

RESEARCH RESPONSE

PATRICK D. O'GRADY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTIONS TO AMEND THE ILLINOIS CONSTITUTION OF 1970

Overview

A total of 889 resolutions have been introduced to date in the General Assembly proposing to amend the Illinois Constitution of 1970. The most common topics for resolutions have been legislative terms, sessions, and procedures; judicial selection methods; and taxes.

The General Assembly has sent 16 proposed amendments to the voters; nine were approved. Those sent to the voters were as follows:

Approved (nine):

- 1 expanding the class of accused persons who may be denied bail (1982)
- 1 further expanding the class of accused persons who may be denied bail (1986)
- 1 guaranteeing to crime victims rights to communicate with the prosecution, attend court proceedings, and receive information on cases involving them (1992)
- 1 changing the right of criminal defendants to meet witnesses against them "face to face" into a right to be "confronted" by those witnesses (1994)
- 1 changing the intended legislative adjournment date from June 30 to May 31 (1994)
- 2 shortening the redemption periods on some kinds of property sold for non-payment of taxes (1980 and 1990)
- 1 reducing the residency requirement for voters from 6 months to 30 days (1988)
- 1 changing the makeup of the Illinois Courts Commission (1998)

Defeated (seven):

- 1 to limit the breadth of amendatory vetoes
- 1 to mandate "equality of educational opportunity" and impose on the state the "preponderant financial responsibility for financing" public schools
- 3 to allow the General Assembly to exempt veterans' organizations from tax

- 1 to eliminate the requirement of abolishing the personal property tax
- 1 to reduce the redemption period for some kinds of property sold for non-payment of taxes (similar to a successful resolution mentioned above)

This Research Response briefly describes the resolutions proposing to amend the 1970 Illinois Constitution (other than those proposing to lower the voting age to 18, which was later done by U.S. Constitutional Amendment 26). If a resolution proposed to amend several sections or articles of the Constitution, it is listed under at least the article and section it would have affected most basically. It is also listed under one or more other article(s) or section(s) if it would have affected them significantly; but each resolution is counted only once in the totals reported here. Endnotes citing these resolutions follow the article in which the resolutions are described.

Table 1 below shows how many proposed amendments to each article of the Constitution have been introduced; sent to the voters; and approved.

Table 1: Constitutional Amendments Proposed by General Assembly

<i>Article</i>	<i>Introduced</i>	<i>Put on ballot</i>	<i>Approved</i>
1. Bill of Rights	38	4	4
2. Powers of the State	0	0	0
3. Suffrage and Elections	18	1	1
4. The Legislature	325	2	1
5. The Executive	58	0	0
6. The Judiciary	121	1	1
7. Local Government	34	0	0
8. Finance	40	0	0
9. Revenue	164	7	2
10. Education	58	1	0
11. Environment	0	0	0
12. Militia	0	0	0
13. General Provisions	21	0	0
14. Constitutional Revision	9	0	0
Proposed new articles	3	0	0
Totals	889	16	9

Unless otherwise stated, each resolution died in its house of origin. The endnotes list the most recent action on each resolution that is still alive. (Each Senate Joint Resolution is designated in the endnotes as "SJR(-CA) ___" even though the Senate numbers all its joint resolutions in a single series, because the *Legislative Synopsis and Digest* and the General Assembly's Internet site compile joint resolutions proposing constitutional amendments separately from other joint resolutions. Unlike the Senate, the House numbers its joint resolutions that propose constitutional amendments in a separate series from its other joint resolutions, so those that propose constitutional amendments must be designated "HJR-CA ___" to distinguish them from other House Joint Resolutions with the same numbers.)

Appendix A to this Research Response lists the votes on all questions involving the Illinois Constitution that have gone to the voters since its ratification in 1970.

Two referendum questions related to the Illinois Constitution of 1970 since its approval that year are not reflected in this Research Response (except Appendix A):

- (1) The so-called "Legislative Cutback" amendment, approved by the voters in 1980. It was proposed by initiative petitions, not by the General Assembly. It reduced the size of the House of Representatives from 177 to 118 members and abolished cumulative voting in electing them.
- (2) The 1988 question whether to call a constitutional convention, which was rejected by the voters.

ARTICLE 1: BILL OF RIGHTS

- Due Process and Equal Protection (Section 2)** One resolution proposed to amend this section to state that no government agency would be required to assign or bus students unless required by the U.S. Constitution.¹
- Rights After Indictment (Section 8)** Four resolutions responding to the Illinois Supreme Court case *People v. Fitzpatrick*, 158 Ill. 2d 360 (1994) sought to allow a criminal defendant at trial only to “confront” adverse witnesses instead of meeting them “face to face.” One of these resolutions passed both houses and was **approved** by the voters in 1994.²
- Crime Victims (new Section 8.1)** Three resolutions proposed to give each crime victim several rights. The rights mentioned included rights to receive notice of court proceedings relating to the crime; to communicate with the prosecution; to be protected from the defendant during criminal justice proceedings; to attend all court proceedings that are open to the defendant; to make a statement to the court before sentencing; to be informed about the disposition of the case including any conviction, sentence, imprisonment, and release of the accused; and to receive restitution. One of these proposals passed both houses and was **approved** by the voters in 1992.³
- Bail and Habeas Corpus (Section 9)** A resolution to expand the categories of persons who may be denied bail, by including persons accused of offenses for which life imprisonment is allowed, was **approved** by the voters in 1982.⁴ Another resolution, providing for denial of bail for a felony for which a sentence of imprisonment is required upon conviction, if the court determines that releasing the accused person would pose a real and present threat to the physical safety of any person, was **approved** by the voters in 1986.⁵ A resolution to delete this provision was introduced in 1987 but no action was taken on it.⁶ A resolution to deny bail to persons accused of domestic battery offenses that caused death also had no action taken on it.⁷ Another unsuccessful resolution would have replaced the then-existing first sentence of this section, which allowed denial of bail to persons accused of crimes punishable by death or life imprisonment when “the proof is evident or the presumption great,” with a statement that “Excessive bail shall not be required.”⁸
- Trial by Jury (Section 13)** Two resolutions would have abolished the right to trial by jury for offenses punishable by no more than 6 months in jail and/or a \$500 fine; another would have abolished trial by jury only for offenses punishable by a fine up to \$500.⁹ One resolution proposed that all prosecutions except those on a plea of guilty, or guilty but mentally ill, be tried by jury unless both the state and the defendant waive a jury trial.¹⁰ Another would have required juries of only 6, with unanimous verdicts, for crimes punishable by jail; juries of 12 with at least 10 jurors agreeing for crimes punishable by prison; and juries of 12 with unanimous verdicts if the death penalty is sought—but no right to a jury trial if the only possible punishment is a fine.¹¹
- Right to Arms (Section 22)** One resolution would have limited the power of local governments to infringe on the right to keep and bear arms.¹²

Proposed New Sections

One resolution proposed a new section to recognize a right of privacy in the state's citizens.¹³ Two resolutions would have prohibited the state from requiring any business to close on Sundays.¹⁴ One would have required that regulation of any lawful business be by the General Assembly, or as permitted under home-rule powers for the legitimate protection of public health, safety, and welfare.¹⁵ Four in the 89th General Assembly would have recognized a right of parents to direct the upbringing and education of their children.¹⁶ Seven resolutions would have required the state to enact a plan for universal health care.¹⁷ Four resolutions would have given all taxpayers standing to sue to enforce rights of taxpayers.¹⁸ Two resolutions proposed in the 95th General Assembly would require a new section to recognize a right to safe and affordable housing.¹⁹

Notes

1. 1981: HJR-CA 24 (Bianco-Capparelli, McAuliffe, Krska, Kosinski et al.).
2. 1994: HJR-CA 25 (Homer); HJR-CA 26 (Dart-Homer-Ostenberg-Gash-von Bergen-Wessels et al. — Hawkinson-Shadid); SJR(-CA) 123 (Shadid-Hawkinson-Welch-Stern-Hasara et al. — Homer-Tom Johnson-Dart), passed both houses and approved by the voters.
3. 1990: HJR-CA 21 (Parke); 1992: HJR-CA 1 (Parke-Balthis); HJR-CA 28 (Granberg-Schoenberg-J.Hoffman-LeFlore-Parke et al. — Leverenz-J.Cullerton-T.Dunn-Karpiel-Hall-Hawkinson-Severns), passed both houses and approved by the voters.
4. 1981: SJR(-CA) 36 (Rock, Donnewald, and Egan), passed both houses and approved by the voters.
5. 1985: SJR(-CA) 22 (Davidson-Sangmeister-Bloom-Barkhausen-Dudycz-Schaefer-Degnan-Jeremiah Joyce-Philip-S.Weaver-DeAngelis-Coffey-Donahue-R.Dunn-Etheredge-Fawell-Friedland-Geo-Karis-Hudson-Karpiel-Keats-Kustra-MacDonald-Mahar-Maitland-Rigney-Rupp-Schuneman-Sommer-Topinka-Watson-Demuzio-Lemke-O'Daniel-Poshard-Vadalabene-Lechowicz — McCracken-Homer-Hasara-Hallock-Didrickson), passed both houses and approved by the voters.
6. 1987: SJR(-CA) 1 (Brookins).
7. 2005: HJR-CA 22 (Black).
8. 1985: SJR(-CA) 38 (Barkhausen).
9. 1983: HJR-CA 3 (Olson); 1989: HJR-CA 14 (M.Olson-J.Dunn); 1990: HJR-CA 15 (M.Olson-J.Dunn).
10. 1989: SJR(-CA) 41 (J.Daley).
11. 1996: HJR-CA 33 (Stephens).
12. 1983: HJR-CA 10 (Tate-Stuffle-Johnson-McPike-Mays).
13. 1975: HJR-CA 34 (Katz).
14. 1986: HJR-CA 19 (Mautino and Wolf).
15. 1990: HJR-CA 20 (Johnson et al.).
16. 1995: SJR(-CA) 7 (O'Malley-Petka-Dillard-Lauzen); HJR-CA 4 (Salvi et al.); HJR-CA 8 (Salvi); HJR-CA 31 (Phelps).
17. 1998: SJR(-CA) 48 (Obama); HJR-CA 17 (Boland-McGuire et al.); 1999: SJR(-CA) 13 (Obama-Viverito); HJR-CA 6 (Boland-Flowers-Scott-Silva-Dart et al.); 2001: HJR-CA 7 (Boland-Dart-Howard-

- Flowers-Kenner et al.); 2003: SJR(-CA) 22 (Obama); HJR-CA 18 (Boland-Delgado).
18. 2002: HJR-CA 16 (Franks); HJR-CA 17 (Franks); 2003: HJR-CA 8 (Franks); HJR-CA 10 (Franks).
 19. 2007: HJR-CA 25 (Dunkin), assigned to House Judiciary I—Civil Law Committee Sept. 25, 2007; HJR-CA 26 (Dunkin), assigned to House Judiciary I—Civil Law Committee Sept. 25, 2007.

ARTICLE 2: POWERS OF THE STATE

No resolutions were found that proposed amendments to Article 2.

ARTICLE 3: SUFFRAGE AND ELECTIONS

**Voting Qualifications
(Section 1)**

Five resolutions proposed to shorten the residency requirement for voting from 6 months to 30 days; one passed both houses and was **approved** by the voters in 1988.¹ One resolution would have permitted voting in a primary by a 17-year-old who would be 18 by the time of the general election.² A resolution in the 95th General Assembly proposes to lower the voting age to 17.³

**Voting Disqualifications
(Section 2)**

One resolution would have prohibited people found mentally incompetent by a court from voting unless they are found later mentally competent.⁴ Two would have prohibited persons civilly committed as sexually dangerous persons from voting.⁵

**Board of Elections
(Section 5)**

Two resolutions would have removed the prohibition on any political party's having a majority on the State Board of Elections;⁶ three would have abolished the Board entirely.⁷

Proposed New Sections

Three resolutions in the 95th General Assembly propose to allow elections on recalling executive branch officers, members of the General Assembly, and judges.⁸

Notes

1. 1975: HJR-CA 9 (Lundy); 1981: HJR-CA 28 (Satterthwaite); 1983: HJR-CA 5 (Satterthwaite); 1985: HJR-CA 8 (Satterthwaite—Netsch), passed the House; 1987: HJR-CA 1 (Satterthwaite—Netsch), passed both houses and approved by the voters.
2. 1993: HJR-CA 17 (Hicks).
3. 2008: HJR-CA 29 (Lang-Boland-Ford-Froehlich et al.), voted "do pass" 5-3 by House Elections and Campaign Reform Committee Feb. 26, 2008.
4. 1997: HJR-CA 13 (Bugielski et al.).
5. 2003: SJR(-CA) 21 (Petka); 2005 SJR(-CA) 24 (Petka).
6. 1973: HJR-CA 21 (Collins); 1977: SJR(-CA) 39 (Soper, Guidice, Rhoads et al.).
7. 1975: SJR(-CA) 62 (Bloom, Roe, Sommer et al.); 1977: HJR-CA 32 (P.W.Collins), SJR(-CA) (1st Spec. Sess.) 1 (Buzbee).
8. 2007: SJR(-CA) 70 (Cronin-Althoff-Hultgren-Pankau-Sieben et al.); 2007-08: HJR-CA 28 (Franks-Tryon-Fortner et al.—Trotter), passed House 75-33, assigned to Senate Executive Committee; 2008: HJR-CA 31 (Lindner), not assigned to a substantive committee.

