Spring 2004 Dr. Roger C. Lowery

## PLS 405, Section 1 AMERICAN PARTIES AND PRESSURE GROUPS Part V: The Party in Government PARTIES IN CONGRESS AND STATE LEGISLATURES

I. How the legislative parties are organized

- A. Party organization in the Congress
  - 1. Organizing Congress Boxes, pp. 255 & 256
    - a. Changes in House party leaders' power
      - (1) The revolt against "Czar" Cannon
        - (a) Appointment of committees, chairs, and staffs
        - (b) Rules committee control of floor debate
      - (2) Growing party coordination
        - (a) The seniority rule and autocratic committee chairs 1911 to 1960s
        - (b) Committee-chair appointments
          - i) Democratic chairs are subject to Democratic-party-caucus secret-ballot challenge;
            ii) Republican chairs are subject to a 6-year term limit
        - (c) Committee-member assignments made by party steering committee chosen by party caucus
        - (d) Rules Committee membership Democratic Speaker, subject to party caucus approval
      - (e) Policy leadership (through ideologically cohesive and polarized party caucuses)
    - b. The Gingrich revolution (new powers to choose committee and subcommittee chairs)
    - c. ... and its aftermath (charges of ethics violations and loss of 5 seats in 1998 midterm election)
- B. Parties in the "individualist Senate"
  - 1. Erosion of the old "club" rules of reciprocity, specialization, and apprenticeship with powerful committees to a much more individualistic body
  - 2. Increased filibustering and non-germane amendments
- C. Parties in the state legislatures
  - 1. Great diversity in party cohesion and polarization
  - 2. Great diversity in balance between leadership & party-caucus influence
- II. The uses of party influence
  - A. Carrots and sticks
    - 1. Pork-barrel legislation
    - 2. Committee assignments
    - 3. Office staff
    - 4. Office location and space
    - 5. Campaign support
    - 6. Committee chair or member assignment
  - B. Limiting factors
    - 1. Constituent influence
    - 2. Primary-election system
    - 3. Committee system
    - 4. Seniority rule
    - 5. Personal ambition

## III. Party influence on legislative voting

- A. How unified is each legislative party
  - Party votes
     Figure 13.1, pp. 264-65; Figure 13.2, p. 265
     % of roll-call votes on which a majority of one party opposed a majority of the other party for both sessions combined
    - a. 1800s: high
    - b. 1910-1930s: decline
    - c. 1930: increase
    - d. 1940s-1960s: decline
    - e. 1970s-present: increase

- 2. Party cohesion: Figure 13.3, p. 266 average % of members voting in agreement with a majority of the party on party votes
  - a. 1961-1970 decrease
  - b. 1970-present increase especially after Voting Rights Act & Southern conservative realignments
- B. When are the parties most unified
  - 1. On issues that touch the interest of the legislative parties
    - a. Votes to organize chambers
    - b. Awarding disputed seats
    - c. In state legislatures (redistricting & election regulations)
  - 2. On the executive's proposals Figure 13.4, p. 268
  - 3. On policies central to the party system (classic realignment issues)
    - a. Party voting and cohesion highest around realignment election
    - b. Tend to decline as the prevailing party system ages and dealignment sets in
- C. Other sources of unified parties
  - 1. Directly related to strength of party leadership in the legislature
  - 2. Inversely related to level of party competition in individual districts (higher party voting and cohesion scores for legislators from "safe" compared to "marginal" districts
  - 3. Directly related to level of party competition in the legislature chamber (large majority parties are more subject in internal divisions regional and personal)
- IV. The limits on party power
- V. When constituency interferes with party unity
  - A. "Blue Dog" Democrats: Southern conservatives
  - B. Progressive Republicans: northeastern moderates
- VI. Comparing party power in Congress and state legislatures
  - A. Greater political homogeneity (of constituents) results in higher levels of intra-party homogeneity at state level
  - B. No competing centers of power
    - 1. Committee system stronger and more autonomous in Congress
    - 2. Seniority system less important in states because less careerism
  - C. Stronger (state and local) party organizations
    - 1. Whose leaders are often legislative leaders as well
    - 2. Offer greater election campaign financing
    - 3. Control of nominations stronger at state and local level
    - 4. Availability of patronage and preferences bigger factor in control of state legislatures
  - D. Lesser legislative professionalism
    - 1. Length of career: 30% average turnover per term in state legislatures
    - 2. Length of legislative sessions: part-time job in most states
    - 3. Staff and budget resources extremely limited in most states
    - 4. Compensation, benefits and perks of office quite low in most states

VII. Legislative parties: fighting for power Box, p. 275

- A. Because of fragmentation of power and representation in the U.S.
- B. U.S. legislators are far more influenced by their constituents than by party leaders
- C. However, party identification is still the best predictor of votes in state legislatures and Congress