

University of Michigan
Journal of Law Reform

Volume 4, Fall 1970 -
Spring 1971

University of Michigan
Law School
Ann Arbor, Michigan
1971

THE ILLINOIS CRIMINAL CODE OF 1961 AND CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE OF 1963

by

Charles H. Bowman*

"I'm the Parliamentary Draftsman. And they tell me it's a fact That I often make a muddle Of a simple little Act."

J.P.C. Poetic Justice 32 (1947).

Early in 1954 the Supreme Court of Illinois and the Governor separately asked the Illinois State and Chicago Bar Associations to initiate a study looking toward a complete revision of the Illinois Criminal Code. On May 25, 1954, the respective presidents of the two associations together appointed the Joint Committee to Revise the Illinois Criminal Code. The committee consisted of sixteen lawyers, judges, prosecuting attorneys and law professors.¹

During the first two years the group considered the scope of the revision problem, including detailed examinations of the proposed American Law Institute Model Penal Code, then in the process of being drafted; the Criminal Code of Louisiana, adopted in 1942; the Wisconsin Criminal Code, then pending before its legislature and adopted by it in 1955; and the Illinois Draft Criminal Code of 1935. The study revealed the magnitude of the project.

Illinois had no "Criminal Code" in the sense of a codified, systematic body of law functioning as an instrument of social control in a modern community. Many provisions had remained unchanged since Judge Lockwood, in submitting a revised draft of the Laws of Illinois to the Illinois General Assembly of 1827, described the small chapter on criminal jurisprudence as deriving primarily from a volume of the Laws of New York of 1802 which he brought with him to Illinois, and a volume of the Laws of Georgia which he located in the office of the Secretary of State. In fact, no serious attempt was made to revamp the criminal laws until 1869 when a commission was appointed by the General Assembly to revise the Law of Illinois. In 1874, chapter

* Professor of Law, University of Illinois College of Law. B.S., 1949, Univ. of Illinois; LL. B., 1935, Cumberland; J. D., 1950, Univ. of Illinois.

¹ Former Illinois Supreme Court Justice Floyd E. Thompson of Chicago was appointed Chairman.

thirty-eight of the commission's draft, which contained the bulk of the penal provisions, was submitted, adopted and designated the "Criminal Code." Although amended many times in the eighty years between 1874 and 1954, no comprehensive revision has every been made.²

As a result, when the Joint Committee was appointed in 1954, the criminal law of Illinois was scattered throughout the 171 chapters of the state statutes. In chapter twenty-three the maximum penalty for contributing to delinquency was one year or one thousand dollars; in chapter thirty-eight (the criminal code), the maximum penalty for the same offense was one year or two hundred dollars. The minimum penalty for stealing a horse was three years; for stealing an automobile, one year. One section said that no infant under ten years could be convicted of crime in Illinois; another said that anyone between the ages of seven and eighteen found smoking in public places should be guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than ten dollars for each offense. Seventy-four separate sections described various forms of theft and eighteen sections related to assaults, many of them prescribing different penalties without regard to relative seriousness.

The procedural provisions of the criminal law were similarly contained in a hodge-podge collection of sections in chapter thirty-eight, many duplicating or inconsistent with provisions in other chapters. The motion practice consisted of the medieval heirarchy of dilatory pleas and pleas in bar, the meaning and effect of which were constantly being changed by different interpretations and construction by the Illinois Supreme Court.

While the criminal laws of Illinois (contained in chapter thirty-eight and designated the "Criminal Code") were concerned with both substantive and procedural law, the Committee decided at an early stage to follow the example of such states as Wisconsin, Michigan, Pennsylvania and New York, and restrict the criminal code to substantive law, and to draft a code of criminal procedure separately. As a result of that decision, the Criminal

² By 1931 the criminal proscriptions in the Illinois statutes were so out-dated, complex and difficult to administrate that revision was essential. The Judicial Advisory Councils of Cook County (Chicago) and of the state made a joint report to the Governor and General Assembly setting forth the acute need for revision in 1931. This report received serious attention throughout the state, primarily due to the prestige and competence of its source. In 1934, Judge Floyd E. Thompson, then President of the Illinois State Bar Association, appointed a committee to draft a revised criminal code. Basing its revision of the substantive part of the criminal law primarily upon the principles of the Judicial Councils' report, and the procedural portion primarily upon the American Law Institute's Code of Criminal Procedure of 1930, the committee submitted the Illinois Draft Criminal Code of 1935 to the General Assembly in 1935, 1937 and 1939. The General Assembly failed to adopt it and no further attempt at revision was made for another twenty-two years (1961).