ARTICLE 4: THE LEGISLATURE

Legislature— Power and Structure (Section 1)

Seventeen resolutions proposed to allow statutes to be enacted by initiative and referendum (although four of them would have put the subjects of appropriations and branch banking off-limits to the initiative process).¹ One resolution would have allowed initiatives to amend the Illinois Constitution and repeal statutes.² Seven resolutions proposed to reduce the number of Legislative (Senate) districts from the current 59 to 50, 49, 45, 35 (two resolutions), 31, or 30;³ one proposed to increase the number to 63.⁴ Most drastically, one House resolution proposed to abolish the Senate,⁵ and two Senate resolutions proposed to abolish the House.⁶ A 2008 resolution proposes to make the General Assembly a unicameral body with 177 members elected from single-member districts.⁷

Legislative Composition (Section 2)

Eight resolutions have proposed to have representatives elected from three single-member districts within each Senate district;⁸ 11 resolutions proposed to have two single-member representative districts within each Senate district—similar to the so-called “Legislative Cutback Amendment” that was proposed by initiative and **approved** by the voters in 1980.⁹ Three resolutions would have provided for two times or three times as many representatives as senators, but apparently with no necessary correspondence between the boundary lines of House and Senate districts.¹⁰ Eight would have provided for two representatives elected at large from each senatorial district;¹¹ most of these resolutions also proposed to eliminate cumulative voting. Two resolutions would have eliminated cumulative voting in House primary elections only.¹² Six resolutions proposed to elect three members each from 39 districts, and to return to cumulative voting.¹³ One resolution called for 59 Senate and 118 House districts initially, but with at least two additional House members elected at large in later years.¹⁴

Nineteen resolutions, one of which passed the House, proposed to give senators alternating 4-year and 6-year terms; 10 of these, along with two other resolutions, also proposed that each House seat go through 10-year cycles composed of two 4-year and one 2-year term; and one of them would have limited the service of both senators and representatives to 10 consecutive years in office.¹⁵ Four resolutions proposed that no person could be elected to the Senate more than 3 times or to the House more than 5 times;¹⁶ one of them would also have limited the terms of the six elected statewide executive officers, and limited increases in spending for the salaries and employees of those statewide officers and legislators to the last year’s increase in the Consumer Price Index.¹⁷ A 1994 resolution would have limited legislators to 8 future years in the General Assembly; thus a House member who served 3 future terms could run for a 2-year Senate term, but not for a 4-year Senate term.¹⁸ Three resolutions proposed that senators have 6-year terms and representatives 4-year terms.¹⁹

Two resolutions would have eliminated the requirement (in subsection 2(b) before the “Legislative Cutback” amendment) that any party nominating candidates for representative in a district nominate at least two; one of these resolutions would also have eliminated cumulative voting.²⁰ Two resolutions would have banned all dual office-holding by legislators.²¹ Another would have prohibited all compensation to legislators by other public bodies, except

compensation for military service or service as an elected official.²² One resolution would have required a three-fifths vote to elect each senator.²³ One resolution would have reduced the age for eligibility to be a legislator from 21 to 18.²⁴ A 2007 resolution would eliminate appointments to fill legislative vacancies; vacancies would be filled either at a special election, or at the next general election if the vacancy occurred within 180 days before the next general election.²⁵

Legislative Redistricting (Section 3)

One resolution would have sharply limited the number of districts that could overlap between Chicago and areas outside Chicago, or between the collar counties and areas outside the six-county Chicago area.²⁶ Another would have provided that if the General Assembly failed to redistrict, no member could be re-elected and a redistricting commission would be appointed by the Governor from nominations by the League of Women Voters.²⁷ Two would have provided for appointing a legislative and congressional redistricting firm to redistrict the state.²⁸ A third would have set further standards for drawing legislative district lines, including putting historically unified areas within a single district and following local governmental or geographical boundaries where possible.²⁹ Yet another would have set standards for both state and Congressional redistricting, and provided for the Governor, Speaker of the House, and President of the Senate to hire a computer firm to help with redistricting.³⁰ Two would have required that separate redistricting plans be drawn for the House and Senate, and would have deleted the requirement that each Legislative district be divided into two representative districts.³¹

Twelve resolutions, including two in 2007 and one in 2008, have proposed to abolish the provisions for a Legislative Redistricting Commission; allow the two houses to adopt redistricting plans by resolution; and require the State Board of Elections to create a redistricting plan using a computer program if the General Assembly failed to create one by a specified date.³² One 2008 resolution proposes to allow the House and Senate to adopt a redistricting plan by resolution, and allow a Legislative Redistricting Commission to create a plan if the House and Senate fail to create one by a specified date.³³ Another 2008 resolution would allow a "special master" appointed by the Supreme Court to create a redistricting plan using a computer program if the House and Senate fail to create one by resolution by a specified date and a Legislative Redistricting Commission fails to create one by a specified date.³⁴ Six resolutions proposed to require the State Board of Elections to file a redistricting plan designed by a computer program in a random manner, by June 1 of the year following each decennial census year.³⁵ Three resolutions proposed that legislative districts must be substantially equal in number of "citizens" rather than population.³⁶ One resolution proposed only a nonsubstantive change.³⁷

Sessions (Section 5)

Most of the resolutions proposing to amend this section have been attempts to limit the amount of time the General Assembly spends in session. Eleven resolutions, including one that passed the Senate, proposed that the General Assembly meet only biennially.³⁸ Two other resolutions proposed to limit regular sessions to 60 days;³⁹ one proposed to limit odd-numbered-year sessions to 100 days and even-numbered-year sessions to 50 days;⁴⁰ and four would have prevented regular sessions from continuing past June 30.⁴¹ Three of those last four, plus two other resolutions,⁴² would have put into the Constitution the provision, now contained in the rules of each house, that sessions in even years are limited to revenue, appropriations, and emergency measures.

Five other resolutions would have reversed the present rule by limiting *odd*-year sessions to revenue and appropriations measures; three of those would also have put shorter limits on the time for the Governor to consider money bills and the General Assembly to respond to vetoes of them.⁴³ One resolution would have provided that the General Assembly convene and executive-branch officers take office in December (along with three others calling for the General Assembly to convene on the second Wednesday of November); all four proposed that laws passed after April 30 not take effect until May 1 of the next year without a three-fifths majority in each house.⁴⁴ Another would have provided for the General Assembly to convene in odd-numbered years in January and in even-numbered years in April, with the latter sessions limited to revenue and appropriations.⁴⁵ Two would have provided for the General Assembly to convene in December of even-numbered years and again, 13 months later, in January of the next even-numbered year.⁴⁶ One would have changed the day of convening from the second Wednesday in January to the Wednesday after the second Monday.⁴⁷ Another resolution would have prohibited any session between the general election and the second Wednesday of January unless the Governor declared an emergency, and would have required a three-fifths vote for any bill passed after April 30 to take effect before May 1 of the next year.⁴⁸ (The 1994 resolution that was approved by the voters, changing the intended session cutoff date to May 31, is listed under section 10—the only section it amended.)

One resolution would have prohibited proxy voting on the floors and in committees of the General Assembly.⁴⁹ Another, which passed the House, would have provided that a special session could not be limited to a specific bill or bills.⁵⁰ Similarly, a 1994 resolution would have prevented the Governor from calling a special session to enact a law that would affect only a single county and/or units of local government or school districts in that county.⁵¹ Four resolutions proposed to require the Governor to have the written consent of all four legislative leaders to call a special session.⁵²

Organization (Section 6)

Most of the resolutions proposing to amend this section were attempts to deal with the problem of lengthy contests over the Speakership of the House. Three resolutions, including one that passed the House, would have provided for persons other than the Governor and Secretary of State to preside over the Senate and House, respectively, until those bodies elected leaders.⁵³ A fourth would have provided for the Lieutenant Governor to convene the House; if no party had a majority there, the Lieutenant Governor would serve as Speaker but have no vote.⁵⁴ Another resolution would have provided for a caucus of the majority party in the House to pick a candidate for Speaker, which choice supposedly would be binding on all members of that party.⁵⁵ Most drastic was a resolution that would have allowed the Secretary of State to designate someone else to preside over the House while it voted on a Speaker, and if no Speaker were elected after 30 days or 100 ballots, the House would be dissolved and a special election held to elect a new one.⁵⁶

One resolution would have changed the leadership structures of the two houses by providing for each to have a majority leader and minority leader in addition to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate.⁵⁷ One resolution proposed that no legislator could chair one or more committees in that legislator's house for a total of more than 4 years.⁵⁸ Another resolution proposed that no legislator could hold a leadership position, other than chairing a

committee or subcommittee, for a total of more than 4 years.⁵⁹ Three resolutions of 2007 or 2008 propose that no person could hold one of the four top legislative leadership positions for more than 10 years; one of those resolutions also proposes that no person could serve more than a total of 14 years in all such positions.⁶⁰ A 1987 resolution proposed that the judging of elections and returns of members of the General Assembly be done by the State Board of Elections rather than by each house; another that year proposed that it be done by a trial court, with direct review by the Supreme Court.⁶¹

**Transaction
of Business
(Section 7)**

A resolution that passed the Senate in 1971 proposed to delete the requirement that each house keep a transcript of its debates, and to provide for journals of each house to be sold to the public at a price set by the General Assembly.⁶²

**Passage
of Bills
(Section 8)**

One resolution would have made the question whether the procedural requirements for passage of a bill had been complied with, a matter for judicial determination.⁶³ Twenty-two resolutions, one of which passed the Senate, would have required a three-fifths vote in each house for any bill to require spending by units of local government or school districts, unless a companion bill provided reimbursement to those local governments or school districts.⁶⁴ One resolution was similar, but added that the Governor could not use a line-item veto on an appropriation that would reimburse local governments or school districts for costs of state requirements.⁶⁵ Another resolution would have required both a three-fifths vote in each house *and* reimbursement for a bill that would impose costs on local governments or school districts to become law;⁶⁶ a similar resolution would have applied only to bills to impose costs on school districts.⁶⁷ Two resolutions would have prohibited any bill requiring spending by units of local government or school districts, unless one of the following was true: (1) the state appropriated additional funds for reimbursement; (2) the bill passed by at least three-fifths in each house; (3) the bill would impose a federal law with which the local government or school district would otherwise be required to comply; (4) the bill created or expanded a criminal law; or (5) the bill created or expanded employer-paid benefits for unemployed or injured workers.⁶⁸

Twenty-two other resolutions proposed a new section to require a three-fifths vote in each house to raise the rate of any state tax;⁶⁹ nine others would have required a *two-thirds* vote in each house to raise the rate of any state tax (or in recent resolutions, any state income or sales tax).⁷⁰ A resolution in the 95th General Assembly would require a two-thirds majority to raise tax rates, and would limit the growth of state spending and require the state to maintain a reserve fund of 3% of the budget enacted for the preceding fiscal year.⁷¹

One resolution would have required courts, upon determining that a law violates the single-subject rule in this section, to certify the invalidity to the General Assembly, which would have 15 calendar days to re-enact any part of the law, to be effective retroactively to the law's original effective date.⁷² Two resolutions would have required any claim that a law violates the single-subject rule to be brought within 3 years after the law takes effect.⁷³

**Veto Procedure
(Section 9)**

Nine resolutions (including one in 2008) have proposed to eliminate the Governor's amendatory veto authority; two of those would also have eliminated item and reduction vetoes.⁷⁴ Five resolutions, including two that passed the House and one that passed both houses but was rejected by the voters in

1974, would have limited the amendatory veto to correction of technical errors or matters of form.⁷⁵ One would have required the Governor to act within 20 days after receiving the General Assembly's acceptance of his recommendations, or return the bill as a vetoed bill.⁷⁶ One resolution would have permitted the General Assembly to reject an amendatory veto by a majority (instead of three-fifths) of the members elected to each house, unless the Constitution otherwise required an extraordinary majority.⁷⁷ Four resolutions would have increased the majority needed to restore an appropriation item reduced by the Governor from a majority to three-fifths of members elected.⁷⁸

**Effective
Dates of Laws
(Section 10)**

A resolution proposed to amend this section by providing that no law changing the salaries or allowances of legislators or executive-branch officers could take effect for one year after its passage.⁷⁹ Five resolutions proposed to change the date after which a bill needs a three-fifths vote to take effect less than a year later, from June 30 to April 30.⁸⁰ Three proposed to change it to May 31—including the one adopted by both houses and **approved** by the voters in 1994.⁸¹ Another resolution called for replacing the effective-date provision with a series of standard effective dates for laws passed by various dates during the year; the General Assembly would set these dates by law.⁸²

**Compensation
and Allowances
(Section 11)**

Six resolutions, one of which passed the Senate, would have prohibited a vote on legislative salary increases between the general election and the time for convening the next General Assembly in January.⁸³ Three resolutions would have gone farther and required that salary increases be voted only in odd-numbered years after the convening of new General Assemblies; such increases would take effect by a date 30 days before the filing deadline for the next general election⁸⁴ or by the first day to file for that election.⁸⁵ One resolution proposed that salaries of legislators, elected state executive officers, and judges be fixed at least 2 months before the general election at which those offices will be filled.⁸⁶ Another resolution would have allowed salary increases to be enacted only during the first year of the 2-year term for which representatives are elected.⁸⁷ One resolution would have changed legislative salaries by the same percentage as annual changes in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers,⁸⁸ and one would have *limited* salary increases to increases in such an index, unless voters approved a larger increase.⁸⁹

Taking a different approach, one resolution proposed to have salaries of elected state officers determined by a state salary commission.⁹⁰ One would have required that legislative salaries be paid in equal monthly installments,⁹¹ and another would have provided for legislators to be paid per diem amounts in lieu of salary.⁹²

**Legislative
Immunity
(Section 12)**

Two resolutions proposed to abolish legislators' immunity from civil arrest while going to, attending, or returning from legislative sessions.⁹³

**Proposed New
Sections**

One resolution proposed a new section to prohibit the General Assembly from expanding riverboat, casino, or off-track gambling in a municipality without approval by local referendum.⁹⁴ Two 1994 resolutions would have required that any bill that would increase state revenue be passed by a three-fifths majority in each house; also, each house would have a revenue committee to

consider all bills that would affect revenues, and no one could serve more than 4 consecutive years on such a committee.⁹⁵ A similar resolution was introduced in 1995, but it would not have limited the terms of revenue committee members. It would establish the sizes of those committees at 25 members in the House and 13 in the Senate.⁹⁶ One 2007 resolution would prevent the General Assembly from voting on final passage of any appropriations bill that was filed or last amended less than 7 calendar days before the vote.⁹⁷ Another 2007 resolution would require a two-thirds majority in each house to pass any bill to increase benefits of members of any state pension or retirement system.⁹⁸ Two resolutions proposed that any statutory provision to increase revenues would not take effect unless it contained a sunset provision automatically repealing it within 5 years; but if the General Assembly extended the provision three times, no further extensions would be required.⁹⁹ Another resolution proposed that all bills to raise revenue must originate in the House.¹⁰⁰ Four resolutions would have allowed the General Assembly to limit non-economic damages in medical malpractice lawsuits.¹⁰¹ Two resolutions proposed to require a three-fifths majority in each house for any bill to divert money from the Road Fund.¹⁰² A 2008 resolution would authorize recall elections for state legislators and executive-branch officers.¹⁰³

Notes

1. 1977: SJR(-CA) 35 (Sommer, Demuzio, Bloom, and Morris); HJR-CA 25 (Byers-Daniels, J.M.Houlihan et al.); 1979: SJR(-CA) 4 (Demuzio); SJR(-CA) 17 (Sommer and Bloom); SJR(-CA) 35 (Demuzio); SJR(-CA) 61 (Gitz); HJR-CA 6 (Kelly); HJR-CA 9 (Leinenweber and Steele); HJR-CA 35 (Stuffle-Watson-Pechous-Boucek); 1980: SJR(-CA) 82 (Regner); 1981: SJR(-CA) 2 (Bloom-Sommer); HJR-CA 14 (Barkhausen); 1983: HJR-CA 15 (Zwick-Harris); 1997: SJR(-CA) 14 (Lauzen); HJR-CA 11 (Boland); 2003: SJR(-CA) 19 (Lauzen); 2005: SJR(-CA) 27 (Lauzen). 1977 SJR(-CA) 35 and HJR-CA 25, and 1979 SJR(-CA) 4 and HJR-CA 6 would not have allowed appropriations or branch banking laws to be enacted by initiative and referendum.
2. 1995: HJR-CA 26 (Skinner).
3. 1977: SJR(-CA) 13 (Wooten); SJR(-CA) 23 (Schaffer); 1979: SJR(-CA) 2 (Sommer); SJR(-CA) 3 (Wooten); HJR-CA 22 (Hoffman); HJR-CA 26 (Simms); 1980: SJR(-CA) 88 (Wooten, Sommer, and Netsch).
4. 1972: HJR-CA 17 (Neff, Brinkmeier, Epton et al.).
5. 1971: HJR-CA 9 (Cunningham).
6. 1973: SJR(-CA) 14 (Knuppel); 1979: SJR(-CA) 34 (Knuppel).
7. 2008: HJR-CA 38 (Boland), not assigned to a substantive committee.
8. 1973: HJR-CA 3 (Hirschfeld); 1974: HJR-CA 31 (Tuerk, Friedland, Hirschfeld, and Gibbs); 1975: HJR-CA 3 (Hirschfeld); HJR-CA 8 (Tuerk); 1977: SJR(-CA) 9 (Wooten); HJR-CA 23 (Tuerk-Schlickman, Neff et al.); 1979: SJR(-CA) 5 (Ozinga-Keats); HJR-CA 25 (Tuerk, W.Walsh, Friedland et al.).
9. 1973: HJR-CA 2 (Hirschfeld); 1975: SJR(-CA) 29 (Knuppel); HJR-CA 4 (Hirschfeld); 1976: HJR-CA 42 (Klosak); 1978: HJR-CA 42 (Giglio and Mahar); 1979: SJR(-CA) 2 (Sommer); SJR(-CA) 70 (Lemke, Nedza, Nega, Nash, and D'Arco); HJR-CA 2 (Boucek and Schuneman); HJR-CA 4 (Davis, Friedland, Neff et al.); HJR-CA 15 (Friedland and Davis); HJR-CA 21 (Griesheimer and Frederick).

