

Public Affairs Bulletin

Volume I, Number 2
March-April, 1968

*A Publication of the Public Affairs Research Bureau,
Southern Illinois University
Editor: David H. Everson*

ILLINOIS ADOPTS LEGISLATIVE TIME SCHEME: HOW THE NEW 1967 RULES WORKED

by Frederic H. Guild*

In 1967, for the first time, the Illinois legislature attempted to provide a schedule for each major step in the legislative procedure, setting a deadline for final action at each stage. Prior to that session there had been only one deadline in the rules, and that for the House only. This provided that no bills should be introduced after April 14, with certain exceptions. Although in existence for at least twenty years, this rule had never been observed, bills being introduced regularly in each house by unanimous consent daily thereafter down to the closing days of the session, as late as June 25, in 1965. In the 1965 session 45% of the bills were introduced after this alleged deadline. With a striking 23% increase in introductions in 1965 over 1963 (3590 in 1965 as against 2916 in 1963) the end result in the closing days of the 1965 session was the most serious "log jam" which Illinois had ever experienced. In order to clear the calendars on third reading (i.e., final passage), the Senate passed 518 bills in less than three and a half hours on Sunday afternoon, June 27th, and the House similarly handled 365 bills the following day.

However, long before the closing log jam had become evident, the 1965 legislature had already provided for the creation of a special interim Commission on the Organization of the General Assembly, to report to the 1967 legislative session. In this it was participating in the nationwide awakened interest in the legislature, evidenced by creation of similar study groups in 37 states over a four-year period. In part, this interest developed with the creation of the National Legislative Conference, which brought together the various State legislative staffs, and the legislators supervising them, for discussion of mutual problems and experience. This was under the aegis of the Council of State Governments, which began the assembling and publication of a substantial amount of information on state legislatures. Subsequently the Legislative Leadership Conference developed a more specialized exchange between the presiding officers and floor leaders. Later a private organization, the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, developed further research and liaison with the official state interim committees and private groups. In the meantime, various groups entered the field with a more academic focus, developing conferences and literature which had never before been available.

*Frederic H. Guild is senior consultant for the Public Affairs Research Bureau and professor of political science in the Southern Illinois University Department of Government.

In this movement, the special Illinois Commission made its contribution by an extensive report covering all aspects of possible modernization of the legislative structure and process. Modernization was in the air, and the Illinois legislature in 1967 proceeded to adopt much of that report.

The particular part of the commission's report with which the present article is concerned relates to the attempt to set up a definite, comprehensive time schedule for the various stages of the legislative procedure, the establishment of deadlines with a specific time for final action at each step. As a result of the Commission's recommendations, the two houses of the legislature did adopt such a deadline schedule, the Senate by adding to Rule 5, and the House by inserting Rule 32 (a). The original schedules, which were identical in dates, with one slight exception for committee reports, May 25 or 26, were as follows:

Original Deadlines Under The New Schedule

May 1	Last day for introduction of all bills
May 19	Final day for Standing Committees to report bills originating in their own house, except those rereferred to a second committee.
May 25 - House)	(Final date for Standing Committees
May 26 - Senate)	--(to report bills originating in that house which had been rereferred.
June 7	Final date for third reading and passage of bills originating in that house.
June 17	Final date for Standing Committees to report bills from the other house.
June 27	Final date for third reading and passage of bills from the other house.
June 30	Final date for consideration and adoption of conference committee reports.

The primary objective of this article is merely to present the facts to show how well these deadlines worked. There is some information as to why the deadline was considered desirable; what problems developed, and, of course,

instances where it was found necessary to shift the date, or to make exceptions. These are considered in order of the stages in the legislative process.