Code of 1961 is generally It, not illogically, include such as place of trial and classified as procedural, substantive provisions a Code. The Code of Criminal general provisions dealing proceeds chronologically from proceedings After Arrest, to

I. T

During the first three y mittee³ met approximately nary drafts prepared by o to prepare the drafts for Joint Committee met in consider, approve, modify mittee the drafts submitted the substantive code and procedural code the subc full committee met bi-mo the fall of 1958, the prelim plished by several membe er. This group worked ful summer of 1960 and on t the summer of 1962.

The most challenging t hundred sections of subst dural with a coherent, sys language. Initially witho association's tradition of c nitude of the undertaking system could bear. Althou evolving drafts of the M

³ In 1956, due to the death and Committee, it was reorganized with (een) and Judge Richard B. Austin County and presently a federal jud Illinois, as Chairman. A drafting st Francis A. Allen, then on the Univer law faculty at the University of M made available to the Committee th outstanding legal researcher and d Judicial Advisory Council of Cook the Committee.

Code of 1961 is generally limited to the substantive law of crimes. It, not illogically, includes other provisions dealing with subjects such as place of trial and sentencing, which are more properly classified as procedural, but which are so closely allied to the substantive provisions as to require inclusion in the Criminal Code. The Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963, in addition to its general provisions dealing with the Rights of the Accused, proceeds chronologically from Apprehension, Investigation, and Proceedings After Arrest, to Proceedings After Trial, and Review.

I. THE CRIMINAL CODE

During the first three years of its labors, the drafting subcommittee³ met approximately twice each month to consider preliminary drafts prepared by other members of the subcommittee, and to prepare the drafts for presentation to the full committee. The Joint Committee met in two-day sessions twice each year to consider, approve, modify, or reject and refer back to the subcommittee the drafts submitted to it. During the last year of work on the substantive code and the entire year and one-half on the procedural code the subcommittee met almost weekly, while the full committee met bi-monthly in two-day sessions. Beginning in the fall of 1958, the preliminary research and drafting was accomplished by several members of the subcommittee and this reporter. This group worked full time on the Criminal Code during the summer of 1960 and on the Code of Criminal Procedure during the summer of 1962.

The most challenging task was the replacement of some eight hundred sections of substantive law and three hundred of procedural with a coherent, systematic code, stated in concise, modern language. Initially without funds, and working within the bar association's tradition of committee service without pay, the magnitude of the undertaking was almost more than the committee system could bear. Although the Wisconsin Code of 1955 and the evolving drafts of the Model Penal Code were relied on for

³ In 1956, due to the death and resignation of some of the members of the Joint Committee, it was reorganized with twenty-one members (subsequently reduced to eighteen) and Judge Richard B. Austin, then Chief Justice of the Criminal Court of Cook County and presently a federal judge of the District Court of the Northern District of Illinois, as Chairman. A drafting subcommittee of seven was appointed with Professor Francis A. Allen, then on the University of Chicago law faculty and presently Dean of the law faculty at the University of Michigan, as Chairman. The University of Chicago made available to the Committee the part-time services of Professor Fred Merrifield, an outstanding legal researcher and draftsman. Financial assistance was supplied by the Judicial Advisory Council of Cook County to help defray clerical and other expenses of the Committee.

guidance, by the spring of 1960 only about a quarter or a third of the substantive Code had been drafted.

Hoping to present the Code to the General Assembly in 1961, and recognizing the proven slowness of the committee system, Judge Austin, as chairman of the Joint Committee, solicited and obtained from the Illinois Judicial Advisory Council sufficient funds to retain a full time, paid reporter. With an additional grant from the University of Illinois Research Board for the employment of two senior law students, the work proceeded rapidly through the summer and fall of 1960 and the substantive Code, with Commentary, was completed in November of 1960. After it was adopted in 1961 and approved by the Governor, it was not difficult to obtain the necessary funds from the Bar Foundations, the Judicial Advisory Councils, and the University of Illinois Research Board to complete the Code of Criminal Procedure. The drafting was finished in late fall of 1962 and the Code presented to the General Assembly in the spring of 1963. The entire six-year project (1956-1962) cost a total of approximately twenty-five thousand dollars.