10. 1973: HJR-CA 4 (Cunningham, Washburn, Blades, and McCormick); 1979: HJR-CA 22 (Hoffman); 1982: SJR(-CA) 80 (Donnewald).
11. 1973: HJR-CA 15 (Clabaugh and Tuerk); HJR-CA 26 (Ralph Dunn and Hirschfeld); 1975: SJR(-CA) 5 (Sommer and Bloom); HJR-CA 37 (Giglio); 1977: SJR(-CA) 22 (Philip, Bowers, and Rhoads); HJR-CA 4 (Giglio and Mahar); 1979: SJR(-CA) 24 (Philip); HJR-CA 38 (Dyer).
12. 1978: HJR-CA 57 (Lucco); 1979: HJR-CA 28 (W. Walsh).
13. 1999: HJR-CA 13 (Feigenholtz-Erwin-Gash et al.); 2001: SJR(-CA) 43 (T. Walsh); HJR-CA 4 (Feigenholtz-Currie-Erwin-Scott-A. Turner et al.); 2003: HJR-CA 22 (Froehlich-Young-Parke-Hamos-Burke et al.); 2005: SJR(-CA) 37 (Winkel); HJR-CA 2 (Froehlich).
14. 1981: SJR(-CA) 51 (Rhoads).
15. 1972: SJR(-CA) 61 (Berning); 1973: SJR(-CA) 9 (Berning); 1975: HJR-CA 7 (Hirschfeld); 1978: HJR-CA 46 (O'Brien-Ewing, Terzich et al.); 1979: HJR-CA 43 (Vinson-Peters-Totten et al.); 1980: SJR(-CA) 85 (Philip); 1981: HJR-CA 11 (O'Brien); 1983: HJR-CA 13 (Taylor); 1984: HJR-CA 18 (Brookins); 1985: HJR-CA 3 (Shaw-Rice); 1987: HJR-CA 6 (Rea, Panayotovich-Piel-Goforth—Poshard-Degnan-DeAngelis), passed the House; 1999: HJR-CA 4 (Boland-E. Lyons-Klingler-Tenhouse-Hannig et al.); 2001: HJR-CA 6 (E. Lyons-Boland-Mulligan-Kosel et al.); 2003: HJR-CA 5 (E. Lyons-Bassi); HJR-CA 6 (Boland); HJR-CA 23 (Kurtz); 2005: HJR-CA 9 (Bassi); 2006: HJR-CA 31 (Bassi); 2007: HJR-CA 6 (Bassi), not assigned to a substantive committee; HJR-CA 22 (Mulligan), not assigned to a substantive committee; 2008: HJR-CA 40 (Bassi), not assigned to a substantive committee.
16. 1993: HJR-CA 4 (Parcells-Lindner-M. Weaver-Balthis et al.); 1994: HJR-CA 29 (Lindner-Hughes-Hanrahan-Weller); 1995: SJR(-CA) 18 (Lauzen); HJR-CA 12 (Lindner)-Hughes-Goslin-Lachner-Stephens et al.).
17. 1995: SJR(-CA) 18 (Lauzen).
18. 1994: HJR-CA 24 (Blagojevich-Sheehy).
19. 1975: HJR-CA 11 (Schraeder-Hirschfeld-Griesheimer); HJR-CA 16 (Griesheimer); 1977: HJR-CA 7 (Ewing, Griesheimer, Kent et al.).
20. 1973: HJR-CA 12 (Bradley); 1974: HJR-CA 29 (Day and Tuerk).
21. 1972: HJR-CA 15 (Lindberg); HJR-CA 17 (Neff, Brinkmeier, Epton et al.).
22. 1975: SJR(-CA) 56 (Philip, H.H. Hall, Sommer et al.).
23. 1975: HJR-CA 14 (Chapman, MacDonald, Catania et al.).
24. 1986: SJR(-CA) 108 (Zito).
25. 2007: HJR-CA 13 (Boland), assigned to House Executive Committee Feb. 15, 2007.
26. 1981: SJR(-CA) 64 (Philip, Weaver, Deangelis, Grotberg, and all other Republican senators).
27. 1982: SJR(-CA) 68 (Schaffer).
28. 1983: HJR-CA 11 (Birkinbine-Koehler) and HJR-CA 16 (Birkinbine-Koehler-B. Pedersen).
29. 1982: HJR-CA 29 (Findley-Barkhausen, Koehler, and Kociolko).
30. 1982: HJR-CA 31 (Birkinbine-Hallstrom-Koehler-Piel and Kociolko).
31. 1982: SJR(-CA) 80 (Donnewald); 1987: SJR(-CA) 21 (Demuzio-Rock).
32. 1999: SJR(-CA) 38 (Philip); 2001: HJR-CA 8 (Black); HJR-CA 9 (Lindner); 2003: SJR(-CA) 19 (Lauzen); HJR-CA 9 (Lindner); HJR-CA

- 13 (Black et al.); 2004: HJR-CA 26 (Lindner); 2005: HJR-CA 8 (Lindner-Froehlich); HJR-CA 24 (Lindner); 2007: HJR-(CA) 3 (Black), not assigned to a substantive committee; HJR-CA 4 (Lindner), not assigned to a substantive committee; 2008: HJR-CA 33 (Lindner), not assigned to a substantive committee.
33. 2008: HJR-CA 44 (Brosnahan), voted "do pass" 9-2 by House State Government Administration Committee April 17, 2008.
 34. 2008: HJR-CA 45 (Cross-Tracy-Durkin-Rose-Mathias et al.), not assigned to a substantive committee.
 35. 2006: SJR(-CA) 61 (B.Brady); HJR-CA 30 (Bassi); 2007: HJR-CA 7 (Bassi-Coulson-Froehlich), not assigned to a substantive committee; HJR-CA 21 (Mulligan), not assigned to a substantive committee; 2008: SJR(-CA) 80 (Murphy et al.), not assigned to a substantive committee; HJR-CA 39 (Bassi), not assigned to a substantive committee.
 36. 2004: SJR(-CA) 57 (Petka-W.Jones); 2005: SJR(-CA) 15 (Petka); HJR-CA 21 (Stephens).
 37. 1998: SJR(-CA) 71 (Maitland-Karpiel).
 38. 1971: SJR(-CA) 55 (Horsley, Sours, Latherow et al.); 1972: SJR(-CA) 77 (Horsley, Groen, Sours et al.); HJR-CA 12 (Hirschfeld, Walters, Lauterbach et al.); 1978: HJR-CA 41 (Giglio); HJR-CA 50 (MacDonald-Madigan); 1979: SJR(-CA) 16 (Bowers-Sangmeister, Bloom et al.) passed the Senate; HJR-CA 3 (Davis, Steele, Friedrich et al.); HJR-CA 26 (Simms); 1981: SJR(-CA) 32 (Bowers-Sangmeister); HJR-CA 22 (Koehler); 2008: HJR-CA 34 (Poe), assigned to House State Government Administration Committee March 5, 2008.
 39. 1974: SJR(-CA) 80 (Regner, Bell, Berning et al.); 1979: HJR-CA 43 (Vinson-Peters-Totten et al.).
 40. 1979: SJR(-CA) 38 (Nimrod).
 41. 1972: SJR(-CA) 77 (Horsley, Groen, Sours et al.); SJR(-CA) 78 (Horsley, Groen, Sours et al.); 1973: HJR-CA 1 (Hirschfeld); 1975: HJR-CA 6 (Hirschfeld).
 42. 1979: HJR-CA 14 (Schraeder); 1981: HJR-CA 10 (Schraeder).
 43. 1975: SJR(-CA) 60 (Harris, Regner, and Mitchler); 1977: SJR(-CA) 8 (Nimrod, Philip, Regner, and H.H.Hall); HJR-CA 28 (McBroom and Ryan); 1979: SJR(-CA) 12 (Nimrod, Shapiro, Weaver et al.); 1981: SJR(-CA) 41 (Nimrod). The resolutions sponsored by Senator Nimrod would have limited the time for vetoes and overrides of money bills.
 44. 1975: HJR-CA 33 (Porter, Washburn, Polk et al.); 1987: HJR-CA 19 (Breslin); 1989: HJR-CA 5 (Breslin); 1991: SJR(-CA) 26 (J.Daley-Jeremiah Joyce).
 45. 1975: SJR(-CA) 26 (Rock, Partee, and Bloom).
 46. 1977: HJR-CA 13 (Skinner and Cunningham); HJR-CA 36 (Porter).
 47. 1979: HJR-CA 17 (Griesheimer).
 48. 1991: SJR(-CA) 27 (Marovitz).
 49. 1973: HJR-CA 27 (Barnes, Choate, Shea et al.).
 50. 1979: HJR-CA 47 (Pullen-Schlickman et al.).
 51. 1994: HJR-CA 28 (Tim Johnson-Black-M.Weaver).
 52. 2005: HJR-CA 7 (Lindner); HJR-CA 23 (Lindner); 2007: HJR-CA 5 (Lindner), not assigned to a substantive committee; 2008: HJR-CA 32 (Lindner), not assigned to a substantive committee.
 53. 1973: HJR-CA 3 (Hirschfeld) passed the House; HJR-CA 18 (Duff-Rayson, K.W.Miller et al.); 1977: SJR(-CA) 11 (Coffey and Rupp).
 54. 1982: HJR-CA 30 (Jaffe).

55. 1975: HJR-CA 2 (Cunningham).
56. 1977: HJR-CA 13 (Skinner and Cunningham).
57. 1975: HJR-CA 21 (Schlickman).
58. 1995: HJR-CA 19 (Dart).
59. 1995: HJR-CA 21 (Dart).
60. 2007: HJR-CA 15 (Lindner), assigned to House Executive Committee Feb. 20, 2007; 2008: HJR-CA 30 (Lindner), not assigned to a substantive committee; SJR(-CA) 79 (Murphy), not assigned to a substantive committee.
61. 1987: HJR-CA 12 (Countryman-Daniels-Johnson); HJR-CA 14 (Johnson-Countryman-Daniels-Slater-Cowlishaw et al.).
62. 1971: SJR(-CA) 23 (Soper and Bidwill).
63. 1978: HJR-CA 50 (MacDonald-Madigan).
64. 1984: SJR(-CA) 98 (Bloom, Lechowicz, Schuneman et al.—Daniels, Hoffman, Davis, Pullen, Ewing, Hallock, and D.Friedrich), passed the Senate; HJR-CA 22 (Yourell et al.); 1985: SJR(-CA) 36 (Bloom-Barkhausen); HJR-CA 15 (Daniels et al.); 1987: SJR(-CA) 2 (Watson); HJR-CA 8 (Hannig); HJR-CA 17 (Granberg); 1989: SJR(-CA) 14 (Watson-Kustra); SJR(-CA) 27 (Maitland-Etheredge-O'Daniel-Woodyard-Watson et al.); HJR-CA 8 (Mulcahey-B.Olson-Saltsman-Wait-Homer et al.); 1991: SJR(-CA) 18 (Watson-Lechowicz et al.); HJR-CA 15 (Parke); HJR-CA 21 (Pullen); 1992: HJR-CA 31 (Homer); HJR-CA 33 (Granberg-Deering-J.Hoffman-Edley-Rotello); 1993: SJR(-CA) 7 (Watson-Klemm-Topinka); HJR-CA 10 (Granberg-Novak-Balthis); HJR-CA 21 (Hanrahan).
65. 1995: HJR-CA 1 (Parke-Stevens); HJR-CA 10 (Hoffman); 1997: SJR(-CA) 3 (Watson-Fitzgerald-Klemm-Jacobs-Geo-Karis); HJR-CA 4 (Granberg-Shoenberg).
66. 1995: HJR-CA 11 (Hoffman-Holbrook-Deering-Brunsvold-Schoenberg et al.).
67. 1995: HJR-CA 10 (Hoffman).
68. 1999: SJR(-CA) 14 (Watson-Lauzen-Jacobs-Shaw-Klemm); 2003: SJR(-CA) 17 (Burzynski).
69. 1984: HJR-CA 19 (Koehler); 1990: SJR(-CA) 151 (Dudycz-Kustra et al.); SJR(-CA) 226 (Dudycz); HJR-CA 16 (B.Pedersen-Daniels-Stephens-Williamson-Zickus et al.); 1991: SJR(-CA) 8 (Dudycz); HJR-CA 11 (DeLeo-Capparelli-Laurino-Bugielski-McAfee et al.); HJR-CA 17 (McAfee); 1992: HJR-CA 30 (McNamara-B.Pedersen et al.); 1995: SJR(-CA) 18 (Lauzen-Dudycz-Fitzgerald et al.); HJR-CA 18 (Pedersen-Skinner et al.), adopted in House May 1, 1996; 1996: HJR-CA 32 (Pedersen-Hughes-Ciarlo-Clayton-Skinner et al.), adopted by House; 1997: SJR(-CA) 13 (Lauzen); HJR-CA 1 (Brown-Daniels-Hughes); 1998: SJR(-CA) 57 (Klemm-Dudycz-Fitzgerald-O'Malley et al.); 1999: HJR-CA 1 (B.Mitchell-Daniels-Kosel-McAuliffe-Righter et al.); 2000: HJR-CA 1 (B.Mitchell-Daniels-Kosel-Mulligan-Bost et al.); 2003: HJR-CA 2 (Cross-B.Mitchell-Sacia-Millner-Bassi et al.); HJR-CA 4 (Schmitz-B.Mitchell-Froehlich-Pritchard-Bassi); 2004: HJR-CA 33 (E.Sullivan-Bellock-Mathias-Poe-Rose et al.); 2005: HJR-CA 5 (Cross-Bassi-Reis-Froehlich-Lindner et al.); HJR-CA 19 (Pihos-Hultgren-Eddy); 2007: HJR-CA 9 (Cross-E.Sullivan-Meyer-Reboletti et al.), assigned to House Executive Committee Feb. 7, 2007.
70. 1997: SJR(-CA) 16 (Fitzgerald-Lauzen); HJR-CA 12 (Skinner-Daniels-Brown-Myers-Righter et al.); 1999: HJR-CA 15 (Skinner-Capparelli-