Before proceeding to this specific detail, however, two facts should be noted. The first is that such deadlines were by no means new. In fact, some of them have been quite common in other states for nearly 50 years. More than half the state constitutions specify a restrictive deadline for final adjournment. A few legislatures are limited to from 36 to 61 calendar days. A large group have 90-day sessions. If the state is small and the number of bills not large, there may be little difficulty. Otherwise, there is danger of a bad log jam at the close of the session. "Stopping the clock" is a well-known expedient in such cases, with the last legislative day extending into the small hours of the morning or well into the next day. Moreover, there have been, irregularly, instances where appropriation bills and revenue measures were not completed and the legislature had to return shortly for a special session to complete its work. Increasingly, more states have had from one to three special sessions in the biennium. This lengthening of time in sessions accounts in part for the increasing number of states turning to annual sessions, since the volume of work has increased without any change in the limitation on length of the regular session. So most of these states have had a limitation on introduction of bills, usually just before the middle of the session, and others have had a time limit for consideration of their own bills, to give the second house more time for consideration. But few have attempted to put a complete schedule in their rules. In fact, the states which appear to be most successful with deadlines usually set such limitations each session, according to the situation encountered in that particular session. When this is done by concurrent or joint resolution, as it is frequently, so that one house alone cannot change the date or make exceptions, these deadlines seem to have held fairly well, with stopping the clock as an expedient held in reserve. Illinois, consequently, is not in the vanguard in deadlines, but it is one of a very few states which have recently attempted a comprehensive schedule for all procedures.

The second fact is far more important. Illinois, meeting for six months, has been one of the "leisure" states, that is, with no rigidly fixed date on which it must adjourn. To be sure, while the constitution itself does not set an adjournment date, another section of the constitution does provide that bills shall take effect on July 1, after passage, except with an emergency clause and a two-thirds vote. The latter is obviously difficult to secure on any hotly contested, controversial matter. Hence, until 1967, June 30 has regularly been understood to be the date for final adjournment in Illinois. (In 1967, for the first time, the session recessed on June 30, to meet in September, October, and March.) But normally, that is, except in the last three or four sessions, for thirty to forty years there just has not been any great need for haste. The volume of bills was not yet great. January was for organization, a meeting of only four or five days in this month; House committees were not appointed until the last January session; and only a few emergency measures were handled promptly. In February and March meetings were held only on Tuesday and Wednesday, with a few Thursdays creeping in by April; then three to four days a week in May and four to five in June only. Committees settled down to work leisurely in February. Barely half the bills were in by the middle of April. Committee reports were building up work on the

floor steadily but in no great volume until well along April.

Consequently, the new schedule in the rules constituted a drastic, dramatic break with the past. It virtually demanded that members shed their leisurely habits, their former legislative behavioral patterns developed over the years, and turn to something akin to the industrial production line. Would it work? Would it be accepted generally? Could "the leadership" secure the cooperation from committee chairmen and from individual members and--even from the "pressure groups"--necessary to hold sufficiently fast to the schedule? The answer, generally, although not in all particulars, was, in 1967 definitely "yes."

The May 1 deadline for introduction of bills and the June 7 deadline for final passage of bills by the first house seem to have worked particularly well. The deadline for committee reports proved to be too tight, particularly with the large volume of bills introduced May 1 and a few days prior thereto, and had to be extended. Obviously, some exceptions had to be made to such rules to handle the actual situation which developed in that particular session. The appropriation and revenue measures had always come up for decision late in the session, and excepting these from deadlines did still crowd the June 27 deadline for consideration of bills by the second house, but the situation did not become serious.

The Legislative Load

The fundamental reason for increased interest in recent sessions may be more apparent with a brief digression for the purpose of analyzing more clearly what had been happening the past ten years to augment materially the volume of work the legislature was facing. The common method in the past has been to compare the number of bills introduced. The tabulation below shows the Illinois situation for the last four sessions, and a comparison with three selected sessions back to 1945. (see Table 1, page 3)

This table poses the problem at a glance or two. By 1963 the Illinois legislature was handling nearly as many bills each session as in the 1945 and 1947 sessions combined. The increase, alone, from 1961 was greater than the entire number of bills in the 1945 session.

