

Online Appendix for “Presidents on the Fast Track”

Eric Magar
ITAM

Valeria Palanza
Univ. Católica de Chile

Gisela Sin
University of Illinois

June 15, 2018

1 Dichotomous variables

| Variable | Definition | =0 | =1 | Total |
|------------------------------------|------------|-------|-------|-------|
| <i>Fast track bill (Dep. Var.)</i> | | 927 | 540 | 1,467 |
| | | .632 | .368 | 1 |
| <i>Co-partisan comm. chair</i> | | 832 | 635 | 1,467 |
| | | .567 | .433 | 1 |
| <i>Coalition comm. chair</i> | | 99 | 1,368 | 1,467 |
| | | .067 | .933 | 1 |
| <i>Multiple referrals</i> | | 1,096 | 371 | 1,467 |
| | | .747 | .253 | 1 |
| <i>Hacienda referral</i> | | 732 | 735 | 1,467 |
| | | .499 | .501 | 1 |
| <i>Introduced in Senate</i> | | 1,224 | 243 | 1,467 |
| | | .834 | .166 | 1 |
| <i>Senate majority</i> | | 512 | 955 | 1,467 |
| | | .349 | .651 | 1 |
| <i>Relax deadlines</i> | | 1,094 | 373 | 1,467 |
| | | .746 | .254 | 1 |
| <i>1998–2002</i> | | 1,195 | 272 | 1,467 |
| | | .815 | .185 | 1 |
| <i>2002–2006</i> | | 1,067 | 400 | 1,467 |
| | | .727 | .273 | 1 |
| <i>2006–2010</i> | | 1,075 | 392 | 1,467 |
| | | .733 | .267 | 1 |
| <i>2010–2014</i> | | 1,064 | 403 | 1,467 |
| | | .725 | .275 | 1 |

2 Continuous variables

| Var. | Def. | Min. | Q1 | Med. | Mean | Q3 | Max. | sd |
|-----------------------|------|-------|----|------|------|------|------|------|
| <i>Year remaining</i> | | 0 | 27 | 51 | 51.5 | 75 | 100 | 27.1 |
| <i>Pres. approval</i> | | -39.2 | -8 | 10.7 | 9.5 | 22.3 | 66.3 | 24.2 |

3 Chilean urgency types

Congressional practice is well summarized by the library of Congress at <http://www.bcn.cl/ecivica/formacion/>. The congressional organic law (*Ley Orgánica del Congreso*, arts. 26 and 27) gives presidents the following choices to qualify urgent bills:

1. simple (*urgencia simple*), providing Congress with 30 calendar days for bill consideration;
2. supreme (*urgencia suma*), providing 15 calendar days for consideration); and
3. immediate discussion (*discusión inmediata*), providing 6 calendar days.

By defining what amounts to ‘simple urgency’ only, the constitution sets a floor for the authority, and higher degrees in the organic law are vulnerable to congressional majorities, who might be inclined to relax the deadlines available if that were in their interest. As, in fact, was done once. The organic law was amended in July 2010, four months into the newly elected legislature (and concurrent Piñera presidential administration), substantially relaxing the deadlines for the ‘immediate discussion’ and ‘supreme urgency’ types, originally set at 10 and 3 days, to 15 and 6 days respectively. ‘Simple urgency’ remained unchanged. But the Constitution (art. 66) also raises the bar for relaxing urgency deadlines by requiring the vote of four-sevenths (≈ 57 percent) of each chamber’s membership for the passage and amendment of constitutional organic laws. While this qualified requirement is below the two-thirds needed for constitutional reform, no coalition has exceeded the organic law threshold in both chambers since the return to democracy.

4 Supreme urgency and the closed rule

In the period we examine, the *Cámara*'s standing rules explicitly precluded the second committee report for bills qualified with supreme urgency (*urgencia suma*), ruling out the bill's second reading by mandating that general (i.e., first reading) and particular (i.e., second reading) considerations take place simultaneously. In other words, supreme urgency mandated a closed floor consideration rule, whereas other urgency types did not.

The text of the relevant Reglamento articles follows. Excerpts are from the standing rules adopted in March 10, 2002 (with text updated to March 2010).

Art. 188. When a project is qualified as “**supreme urgency**”, its discussion shall proceed thus: **There will be no second committee report** and the project shall be dispatched by the Chamber in ten days [...] **Discussion shall be general and particular at once**. Only amendments and additions rejected in committee, but renewed with the signature of thirty Deputies, including at least three committee chairs, shall be admitted for discussion and vote [...]

(In Spanish: Art. 188. *Cuando un proyecto sea declarado de “suma urgencia”, se procederá a su discusión en la siguiente forma: No habrá segundo informe de Comisión y el proyecto deberá ser despachado por la Cámara en diez días [...] La discusión se hará en general y particular a la vez. Sólo se admitirán a discusión y votación las indicaciones o disposiciones que, rechazadas por la Comisiones informantes, sean renovadas con las firmas de treinta Diputados que incluyan, a lo menos, a tres Jefes de Comités [...]*)

Art. 189. When a project is qualified as “**immediate discussion**”, its discussion shall proceed thus: The project shall be dispatched by the Chamber in three days [...] **Discussion of these projects shall be general and particular at once. They will not be subject to a second committee report.**

(In Spanish: Art. 189. *Cuando un proyecto sea declarado de “discusión inmediata”, se procederá a su discusión y votación en la forma siguiente: El proyecto deberá ser despachado por la Cámara en tres días [...] La discusión de estos proyectos se hará en general y particular a la vez. No serán sometidos a segundo informe.*)

Cámara rules were amended in 2014 to generalize closed consideration rules for urgencies regardless of degree. This, however, falls outside the time span of the data we analyze.