- Parke); 2000: SJR(-CA) 57 (W.Jones); 2002: SJR(-CA) 51 (Mahar); SJR(-CA) 53 (Cronin); HJR-CA 11 (Franks); 2005: SJR(-CA) 12 (Dahl); 2006: SJR(-CA) 69 (B.Brady).
71. 2007 SJR(-CA) 25 (Murphy), not assigned to a substantive committee.
 72. 2000: HJR-CA 20 (Leitch-Krause-Dart-Scott-T.Johnson).
 73. 2000: HJR-CA 21 (Leitch-Krause-Dart-Scott-T.Johnson); 2001: HJR-CA 5 (Dart).
 74. 1971: SJR(-CA) 56 (Berning); 1972: SJR(-CA) 66 (Daniel P. O'Brien, Jr.); HJR-CA 10 (Matijevich and Barry); 1975: SJR(-CA) 61 (Regner, Nimrod, H.H.Hall et al.); 1977: HJR-CA 11 (Friedrich, Giorgi, P.W.Collins et al.); 1981: HJR-CA 12 (Giglio, Ronan, McClain, O'Connell, and Slape) proposed to eliminate reduction, item, and amendatory vetoes; 1986: HJR-CA 16 (A.Young-Shaw); HJR-CA 17 (A.Young-Shaw); 2008: HJR-CA 35 (Fritchey-Miller), voted "do pass" 8-1 by House State Government Administration Committee April 15, 2008.
 75. 1972: HJR-CA 11 (Fleck) passed House; 1973: HJR-CA 7 (Fleck, Redmond, Collins et al.) passed both Houses, rejected by voters; 1976: HJR-CA 40 (Madigan) passed House; 1977: HJR-CA 11 (Friedrich, Giorgi, P.W.Collins et al.); 1983: SJR(-CA) 2 (Buzbee, Sangmeister, and Welch).
 76. 1983: HJR-CA 6 (Terzich, Capparelli, and Greiman).
 77. 1985: HJR-CA 1 (Madigan).
 78. 1990: SJR(-CA) 119 (Kustra-Philip-S.Weaver et al.); HJR-CA 19 (Daniels-Ryder-Stephens-Hoffman-Ewing et al.); 1991: SJR(-CA) 29 (Etheredge-Philip-S.Weaver-Davidson-Schaffer-DeAngelis-Schuneman et al.); HJR-CA 12 (Ryder-Daniels-M.Weaver-Wojcik-Black).
 79. 1975: SJR(-CA) 14 (Latherow, Merritt, Graham et al.).
 80. 1991: SJR(-CA) 89 (Watson et al.), HJR-CA 16 (Petka-Stern-Burzynski-Parcells-R.Olson et al.), and HJR-CA 27 (Hicks); 1993: SJR(-CA) 1 (Watson-Klemm-Topinka-Sieben-Fawell et al.) and HJR-CA 11 (Hicks).
 81. 1991: HJR-CA 25 (Homer); 1993: SJR(-CA) 117 (R. Dunn); 1994: HJR-CA 35 (M.Madigan—Philip), passed both houses and approved by the voters.
 82. 1993: SJR(-CA) 81 (R.Dunn-Fawell-O'Malley).
 83. 1973: HJR-CA 8 (Hirschfeld and Hudson); 1975: HJR-CA 5 (Hirschfeld-Hudson); 1977: SJR(-CA) 34 (Sommer, Berman, Berning et al.); 1979: SJR(-CA) 1 (Rhoads-Shapiro, Sangmeister, Sommer, and Nedza) passed the Senate; 1981: HJR-CA 17 (Koehler, MacDonald, Zwick, Deuchler, Birkinbine et al.); 1984: HJR-CA 21 (Hannig).
 84. 1978: HJR-CA 39 (Ebbesen); 1979: HJR-CA 5 (Ebbesen, Steele, Reilly, and Schraeder).
 85. 1979: HJR-CA 8 (Bowman-Kempiners et al.).
 86. 1991: SJR(-CA) 11 (Kelly).
 87. 1979: HJR-CA 18 (Hudson, Schuneman, MacDonald et al.).
 88. 1979: HJR-CA 19 (Yourell).
 89. 1978: HJR-CA 40 (Simms).
 90. 1979: HJR-CA 7 (Davis, Kent, Schoeberlein et al.).
 91. 1975: SJR(-CA) 57 (Philip, H.H.Hall, Sommer et al.).
 92. 1979: HJR-CA 43 (Vinson-Peters-Totten et al.).
 93. 1978: HJR-CA 43 (Griesheimer); HJR-CA 50 (MacDonald-Madigan).
 94. 1994: HJR-CA 34 (Sheehy).

95. 1993: HJR-CA 18 (M.Murphy et al.); 1994: SJR(-CA) 124 (Cronin).
96. 1995: HJR-CA 18 (Pedersen).
97. 2007: SJR(-CA) 24 (Radogno-F.Watson-Althoff-Pankau-Dahl et al.), not assigned to a substantive committee.
98. 2007: HJR-CA 24 (Madigan), not assigned to a substantive committee.
99. 2004: HJR-CA 34 (E.Sullivan-Black-Brauer-Poe-Mathias et al.); 2005: HJR-CA 18 (Hultgren-Winters-Kosel-Pihos).
100. 2004: HJR-CA 16 (Kosel-Biggins-Mulligan).
101. 2004: SJR(-CA) 54 (Luechtefeld-Watson-Dillard-J.Jones et al.); 2004: HJR-CA 36 (Cross-Coulson-Pritchard-Bassi-Munson et al.); 2005: SJR(-CA) 7 (Luechtefeld-F.Watson-J.Jones-Dillard et al.); 2005: HJR-CA 14 (Cross-Munson-Reis-Coulson-Schock et al.).
102. 2005: HJR-CA 17 (Reis-Black); 2007: HJR-CA 11 (Black-Fortner-Schmitz-Schock-Mathias et al.), assigned to House Executive Committee Feb. 15, 2007.
103. 2008: HJR-CA 37 (Froehlich), not assigned to a substantive committee.

ARTICLE 5: THE EXECUTIVE

- Officers
(Section 1)** Addition to the list of executive officers of a Solicitor General, Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Superintendent of Insurance has been proposed by one resolution each.¹ Seven resolutions would have abolished the office of Lieutenant Governor; one of those would have put the Attorney General first in line of succession to the Governorship.² One resolution proposed that the Governor would appoint the Attorney General;³ three called for the Governor to appoint the Lieutenant Governor if that office became vacant.⁴ One resolution would have abolished the office of Treasurer and given the Treasurer's duties to the Comptroller.⁵ Six resolutions, including one in 2007, proposed to abolish the office of the Comptroller and give the Comptroller's duties to the Treasurer.⁶ Six, including one in 2007, proposed to abolish the offices of the Treasurer and Comptroller, and give both offices' duties to a new State Financial Officer.⁷ Five resolutions, including one in 2007, proposed to combine the offices into one Comptroller of the Treasury.⁸ One in 2007 would require the Governor to live in and be present at the seat of government while the General Assembly is in session, excluding perfunctory session days.⁹ Another 2007 resolution would change the position of Auditor General from being appointed by the General Assembly to being elected, and expand the Auditor General's powers.¹⁰
- Terms
(Section 2)** Seven resolutions proposed to bar anyone from being elected to any one of the six statewide executive offices more than twice.¹¹ Three resolutions would have required those six statewide officers to be elected in the same years as U.S. Presidents.¹²
- Joint Election
(Section 4)** One resolution would have ended joint election of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor.¹³ Another proposed that candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor be nominated jointly.¹⁴
- Gubernatorial
Succession
(Section 6)** One resolution would have barred the Lieutenant Governor from succeeding the Governor, but required that the successor to the Governor be of the same political party as the Governor.¹⁵
- Vacancies in
Other Elective
Offices
(Section 7)** One resolution would have provided that if the Governor must appoint a person to fill a vacancy in a statewide executive office, the replacement must be of the same political party as the person replaced.¹⁶ Another would have required any appointment to replace the Attorney General, Secretary of State, Comptroller, or Treasurer to have Senate confirmation.¹⁷ A third would have allowed the Governor to appoint a replacement Lieutenant Governor (with Senate confirmation).¹⁸ One resolution would have provided for the Governor to appoint a replacement Lieutenant Governor without Senate confirmation.¹⁹ Another proposed only making references to persons holding Executive office gender-neutral.²⁰
- Governor—
Appointing
Power
(Section 9)** Two resolutions would have provided that if the Senate failed to act on an appointment within 60 days, it would be considered automatically rejected rather than automatically accepted.²¹ One would have allowed the Senate to reconsider its consent to an executive appointment.²²

**Governor—
Agency
Reorganization
(Section 11)**

Two resolutions, in 1993 and 1994, sought to change the April 1 deadline for the Governor to submit executive reorganization orders for consideration in that General Assembly. The 1993 resolution would have changed the date to February 1, and the 1994 resolution to March 1.²³

**Treasurer—
Duties
(Section 18)**

One resolution proposed to authorize the State Treasurer to regulate insurance.²⁴

Notes

1. 1973: HJR-CA 16 (Friedland, Matijevich, McCormick et al.); HJR-CA 23 (Fleck, Hyde, Bluthardt et al.); 1978: SJR(-CA) 81 (Newhouse-Chew, K.Hall et al.).
2. 1973: HJR-CA 17 (Friedland); 1986: SJR(-CA) 125 (Lemke); 1996: SJR(-CA) 115 (Carroll-Bowles); 1997: SJR(-CA) 1 (Carroll-Bowles); 1999: HJR-CA 8 (Franks); 2004: HJR-CA 29 (Cross-Pritchard-Bassi-Munson-McAuliffe et al.); 2005: HJR-CA 12 (Granberg).
3. 1983: HJR-CA 4 (Davis).
4. 1995: HJR-CA 23 (Wennlund-Meyer); 1999: HJR-CA 11 (M.Madigan); HJR-CA 12 (M.Madigan).
5. 1997: SJR(-CA) 9 (Dillard).
6. 1997: HJR-CA 2 (Boland-Kosel-Scott-M.Smith-Holbrook et al.); 1999: SJR(-CA) 5 (Dillard); 2001: SJR(-CA) 10 (Dillard et al.); 2004: HJR-CA 28 (Cross-Pritchard-Bassi-Munson-McAuliffe et al.); 2006: SJR(-CA) 68 (Pankau); 2007 SJR(-CA) 18 (Murphy-Pankau), not assigned to a substantive committee.
7. 1997: SJR(-CA) 15 (Dillard—Capparelli-Brady-Biggins-Zickus-Boland), passed the Senate; 1999: SJR(-CA) 18 (Lauzen-Dillard), passed the Senate; HJR-CA 7 (Franks); 2001: SJR(-CA) 8 (Lauzen); 2004: HJR-CA 30 (Boland); 2007: HJR-CA 14 (Boland-Froehlich-Mathias), assigned to House Executive Committee March 1, 2007.
8. 1999: SJR(-CA) 26 (Obama); 2001: SJR(-CA) 14 (Obama); 2003: SJR(-CA) 18 (Silverstein); 2005: HJR-CA 16 (Franks); 2007: HJR-CA 19 (Franks), assigned to House Executive Committee March 1, 2007.
9. 2007: HJR-CA 27 (B.Mitchell), not assigned to a substantive committee.
10. 2007: SJR(-CA) 19 (Murphy), not assigned to a substantive committee.
11. 1991: HJR-CA 19 (Parcells-Ewing et al.); 1993: HJR-CA 5 (Hanrahan-M.Weaver-Balthis-Schoenberg-Lindner et al.); 1994: HJR-CA 23 (Blagojevich-Sheehy); HJR-CA 30 (Hughes-Linder-Weller); 1995: SJR(-CA) 13 (Bowles); SJR(-CA) 18 (Lauzen); HJR-CA 13 (Hughes-Lindner-Goslin-Lachner-Balthis et al.
12. 1995: SJR(-CA) 13 (Bowles); 1996: SJR(-CA) 115 (Carroll-Bowles); 1999: SJR(-CA) 8 (Welch).
13. 1986: HJR-CA 18 (Levin).
14. 1987: HJR-CA 10 (McGann).
15. 1986: SJR(-CA) 130 (Marovitz).
16. 1979: HJR-CA 44 (Breslin).

17. 1980: HJR-CA 51 (Pierce, Lechowicz, Getty et al.).
18. 1981: SJR(-CA) 66 (Bloom, Buzbee, Totten et al.).
19. 1995: HJR-CA 23 (Wennlund-Meyer).
20. 1999: HJR-CA 9 (M.Madigan).
21. 1981: SJR(-CA) 47 (Friedland, Sommer, Philip, Simms, Mahar, and Rhoads); HJR-CA 26 (J.Kelly).
22. 1985: SJR(-CA) 102 (Luft).
23. 1993: HJR-CA 11 (Hicks); 1994: SJR(-CA) 117 (R.Dunn).
24. 1991: HJR-CA 14 (Matijevich).

ARTICLE 6: THE JUDICIARY

- Courts
(Section 1)** One resolution would have provided for lawyers and the profession of law to be regulated as provided by law.¹ Three other resolutions would have created a Supreme Court of Criminal Appeals having final appellate jurisdiction in all criminal cases.² One resolution proposed only a nonsubstantive change in this section.³
- Judicial Districts
(Section 2)** Two resolutions proposed to increase the number of judicial districts in the state from five to seven; one of these would also have established a plan for judicial redistricting.⁴ One resolution would have permitted the General Assembly to divide the First Appellate District (Cook County) into subdistricts for selecting judges.⁵ Two resolutions proposed only nonsubstantive changes in this section.⁶
- Supreme Court—
Organization
(Section 3)** One resolution would have provided for one justice of the Supreme Court to be elected from Chicago, one from Cook County outside Chicago, and one from Cook County at large (the Constitution now simply requires three to be elected from Cook County).⁷ Another resolution would have provided for one justice of the Supreme Court to be elected from Chicago, one from suburban Cook County, and one from each of the other five districts.⁸ Two resolutions proposed to divide Cook County into three subdistricts of substantially equal population for electing Supreme Court justices.⁹ One resolution proposed to double the number of Supreme Court justices to 14 and create civil and criminal divisions of the Court with seven justices each; those in the civil division would be chosen by a “merit” system.¹⁰
- Appellate Court—
Organization
(Section 5)** One resolution proposed only a nonsubstantive change in this section.¹¹
- Appellate Court—
Jurisdiction
(Section 6)** One resolution proposed that in a criminal case heard by a jury, if the jury returns a verdict of guilty but the judge overrules the jury and directs acquittal, the state could appeal the judge’s decision.¹²
- Judicial Circuits
(Section 7)** Two resolutions would have provided for election of Cook County circuit judges from six districts within the county.¹³ One resolution proposed that the Supreme Court appoint the chief judge of the Cook County Circuit Court.¹⁴
- Associate Judges
(Section 8)** Two resolutions would have required votes by circuit judges on choosing associate judges to be public and recorded.¹⁵ One proposed to require that associate judges have been admitted to practice law for at least 5 years, and that appointment be by secret ballot of circuit judges.¹⁶ Two others proposed that associate judges outside Cook County be elected for 6-year terms.¹⁷ One proposed to eliminate the office of associate judge and convert existing associate judges into circuit judges.¹⁸
- Terms of Office
(Section 10)** Two resolutions proposed to reduce the terms of Supreme and Appellate Court judges from 10 to 6 years; another would have reduced them to 5 years.¹⁹ Yet another would have given all judges initial 4-year terms. After

that, if retained once in office, they would serve until death, retirement, or removal.²⁰