Blissfully unaware of the impending "bill explosion" shortly to burst upon it, the Illinois legislature was nevertheless among the first to become concerned about some modernization of its situation, as evidenced by the fact that it was one of the earliest states to create a legislative council, in 1937. In 1945 it established an interim committee for the revision of House and Senate rules, which reported in 1947 that it was recommending no major changes. It did suggest some minor revisions in the House Rules, but stated that its Senate members saw no reason for changes in the rules of the Senate. The leisurely patterns of the past apparently would suffice.

Table 1 shows how the situation on bills introduced had changed by 1965. The Commission had numerous important recommendations as to desirable, or essential, changes, not merely on time schedules and other procedures but also on compensation, quarters, and other facilities for legislators, and adequate staffing to meet the modern conditions.

Total "Bill Decisions"

In statistical analysis in the past, the basic figures

TABLE I

Bills Introduced

Increase in number and percent over selected sessions, with 1945 Base.

Session	Total Bills Introduced	Increase in number and Percentage			
		Over prior session cited		Over 1945 Base	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1967	4,268	678	18.88	2,761	183.21
1965	3,590	674	23.1	2,083	138.22
1963	2,916	236	8.8	1,409	93.43
1961	2,680	522	24.19	1,173	77.84
1955	2,158	483	28.83	651	43.19
1947	1,675	168	11.14	168	11.14
1945	1,507				

TABLE II

Real Bill Load In Each House

	1965	1945
House Bills introduced in the House	<u>2,269</u>	<u>835</u>
Senate Bills received by the House	<u>1,059</u>	<u>445</u>
Gross total of bills which were handled by the House	3,328	1,280
Senate bills introduced in the Senate	1,321	672
House bills received by the Senate	<u>1,637</u>	<u>421</u>
Gross total of bills which were handled by the Senate	2,958	1,093
Gross Total Bill Decisions For The Session	6,286	2,373

TABLE IV

May 1: Introduction Deadline

1967. Bills introduced through May 1:

House Bills	2,430	-	97.8% of the	2,485	total
Senate "	<u>1,772</u>	-	<u>99.3</u>	"	<u>1,783</u> "
	4,202		98.45	"	4,268 "

1965. Same period.

House Bills	1,431	-	63.1	"	2,269 "
Senate "	<u>900</u>	-	<u>68.1</u>	"	<u>1,321</u> "
	2,331	-	64.9	"	3,590 "

TABLE VI

Bill Introductions: April 15 - May 1, and after May 1

	1967				1965			
	House Number	%	Senate Number	%	House Number	%	Senate Number	%
April 15 thru May 1	1,050	42.3	596	33.4	183	8.1	70	5.3
After May 1	55	3.2	11	.6	838	37.0	421	31.8

TABLE VII
 PASSAGE OF BILLS, AROUND DEADLINES OF JUNE 7 AND 10, 1967

Bills Acted Upon On Third Reading

Date	HOUSE			SENATE		
	House Bills	Senate Bills	Total	Senate Bills	House Bills	Total
June 5	109	1	110	31	-	31
6	96	5	101	51	-	51
7	27	-	27	58	-	58
8	88	1	89	3	84	87
9	70	-	70	-	49	49
10	No Session (Saturday)			No Session (Saturday)		
Totals	390	7	397	143	133	276

TABLE VIII

The Comparable 1965 Situation

Date	Senate Bills in Senate	House Bills in House	Date	Senate Bills in Senate	House Bills in House
June 7	9	38	18	-	28
8	13	30	21	-	48
9	9	19	22	-	55
10	24	37	23	2	59
11	13	--	24	97	74
14	38	33	25	7	46
15	1	47	26	11	12
16	-	22	27	2	--
17	-	43	28	--	25
			Total	226	616

TABLE IX

BILLS HANDLED LAST THREE DAYS OF SESSION IN EACH HOUSE:

