 89 nays 8 absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 131- May 22, 2003 pg. 30 House bill no 542 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 48 nays 47 absent 10. Bill failed to pass.

Var 132- May 22, 2003 pg. 30 and 31 House bill no 628 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 35 nays 65 absent 5. Bill failed to pass.

Var 133- May 22, 2003 pg. 31 House bill no 655 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 36 nays 59 absent 10. Bill failed to pass.

Var 134- May 22, 2003 pg. 32 House bill no 105 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 58 nays 39 absent 8. Bill failed to pass.

Var 135- May 22, 2003 pg. 44 House bill no 653 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 63 nays 28 absent 14. Bill failed to pass.

Var 136- May 22, 2003 pg. 46 House bill no 713 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 52 nays 38 absent 15. Failed to pass.

ADDITION: Var 272. May 27, 2003. Pg. 6. Senate bill no 1025. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 25, Nays- 49, Absent- 31. The House refused to discharge the Committee on Administration of Criminal Justice from further consideration of the bill.

Var 137- May 27, 2003 pg. 36 House bill no 547 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 37 nays 59 absent 9. Bill failed to pass.

ADDITION: Var 273. May 27, 2003. Pg. 38. House bill no 1472. Rep. Thompson moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 77, Nays- 20, Absent- 8. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

ADDITION: Var 274. May 27, 2003. Pg. 38-39. House bill no. 1652. Rep. Thompson moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 82, Nays- 17, Absent- 6. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

ADDITION: Var 275. May 27, 2003. Pg. 39. House bill no 1675. Rep. Thompson moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 88, Nays- 9, Absent- 8. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 138- May 27, 2003 pg. 42 Senate bill no 144 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 97 nays 5 absent 3.

Var 139- May 27, 2003 pg. 52 and 53 Senate bill no 554 Final Passage of the bill yeas 48 nays 52 absent 5

Var 140- May 27, 2003 pg. 54 Senate bill no 621 Final Passage of the bill yeas 96 nays 6 absent 3

Var 141- May 27, 2003 pg. 57 and 58 Senate bill no 1093 Final Passage of the bill yeas 93 nays 7 absent 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 142- May 28, 2003 pg. 17 House bill no 294 Final Passage of the bill yeas 91 nays 10 absent 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 143- May 28, 2003 pg. 22 House bill no 1078 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 84 nays 12 absent 9

Var 144- May 28, 2003 pg. 22 and 23 House bill no 1236 Final Passage of the bill yeas 83 nays 12 absent 10

Var 145- May 28, 2003 pg. 23 and 24 House bill no 1323 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 91 nays 6 absent 8

Var 146- May 28, 2003 pg. 24 House bill no 1327 Final Passage of the bill yeas 93 nays 7 absent 5

Var 147- May 28, 2003 pg. 26 and 27 House bill no 1786 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 85 nays 16 absent 4

Var 148- May 28, 2003 pg. 29 House bill no 1556 Final Passage of the Bill yeas 85 nays 11 absent 9

Var 149- May 28, 2003 pg. 31 House bill no 314 Final Passage of the bill yeas 84 nays 15 absent 6

Var 150- May 28, 2003 pg. 33 House bill no 417 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 86 nays 7 absent 12

Var 151- May 28, 2003 pg. 34 and 35 House bill no 455 Final Passage of the bill yeas 69 nays 26 absent 10

Var 152- May 28, 2003 pg. 37 House bill no 995 Final Passage of the bill yeas 89 nays 6 absent 10

Var 153- May 28, 2003 pg. 44 House bill no 1520 Final Passage of the Bill as amended yeas 43 nays 46 absent 16

Var 154- May 28, 2003 pg. 48 House bill no 1809 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 86 nays 9 absent 10

Var 155- May 28, 2003 pg. 54 House bill no 1017 Final Passage of the bill yeas 81 nays 20 absent 4

ADDITION: Var 276- May 29, 2003. Pg. 10-11. Senate bill no 479. Rep. Faucheux moved the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Transportation, Highways, and Public Works. Rep. Martiny objected. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 49, Nays- 37, Absent- 19. The House agreed to recommit the bill to the Committee on Transportation, Highways and Public Works.

Var 156- May 29, 2003 pg. 12 and 13 House bill no 2026 Final Passage of the bill yeas 87 nays 12 absent 6

Var 157- May 29, 2003 pg. 13 House bill no 2027 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 72 nays 20 absent 13

ADDITION: Var 277- May 29, 2003 pg. 19. Senate bill no 889. Rep. Gallot moved the adoption of the amendments. Rep. Bruneau objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 31, Nays- 57, Absent- 17. The amendments were rejected.