**Eligibility
for Office
(Section 11)**

One resolution proposed that any applicant for a judgeship must have been a resident lawyer for 10 years and active for 7 of the last 12 years, and in addition pass an examination given by the Supreme Court.²¹ One resolution, which passed the House, would have required an applicant for a judgeship to have been licensed as a lawyer for at least 10 years including at least 5 years in Illinois; and an applicant for an associate judgeship to have been licensed for at least 8 years including 5 years in Illinois.²² Six others would have required each nonincumbent prospective judge or associate judge to have been licensed to practice law in Illinois for at least 10 years.²³

**Election and
Retention
(Section 12)**

One resolution would have increased the popular vote required to retain a judge from three-fifths to two-thirds.²⁴ Eleven resolutions, including one that passed the House and another that passed both houses but was later withdrawn by a joint resolution, proposed to delete the present provision for a judge to be retained by vote of the people, thus requiring judges to run for re-election in contested elections.²⁵ Another would have done this only as to circuit judges.²⁶ One resolution would have created a Judicial Retention Commission in each judicial district to assess the qualifications of judges seeking retention, with judges not found qualified allowed to seek retention by the voters.²⁷ One would have provided for the Governor to appoint all judges from nominations made by judicial nominating commissions.²⁸ Nine resolutions proposed to have the Governor make such appointments for all Supreme and Appellate judges, Cook County circuit judges, and circuit judges in any other circuit adopting the plan by referendum.²⁹ One provided for the Supreme Court to appoint all Supreme, Appellate, circuit, and associate judges from recommendations by bar organizations.³⁰ Another would have had the Supreme Court appoint judges in Cook County from nominations by circuit-wide and subcircuit Judicial Nominating Commissions.³¹

Fifteen resolutions, including one that passed the Senate, proposed to have the Governor make such appointments for Supreme and Appellate Court judges, and of circuit judges in any circuit adopting the plan.³² One would have had the Governor appoint Supreme Court judges and Cook County Appellate and circuit judges.³³ Two resolutions proposed to have the Governor appoint only circuit judges, and only in circuits adopting the plan.³⁴ One would have had the Governor appoint Supreme Court judges with approval of the Senate. It would have *required* the First Judicial Circuit, and *allowed* other circuits with voter approval, to fill Appellate and circuit court vacancies by appointments made by a Merit Selection Commission.³⁵ Another would have created the same requirements for Appellate and circuit court vacancies, but would not have let the Governor appoint Supreme Court justices.³⁶ Taking a somewhat different approach, one resolution proposed to have judges actually appointed by a commission, but with the Governor having one veto per vacancy to be filled. Judges could run for retention if the Illinois Courts Commission determined that they met accepted judicial standards.³⁷ Seven other resolutions would have abolished the office of associate judge and had the Governor appoint judges from nominations by a judicial nominating commission.³⁸ Two resolutions would also have abolished the office of associate judge, but had the Supreme Court appoint judges from nominations by a judicial nominating commission.³⁹ Another resolution would have had the Supreme Court choose judges from nominees, but would not have abolished the office of associate

judge.⁴⁰ One proposed to create judicial nominating commissions in each circuit to select circuit judges.⁴¹ Another would have given judicial districts the option to decide whether to allow nomination by a commission of Appellate Court, circuit, and associate judges.⁴² Another proposed an elected Supreme Court, which would appoint Appellate and circuit court judges from nominating lists.⁴³

Less sweeping was a resolution proposing to have nonpartisan primary and general elections for judges, with the general election a runoff between the two top contenders for each position in the primary.⁴⁴ One resolution proposed that the retention vote for each circuit judge be held in that judge's county of residence rather than throughout the judicial circuit.⁴⁵ One would have allowed judges in Cook County to be retained by approval of Judicial Review Commissions or by approval of three-fifths of voters.⁴⁶ One resolution would have prevented a judge who failed to file a declaration of candidacy for retention from filing petitions as a candidate for the judicial vacancy created by that failure.⁴⁷ Three resolutions proposed to add a new section 12A allowing the voters to recall judges.⁴⁸ Finally, one resolution proposed to add "or her" after "his" in this section.⁴⁹

**Prohibited
Activities
(Section 13)**

One resolution would have allowed the practice of law to be regulated only as provided by the General Assembly.⁵⁰

**Retirement—
Discipline
(Section 15)**

One resolution, apparently a reaction to the Illinois Supreme Court's decision in *People ex rel. Harrod v. Illinois Courts Comm'n*, 69 Ill. 2d 445 (1977), proposed to amend this section to provide that the Judicial Inquiry Board and Courts Commission not be limited in their standards for judicial discipline to the rules of judicial conduct adopted by the Supreme Court, and to say that decisions of the Commission "shall not be judicially reviewable directly or collaterally except as to charges that the Board or Commission has acted clearly without lawful authority."⁵¹ Another, which passed the House, would have required that information relating to a judge's misconduct that is received by the Judicial Inquiry Board be turned over to the appropriate state's attorney after the Board concludes its proceedings.⁵² Another resolution would have prevented retired judges who perform judicial services from receiving retirement benefits.⁵³

A resolution that the voters **approved** in 1998 increased the number of members of the Courts Commission from five to seven, and required the Governor to appoint two "citizens" to it. It also barred members of the Commission from also being on the Judicial Inquiry Board.⁵⁴ Three resolutions proposed that the Courts Commission be made up of seven members, with two each appointed by the Appellate Court and the circuit court, and three "citizens" appointed by the Supreme Court.⁵⁵ One resolution proposed to abolish the Judicial Inquiry Board and the Courts Commission, and to create a Judicial Discipline and Incapacity Commission.⁵⁶ One resolution proposed only a nonsubstantive change.⁵⁷

**Proposed New
Section**

Two resolutions would have provided that the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission be appointed by the Governor with Senate confirmation, and that at least three-fifths of its members be nonlawyers.⁵⁸ Two others would have provided for the Commission to be appointed by the Supreme Court with Senate confirmation.⁵⁹

Notes

1. 1986: SJR(-CA) 118 (Kustra-Dudycz-Topinka).
2. 1987: HJR-CA 11 (Petka et al.); 1993: SJR(-CA) 72 (Petka et al.); 2001: SJR(-CA) 18 (Petka).
3. 1995: HJR-CA 17 (Kubik-Churchill).
4. 1977: HJR-CA 31 (Pechous); 1981: SJR(-CA) 21 (DeAngelis, Shapiro, Philip, and Weaver) would have provided for judicial redistricting.
5. 1991: HJR-CA 3 (A.Young and Kubik).
6. 1995: HJR-CA 24 (Kubik); 1999: HJR-CA 5 (Granberg).
7. 1987: SJR(-CA) 13 (Keats).
8. 1996: HJR-CA 27 (Parke).
9. 1998: SJR(-CA) 55 (Petka); 1999: SJR(-CA) 27 (Philip).
10. 1996: SJR(-CA) 80 (Petka).
11. 1995: HJR-CA 25 (Kubik).
12. 1984: SJR(-CA) 91 (Lemke).
13. 1981: SJR(-CA) 43 (Berman); 1983: SJR(-CA) 25 (Berman).
14. 1986: SJR(-CA) 119 (Kustra-Dudycz-Topinka).
15. 1985: SJR(-CA) 39 (Philip); 1987: SJR(-CA) 18 (Keats).
16. 1986: SJR(-CA) 115 (Lemke).
17. 1987: HJR-CA 4 (McPike et al.); 1989: HJR-CA 11 (Petka-Ewing).
18. 1987: HJR-CA 20 (J.Dunn and Slater).
19. 1973: HJR-CA 24 (McCourt, Hyde, and Ebbesen); 1981: HJR-CA 5 (J.J.Wolf); 1990: HJR-CA 22 (Hicks).
20. 1979: HJR-CA 24 (Greiman).
21. 1971: SJR(-CA) 28 (Daniel O'Brien, Jr.).
22. 1996: HJR-CA 35 (Daniels-Cross-Erwin-Kubik-Schoenberg et al.).
23. 1992: HJR-CA 32 (Preston); 1995: SJR(-CA) 25 (Dillard); SJR(-CA) 27 (Philip); 1996: SJR(-CA) 93 (DeLeo); 1998: HJR-CA 18 (Dart); 1999: HJR-CA 14 (Dart).
24. 1979: HJR-CA 38 (Dyer).
25. 1971: SJR(-CA) 32 (McBroom and Knuppel); 1973: SJR(-CA) 23 (McBroom, Knuppel, Sours et al.) (passed both houses in 1973 but was withdrawn by SJR(-CA) 50 in 1973; HJR-CA 5 (Cunningham, Borchers, Pappas et al.); 1975: SJR(-CA) 6 (Sommer, Bloom, and Bell); HJR-CA 29 (Cunningham, Giorgi, Keller et al.); HJR-CA 36 (Mudd); 1977: HJR-CA 33 (Van Duyne, Lauer, Cunningham et al.); 1979: HJR-CA 30 (Van Duyne); 1981: HJR-CA 9 (Stuffle-Van Duyne); HJR-CA 19 (Friedrich and Schraeder) passed the House; 1991: HJR-CA 6 (Hicks).
26. 1985: HJR-CA 14 (Curran).
27. 2000: HJR-CA 22 (Schoenberg).
28. 1973: HJR-CA 18 (Duff-Rayson, K.W.Miller et al.).
29. 1972: HJR-CA 14 (Glass, Burditt, Scariano et al.); 1973: SJR(-CA) 18 (Fawell, Netsch, Harris et al.); 1977: HJR-CA 35 (McCourt, L.Martin, Schlickman et al.); 1979: HJR-CA 10 (McCourt); 1981: HJR-CA 21 (McCourt); 1994: SJR(-CA) 144 (Cronin); HJR-CA 33 (Erwin-Daniels-John Dunn-Weller); 1997: HJR-CA 10 (Erwin); 2005: HJR-CA 6 (Coulson).
30. 1987: SJR(-CA) 14 (Kelly).
31. 2006: HJR-CA 28 (Coulson).
32. 1975: SJR(-CA) 20 (Netsch, Glass, Fawell et al.); HJR-CA 1 (Duff, Brinkmeier, Satterthwaite et al.); 1976: HJR-CA 41 (Duff); 1977: SJR(-CA) 37 (Netsch, Glass, Roe et al.); HJR-CA 1 (Wolf, Conti,

- Antonovych et al.); HJR-CA 2 (Daniels, Porter, Polk et al.); 1979: SJR(-CA) 25 (Netsch, R. Walsh, Rhoads, and Martin) passed the Senate; HJR-CA 31 (J.J. Wolf-Daniels-Mugalian et al.); 1981: SJR(-CA) 24 (Netsch-R. Walsh); HJR-CA 13 (Daniels-Dunn, John-Braun, Barkhausen, and Hoffman); 1983: SJR(-CA) 73 (Netsch-Kustra); 1985: SJR(-CA) 30 (Netsch-Kustra-Barkhausen); HJR-CA 9 (Daniels-J. Dunn-Stern et al.); 1987: SJR(-CA) 7 (Netsch-Kustra); HJR-CA 3 (Daniels-J. Dunn-Panayotovich).
33. 1971: HJR-CA 6 (Glass, Burditt, Duff et al.).
 34. 1976: HJR-CA 39 (T.H. Miller, Totten, Telcser et al.); 1977: HJR-CA 6 (T.H. Miller).
 35. 1996: SJR(-CA) 85 (Dillard).
 36. 1996: SJR(-CA) 86 (Dillard).
 37. 1973: HJR-CA 24 (McCourt, Hyde, and Ebbesen).
 38. 1988: SJR(-CA) 105 (Netsch-Kustra); HJR-CA 25 (Daniels-Ronan-Panayotovich-J. Dunn-Didrickson and Kirkland); 1989: SJR(-CA) 88 (Netsch-Kustra-Jeremiah Joyce-MacDonald); HJR-CA 12 (J. Dunn-Kirkland); 1992: HJR-CA 36 (Preston); 1995: HJR-CA 22 (Erwin-Lindner-Gash-Schoenberg et. al.); SJR(-CA) 31 (Cronin-Dillard).
 39. 1997: HJR-CA 8 (Schoenberg); SJR(-CA) 23 (Cronin).
 40. 1999: HJR-CA 16 (Erwin).
 41. 1987: HJR-CA 5 (Ronan-Didrickson-Panayotovich et al.).
 42. 1987: HJR-CA 16 (Farley).
 43. 1987: HJR-CA 18 (Cullerton).
 44. 1975: HJR-CA 19 (Brinkmeier, Bradley, Rigney et al.).
 45. 1979: HJR-CA 42 (Johnson).
 46. 2004: SJR(-CA) 55 (Schoenberg).
 47. 2006: SJR(-CA) 65 (F. Watson).
 48. 1978: HJR-CA 51 (Skinner, Greiman, Dyer et al.); 1997: HJR-CA 15 (McCarthy-Boland-Skinner); 1999: HJR-CA 10 (McCarthy).
 49. 1991: HJR-CA 10 (DeLeo and Laurino).
 50. 1981: HJR-CA 16 (Friedrich-Schraeder, Leverenz, Keane, Neff et al.).
 51. 1978: HJR-CA 48 (Willer, R. Dunn, MacDonald, and Rigney).
 52. 1979: HJR-CA 46 (Friedrich and McClain).
 53. 1997: SJR(-CA) 43 (Cullerton).
 54. 1998: SJR(-CA) 52 (Cronin-Philip-Berman et al. — Lang-Brady-Klingler-Black).
 55. 1997: HJR-CA 14 (Brady-Klingler-E. Lyons et al.); 1998: SJR(-CA) 56 (Maitland); HJR-CA 20 (Lang-Brady-Dart-Black-Granberg et al. — Cronin), passed House.
 56. 1998: HJR-CA 19 (Schoenberg).
 57. 1997: HJR-CA 16 (M. Madigan).
 58. 1987: SJR(-CA) 35 (Keats); 1991: SJR(-CA) 7 (Keats).
 59. 1987: SJR(-CA) 42 (Kustra-MacDonald-Demuzio-Schuneman); 1989: SJR(-CA) 40 (Keats and Topinka).