In retrospect, and in view of the experience of the American Law Institute and of states which have revised their criminal laws since Illinois, it seems obvious to this reporter that the most efficient method of accomplishing such a task is to employ a full time paid reporter to direct and supervise the initial research and drafting for presentation to a full committee of practitioners. An intermediate subcommittee, or "advisory" committee, might be utilized to review and modify the preliminary drafts of the reporter so as to reduce the time the full committee need spend on final approval of the drafts. It also seems clear that a person who has been teaching criminal law is a logical person to employ as a reporter. Such an individual is thoroughly familiar with state and decisional law of both local and foreign jurisdictions. He is familiar with both the critical literature on controversial subjects in the criminal law field and the experience of other jurisdictions with different provisions. The library of a law school is often the most comprehensive in the state; and qualified law student researchers are usually readily available at substantially less cost than members of the bar. The practical experience of the members of the advisory committee, and of the full committee, ensures that their efforts to improve the code will be both realistic and oriented towards achieving acceptance by the legislature.

Several methods are available to those revising and codifying the criminal laws of a state. Some prefer a step-by-step approach of amending or codifying existing law on a particular subject, such

as theft, homicide, sex offenses, and the like. The Code of Criminal Law is as archaic in language as the Code of Civil Procedure in Illinois', however, the total cost of the Code is a very practical method. More important, the Code has the additional advantage of providing a single gathering together of isolated provisions.

After making the initial recommendations to the legislature separately the question became which provisions of the procedural morass was to be retained in the substantive code was changed. The Code of Criminal Law is, on the whole, less archaic than the Code of Civil Procedure, generally, most people agree that the Code of Criminal Procedure is proscribed; disagreement exists as to the conduct, and the penalty. The Code of Civil Procedure could be more archaic than vice versa.

The New Code comprises 197 new sections into 197 new sections.⁴ New provisions are provided for common law crimes; abolished all sentences in excess of one year term; retained the death penalty for ransom, but restricted to cases recommended by the jury; the jury (except for the death penalty) if two or more offenses are charged, sentences must run concurrently.

In the article labelled "The New Code" if two or more offenses are charged, they are tried together if this fact is proved that acquittal or conviction on one offense in another jurisdiction does not bar prosecution in this state.

The Model Penal Code

⁴ The sections were organized as follows: I. General Provisions; Title and Construction; II. Rights of Defendant; III. Parties to Crime; Responsibility; IV. Specific Offenses; Inchoate Offenses; V. Offenses Directed Against Property; VI. Offenses Affecting Governmental Administration (of prior laws). For lack of a better way, we put Place of Trial and Venue in the same section.

⁵ However, the jury recommendation is not binding; the court might impose death or imprisonment.

as theft, homicide, sex offenses, gambling, etc. When the existing law is as archaic in language, inconsistent and duplicative as was Illinois', however, the total death (repeal) and rebirth is the only practical method. Moreover, writing a systematic code has the additional advantage of producing a unified law and not merely a gathering together of isolated, ad hoc provisions.

After making the initial decision to draft and submit to the legislature separately the substantive and procedural codes, the question became which to prepare first. Although the Illinois' procedural morass was more in need of immediate revision, the substantive code was chosen, primarily because the substantive law is, on the whole, less controversial than the procedural. Generally, most people agree on the type of conduct that should be proscribed; disagreement arises over the precise definition of such conduct, and the penalty. Moreover, it was felt that the procedural code could be more definitively related to a substantive code than vice versa.

The New Code compressed approximately eight hundred old sections into 197 new sections and repealed outright all of the old sections.⁴ New provisions made the following changes: abolished common law crimes; abolished the life sentence and provided that all sentences in excess of one year should be for an indeterminate term; retained the death penalty in treason, murder, kidnapping for ransom, but restricted its imposition to cases where it is recommended by the jury;⁵ took all sentencing power away from the jury (except for the death recommendation); and provided that if two or more offenses arose out of the same conduct the sentences must run concurrently.