	<u>-1967-</u>								<u>-1965-</u>							
	June 28		June 29*		June 30		Total		June 28		June 29		June 30		Total	
	H	S	H	S	H	S	H	S	H	S	H	S	H	S	H	S
2nd Reading	3	24	16	65	*	*	19	89	44	50	26	42	*	*	70	92
3rd Reading	56	15	65	102	26	137	147	254	365	33**	88	104	41	159	494	296
Concur.	7	-	3	42	131	61	141	103	24	1	-	53	119	16	143	70
Conf. Ctee.	2	-	-	11	38	28	40	39	-	-	-	-	47	47	47	47
	<u>68</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>195</u>	<u>226</u>	<u>347</u>	<u>485</u>	<u>433</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>114</u>	<u>199</u>	<u>207</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>754</u>	<u>505</u>
Gross House & Senate	107		304		421		832		517		313		429		1,259	

*Those recalled for Amendment are included in 3rd Reading.

**Senate had passed 518 House Bills on June 27.

ed upon have been primarily the number of bills introduced. For Illinois in 1965 the figures given show: total introduced 3,590; 2,269 in the House and 1,321 in the Senate. For the 1967 session, i.e., through June 30, the total was 4,268; 2,485 in the House and 1,783 in the Senate. This, however, is an entirely inadequate presentation of the bill load on the House and on the Senate.

What has been overlooked frequently is the fact, that, in addition to the bills introduced in the house of origin, each house must also handle all of the bills received by it after they have been passed by the other house. And, of course, these must receive the same handling as the bills originally introduced in each house. This presents an entirely different total for the work load of each house, and consequently of the entire legislature, as demonstrated by the tabulation, in Table II on page 3.

In other words, there is a gross understatement of 2,696 bill decisions or bill handlings when the original introduction of 3,590 bills is used to measure the work load of the 1965 session, instead of gross numbers of bill decisions. Preliminary estimates, subject to correction when the computer processing is complete, indicate that the 4,268 bills introduced in 1967, required more than 7,200 individual bill decisions.

Moreover, utilization of the "gross bills" figures instead of the "bills introduced" makes a substantial difference in the comparison of work loads in different sessions, as the following tabulation demonstrates:

Table III
Increase in Real Bills: 1945-1965

	1945	1965	Increase	% Increase
Bills Introduced	1,507	3,590	2,083	138.2
Gross bills	2,373	6,286	3,914	164.9

Consequently, the actual increase in work load has been much greater than apparent merely from bills introduced. Careful analysis of all the sessions since 1945 bears this out. The 1951 session is the only exception, with a sudden increase of 400 gross bills over 1949, followed by a reduction of 500 bills, to less than in 1946 and in 1953. Aside from that session, there has been a steady increase in bills introduced, as already shown, but even greater in gross bill decisions, particularly since 1953.

The significance here is merely that the 4,268 introductions in 1967 apply in considering deadline schedules in the first house, that is, the house of origin. The deadline for passage therein, June 7 or 10, and the deadlines preceding these, were for the purpose of expediting the 4,268 bills originally introduced, to guarantee time for consideration by the second house. Hence the subsequent deadlines applied only to the 2,696 bills which went to the second house.

Introduction of Bills

To return, then, to the deadline scheduled for the introduction of the 4,268 bills, all of them had to be introduced in the respective houses by May 1. As will be noted in the Table IV on page 3, this deadline was kept remarkably well.

Another approach, however, indicates that the adoption of the introduction deadline had little effect on the first few months of the session, and, consequently, that the last two weeks in April had to bear the full brunt of the

congestion because of the new restriction. Taking April as about the middle of the work period of the session, and also because the House carried this date for years in its rules as deadline for introduction, although never enforced, introduction comparisons for the first part of the session were:

Table V
Introductions Through April 14th

	1965		1967	
	Number	%	Number	%
House	1,248	55.0	1,380	55.5
Senate	830	62.8	1,176	66.0

For the first three and a half months of the 1967 session, consequently, the House, percentage-wise, had not accelerated its pace over 1965 and the Senate increase was slight. Numerically, the 1967 introductions were an increase over 1965 of 600 bills, or 18.9%; 216 House Bills, and 464 Senate Bills. It might be concluded that the two houses had absorbed the increase, at least in part, but had not gained on it. Of course, the full impact of the new schedules was probably not well understood at the beginning of the session, and hence there was little acceleration of effort.