Var 158- May 29, 2003 pg. 20 Senate bill no 889 final Passage of the bill yeas 83 nays 16 absent 6. Bill was finally passed. (Wrong in digest should be: Yeas- 84, Nays-16, absent-5).

Var 159- May 29, 2003 pg. 22 Senate bill no 131 Final Passage of the bill yeas 40 nays 55 absent 10

Var 160- May 29, 2003 pg. 23 and 24 Senate bill no 828 final passage of the bill yeas 66 nays 32 absent 7

Var 161- May 29, 2003 pg. 29 and 30 Senate bill no 292 Final Passage of the bill yeas 82 nays 17 absent 6

Var 162- May 29, 2003 pg. 34 Senate bill no 482 Final Passage of the bill yeas 83 nays 15 absent 7

Var 163- May 29, 2003 pg. 37 Senate bill no 634 Final Passage of the bill yeas 81 nays 18 absent 6

Var 164- May 29, 2003 pg. 41 Senate bill no 902 Final passage of the bill yeas 94 nays 6 absent 5.

June 1, 2003- NONE.

Var 165- June 2, 2003 pg. 13 House bill no 1724 Final passage of the bill yeas 78 nays 20 absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 166- June 2, 2003 pg. 13 House bill no 1744 Final Passage of the bill yeas 89 nays 5 absent 11. Bill was finally passed.

Var 167- June 2, 2003 pg. 14 House bill no 2001 Final Passage of the bill as amended yeas 76 nays 17 absent 12. Bill was finally passed.

Var 168- June 2, 2003 pg. 23 House bill no 1930 Final passage of the bill yeas 37 nays 57 absent 11. Bill failed to pass.

Var 169- June 2, 2003 pg. 23 House bill no 2029 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 63 nays 33 absent 9. Bill failed to pass.

Var 170- June 2, 2003 pg. 24 and 25 House bill no 1087 Final passage of the bill yeas 77 nays 16 absent 12. Bill was finally passed.

Var 171- June 3, 2003 pg. 23 and 24 House bill no 679 Final passage of the bill yeas 38 nays 57 absent 10. Final passage of the bill.

Var 172- June 3, 2003 pg. 31 House bill no 2022 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 80 nays 21 absent 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 173- June 3, 2003 pg. 32 House bill no 737 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 62 nays 36 absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 174- June 3, 2003 pg. 34 and 35 House bill no 1941 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 55 nays 40 absent 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 175- June 3, 2003 pg 36 and 37 Senate bill no 38 Final passage of the bill yeas 85 nays 16 absent 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 176- June 4, 2003 pg. 49 and 50 House bill no 638 Final passage of the bill yeas 18 nays 77 absent 10. Bill failed to pass.

Var 177- June 4, 2003 pg 50 House bill no 1202 Final passage of the bill yeas 72 nays 24 absent 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 178- June 4, 2003 pg. 50 and 51 House bill no 1463 Final passage of the bill yeas 55 nays 35 absent 15. (Wrong in digest should be: Yeas- 55, Nays- 36, Absent- 14). Bill was finally passed.

Var 179- June 4, 2003 pg. 52 House bill no 2003 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 54 nays 37 absent 14. Bill was finally passed.

Var 180- June 4, 2003 pg. 53 House bill no 2029 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 11 nays 78 absent 16. Bill failed to pass.

Var 181- June 5, 2003 pg. 27 and 28 Senate bill no 565 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 70 nays 23 absent 12. Bill was finally passed.

Var 182- June 5, 2003 pg. 30 House bill no 862 Final passage of the bill yeas 72 nays 17 absent 16. Bill was finally passed.

Var 183- June 5, 2003 pg. 33 House bill no 1700 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 79 nays 16 absent 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 184- June 5, 2003 pg. 36 House bill no 804 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 60 nays 31 absent 14. Bill was finally passed.

Var 185- June 5, 2003 pg. 37 House bill no 713 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 69 nays 27 absent 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 186- June 5, 2003 pg. 40 House bill no 1876 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 64 nays 32 absent 9. Bill failed to pass.

Var 187- June 5, 2003 pg. 40 and 41 House bill no 1987 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 70 nays 25 absent 10. Bill was finally passed.

ADDITION- Var 278- June 5, 2003 pg. 41-42. Senate bill no 500. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 23, Nays- 64, Absent- 18. The amendments were rejected.