ARTICLE 7: LOCAL GOVERNMENT

- County Boards
(Section 3)** Two resolutions proposed to change the method of electing Cook County board members; they would be elected from 15 single-member districts, to be drawn upon adoption of the amendment and after each decennial census. This method of electing board members would not be subject to change by referendum.¹ One resolution proposed to allow the number of members of a county board to be determined by a county-wide referendum, in addition to by ordinance.² A 2008 resolution would allow voters to petition for a county-wide referendum to reduce the number of board members of any county board having at least 17 members.³
- County Officers
(Section 4)** One resolution would have provided for election of a recorder and auditor in each county, and of a coroner in counties of under 1 million.⁴
- Townships
(Section 5)** One resolution proposed to prohibit annexation of any part of a township to another township or municipality without approval by voters in the area to be annexed.⁵
- Powers of Home-Rule Units
(Section 6)** One resolution proposed to repeal section 6, which gives home-rule powers;⁶ three, including two in 2007, have proposed to remove counties from the list of kinds of local governments with potential to have home rule.⁷ A third would have allowed home-rule units to license or regulate an occupation only if permitted by statute.⁸ One resolution proposed to give school districts home rule.⁹
- Counties and Municipalities Without Home Rule
(Section 7)** One resolution would have allowed any county to “suspend or abate” property taxes, subject to limitations set by the General Assembly.¹⁰
- Powers and Officers of School Districts and Other Local Governments
(Section 8)** One resolution would have required a three-fifths vote in each house of the General Assembly to approve any bill that would raise the tax rate limit for a special district.¹¹ Another would have required election of all local boards that have authority to levy taxes.¹²
- Salaries and Fees
(Section 9)** Four resolutions, including one that passed the House, proposed that counties be allowed to charge other units of local government for the costs of extending and collecting taxes for those units.¹³ Another resolution would have deleted the requirement that fees collected by a local government be deposited upon receipt with the treasurer of that unit, and deleted the prohibition on fees based on funds disbursed or collected on taxes.¹⁴
- Other Proposals** One resolution proposed to add a section 13 making any new statutory powers or duties of units of local government or school districts merely permissive to the extent the General Assembly did not fund them.¹⁵ Two others would have made unfunded mandates unenforceable unless imposed by three-fifths vote in each house.¹⁶ Six resolutions, including two that passed the House, proposed to require reimbursement of local governments and school districts for

all new state mandates, and require a three-fifths vote in each house to impose any such mandates.¹⁷ Two resolutions made a similar proposal but would have exempted tax limitations on local governments from counting as unfunded mandates.¹⁸ Another resolution would have required a two-thirds vote to impose unfunded mandates, and made administrative or executive actions imposing unfunded mandates on local governments unenforceable.¹⁹ Finally, three resolutions proposed that the state must reimburse local governments for a state mandate not enacted by a four-fifths vote in each house.²⁰

Notes

1. 1973: HJR-CA 19 (Jaffe, Lundy, Epton, and Catania); 1977: HJR-CA 30 (Jaffe-Giglio, Getty et al.).
2. 2003: HJR-CA 19 (Boland).
3. 2008: HJR-CA 41 (Boland), assigned to House State Government Administration Committee April 8, 2008.
4. 1985: HJR-CA 7 (Davis).
5. 1981: SJR(-CA) 12 (Berning).
6. 1980: HJR-CA 49 (Griesheimer).
7. 1972: HJR-CA 16 (Bluthardt); 2007: SJR(-CA) 12 (J.Jones), not assigned to a substantive committee; HJR-CA 17 (Granberg), assigned to House Executive Committee Feb. 22, 2007.
8. 1974: HJR-CA 30 (W.D. Walsh, Palmer, and Geo-Karis).
9. 1993: HJR-CA 13 (Stroger-Curran).
10. 1978: HJR-CA 49 (Beatty).
11. 1979: HJR-CA 40 (Balanoff-Currie-Bowman).
12. 1979: HJR-CA 48 (Grossi).
13. 1973: SJR(-CA) 15 (Berning); HJR-CA 22 (Hart-McMaster, Keller et al.); 1975: HJR-CA 17 (Hart and Yourell) passed the House; 1977: HJR-CA 24 (Van Duyne-Hart, Madigan et al.).
14. 1984: HJR-CA 20 (Ropp, Olson, and Tuerk).
15. 1979: SJR(-CA) 36 (Bloom).
16. 1994: SJR(-CA) 153 (Fitzgerald-Rauschenberger-Karpiel-Syverson-O'Malley et al.); SJR(-CA) 154 (Fitzgerald-Syverson-Rauschenberger-Karpiel).
17. 1990: SJR(-CA) 152 (Barkhausen et al.); 1991: HJR-CA 9 (Black); 1992: HJR-CA 29 (Homer-Daniels-Schoenberg-Churchill-Edley et al. — Luft-Watson-J.Cullerton-Geo-Karis), passed House, and HJR-CA 34 (Daniels et al.); 1993: HJR-CA 1 (Weller-Lawfer-Stephens-Zickus-Ackerman et al.); 1995: HJR-CA 3 (Zickus).
18. 1995: SJR(-CA) 3, passed Senate; HJR-CA 20 (Pankau).
19. 1995: HJR-CA 9 (Balthis).
20. 1993: HJR-CA 20 (Parcells); SJR(-CA) 30 (LaPaille); HJR-CA 14 (Granberg-Novak-von Bergen-Wessels-Balthis-Saviano et al. — Watson-LaPaille-Geo-Karis-Cullerton-Klemm), passed House.

ARTICLE 8: FINANCE**General Provisions (Section 1)**

One resolution, apparently resulting from the Illinois Supreme Court's former refusal to allow the Auditor General to audit agencies that Court had created, would have defined "public funds" and added that even nonpublic funds held by a government instrumentality may be spent only as provided by law or ordinance. It passed the House.¹

State Finance (Section 2)

Ten resolutions have proposed that state budgets be biennial.² One would have caused the salaries of legislators and the Governor to be reduced by the percentage by which the appropriations they pass or approve, respectively, exceed the amount of money estimated to be available by the Economic and Fiscal Commission or the Bureau of the Budget, respectively.³ Another would have required that any law creating or increasing a state tax be approved by a three-fifths majority in each house of the General Assembly or by three-fifths of those voting in an election, and would have prohibited an increase in appropriations exceeding "the rate of increase in the Illinois economy" for the last known fiscal year.⁴ One resolution proposed to require approval by a three-fifths majority in each house for appropriations exceeding revenues of the previous fiscal year, if borrowing occurred due to "cash flow timing variations or revenue shortfalls" in the previous fiscal year.⁵ One resolution each in 2006 and 2007 would require approval by a three-fifths majority in each house for any appropriation bill.⁶ Two other resolutions proposed that no appropriations bill, or portion of it, could become law if, at the time it was to become law, total appropriations would exceed estimated revenues.⁷ Another resolution would have limited total appropriations to 105.5% of the last fiscal year's total appropriations.⁸ Two resolutions would have limited total appropriations to 3% above the higher of the last fiscal year's appropriations or the percentage increase in an inflation index designated by law, unless greater amounts were approved by a three-fifths majority in each house.⁹ A similar resolution would have limited appropriations to 4% over the previous fiscal year's appropriations.¹⁰ One in 2007 would impose the same limitation, but would allow the limit to be exceeded if approved by a three-fifths majority in each house.¹¹ Two resolutions would have limited appropriations to 98% of available funds in each fiscal year.¹² One resolution would have limited general increases in appropriations to the inflation rate or 5%, whichever is lower. But this limit could be exceeded if the Governor declared an emergency and three-fifths of the members of each house approved.¹³ Two would have required that all money administered by the state be appropriated.¹⁴

State Audit and Auditor General (Section 3)

Three resolutions proposed to redefine "public funds of the state" to include all funds administered directly or indirectly by the legislative, executive, or judicial branches or any instrumentality of those branches, whether or not appropriated, and however derived.¹⁵ Six other resolutions, one of which passed the Senate, proposed that the General Assembly provide for the audit of all funds administered by state government, regardless of branch and whether or not appropriated.¹⁶ One resolution proposed to limit the Auditor General to one term.¹⁷

Proposed New Section

One resolution proposed a new section establishing a "Budget Reserve Account" into which excess funds (up to 5% of the state's general revenue) could be placed, to be spent later if approved by two-thirds vote in each house.¹⁸ Another resolution to require a special fund for excess revenues would have required a three-fifths vote to spend any money from the fund.¹⁹

Notes

1. 1981: HJR-CA 15 (Friedrich, Leverenz, Keane, Neff et al.). The Illinois Supreme Court now allows the Auditor General to audit its agencies.
2. 1975: SJR(-CA) 60 (Harris, Regner, and Mitchler); 1977: HJR-CA 26 (Matijevich); HJR-CA 28 (McBroom and Ryan); 1979: SJR(-CA) 16 (Bowers-Sangmeister, Bloom et al.); HJR-CA 27 (Hallock); 1990: SJR(-CA) 118 (Kustra-Philip-S.Weaver-DeAngelis et al.); HJR-CA 18 (Daniels-Ryder-Stephens-Hoffman-Ewing et al.); 1991: SJR(-CA) 28 (Etheredge et al.); HJR-CA 13 (Ryder-Daniels-M.Weaver-B.Olson-Wojcik); 2006: SJR(-CA) 62 (B.Brady).
3. 1977: SJR(-CA) 40 (Regner, H.H.Hall, and Rhoads).
4. 1979: SJR(-CA) 36 (Bloom).
5. 2006: HJR-CA 25 (J.Watson).
6. 2006: HJR-CA 32 (Mathias); 2007: HJR-CA 12 (Mathias-Stephens-Poe-Ramey-Dunn et al.), assigned to House Executive Committee Feb. 15, 2007.
7. 1989: HJR-CA 1 (Bowman-Ewing et al.) and HJR-CA 9 (Mays-Daniels-Ryder).
8. 1991: HJR-CA 4 (Harris).
9. 2002: HJR-CA 14 (B.Mitchell-Kurtz); 2003: HJR-CA 17 (Pihos-Dunn-Lyons et al.).
10. 2004: HJR-CA 32 (B.Mitchell-Bellock-E.Sullivan-Poe-Rose et al.).
11. 2007: HJR-CA 18 (B.Mitchell), voted "do pass" 11-0 by House State Government Administration Committee March 14, 2007.
12. 1996: HJR-CA 29 (Schoenberg-Erwin-Gash); 1997: HJR-CA 7 (Schoenberg).
13. 1995: SJR(-CA) 33 (Jones).
14. 1993: HJR-CA 3 (Novak-Edley-Hicks-Woolard); HJR-CA 6 (Novak-Edley-Hicks-Deering-Woolard).
15. 1988: SJR(-CA) 94 (MacDonald-Netsch-Kustra-R.Dunn-Rigney); HJR-CA (Keane-Parcells-Mays-Didrickson-Leverenz); 1989: SJR(-CA) 72 (MacDonald-Netsch-Kustra-Hudson-Rigney-R.Dunn-Philip-Fawell-Schaffer).
16. 1991: SJR(-CA) 15 (MacDonald-Geo-Karis et al.—McGann-Parcells-McNamara-Klemm), passed the Senate; HJR-CA 22 (Keane et al.); 1993: SJR(-CA) 9 (Klemm-Severns-Topinka et al.); SJR(-CA) 59 (Topinka); HJR-CA 7 (Novak-Edley-Hicks-Woolard); HJR-CA 19 (Hanrahan).
17. 1991: HJR-CA 18 (Matijevich).
18. 1995: HJR-CA 5 (Salvi).
19. 2003: HJR-CA 11 (J.Watson-B.Mitchell-Stephens).

ARTICLE 9: REVENUE**State Revenue
Power
(Section 1)**

Five resolutions proposed to allow the voters by statewide referendum to limit the General Assembly's power to raise revenue.¹

**Limitations
on Income
Taxation
(Section 3)**

Most of the resolutions proposing to amend this section dealt with the provision in subsection 3(a) that the income tax rate on corporations may not exceed that on individuals by a ratio of more than 8 to 5. Five resolutions proposed to remove the limit.² Two others would have required that the corporate tax rate exceed that on individuals by *at least* 8 to 5,³ and an additional three proposed to raise the limiting ratio to 2 to 1.⁴ Yet another resolution would have removed section 3's provision that there may be no more than one state income tax on individuals and one on corporations at one time.⁵ Nineteen resolutions, including three in 2007 and four in 2008, proposed graduated income taxes.⁶ Another resolution would have authorized an additional income tax on individuals and corporations at a rate up to 0.5% to fund schools.⁷ Two resolutions would have permitted a higher rate on net incomes over \$80,000,⁸ \$100,000,⁹ or \$250,000.¹⁰ One resolution proposed an income tax surcharge on the income of a nonresident that is earned in Illinois, if the nonresident's state of residence imposes a higher income tax rate than does Illinois and there is no reciprocal agreement between Illinois and that state.¹¹

**Proposed
Section on
Separate Fund
for Increase**

One resolution proposed a new Section 3.1 to provide that the proceeds of all taxes or tax increases levied for a specific purpose be placed into a separate fund and not diverted for any other purpose, and that voters must approve at a referendum any tax levied for a specific purpose.¹²

**Real Property
Taxation
(Section 4)**

Many of the resolutions proposing to amend section 4 dealt in one way or another with the provision in subsection 4(b) that counties of more than 200,000 may classify real property for taxation purposes, taxing some property at a rate as much as 2½ times as high as other property. Three resolutions have proposed to abolish this authority;¹³ eight proposed to extend it to all counties.¹⁴ Two others proposed to keep the 200,000 threshold but remove the 2½-to-1 ratio limit.¹⁵

One resolution would have prohibited all property taxes, if not approved by referendum for a bond issue, on property occupied as a home for more than half of the year and not used for business purposes.¹⁶ Three others would have allowed the General Assembly to provide for delaying increases in the assessment of parcels of real property following improvements to them.¹⁷ Somewhat similarly, four resolutions proposed to allow home-rule units to designate development areas within their boundaries which would be taxed on the basis of their land values alone for 12 years, extendible for up to 12 more years, to encourage development on the land.¹⁸ Three, including one that passed the House, would have authorized the General Assembly to let counties or municipalities make similar tax abatements.¹⁹

One resolution would have allowed the voters of a county to limit property taxes on residential properties to some percentage of the market value of each such property.²⁰ Another would have required a three-fifths vote in each house to authorize an increase in property tax rates.²¹ Two resolutions would have

permitted the General Assembly to provide for a tax on real property based on the value of land without regard to improvements, and to provide for separate classifications based on only the value of the land and only the value of the improvements.²² One resolution proposed that the tax on any property receiving a homestead exemption could not exceed 2% of its fair market value.²³ Two resolutions proposed to exempt property owned by veterans' organizations from property taxes.²⁴

Proposed Tax Limit Section

One resolution proposed a new section 4A limiting each year's real estate taxes to specified percentages between 2% and 4% of market value.²⁵

Personal Property Taxation (Section 5)

Fourteen resolutions proposed to prevent the January 1, 1979 abolition of all remaining personal property taxation;²⁶ one of them passed both houses but was rejected by the voters in 1978. One resolution proposed to modify the abolition to the extent of retaining the personal property tax as to agricultural partnerships;²⁷ another (which passed the House) would have delayed the abolition for 10 years;²⁸ and two would have changed the Constitution's mandatory abolition to a permissive one.²⁹ On the other hand, one resolution proposed that the abolition occur automatically on January 1, 1979 (which actually happened due to the Illinois Supreme Court's decision in *Client Follow-up Co. v. Hynes*, 75 Ill. 2d 208 (1979))—but with no requirement for replacing of lost revenues.³⁰

Exemptions From Property Taxation (Section 6)

Eight resolutions, including three that passed both houses but were rejected by the voters in 1978, 1984, and 1986, have proposed to allow the General Assembly to exempt veterans' organizations from property tax;³¹ one introduced in 1995 would have *directed* the General Assembly to do so.³² Others would have allowed the General Assembly to exempt improvements to real property from taxation,³³ or allowed taxing districts to exempt some business properties for up to 10 years.³⁴ Yet another would have removed the requirement that property used for agricultural and horticultural societies and school, religious, cemetery, and charitable purposes be used "exclusively" for those purposes if it is to be exempt from property tax.³⁵ Two resolutions proposed to allow a homestead exemption of two-thirds of the assessed property value of the home of a person eligible for a grant under the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act.³⁶ Another resolution would have exempted from taxation any church property used as a parsonage.³⁷ One resolution proposed to exempt real property from progressively higher portions of school operating property taxes over a 5-year period, to be replaced by state reimbursement.³⁸

Tax Sales (Section 8)