The effect of this may be more readily discernible, in comparison, by noting what took place after May 1 in the two sessions. Table VI on page 3 shows introductions from April 15 to May 1, inclusive, for the two sessions, and introductions after the May 1 date.

This was a remarkably good showing. Only 66 bills, or 1.02%, in 1967 were introduced after the original deadline, as contrasted with 1,259, or 35.19% in 1965. Some exceptions had to be made; while they were few in number, many were significant in content. It soon became evident that it would not be possible or desirable to insist that all appropriation and revenue bills must be in by May 1. The governor's budget message did not come in until the middle of April. Obviously, there would be appropriation considerations not determined until late May or even June and it might not be possible to draft some revenue measures until most appropriations were acted upon. Hence these two categories of bills were excluded, not only from this but also from other deadlines. But the number involved in the extension proved to be relatively few in number.

Two additional facts are immediately noticeable. The first is the very large number of introductions in 1967 in the two weeks before the May 1 deadline. Out of a total of 2,485 House bills, over 40% were introduced in the two weeks from April 15 through May 1, inclusive. In fact, 478, or 19% of all House bills introduced, were introduced on the single day of May 1. On the same day 209 Senate bills (11.75%) were introduced. The total was 687 bills, or 16.1% in a single day--certainly a record for Illinois.

The second fact is that, whereas 1,259 bills (838 House; 421 Senate) had been introduced after May 1 in 1965, only 66 bills (55 House; 11 Senate) were introduced after that date in 1967 despite the fact that there had been an increase of 678 bills. In effect more than 1875 bills were pushed back to the May 1 date under the new deadline, as contrasted with the 1965 session, and only bills in excepted categories, mostly appropriations and revenue, came in after that: a substantial accomplishment.

Naturally the deadline put considerable pressure on

legislative membership. Each legislator had to decide much more rapidly than hitherto, how many bills to introduce, the major objective in each, and more particularly the precise legal content, with conferences to secure co-sponsors. However, since this task was divided among 177 members of the House and 58 members of the Senate, it averaged out about seven bills per member, so that this work load on legislators was by no means as great as the totals would indicate.

The major pressure was on the staff, particularly the bill drafters. It must have been a physically impossible task for all of these bills to have been handled by the regular bill drafting staff of the Legislative Reference Bureau. Many bills must have been drafted privately, by individuals or interim committees, and the bill drafters surely did not even have time to review these private drafts as to correctness of form, references, etc.

This strain on the staff, performing a background, out-of-sight task, is usually overlooked entirely by the general public, and unfortunately is rarely appreciated by many members of the legislature. One of the accomplishments of the 1967 session, as a result of the deadline, was an awareness of the problem and provision for an increase in the permanent drafting staff for future sessions. If the uninitiated desires a realistic approach to such staff problems, it may be sufficient to recall to them that, for introduction, each bill must be typed and accompanied by four copies. So, entirely apart from the technique of bill drafting, there was the task of typing, proof reading and correcting approximately 1800 bills in a short two weeks. The staff congestion and pressure must have been terrific, not overlooking the pressures on the staff of the chief clerk and secretary.

Then, too, there is the printer's problem. Each bill must be printed on introduction. In a relatively normal day, most of the bills will be printed and on the members' desk the next morning, as are the daily Journal and calendars. With the May 1 deadline, and with 687 bills introduced on that day the printer was hard pressed for more than a week to deliver bills which should have been on members' desks the next day. Moreover, until the printed bills were available there was delay in committee consideration, increasing the pressure on the deadline for committee reports. Moreover, the Journals show that more than a week elapsed before journals could be approved, because they had not been printed. This was an awkward break in the normal legislative information which each legislator expected to have in the daily journal and bills on his desk each morning, to check the actions taken the preceding day. But each house survived this vacuum.