In the article labelled Rights of Defendant it was provided that if two or more offenses arose out of the same act, they must be tried together if this fact is known to the prosecutor; it was also provided that acquittal or conviction of the defendant for the same offense in another jurisdiction (federal or state) shall be a defense to prosecution in this state.

The Model Penal Code approach restricting all mental states

⁴ The sections were organized in the traditional textbook arrangement: I. General Provisions; Title and Construction of the Act and State Jurisdiction, General Definitions and Rights of Defendant; II. Principles of Criminal Liability; Criminal Act and Mental State, Parties to Crime, Responsibility and Justifiable Use of Force and Exoneration; III. Specific Offenses; Inchoate Offenses, Offenses Directed Against the Person, Offenses Directed Against Property, Offenses Affecting Public Health, Safety and Decency, Offenses Affecting Governmental Functions; IV. Construction, Effective Date and Repeal (of prior laws). For lack of a better place, and because they are primarily procedural anyway, we put Place of Trial and Sentencing in the first part on General Provisions.

⁵ However, the jury recommendation is not mandatory on the court (in bench trials the court might impose death or imprisonment).

to four—intent, knowledge, recklessness and negligence—was adopted in the article on the Criminal Act and Mental State. The new Code specified the precise situations in which a person's reasonable belief that his conduct does not constitute an offense would be a defense, including when he acts in reliance upon an order or opinion of an Illinois appellate or supreme court, or a United States appellate court later overruled or reversed.

The new Code abolished all "assault with intent to" (rape, murder, etc.) offenses and provided that such conduct shall be prosecuted as attempts. An offense of "Reckless Conduct" was created which was defined as endangering the bodily safety of an individual by any means. The Code repealed the seventy-four sections dealing with various forms of theft and adopted one comprehensive theft offense. It restricted absolute liability offenses to those not punishable by incarceration or a fine exceeding five hundred dollars, unless the statute defining the offense specifically and clearly provided otherwise.

The age of infancy was raised from ten to thirteen, and the Model Penal Code formulation of the test for insanity was adopted. It also adopted the "apparent," rather than actual, necessity rule for the use of force in defense of one's person or that of another, and abolished the right of a person to resist an unlawful arrest, even if he knows it is unlawful and it is in fact unlawful. Although the total ban against eavesdropping by any means was retained, this was amended in 1969 to permit eavesdropping with the consent of one of the parties to the conversation, and at the request of a state's attorney.⁶

The new Code revamped entirely the sex offenses so that sexual activity between consenting adults (18 and over) in private would not be a crime, and legalized sexual activity between humans and animals. It abolished statutory rape and added three affirmative defenses to the offense of indecent liberties with a child: that the accused reasonably believes the child was sixteen years of age or over; that the child is a prostitute; or, that the child has previously been married. However, contributing to the sexual delinquency of a child was made an absolute liability offense with a maximum of one year or one thousand dollars. The Model Penal Code defenses to abortion were included, but the legislature amended out the defenses and restored the old "except when necessary to save the mother's life" provision.⁷

⁶ Eavesdropping of this nature was recently held not to violate the fourth amendment. *United States v. White*, 39 U.S.L.W. 4387 (U.S. Apr. 5, 1971).

⁷ This was held to be unconstitutionally vague and an invasion of the mother's right of privacy by the federal District Court for the Northern District of Illinois on January 29, 1971.

Immediately after ce available,⁸ the Joint Co two-day seminars in Ch ize the bench, the bar provisions. Various me plained separate articles large number of comme ceived from participant suggestions for change sequently considered by changes were adopted.⁷ Reference Bureau in put

One of the most critic is the procedure to be f legislature. Although var successful a tremendou produced no reward.