Var 188- June 5, 2003 pg. 48 and 49 Senate bill no 901 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 83 nays 14 absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 189- June 9, 2003 pg. 23 House bill no 783 Final passage of the bill yeas 71 nays 29 absent 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 190- June 9, 2003 pg. 24 House bill no 787 Final passage of the bill yeas 79 nays 15 absent 11. Bill was finally passed.

Var 191- June 9, 2003 pg. 30 and 31 House bill 1815 Final passages of the bill as amended yeas 89 nays 6 absent 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 192- June 9, 2003 pg. 31 and 32 House bill 1837 Final passage of the bill yeas 91 nays 6 absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 193- June 9, 2003 pg. 34 and 35 House bill 1516 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 57 nays 31 absent 17. Bill was finally passed.

Var 194- June 10, 2003 pg. 29 and 30 House bill 1313 Final passage of the bill yeas 54 nays 42 absent 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 195- June 10, 2003 pg 33 and 34 Senate bill 1019 Final passage of the bill yeas 86 nays 13 absent 6. (Wrong in digest should be: Yeas- 85, Nays- 14, Absent-6). Bill was finally passed.

Var 196- June 10, 2003 pg. 35 and 36 Senate bill 336 Final passage of the bill yeas 83 nays 14 absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 197- June 10, 2003 pg. 37 and 38 Senate bill 512 Final passage of the bill yeas 41 nays 50 absent 14. Bill was finally passed.

Var 198- June 10, 2003 pg. 55 senate bill 106 Final passage of the bill yeas 89 nays 7 absent 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 199- June 10, 2003 pg. 57 senate bill 265 final passage of the bill yeas 9 nays 90 absent 6. Bill failed to pass.

Var 200- June 11, 2003 pg. 16 and 17 house bill 1157 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 49 nays 48 absent 8. Failed to pass.

Var 201- June 11, 2003 pg. 17 house bill 1317 Final passage of the bill yeas 49 nays 47 absent 9. Failed to pass.

Var 202- June 11, 2003 pg. 20 and 21 house bill no 19 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 88 nays 10 absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 203- June 11, 2003 pg 21 and 22 house bill no 771 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 40 nays 57 absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 204- June 11, 2003 pg. 24 and 25 house bill 1876 final passage of the bill yeas 76 nays 20 absent 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 205- June 11, 2003 pg. 30 house bill 2000 final passage of the bill yeas 63 nays 32 absent 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 206- June 11, 2003 pg 32 senate bill 886 final passage of the bill yeas 92 nays 6 absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 207- June 11, 2003 pg. 38 and 39 senate bill 1046 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 83 nays 18 absent 4. Bill was finally passed.

ADDITION: Var 279- June 11, 2003. pg. 43-44. Senate bill no 178. Rep. Morrell moved the bill be indefinitely postponed. Yeas- 52, Nays- 43, Absent- 10. The bill was indefinitely postponed.

Var 208- June 11, 2003 pg 48 senate bill 855 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 95 nays 5 absent 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 209- June 11, 2003 pg. 49 senate bill 110 final passage of the bill yeas 98 nays 5 absent 2. Bill was finally passed.

Var 210- June 11, 2003 pg. 50 Senate bill 71 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 55 nays 42 absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 211- June 11, 2003 pg. 50 and 51 senate bill 320 final passage of the bill yeas 81 nays 19 absent 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 212- June 12, 2003 pg. 20 house bill 28 final passage of the bill yeas 94 nays 6 absent 5. Bill was finally passed.

ADDITION: Var 280- June 12, 2003 pg. 21- 22. House bill no 316. Rep. Scalise moved the adoption of the amendments. Rep. Daniel objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 68, Nays- 27, Absent- 10. The amendments were adopted.

Var 213- June 12, 2003 pg. 23 and 24 house bill 1404 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 73 nays 22 absent 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 214- June 12, 2003 pg. 25 house bill 1663 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 42 nays 53 absent 10. Bill failed to pass.

Var 215- June 12, 2003 pg. 26 house bill 1791 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 46 nays 53 absent 6. Bill failed to pass.

Var 216- June 12, 2003 pg. 27 house bill 1822 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 57 nays 41 absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 217- June 12, 2003 pg. 31 senate bill 767 final passage of the bill yeas 84 nays 9 absent 12. Bill was finally passed.

Var 218- June 12, 2003 pg. 40 and 41 senate bill 11 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 68 nays 29 absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 219- June 16, 2003 pg. 20 and 21 house bill 1157 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 83 nays 10 absent 12. Bill was finally passed.