Deadline For Committee Reports

Obviously, with the great volume of introductions on May 1 and immediately preceding, the burden imposed on committees was too great. The May 19 deadline provided little time. On May 18 the deadline for House committee reports was extended to May 23 for the Executive Committee, and to May 26 for Appropriations and Judiciary, and for the latter again to May 31. On May 18 the Senate simply extended the deadline for appropriation and revenue measures without a date. There were a few other special exceptions but otherwise the deadlines held.

There was an additional new rule increasing com-

mittee work by requiring that all bills must be referred to committees except in instances of "demonstrable emergency." This had been occasioned by an increasing development of a legislative behavioral pattern under which, on introduction, many sponsors secured unanimous consent for immediate first reading, and advancement to second reading without reference to committee. In 1965, with 3,590 bills introduced, there were 1977 instances of such action "without reference." At first this was misunderstood to mean that more than half the bills failed to go to committee. Since, however, many of these bills went without reference in both houses, many had been counted twice. For accurate comparison, it is necessary to return to the tabulation showing that 3,590 bills meant 6,286 bill considerations in the two houses, i.e., including both the bills originally introduced and those received by the second house from the first house. Nevertheless that was 31.45%, still nearly one third of the gross bills handled.

Preliminary count has thus far identified 1432 instances of "without reference" in 1967, a reduction of 545, or 27.6%. Since the 1967 session had an increase of 678 bills over 1965, this means that the committees had an increased burden, over 1965, of 1,223 bills.

The June 7 Deadline For Passage Of Bills In The House Of Origin

The House extended the date to June 10, generally, and to June 14 for appropriations, revenue and highway bills. The Senate maintained the original date, but with similar exceptions without date, a policy the House later followed. This deadline provided no particular problems or frantic congestion. Bills were moved steadily from second reading to third reading and passage. There were a few heavy days. The situation is best disclosed by Table VII on page 4. It will be noted that the rule required the House to clear House bills and the Senate the Senate bills by passage on or before the deadline date.

Naturally each house was busy clearing its own bills in this period, and for a week prior to June 5. The Senate met the deadline quite well, with only three Senate bills on the 8th (appropriation and revenue bills excepted), and was able to proceed to House Bills on that date.

The House had extended its deadline to June 10, and was able to meet that deadline. The calendars were cleaned so well (partly by tablings, of course) that neither house had to hold a session on Saturday, June 10. Of course many bills exempted from the deadlines came in later in both houses, but the above indicates successful observance of this deadline.

Contrast with June, 1965

To show the relief afforded the second house by earlier handling of bills in the first house by the June 7-10 deadline, there are given in Table VIII the daily figures of bills which were disposed of on Third Reading in the house of origin in the previous session on and after June 7, 1965.

This was a fairly heavy work load to pass on to the second house so late in the session. It gave that house less than 15 work days, and for much of it less than 9 work days, to handle these new assignments, while still struggling with the back log already accumulated on its calendars. It is immediately apparent that the June 7-10 deadline in 1967 aided materially in eliminating this situation.

June 17 Deadline For Committee Reports

The original schedule which set June 17 as the deadline for reports from standing committees on bills in the second house apparently produced no congestion. That deadline happened to fall on a Saturday. The House did not hold a meeting on that day. It had cleared the deadline on the 16th, and did so with relatively few reports coming in on that date. Of course the appropriation and revenue bills and a few others had been excepted from the deadline and reports on these continued until late June, but a substantial number of these bills, and others before the deadline, were handled "without reference" to committees and hence were not involved in the committee report deadline.

The Senate did hold a perfunctory session of 30 minutes on Saturday, June 17, for such reports and other routine business, but only 44 reports from three committees came in at that time, although 143 bills had been reported on the preceding day. Hence the deadline was a bit tight but held rather well in both houses.