Every attempt at comp encounter opposition to groups. Many seem wil changes are not made to enough, in Illinois, the fi an organized group cam changes in Chicago. The prohibited gambling in fu tative Final Draft was p ceived a joint request fro representing the exchange In the highest tradition o for the exchanges requ amended to except contr ially in view of the exi counsel even presented th sion which would accor eration, the subcommittee isfactory reason for excep proscriptions, and decline In the meantime, since the two bar associations

⁸ The substantive Code and Co Tentative Final Draft, and Comme by West Publishing Company of request by the headquarters staffs withheld to assure individual copies when the Code was introduced in th

Immediately after copies of the Tentative Final Draft were available,⁸ the Joint Committee sponsored a series of one and two-day seminars in Chicago and downstate localities to familiarize the bench, the bar and the public with the proposed Code provisions. Various members of the drafting subcommittee explained separate articles of the Code prior to open discussion. A large number of comments, favorable and unfavorable, were received from participants in the seminars and later by mail. All suggestions for changes, modifications or deletions were subsequently considered by the Joint Committee and a few minor changes were adopted. This reporter then assisted the Legislative Reference Bureau in putting the Code into bill form.

One of the most critical decisions of any revisions commission is the procedure to be followed in presenting the revision to the legislature. Although various methods may be used, if they are not successful a tremendous amount of dedicated effort will have produced no reward.

Every attempt at comprehensive revision of the law is bound to encounter opposition to specific provisions by special interest groups. Many seem willing to sacrifice the entire revision if changes are not made to meet their particular demands. Strangely enough, in Illinois, the first request and pressure for change from an organized group came from the commodities and stock exchanges in Chicago. The proposed Code, in article twenty-eight, prohibited gambling in futures. Almost immediately after the Tentative Final Draft was published, the drafting subcommittee received a joint request from two of the top legal firms in Chicago, representing the exchanges, for a meeting with the subcommittee. In the highest tradition of professional negotiations, the counsel for the exchanges requested that the futures provision be amended to except contracts executed on the exchanges, especially in view of the existing federal and internal policing. The counsel even presented the subcommittee with a re-worded provision which would accommodate their request. After consideration, the subcommittee nevertheless decided there was no satisfactory reason for excepting any group or agency from criminal proscriptions, and declined to make the change.

In the meantime, since the Joint Committee was an agency of the two bar associations, the Tentative Final Draft had been

⁸The substantive Code and Commentary were completed in October 1960, and the Tentative Final Draft, and Commentary, were published free of charge in pamphlet form by West Publishing Company of St. Paul. Five thousand copies were distributed on request by the headquarters staffs of the two bar associations. Five hundred copies were withheld to assure individual copies for each legislator and others who would need copies when the Code was introduced in the General Assembly.

submitted to the respective governing boards of the associations for approval, subject to minor modifications as the Joint Committee might deem desirable. Although the Board of Governors of the Illinois State Bar Association gave prompt approval, for some unexplained reason the Board of Managers of the Chicago Bar Association delayed action on the Code. Investigation by the Committee indicated that only acquiescence in the amendment proposed by the exchanges would halt the delay in favorable action by the Board of Managers. As a result the Committee threatened to expose the whole matter to the newspapers which brought quick approval of the Code by the Board of Managers. The exchanges later sponsored their amendment in the legislature but it was easily defeated.

Although the Illinois State Bar Association has a representative in each session of the General Assembly to explain and lobby for bills sponsored by the association, and to notify association officers and committee members when and where to appear for committee hearings on such bills, the Joint Committee felt that the criminal Code was too complicated and complex to leave to the guidance of a single spokesman who was neither a criminal law practitioner nor familiar with the new Code. With the approval of the two governing boards, the Joint Committee appointed this reporter the spokesman for the Joint Committee and the bar associations before the legislature. It was agreed that all requests for explanations and amendments would be directed to the spokesman for reply and handling, and that unless requested to do so by the spokesman, other members of the Joint Committee would not agree to any amendments. It was agreed, also, that authority to approve minor amendments be vested in the spokesman but that any major amendments should be considered by the drafting subcommittee.

In order to keep the sponsorship of the Code nonpartisan, it was decided to ask the Democratic chairman of the House and the Republican chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee to act as prime sponsors for the Code. These sponsors and the Joint Committee agreed that it would be wise to seek as many secondary sponsors as possible and, in order to expedite consideration of the bill, to introduce the Code in both Houses simultaneously to be referred to subcommittees of their respective committees. The chairmen of the subcommittees then agreed, for the first time in Illinois history, to hold joint public hearings on the Code and, if possible, make identical recommendations to their respective parent committees.