ADDITION: Var 281- June 16, 2003. pg. 23-24. House bill no 310. Rep. Pinac moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 92, Nays- 5, Absent- 8. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

ADDITION: Var 282- June 16, 2003. pg. 58-59. House bill no 1017. As a substitute motion Rep. Hunter moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. Rep. Devillier objected. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Yeas- 53, Nays- 47, Absent- 5. The amendments proposed by the Senate were rejected.

ADDITION: VAR 283. JUNE 16, 2003 PG. 62-63. HOUSE BILL NO 1090. As a substitute motion Rep. Daniel moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. Rep. Robert Carter objected. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Yeas- 55, Nays- 43, Absent- 7. The amendments proposed by the Senate were rejected.

ADDITION: Var 284- June 16, 2003 pg. 66-68 House bill no 1686. Rep Crane moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 93, Nays- 5, Absent- 7. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

ADDITION: Var 285- June 16, 2003. pg. 68-69. House bill no 1321. Rep. Karen Carter moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 91, Nays- 6, Absent- 8. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

ADDITION: Var 286- June 16, 2003. pg. 70-71. House bill no 121. Rep. Shaw moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. As a substitute motion, Rep. Townsend moved to table the bill. Rep. Shaw objected. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Yeas- 52, Nays- 50, Absent- 3. The House agreed to table the bill.

ADDITION: Var 287- June 16, 2003. Pg. 82. House bill no 232. Rep. Futrell moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 97, Nays- 6, Absent- 2. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

ADDITION: Var 288- June 16, 2003. Pg. 88. House bill no 531. Rep. Pitre moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 91, Nays- 10, Absent- 4. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

ADDITION: Var 289- June 16, 2003. Pg. 94-95. House bill no 1118. Rep. Toomy moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 85, Nays- 15, Absent- 5. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

ADDITION: Var 290- June 16, 2003 pg. 99-101. House bill no 1669. Rep. Thompson moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 78, Nays- 26, Absent- 1. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

ADDITION: Var 291- June 16, 2003 pg. 103-104. House bill no 1017. Rep. Devillier moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 62, Nays- 39, Absent- 4. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 220- June 16, 2003 pg. 106 House bill 1317 Final passage of the bill yeas 61 nays 34 absent 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 221- June 17, 2003 pg. 20 and 21 Senate bill 418 Final passage of the bill yeas 94 nays 6 absent 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 222- June 17, 2003 pg. 21 and 22 Senate bill 518 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 84 nays 14 absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 223- June 17, 2003 pg. 23 Senate bill 663 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 77 nays 19 absent 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 224- June 17, 2003 pg. 38 Senate bill 685 Final passage of the bill yeas 88 nays 9 absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 225- June 17, 2003 pg. 44 and 45 Senate bill 133 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 78 nays 20 absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

ADDITION: Var 292- June 17, 2003 pg. 45-46. Senate bill no 1052. Rep. Ansardi moved to indefinitely postpone the subject matter. Rep. Walker objected. Yeas- 71, Nays- 24, Absent-10. The House agreed to indefinitely postpone the subject matter.

ADDITION: Var 293- June 17, 2003 pg. 47-48. Senate bill no 929. Rep. Swilling moved the adoption of the amendments. Rep. Winston objected. A record vote was asked for and ordered by the House. Yeas- 38, Nays- 51, Absent- 16. The amendments were rejected.

Var 226- June 17, 2003 pg. 47 -49 Senate bill 929 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 87 nays 9 absent 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 227- June 17, 2003 pg. 50 and 51 Senate bill 227 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 93 nays 5 absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 228- June 17, 2003 pg. 52 and 53 Senate bill 349 Final passage of the bill yeas 91 nays 5 absent 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 229- June 18, 2003 pg. 10 - 14 house bill 2029 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 85 nays 6 absent 14. Bill was finally passed.

ADDITION: Var 294- June 18, 2003 pg. 14-15. House bill no 818. As a substitute motion, Rep. Murray moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. Rep. Pinac objected. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Yeas- 30, Nays- 67, Absent- 8. The House refused to reject the amendments.