Final Passage - The June 27, 1967
Deadline

No intensive analysis of the end of the session "log jam" will be possible until after computer analysis, but the following tentative information, for which there are accurate minimum figures, is of some significance. They are taken from the journal entries.

In general, the heavy "bill-volume" log jam, habitual in prior sessions, was fairly well broken up by the new rules. The pushing back of the deadline for bills in the house of origin, and for bills from the other house, really created two smaller log jams for those deadlines in each house, but their composition, and resolution, requires computer analysis. Tabulations in Table IX present a comparison of the closing days of the 1965 and 1967 sessions.

The break-through in 1965 in the Senate was on June 27, when the Senate passed 518 bills on third reading on a Sunday afternoon, from 3:00 P.M. to 6:25 P.M.--at the rate of better than two bills per minute. The House break-through came on June 28 in 1965 with 365 bills on third reading. Incidentally, these two spectacular performances, numerically or statistically, greatly exceeded any similar calendar clearance over the country which the present writer has noted in his 40-odd years of experience in the field.

The particular point here is that nothing of the kind was required in Illinois in 1967. The new rules, while not entirely successful, at this point did operate to spread the end-of-the-session load far more evenly than in former sessions.

Since the original deadline rule for June 27 had contemplated reserving the three days of June 28, 29, and 30 solely for concurrence and conference, the tabulation in Table IX, page 4, for 1967 presents the extent to which this objective was not accomplished. These were bills which had been exempted from one or more deadlines, including, of course, the June 27 date. Many of the bills in the exempted categories were handled in time to meet the deadlines at a point prior to June 27. Those which remained were not a light load for the three days, but even so were barely 66% of the corresponding load for the 1965 session. A summary of the preceding tabulation will bring

out the point.

Table X
Bills Disposed Of In Last Three Days Of
Session

		1967	1965
Second and Third Reading	House	166	564
" " " "	Senate	343	398
	Total	409	962

The exempted bills in 1967 were primarily appropriation and revenue measures. The 1965 figures included many bills in other categories, and the load in 1965 was more than twice as great as that in 1967.

Concurrence And conferences

While the deadline observance greatly reduced the work load for these three days in 1967, the concurrence and conference volume was greater in 1967, largely because a special period had been set aside for these particular actions.

Table XI

		1967	1965
Concurrence and Conference	House	169	196
" " "	Senate	181	117
	Total	350	307

These bill procedures for which the period was designed provided a fairly busy three days. Adding to this the exempted bills on second and third reading handled in the same period resulted in a minor log jam, with a flurry of overloading, but still a big relief from the overloading of these three days in 1965.

All of the above, thus far, has been statistical. Bill volume shows the ostensible log jam, which is not inconsiderable. But the legislature has ways of clearing calendars rapidly, particularly where the bills concerned, although late comers, are completely uncontested, and will ultimately be passed by a unanimous vote, or with negligible opposition. However, a very real log jam occurs when there is controversy and delay in final decision-making, regardless of the statistical volume. An illustration in the 1965 session was the adoption of the house joint resolution submitting the proposed amendment of the revenue article of the constitution. Obviously, the legislature experienced great difficulty in arriving at any agreement on the new constitutional language. At the last possible moment a compromise was drafted. Introduced in the House on June 29, it was adopted immediately. In the Senate, on June 30, it was amended the same day. The House concurred, and the proposal was adopted, with only one day for consideration in each house. The negative reception given the proposal at the general election clearly indicated the need for more extended time in the session to arrive at a real consensus. Time lapse became the dominant factor--two days left, with those two days required for the action. The question before the legislature on June 28 was: Shall it be nothing, or the best compromise we can get by tomorrow?

Now the particular point here is that precisely the same type of decision making faced the 1967 session. Despite the fact that the log jam pressure, measured by statistical volume, had been greatly reduced, the problem

EDITOR'S NOTES

... time was revenue. On June 24, a package of 15 revenue bills (H.B. 2471-2485) had not yet been introduced, with six days remaining in the session, and with the constitution requiring reading on three separate days in each house. Another package of five bills (H.B. 2466-2470) had also been introduced on the 24th. Another revenue package of eight bills (S.B. 1775-1782) had passed the Senate on the 28th. Most of these were finally passed, and approved by the governor.