Five resolutions proposed to amend this section to shorten the period during which a former owner of real property, who has lost ownership of it due to nonpayment of taxes and the sale of the property to another, can redeem the property by paying all sums due. The redemption period under the original 1970 Constitution was 2 years. Two of these resolutions proposed to reduce this redemption period for (1) vacant lots, and (2) apartment buildings with seven or more units, to 90 days;³⁹ one of these passed both houses and was **approved** by the voters in 1980. Five resolutions would have reduced the redemption period for (1) industrial property, and (2) apartment buildings with seven or more units, to 6 months. Two of them passed both houses; one of those was rejected by the voters in 1988, but the other was **approved** in 1990. Three of those five (including the two that passed both houses—one of which,

as just mentioned, the voters approved in 1990) also proposed to reduce the tax delinquency period from 5 years to 2 years.⁴⁰

State Debt (Section 9)

Two resolutions proposed to require a seven-eighths majority in each house of the General Assembly (instead of the present requirement of three-fifths), or approval by a majority of the voters, to incur any state debt.⁴¹ Another would have limited state debt to \$3.5 billion except as approved by the voters.⁴² Two resolutions would have limited total outstanding state debt to 50% of state revenues in the fiscal year.⁴³ Two resolutions proposed, and a 2007 resolution proposes, to prohibit the state from issuing general obligation bonds if the resulting amount of debt service in the next fiscal year would exceed 7% of that fiscal year's total appropriations of general funds and specific vehicle or fuel-related revenues, unless the Comptroller and Treasurer consent to the bonds in writing.⁴⁴

Proposed Sections

In addition to the resolutions described above, a number have proposed to add sections limiting state taxes or making it harder to impose them. Five resolutions proposed that any new or increased tax must have a three-fifths vote in each house.⁴⁵ One would have required a two-thirds vote,⁴⁶ and another would have required referendum approval of any new or increased tax.⁴⁷ Twelve resolutions, including one that passed the House, have proposed with varying details to limit taxes as a percentage of income or of the value of property, and to require that local programs mandated by the state be funded by it.⁴⁸ One resolution would have required the General Assembly by 1981 to exempt from sales tax drugs and food for use off the premises, and to replace the revenue lost thereby.⁴⁹ Two other resolutions would have limited taxes and user fees to 1990 levels, and would have prevented reassessments to increase the assessed value or equalization of property.⁵⁰ Three resolutions, including one in 2007, proposed to eliminate the estate tax if the federal government eliminates it.⁵¹

Three resolutions would have added a section 11 to this article, limiting each year's taxes imposed by the General Assembly to 8.5% of average annual personal income in three earlier years. One would have prohibited units of local government and school districts from imposing, without voter approval, property taxes (except to pay off bonds) whose total collections would rise in any year by more than three-fourths of the increase in the Consumer Price Index. It would also have required the state to reimburse local governments and school districts for all new mandates, and prohibited the state from reducing the percentage of spending going to local governments below fiscal 1984 levels.⁵²

Another resolution would have added a new section 11 limiting planned state revenues (except from federal funds) to 7% of average annual personal income in the state for three recent years. It also would have imposed a constitutional requirement that no expenses be incurred beyond revenues. If revenues exceeded the 7% limit, the excess would be transferred to a Budget Stabilization Fund that could be spent only in an emergency declared by the Governor with approval of a three-fifths majority in each house. Spending above the 7% limit could occur only in an emergency declared by the Governor and with a two-thirds majority in each house.⁵³ One resolution, which passed the House, would have limited state taxes to 6.5% of average annual personal income for the last 3 years.⁵⁴ Taking a different approach, two resolutions sought to limit expenditures to those of the year before plus an annual percentage increase, not to exceed the increase in the state's per-capita income.⁵⁵ One resolution would have limited increases in expenditures to the percentage increase in the "cost of

living” as legislatively defined, adjusted for growth in the state’s population; excess funds would go into a budget reserve fund.⁵⁶ Six resolutions, including one in 2007, proposed to limit the expenditure of fees and taxes relating to motor vehicles and fuels to transportation-related uses only.⁵⁷ One resolution proposed to require that at least one-tenth of proceeds from income taxes go to municipalities and counties based on population.⁵⁸

Notes

1. 1987: SJR(-CA) 90 (Raica-Dudycz-Mahar-Friedland et al.); 1988: HJR-CA 22 (McNamara-McGann); 1989: SJR(-CA) 22 (Raica); SJR(-CA) 28 (Raica-Dudycz); HJR-CA 13 (Zickus and Kubik).
2. 1971: SJR(-CA) 3 (Partee); 1973: SJR(-CA) 20 (Daley, Savickas, Carroll et al.); 1975: SJR(-CA) 31 (Netsch); HJR-CA 22 (Stubblefield, Byers, and J.M.Houlihan); HJR-CA 23 (Berman).
3. 1971: SJR(-CA) 4 (Partee, Cherry, and Donnewald); HJR-CA 4 (Tipsword, Choate, Shea et al.).
4. 1974: HJR-CA 28 (Choate, Shea, Lechowicz et al.); 1975: HJR-CA 24 (Choate, Hart, Calvo et al.); HJR-CA 31 (Choate, Shea, Madigan et al.).
5. 1975: HJR-CA 26 (Berman).
6. 1971: SJR(-CA) 52 (Knuppel); 1972: SJR(-CA) 60 (Knuppel); 1973: HJR-CA 25 (Rayson); 1988: SJR(-CA) 109 (Collins); 1991: SJR(-CA) 34 (Collins); HJR-CA 26 (Woolard); 1992: SJR(-CA) 133 (Collins); SJR(-CA) 139 (Welch-Collins); 1993: SJR(-CA) 26 (Palmer-Stern-Berman-Shaw-Cullerton-Collins-Garcia-Jones et al.); HJR-CA 9 (Woolard-Phelps-Balanoff-Brunsvold-Hawkins); HJR-CA 12 (Woolard); HJR-CA 16 (Woolard-Turner-Brunsvold-Levin-Hawkins et al.); 2007: SJR(-CA) 7 (Sandoval-Frerichs), not assigned to a substantive committee; SJR(-CA) 69 (Frerichs-Raoul-Harmon-J.Collins et al.), not assigned to a substantive committee; HJR-CA 23 (W.Davis et al.); 2008: SJR(-CA) 86 (Frerichs-Raoul), not assigned to a substantive committee; SJR(-CA) 89 (Frerichs-Raoul-Koehler-Steans-J.Collins et al.), not assigned to a substantive committee; SJR(-CA) 92 (Frerichs-Raoul-Harmon-Steans-Hunter), adopted by Senate Executive Committee 7-5 April 16, 2008; HJR-CA 43 (W.Davis-Currie-Hamos-Ryg-Turner et al.), not assigned to a substantive committee.
7. 1985: SJR(-CA) 32 (Schuneman).
8. 1993: SJR(-CA) 31 (Welch-Palmer).
9. 1993: HJR-CA 8 (Curran-Woolard-Levin-Balanoff et al.).
10. 2008: HJR-CA 42 (Smith-Soto-M.Davis-Holbrook-Graham et al.), failed on Third Reading in the House.
11. 2002: SJR(-CA) 54 (Jacobs).
12. 1985: HJR-CA 11 (Vinson).
13. 1973: HJR-CA 9 (Redmond and Hill); HJR-CA 11 (Redmond and Hill); 1994: SJR(-CA) 126 (O’Malley).
14. 1971: HJR-CA 8 (Fennessey, Craig, and Markert); 1973: HJR-CA 10 (Skinner); 1975: HJR-CA 10 (Mudd, Giorgi, Mulcahey et al.); HJR-CA 25 (Farley) passed the House; HJR-CA 28 (Farley); HJR-CA 35 (Maragos, Skinner, LaFleur et al.); 1977: HJR-CA 10 (Skinner-Mudd-Ewing et al.); 1983: HJR-CA 7 (Mautino-Davis).

15. 1971: SJR(-CA) 5 (Partee, Cherry, and Donnewald); HJR-CA 5 (Lechowicz, Choate, Shea et al.).
16. 1973: HJR-CA 6 (Hart).
17. 1973: HJR-CA 13 (J.J.Wolf, McAuliffe, Fleck et al.) passed the House; 1975: HJR-CA 12 (Mudd, Giorgi, Luft et al.); HJR-CA 30 (Dyer) passed the House.
18. 1976: HJR-CA 38 (Skinner); 1977: HJR-CA 37 (Skinner, Shumpert, Pierce et al.); HJR-CA 38 (Shumpert and Taylor); 1979: HJR-CA 45 (Skinner).
19. 1980: HJR-CA 50 (Bullock-Totten-Daniels); 1981: HJR-CA 2 (Bullock-Daniels-Davis-Mautino-Griffin) passed the House; 1983: HJR-CA 12 (Bullock, Hastert, Davis, Mautino, and Ropp).
20. 1979: HJR-CA 11 (Skinner, Boucek, Willer, and W. Walsh).
21. 1981: HJR-CA 7 (O'Brien).
22. 1985: SJR(-CA) 13 (Kustra-Netsch); HJR-CA 10 (B.Pedersen et al.).
23. 1988: HJR-CA 28 (Panayotovich-Parcells-Farley).
24. 1995: HJR-CA 7 (Stephens-Meyer); 1997: SJR(-CA) 6 (Mahar).
25. 1993: HJR-CA 15 (Kubik).
26. 1971: SJR(-CA) 35 (T.G.Lyons); 1973: SJR(-CA) 21 (Berning); 1975: SJR(-CA) 33 (Berning); 1976: SJR(-CA) 67 (Soper, Dougherty, Berning et al.); 1977: SJR(-CA) 7 (Soper); SJR(-CA) 10 (Nimrod and H.H.Hall); HJR-CA 8 (McBroom, Pullen, Telcser et al.); HJR-CA 9 (Matijevich); HJR-CA 16 (Sandquist); HJR-CA 17 (Bowman-Matijevich); HJR-CA 19 (Sandquist); HJR-CA 21 (McBroom, Ryan, and Telcser) passed both houses, but was rejected by the voters in 1978; HJR-CA 34 (McCourt); 1979: SJR(-CA) 9 (Nimrod and DeAngelis).
27. 1975: HJR-CA 15 (Lauer-Deavers).
28. 1977: HJR-CA 20 (Ralph Dunn and Matijevich).
29. 1977: SJR(-CA) 29 (Maragos, Regner, and Carroll); 1978: HJR-CA 47 (Pierce). HJR-CA 47 passed both houses but was rescinded by HJR-CA 52 (1978) to avoid placing two similar propositions on the ballot.
30. 1975: HJR-CA 27 (Taylor).
31. 1977: SJR(-CA) 33 (Sommer, Berman, Berning et al.); SJR(-CA) 36 (Mitchler); HJR-CA 29 (DiPrima, Madigan, and P.W.Collins) passed both houses but was rejected by voters in 1978; 1981: HJR-CA 25 (DiPrima, Madigan, Lechowicz, Telcser, Conti et al.); 1983: HJR-CA 2 (DiPrima, Madigan, Matijevich, Mays, Giorgi et al. — Rock-Vadalabene et al.), passed both houses but rejected by the voters; 1985: SJR(-CA) 11 (Vadalabene-Lemke — Pangle) passed both houses but rejected by the voters; 1991: HJR-CA 8 (Stange).
32. 1995: HJR-CA 7 (Stephens-Meyer).
33. 1977: SJR(-CA) 26 (Leonard-Netsch, Carroll et al.).
34. 1981: SJR(-CA) 3 (Sangmeister-Bowers); HJR-CA 4 (Younge).
35. 1976: HJR-CA 44 (DiPrima).
36. 1994: SJR(-CA) 150 (Shaw et al.); HJR-CA 37 (Flowers).
37. 1984: SJR(-CA) 87 (Sangmeister).
38. 1993: HJR-CA 2 (Wennlund).
39. 1979: SJR(-CA) 56 (Rock, Savickas, Daley et al.) passed both houses and was approved by the voters; HJR-CA 41 (Madigan-Taylor-Telcser).
40. 1979: HJR-CA 39 (Abramson); 1987: SJR(-CA) 41 (Lechowicz); HJR-CA 13 (Lang-Keane-Turner-Bowman-Currie et al. — Carroll-Netsch-del Valle et al.), passed both houses but rejected by voters;

- HJR-CA 15 (Turner et al.); 1989: HJR-CA 4 (Lang), passed both houses and approved by voters.
41. 1974: SJR(-CA) 58 (McCarthy, Vadalabene, and Sours); 1976: SJR(-CA) 70 (McCarthy).
 42. 1978: HJR-CA 44 (Totten-Lechowicz-Geo-Karis et al.). *
 43. 1996: HJR-CA 28 (Schoenberg-Mautino-Erwin-Deering-J.Curry et al.); 1997: HJR-CA 6 (Schoenberg).
 44. 2006: SJR(-CA) 71 (Radogno); HJR-CA 26 (J.Watson-Parke); 2007: HJR-CA 20 (J.Watson-Durkin-Stephens-Kosel-E.Sullivan et al.), not assigned to a substantive committee.
 45. 1979: HJR-CA 34 (O'Brien-Schlickman); 1985: HJR-CA 2 (Harris); 1987: HJR-CA 2 (Harris); 1995: HJR-CA 14 (Roskam); 1996: SJR(-CA) 78 (Dudycz).
 46. 1979: SJR(-CA) 18 (Knuppel).
 47. 1973: HJR-CA 20 (Keller, McCormick, Blades et al.).
 48. 1975: SJR(-CA) 39 (Philip, Nimrod, Clarke et al.); HJR-CA 32 (Totten, Hudson, Porter et al.); 1976: HJR-CA 45 (Totten, Ryan, Hudson et al.); 1977: HJR-CA 22 (Totten-Lechowicz, Porter et al.); 1978: SJR(-CA) 102 (Sangmeister-Rhoads-Regner); 1979: SJR(-CA) 18 (Knuppel); HJR-CA 13 (Totten, Flinn, Pullen et al.) passed the House; 1981: SJR(-CA) 37 (Totten, Bloom, Friedland et al.); SJR(-CA) 54 (Totten-Bloom et al.); HJR-CA 27 (Vinson, Brummer, Bower, Ewing, Miller et al.); 1994: HJR-CA 32 (Stephens); 2007: SJR(-CA) 13 (Lauzen-Murphy-Millner-Risinger-Burzynski et al.), not assigned to a substantive committee.
 49. 1979: SJR(-CA) 28 (Philip).
 50. 1996: HJR-CA 30 (Capparelli); 1997: HJR-CA 3 (Capparelli-McAuliffe-Bugielski-J.Lyons).
 51. 2003: HJR-CA 15 (Rose-Poe-Braue-Kurtz-Saviano et al.); 2005: HJR-CA 4 (Rose); 2007: HJR-CA 8 (Rose), not assigned to a substantive committee.
 52. 1984: SJR(-CA) 100 (Schuneman); 1987: HJR-CA (B.Pedersen et al.); 1989: HJR-CA 6 (B.Pedersen).
 53. 1984: HJR-CA 26 (B.Pedersen et al.).
 54. 1985: HJR-CA 12 (B.Pedersen et al.), passed the House.
 55. 1994: SJR(-CA) 114 (Petka-Lauzen-Geo-Karis); HJR-CA 22 (Salvi).
 56. 1995: HJR-CA 6 (Salvi).
 57. 2004: SJR(-CA) 62 (Bomke-Risinger-Righter-J.Jones-F.Watson); HJR-CA 35 (Sacia); 2005: SJR(-CA) 17 (Bomke-Risinger-Righter-J.Jones-F.Watson et al.); HJR-CA 15 (Sacia-Tryon-Bost-Schock-Pritchard et al.); HJR-CA 20 (Gordon et al.); 2006: SJR(-CA) 72 (Righter-Axley-Dillard-Risinger-J.Jones et al.); 2007: SJR(-CA) 31 (Bomke-J.Jones-Syverson-Lauzen-Radogno et al.), not assigned to a substantive committee.
 58. 2003: HJR-CA 14 (Molaro-Colvin-Rita-Osterman-Mathias et al.).