Addition: Var 295- June 18, 2003 pg.15-16. House bill no 818. Rep. Pinac insisted on his motion that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 79,

Nays- 15, Absent- 11. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Addition: Var 296- June 18, 2003 pg. 46-47. House bill no 633. Rep. Hutter moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 89, Nays- 11, Absent- 5. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Addition: Var 297- June 18, 2003 pg. 81-82. House bill no 409. Rep. Martiny moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 79, Nays- 14, Absent- 12. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 230- June 18, 2003 pg. 94 Senate bill 304 final passage of the bill yeas 79 nays 20 absent 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 231- June 18, 2003 pg. 95 Senate bill 424 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 68 nays 32 absent 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 232- June 18, 2003 pg. 97 and 98 senate bill 477 final passage of the bill yeas 70 nays 28 absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 233- June 18, 2003 pg. 98 and 99 senate bill 98 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 96 nays 7 absent 2. Bill was finally passed.

Var 234- June 18, 2003 pg. 100 and 101 senate bill 481 final passage of the bill yeas 66 nays 35 absent 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 235- June 18, 2003 pg. 101 and 102 senate bill 508 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 42 nays 54 absent 9. Bill failed to pass.

Var 236- June 18, 2003 pg. 105 senate bill 627 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 37 nays 63 absent 5. Bill failed to pass.

Var 237- June 18, 2003 pg. 106 senate bill 706 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 73 nays 27 absent 5. Bill was finally passed.

ADDITION: Var 298- June 19, 2003 pg. 8-9. House bill no 417. Rep. Murray moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas-89, Nays- 9, Absent- 7. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

ADDITION: Var 299- June 19, 2003 pg. 20-21. House bill no 1786. Rep. Alario moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 85, Nays- 15, Absent- 5. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 238- June 19, 2003 pg. 31 senate bill 728 final passage of the bill yeas 46 nays 50 absent 9. Bill failed to pass.

Var 239- June 19, 2003 pg. 32- 35 senate bill 867 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 87 nays 15 absent 3. Bill was finally passed.

Var 240- June 19, 2003 pg. 40-41 senate bill 30. Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 83 nays 16 absent 6. Bill was finally passed.

Var 241- June 19, 2003 pg. 46 senate bill 687 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 63 nays 29 absent 13. Bill was finally passed.

Var 242- June 19, 2003 pg. 47 and 48 senate bill 839 final passage of the bill yeas 90 nays 8 absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

Var 243- June 19, 2003 pg. 53 and 54 senate bill 1101 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 95 nays 6 absent 4. Bill was finally passed.

Var 244- June 19, 2003 pg. 55 senate bill 437 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 63 nays 32 absent 10. Bill was finally passed.

Var 245- June 19, 2003 pg. 66 and 67 senate bill 1032 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 44 nays 49 absent 12. Bill failed to pass.

ADDITION: Var 300- June 19, 2003. Pg. 70-71. Senate bill no 594. Rep. Pinac moved the bill be indefinitely postponed. Yeas- 90, Nays- 5, Absent- 10. The bill was indefinitely postponed.

ADDITION: Var 301- June 21, 2003. Pg. 59-61. House bill no 1681. Rep. Flavin moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 90, Nays- 9, Absent- 6. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House. **Var 246-** June 21, 2003 pg. 93 senate bill 331 Final passage of the bill yeas 92 nays 6 absent 7. Bill was finally passed.

ADDITION: Var 302- June 22, 2003. pg. 17-18. House bill no 1556. Rep. Schwegmann moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 92, Nays- 6, Absent- 7. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Addition: Var 303- June 22, 2003. pg. 19-20. House bill no 1633. Rep. Murray moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 79, Nays-16, Absent-10. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Addition: Var 304- June 22, 2003. pg. 35-36. House bill no 1852. Rep. Robert Carter moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 86, Nays- 7, Absent- 12. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Addition: Var 305- June 22, 2003 pg. 37-38. House bill no 1404. Rep. Townsend moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 87, Nays- 7, Absent-11. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House. **Var 247-** June 22, 2003 pg. 38 and 39 senate bill 732 Final passage of the bill yeas 87 nays 13 absent 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 248- June 22, 2003 pg. 43 and 44 senate bill no 683 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 62 nays 33 absent 10. Bill was finally passed.

ADDITION: Var 306- June 22, 2003 pg. 53-54. House bill no 884. Rep. Heaton moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 82, Nays- 7, Absent-16. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Var 249- June 22, 2003 pg. 72 and 73 senate bill no 1009 final passage of the bill as amended yeas 90 nays 7 absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Var 250- June 22, 2003 pg. 73 and 74 Senate bill 528 Final passage of the bill yeas 71 nays 29 absent 5. Bill was finally passed.