The subcommittees held seven public hearings on the Code:

five in Springfield and two in Chicago. At these meetings, several groups expressed their opposition to the Code. The commodities commission accepted from the gambling industry, the American Society, and some others expressed their opposition to the sentencing article; the manufacturing industry of state wanted to be excluded from the Code; the National Automobile Association wanted to be excluded from the Code; the Association wanted sentencing provisions to be included in the Code; the Council of Criminal Defense Attorneys in the abortion Code; the Council of Criminal Defense Attorneys and members of the Code wanted to be excluded from the Code; the Code opposed the entire Code; the Code wanted to be excluded from the Code; the Code wanted them draft the "weapons" Code.

Most opposition never materialized. The chances of passing. Seven public hearings favorable consensus supported the Code. Explanatory meetings held to help to familiarize the members of the Code and the Code. Second, as soon as the bill was introduced, furnished with a personal copy of the Code Commentary which provided for a study it. Third, the members of the Code who approved the Code in the House and the Senate. Moreover, they held public hearings with the specific provisions of the Code to explain its background and the Code. Fourth, the Code provisions in other jurisdictions were personally available to answer questions at public hearings, the spokesman provided detailed written explanations of the Code which were duplicated and distributed to the House and the Senate. This served to help to explain the Code and the Code. The Code was approved by the Code.

Only three groups made amendments to the Code. We succeeded in amending the Code with the third. The Defense Attorneys wanted to amend the sentencing provisions of the Code, but they were defeated in the House. The gun lobbyists were defeated on the floor of the House.

five in Springfield and two all-day sessions in Chicago. At these meetings, several groups indicated opposition to part or all of the Code. The commodities and stock exchanges wanted to be exempted from the gambling article; The Altar and Rosary Society, and some others, wanted to except bingo from the gambling article; the manufacturers of slot machines for shipment out of state wanted to be exempted from the anti-slot-machine provision; the National Automobile Theft Bureau wanted motor vehicles included in the burglary statute; the Defense Lawyers Association wanted sentencing power left with the jury in certain cases; the Council of Catholic Churches opposed the affirmative defenses in the abortion provision; and The National Rifle Association and members of about four hundred gun clubs in Illinois opposed the entire Code because the subcommittee had not let them draft the "weapons" article.

Most opposition never posed a serious threat to the Code's chances of passing. Several factors probably contributed to the favorable consensus supporting the proposal. First, the explanatory meetings held throughout the state prior to the session helped to familiarize the news media and the public with provisions of the Code and the old laws they were intended to replace. Second, as soon as the bills were introduced, each legislator was furnished with a personal copy of the Tentative Final Draft with Commentary which provided them additional opportunity to study it. Third, the members of the Senate and House subcommittees who approved the Code were highly respected in both Houses. Moreover, they had thoroughly familiarized themselves with the specific provisions of the Code and were thereby able to explain its background and need, and compare it with similar provisions in other jurisdictions. Fourth, in addition to being personally available to answer any and all questions raised in the hearings, the spokesman for the Joint Committee provided detailed written explanations concerning any troublesome questions which were duplicated and sent to each member of the General Assembly. This served to inform all legislators about questions being raised and the explanations being given even before the Code was approved by the committees.

Only three groups made sustained and continued efforts to amend the Code. We successfully resisted two and compromised with the third. The Defense Lawyers Association made efforts to amend the sentencing provisions so as to retain some sentencing power in the jury, but the proposed amendment was easily defeated on the floor of the House, and never offered in the Senate.

The gun lobbyists were fanatic in their attempts to influence the

Code. Illinois has always had one of the most liberal "gun laws" in the country. No registration or licensing was required, and the only real prohibition was against the carrying of "concealed" weapons. The proposed Code prohibited possession of certain types of dangerous weapons which had no ordinary lawful use (for example, blackjacks, metal knuckles, switch-blade knives, sawed off shotguns, machine guns, spring guns, silencers and tear gas guns). In most instances, these weapons had been proscribed in isolated sections of the prior law, the Code simply bringing them all together in one article. The new article was neither more liberal nor more restrictive than the prior law. Nevertheless, the gun lobby, in newspapers throughout the state, condemned the new Code as being poorly drafted, inimical to the best interests of all citizens and of sportsmen in particular, and a denial of several constitutional rights. The National Rifle Association magazine continually criticized the new Code, in part, by carrying erroneous reports of what the weapons article provided. Explanatory letters to them accomplished nothing except renewed attacks. The joint subcommittees listened to some twenty-five representatives of the gun people in one afternoon session which deteriorated into a shouting match between gun representatives and individual members of the subcommittees. All members of the subcommittees were so incensed after that session that none of them ever offered an amendment to the weapons article.