ARTICLE 10: EDUCATION**Goal—Free
Schools
(Section 1)**

One resolution proposed to mandate that the General Assembly appropriate each year the amount needed to “fully fund” the distribution of state school aid under the school aid formula.¹ One in the 95th General Assembly would make the state “solely responsible” for education funding, and prohibit use of property tax revenues to finance education.² One resolution would have required the state to finance at least two-thirds of the cost of public education,³ another would have set the minimum state funding level at 60%.⁴ Ten resolutions would have required the state to provide at least half the funding of public education through high school.⁵ Another resolution would have given each person enrolled in a public school a judicially enforceable right to be educated.⁶ A resolution that passed both houses but was rejected by the voters would have said that the state has “the paramount duty . . . to guarantee equality of educational opportunity” and “the preponderant financial responsibility for financing the system of public education.”⁷ Six similar resolutions were proposed later but died in the General Assembly;⁸ a seventh, proposed in 2007, has not been assigned to a substantive committee.⁹ Two resolutions proposed a state obligation to provide to all children a free education through the secondary level.¹⁰ A 2008 resolution would declare the goals and responsibilities of Article 10 to be the “duty” of the state.¹¹ Two other resolutions proposed a 3% surtax on individual incomes to the extent they exceed \$250,000, with some or all of the proceeds to go to public schools.¹²

**State Board of
Education—
Chief State
Educational
Officer
(Section 2)**

Thirteen resolutions proposed to replace the State Board of Education with an elected superintendent of education or of public instruction.¹³ Twelve others would have provided for electing the state school superintendent without abolishing the State Board of Education.¹⁴ One resolution, which passed the Senate, would have required Senate confirmation of the State Board’s appointment of the chief state educational officer.¹⁵ Another would have required the Governor to appoint the chief educational officer with Senate confirmation.¹⁶

A less sweeping resolution would have had members of the State Board elected from districts, and a president of the Board elected from the entire state; another would have provided for election of the Board on a regional basis.¹⁷

**Public Funds
for Sectarian
Purposes
Forbidden
(Section 3)**

One resolution proposed to remove the prohibition on use of public funds for sectarian purposes.¹⁸

Notes

1. 1977: HJR-CA 12 (Giorgi, Simms, L.Martin et al.).
2. 2007: HJR-CA 16 (Lang-Black-Yarbrough et al.), voted “do pass” 13-7 by House Elementary and Secondary Education Committee March 1, 2007.
3. 1983: HJR-CA 14 (R.Dunn, Mulcahey, Oblinger, Stuffle, Klemm, Deuchler, and Keane).

4. 1992: SJR(-CA) 132 (Collins).
5. 1985: SJR(-CA) 9 (Demuzio-R.Dunn et al.); HJR-CA 6 (McPike-Brunsvold-LeFlore-Rea-Oblinger et al.); 1988: SJR(-CA) 110 (Collins); 1991: HJR-CA 5 (McAfee); 1996: SJR(-CA) 84 (Maitland-Woodyard); HJR-CA 34 (Black-M.Weaver-Woolard); 1997: HJR-CA 9 (Woolard); 1999: HJR-CA 18 (Scully); HJR-CA 19 (Scully-Crotty et al.); 2006: HJR-CA 27 (Scully et al.).
6. 1988: SJR(-CA) 107 (Collins).
7. 1992: SJR(-CA) 130 (Berman-Maitland-Rea—M.Madigan-Rotello-Shaw-Lang-Schakowsky), passed both houses but rejected by voters.
8. 1993: SJR(-CA) 90 (Berman); SJR(-CA) 98 (Berman); 1994: SJR(-CA) 127 (Hendon); 2004: HJR-CA 27 (Black); 2005: HJR-CA 10 (Black-Lang-Fritchey); 2006: HJR-CA 29 (Black-Fritchey et al.).
9. 2007: HJR-CA 10 (Black-Froehlich-Boland-Lang et al.).
10. 1992: SJR(-CA) 131 (Berman-Maitland); HJR-CA 35 (Rotello).
11. 2008: HJR-CA 36 (Colvin), not assigned to a substantive committee.
12. 2003: SJR(-CA) 20 (Crotty-Maloney); 2006: HJR-CA 27 (Scully et al.).
13. 1975: HJR-CA 13 (Friedrich, Choate, Campbell et al.); 1977: SJR(-CA) 31 (Lemke, Savickas, Soper et al.); HJR-CA 15 (Friedrich, Kent, Matijevich et al.); 1978: HJR-CA 45 (C.M.Stiehl, Polk, Ryan et al.); 1979: HJR-CA 12 (Stuffle-Friedrich-Winchester-Terzich, and Slape); 1981: HJR-CA 20 (D.Friedrich); 1984: HJR-CA 23 (R.Dunn); HJR-CA 25 (Klemm and Mulcahey); 1985: HJR-CA 4 (D.Friedrich, Richmond, Hastert, Mautino, and Ryder); HJR-CA 5 (Klemm and Mulcahey); 1987: HJR-CA 7 (Wennlund et al.); 2004: SJR(-CA) 46 (B.Brady); 2006: SJR(-CA) 63 (B.Brady).
14. 1989: HJR-CA 7 (Mulcahey); HJR-CA 10 (Granberg); 1994: HJR-CA 36 (Cowlshaw); 1995: HJR-CA 2 (Cowlshaw); 1998: SJR(-CA) 51 (Demuzio); 2001: SJR(-CA) 13 (Demuzio-Myers); 2002: HJR-CA 10 (Hoeft-Moffitt-Kosel); HJR-CA 12 (Hoeft); HJR-CA 13 (Hoeft-Moffitt-M.Davis-Kosel-Boland et al.); HJR-CA 15 (Franks); 2003: HJR-CA 7 (Franks-Lang-Lindner-Boland); 2004: SJR(-CA) 44 (Cronin et al.).
15. 1985: SJR(-CA) 4 (Friedland et al.—W.Peterson-Hastert-D.Friedrich-Ryder-Zwick).
16. 1985: SJR(-CA) 41 (Schaffer).
17. 1979: SJR(-CA) 21 (Lemke, Regner, and Bloom); 1985: HJR-CA 13 (Woodyard).
18. 1971: SJR(-CA) 6 (Berning).

ARTICLE 11: ENVIRONMENT

No amendments have been proposed to Article 11.

ARTICLE 12: MILITIA

No amendments have been proposed to Article 12.

ARTICLE 13: GENERAL PROVISIONS

Proposed New Sections

One resolution proposed to give the General Assembly exclusive authority to provide for the “administration of government” and for the systems, standards, and policies governing accounting, auditing, procurement, filing, reporting, financial, and regulatory controls applicable to state and local government and school districts.¹ Another resolution proposed to add to the oath for statewide executive officers the words “so help me God” (which would be optional).² One resolution proposed to limit gambling to the state lottery, horse racing, and raffles and bingo games.³ Another resolution would have prohibited anyone from holding two compensated elective public offices at the same time.⁴ One resolution proposed to say that each child has a right to an adequate opportunity for a safe, nurturing environment.⁵ Six resolutions, including one introduced in 2007, have proposed to prohibit same-sex marriages and civil unions.⁶ One in 2006 would have prohibited the state from creating or recognizing “a legal status similar to that of marriage.”⁷ Two resolutions would have prohibited same-sex marriages without mentioning civil unions.⁸ One resolution would have prohibited same-sex marriages, and prohibited state and local governments from creating or recognizing “a legal status similar to that of marriage.”

One resolution proposed to require all revenue from excise taxes on motor fuel to be used for road construction and maintenance, or for public transportation.⁹ Two resolutions proposed to create a new Office of Insurance Commissioner to regulate the insurance industry.¹⁰ Two resolutions would have allowed the General Assembly to require pretrial medical review of all medical malpractice suits.¹¹ A 2008 resolution would require that all pension benefits, and the rights of all executive and legislative branch officers and employees, be administered under a unified pension system.¹²

Notes

1. 1990: HJR-CA 17 (Johnson et al.).
2. 1991: SJR(-CA) 17 (Keats).
3. 1991: HJR-CA 7 (Cowlshaw).
4. 1991: HJR-CA 23 (Matijevich).
5. 1993: SJR(-CA) 32 (Collins).

6. 2004: SJR(-CA) 56 (J.Jones-Burzynski et al.); HJR-CA 31 (Grunloh-Phelps-Millner et al.); HJR-CA 24 (B.Mitchell-Eddy); 2005: SJR(-CA) 23 (Petka); 2006: SJR(-CA) 70 (B.Brady); 2007: SJR(-CA) 8 (B.Brady), not assigned to a substantive committee.
7. 2006: HJR-CA 1 (Reis), not assigned to a substantive committee.
8. 2004: HJR-CA 1 (B.Mitchell); HJR-CA 25 (Grunloh-Phelps); 2005: HJR-CA 11 (Reis-Moffitt et al.).
9. 1999: HJR-CA 2 (Granberg).
10. 1999: HJR-CA 17 (Lang); 2001: HJR-CA 2 (Lang).
11. 2004: HJR-CA 37 (Cross-Coulson-Pritchard-Bassi-Munson et al.); 2005: HJR-CA 13 (Cross-Coulson-Winters-Schock-Bost et al.).
12. 2008: SJR(-CA) 84 (Dahl et al.), not assigned to a substantive committee.

ARTICLE 14: CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION

Constitutional Convention (Section 1)

Two early resolutions proposed to delete the requirement that the Secretary of State submit to the voters, when the question has not been asked for 20 years, the question whether a constitutional convention should be called, and the provision allowing the General Assembly to submit the question to the voters if it chooses. One of those resolutions would have allowed a convention to be called by petition and referendum, and a constitutional revision commission to be appointed every 20 years to propose amendments to the voters; the other would not have provided for the voters to call constitutional conventions.¹

Constitutional Initiative for Legislative Article (Section 3)

Two resolutions proposed to allow amendments to any part of the Constitution to be proposed by petition—not only amendments to Article 4 as the Constitution now allows.² Two others would have provided that amendments proposed by initiative, and making structural changes to the General Assembly, not take effect until after the next decennial census.³

Amendments to Constitution of the United States (Section 4)

Three resolutions would have reduced the majority stated to be required in each legislative house to ratify U.S. constitutional amendments from three-fifths to a constitutional majority.⁴

Notes

1. 1978: HJR-CA 56 (Conti); 1981: HJR-CA 8 (Pullen-Hudson et al.).
2. 1971: SJR(-CA) 37 (Newhouse); 1979: HJR-CA 36 (O'Brien).
3. 1974: HJR-CA 33 (MacDonald, Blair, Choate et al.); 1975: HJR-CA 20 (MacDonald).
4. 1979: HJR-CA 20 (Deuster); 1983: SJR(-CA) 4 (MacDonald, Netsch, Collins, Fawell, Geo-Karis, and Barkhausen); HJR-CA 9 (Hoffman).

PROPOSED NEW ARTICLES

- Taxpayer Rights** One resolution proposed an Article 9A entitled "Taxpayers' Rights." Under it, tax increases could not raise state revenues over the highest revenue in the last four budget years, adjusted by inflation since the year of each year's budget.¹
- Conservation** One resolution would have added an Article 15 on conservation, creating a four-member commission to control the state's conservation activities and appoint the Director of Conservation.²
- Recall of Officers** Another resolution would have added an Article 15 to allow recall of any elective officer after the officer's first year of service, by a referendum called by a petition signed by 25% of the number of voters who last voted for Governor in the area from which the officer was elected.³ (See entry under Article 3, "Proposed New Sections" for other resolutions proposing to allow recall of officials.)

Notes

1. 1995: HJR-CA 16 (Pedersen).
2. 1973: SJR(-CA) 1 (Knuppel).
3. 1979: SJR(-CA) 57 (Gitz).

Appendix A: Referendum Questions on the 1970 Illinois Constitution Since its Ratification

(**Boldfaced** proposals were approved by the voters)

<i>Proposed change</i>	<i>Art.</i>	<i>Sec.</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Votes for</i>	<i>Votes against</i>	<i>Total votes at election*</i>
Restrict Governor's amendatory veto power	4	9(e)	1974	1,302,313	1,329,719	3,047,822
Prevent abolition of remaining taxation of personal property	9	5	1978	952,416	733,845	3,342,985
Exempt veterans' organizations from property taxation	9	6	1978	747,907	806,579	3,342,985
Reduce size of House by one-third and abolish cumulative voting in electing its members	4	1-3	1980	2,112,224	962,325	4,868,623
Reduce the time allowed for redeeming some kinds of property sold for nonpayment of taxes	9	8	1980	1,857,985	798,422	4,868,623
Expand the class of persons accused of serious crimes who can be denied bail	1	9	1982	1,389,796	239,380	3,856,875
Exempt veterans' organizations from property taxation	9	6	1984	1,147,864	1,042,481	4,969,330
Further expand the class of persons accused of crimes who can be denied bail	1	9	1986	1,368,242	402,891	3,322,657
Exempt veterans' organizations from property taxation, with state reimbursement of local governments' resulting reduction in revenues	9	6	1986	860,609	727,737	3,322,657
Lower the minimum voting age to 18 and reduce the residency requirement to 30 days	3	1	1988	2,086,744	1,162,258	4,697,192
Further change redemption periods for property sold for nonpayment of taxes (similar to successful proposal in 1990)	9	8	1988	1,497,885	1,035,190	4,697,192
Call a constitutional convention	-	-	1988	900,109	2,727,144	4,697,192

Appendix A: Referendum Questions on the 1970 Illinois Constitution Since its Ratification (cont'd)

(Boldfaced proposals were approved by the voters)

<i>Proposed change</i>	<i>Art.</i>	<i>Sec.</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Votes</i>		<i>Total votes at election*</i>
				<i>for</i>	<i>against</i>	
Further change redemption periods for property sold for non-payment of taxes	9	8	1990	1,004,546	385,772	1,390,318
Add a new section on crime victims' rights to the Bill of Rights	1	8.1	1992	2,964,592	715,602	5,164,357
Mandate "equality of educational opportunity" and predominant school funding by the state	10	1	1992	1,882,569	1,417,520	5,164,357
Replace criminal defendants' right to meet witnesses "face to face" with a right to be "confronted" by those witnesses	1	8	1994	1,525,525	906,383	3,219,122
Change intended legislative adjournment date from June 30 to May 31	4	10	1994	1,476,615	667,585	3,219,122
Strengthen judicial discipline bodies and processes	6	15	1998	1,677,109	407,014	3,541,379

* To be approved, a proposed constitutional amendment (or proposal to call a constitutional convention) must receive either (1) three-fifths of the votes of those voting on that question, or (2) the votes of a majority of all persons voting at the election. All successful measures shown above passed test (1); only two (in 1990 and 1992) also passed test (2).

Sources: Adapted from "Constitution of the State of Illinois: Amendments Proposed" (table, downloaded from Legislative Reference Bureau Internet site) and Legislative Research Unit, "1970 Illinois Constitution Annotated for Legislators" (4th ed., updated 2005).