Var 251- June 22, 2003 pg. 77-78 Senate bill 556 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 80 nays 16 absent 9. Bill was finally passed.

Var 252- June 22, 2003 pg. 78- 82 Senate bill 89 Final passage of the bill yeas 92 nays 7 absent 6. Bill was finally passed.

Addition: Var 307- June 23, 2003 pg. 41-42. House bill no 1352. Rep. LaFleur moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas- 92, Nays- 7, Absent- 6. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Addition: Var 308- June 23, 2003 pg. 48-49. House bill no 236. Rep. Townsend moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 92, Nays- 7, Absent- 6. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Addition: Var 309- June 23, 2003- pg. 49-50. House bill no 409. Rep. Martiny moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 71, Nays- 25, Absent- 9. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Addition- Var 310- June 23, 2003 pg. 51-52. House bill No. 862. Rep. Alario moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 91, Nays- 8, Absent- 6. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Addition: Var 311- June 23, 2003 pg. 54-55. House bill no 1416. Rep. Gallot moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 73, Nays- 25, Absent- 7. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Var 253- June 23, 2003 pg. 59 and 60 Senate bill 431 Final passage of the bill yeas 60 nays 13 absent 32. Bill was finally passed.

Var 254- June 23, 2003 pg. 65- 68 Senate bill 1122 Final passage of the bill as amended yeas 89 nays 8 absent 8. Bill was finally passed.

Addition: Var 312- June 23, 2003 pg. 85-86. Senate bill NO. 133. Rep. Salter moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 76, Nays- 20, Absent- 9. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Addition: Var 313- June 23, 2003 pg. 89. House bill no 19. As a substitute motion, Rep. Townsend moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be rejected. Rep. Frith objected. The vote recurred on the substitute motion. Yeas- 28, Nays-64, Absent- 13. The House refused to reject the amendments.

Addition: Var 314- June 23, 2003 pg. 89-90. House bill no 19. Rep. Frith insisted on his motion that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas-79, Nays- 14, Absent- 12. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Addition: Var 315- June 23, 2003 pg. 92-93. Senate bill no 1039. Rep. Townsend moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 94, Nays- 7, Absent- 4. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Addition: Var 316- June 23, 2003 pg. 102-103. House bill no 2027. Rep. Martiny moved that the amendments proposed by the Senate be concurred in. Yeas-78, Nays- 20, Absent- 7. The amendments proposed by the Senate were concurred in by the House.

Addition: Var 317- June 23, 2003. pg. 107. House bill no 398. Rep. Baldone moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 29, Nays- 63, Absent- 13. The House refused to adopt the Conference Committee Report.

Addition: Var 318- June 23, 2003. pg. 126-127. House bill no 1137. Rep. Townsend moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 88, Nays- 8, Absent- 9. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Addition- Var 319- June 23, 2003. Pg. 129-130. House bill no 294. Rep. Martiny moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 61, Nays- 35, Absent- 9. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Addition- Var 320- June 23, 2003. Pg. 131-132. House bill no 1476. Rep. Hebert moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 74, Nays- 20, Absent- 11. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Addition- Var 321- June 23, 2003. Pg. 134-135. Senate bill no. 1111. Rep. Jack Smith moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 83, Nays- 12, Absent- 10. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Addition- Var 322- June 23, 2003. Pg. 137-138. Senate bill no 1122. Rep. Swilling moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 80, Nays- 10, Absent- 15. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

Addition-Var 323- June 23, 2003. Pg. 140-141. House bill no 795. Rep. Martiny moved to adopt the Conference Committee Report. Yeas- 72, Nays- 24, Absent- 9. The Conference Committee Report was adopted.

VITA

She was born in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, on April 5, 1978, to Thomas and Patricia Sandahl. She has an older brother Todd, and a twin brother Trent. She is a graduate of St. Jude Catholic Elementary School and Bishop Sullivan Catholic High School. After High School she continued her catholic education by attending Spring Hill College in Mobile, Alabama. She began college unsure of her academic path, until she took her very first political science class. After that she was hooked. She graduated from Spring Hill College in May 2000 with a Bachelor of Science of Political Science. After college her love for the study of political science led her back home and to graduate school at Louisiana State University, where she currently working on her Masters degree in political science with a concentration in American government. Graduate school at Louisiana State University has been an unbelievable experience. My parents along with my major professor Dr. Garand have been a guiding force in my graduate school education. My long term goal is to achieve a Doctor of Philosophy degree.