This required expert handling. For the Senate bills, the procedure was simple. The House had to receive them on the same day they passed the Senate, the 28th; suspend the rules for immediate first reading, without reference to committee, and immediate advancement to second reading. Then second reading on the 29th and third reading and passage on the 30th were within the constitutional requirement.

The first two packages required a bit more planning. So a special "perfunctory session" was held on Sunday, June 25. At that time these bills were introduced and were treated like the others with suspension of rules for immediate first reading, without reference to committee, and immediate reference to second reading for the next day. This provided six days, for a reading each day, without much time for floor consideration, but sufficient to meet the constitutional requirement of readings on three separate days in each house.

In 1967, at least one of the bills in the packages was caught in a decision-making log jam. That bill, of course, was the one amending the inheritance tax law. The outburst of opposition--popular and administrative--which followed immediately, and the fact that the legislature in its September and October sessions, retracted and revised the substantive law in that bill requires no further comment.

Consequently, the 1967 session did have some log jam problems, and part of these were not eliminated or affected by the new time schedules. The time-lapse problem was pushed back to several stages earlier in the session, and hence provided relief for the closing days, except for the appropriation and revenue bills, and a few others specifically exempted from the deadlines. This left some congestion at the end of the session. The decision-making jam was probably lightened somewhat for the closing days by the focusing on decision making at the deadlines earlier in the session, particularly in the first house, but was not eliminated. On the other hand, in general the "bill-volume" congestion, so obvious in the 1965 session, was greatly reduced, although the three log jams together continued to provide a substantial work load in the final weeks.

Obviously, the statistical method has limitations. The computer can merely sort, coordinate and count. It can deliver no value judgments, and none, consequently, are intended herein. But the statistical method can explore and discover significant areas, and hence point up possible problems. These may merit additional study, of perhaps a different character, in order that, in the future, there can be a better, more comprehensive understanding of behavioral patterns in the legislative process.

The next issue of the Bulletin will feature an article by Jack VanDerSlik on the subject of the voting patterns of Southern Democrats in the 88th Congress. This piece should shed some light on a subject which is often speculated about, but less often examined empirically, the so-called "Conservative Coalition."

Fred Guild will present a paper entitled "An Analysis of Legislative Devices to Copo with Work Load in Illinois" at the annual Midwest Political Science Association Meeting, May 2-4 in Chicago. At the same meeting, Government Department member, Stephen Wasby, will chair a panel on Constitutions and Constitutional Policies.

Bureau Director, David Kenney, will speak to the Central Illinois Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration in Springfield, Illinois on the subject, "Today's Needs for Constitutional Change," on March 19. He will be one of three participants on a panel discussion: "Outlook for a New Constitution in Illinois."

.....

The following is a list of Public Affairs Research Bureau publications which are available upon request:

1. The Politics of Reapportionment in Illinois by James L. McDowell - - - \$2.00
2. Urbanism in Illinois by Seymour Mann and Ronald Boyce - - - \$1.50
3. State Supervision Over Local Government In Illinois by Irving Howards - - - \$2.00
4. Legislative Councils After Thirty Years by Frederic H. Guild - - - \$1.00
5. County Government in Illinois by Irving Howards and Clyde Snider - - - \$2.00
6. Source Book on Illinois County Government - - - Free
7. The Special Assessment in Oak Lawn by Donald Hermann - - - \$1.00
8. An Analysis of Municipal Licensing in the City of Evanston by Wayne F. Anderson - - - \$2.00
9. City Manager Government in Illinois - - - \$0.50

ORDER BLANK

PUBLIC AFFAIRS RESEARCH BUREAU
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CARBONDALE, ILLINOIS 62901

Please send me _____ copies of _____

_____ (title and number)

Bill me _____ or Payment enclosed _____

Name _____

Address _____