The third group, the Council of Catholic Churches, had warned the full Joint Committee that it would organize terrific opposition to the Code's inclusion of the three Model Penal Code defenses to abortion — to save the life "or health" of the mother, if there is an irremediable defect in the fetus, and if pregnancy results from forcible rape or aggravated father-daughter incest.⁹ Although the issue was not raised during the early hearings of the joint subcommittees, the abortion provisions were receiving much attention in the press. Shortly after the third hearing the representative of the Council of Catholic Churches made it known that unless an agreement could be reached amending out the defenses, the Council would denounce the provisions from the pulpit. Although it was felt that the abortion sections were valid in the minds of the sponsors and would receive considerable support on the floor, the Code's supporters were not ready to jeopardize the entire Code just because of the abortion provisions.

⁹ Illinois was the first state to submit the Model Penal Code defenses to its legislature long before Colorado became the first to adopt them in 1967, and at that time — 1961 — the population of Illinois was estimated to be 35 percent Catholic and that of Chicago about 55 percent.

Subsequently, the Code defenses were amended when necessary to save the Churches would support proposed amendment was the drafting subcommittee defenses should not be an amendment of the Catholic subcommittees which added to the judiciary commissions the abortion defenses discussed in any legislative House of the legislature.

Although the heart of Catholic Churches in accordance with the sex provisions in the Code, the first, and still the only consenting adults in private agreement on abortion, all amendments subcommittees were of minor importance was easily passed by both

II. THE CODE

As anticipated, achieving the full Committee on Code was more difficult might also be expected, the drawn between the "defended" members of the committee 1961-62, we did not have due process decisions had Supreme Court during the passage of the Code, the subcommittee all of the constitutional provisions since held to belong to per

Two of the most controversial "frisk" section, borrowed from

¹⁰ The basic procedure adopted for the Code was with this reporter and the younger members of the committee preliminary research and drafting: the committee met every two weeks and the full committee met full time on the Code in June of 1961. The full Committee monthly until the Code

Subsequently, the Council's representative indicated that if the defenses were amended out, and abortions were permitted only when necessary to save the mother's life, the Council of Catholic Churches would support all other provisions of the Code. This proposed amendment was discussed with the other members of the drafting subcommittee who promptly decided that the abortion defenses should not be allowed to defeat the Code. Thus, the amendment of the Catholic Churches was submitted to the joint subcommittees which adopted it as an amendment to be recommended to the judiciary committees. As a result of these determinations the abortion defenses were never brought into issue nor discussed in any legislative committee nor on the floor of either House of the legislature.

Although the heart of the abortion provisions were lost, the Catholic Churches in accord with their agreement did not attack the sex provisions in the Code, and Illinois consequently became the first, and still the only, state in which sexual activity between consenting adults in private is not a crime. Excepting the amendment on abortion, all amendments recommended by the joint subcommittees were of minor importance. As amended, the Code was easily passed by both Houses of the legislature.

II. THE CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

As anticipated, achieving a consensus of the subcommittee and of the full Committee on the precise wording of the procedural Code was more difficult than with the substantive Code.¹⁰ As might also be expected, the lines of disagreement were generally drawn between the "defense minded" and the "prosecution minded" members of the committee. Since these discussions were in 1961-62, we did not have the benefit of the numerous procedural due process decisions handed down by the United States Supreme Court during the past eight years. Nevertheless, on drafting the Code, the subcommittee did provide by statute for practically all of the constitutional "rights" which the Supreme Court has since held to belong to persons accused of crimes.

Two of the most controversial provisions were the "stop and frisk" section, borrowed from the Uniform Arrest Act, and the

¹⁰ The basic procedure adopted for the drafting of the substantive Code was continued with this reporter and the younger members of the drafting subcommittee doing the preliminary research and drafting; the drafting subcommittee then discussing and redrafting the proposals for submission to the full Joint Committee. The drafting subcommittee met every two weeks and the full committee quarterly until this reporter began working full time on the Code in June of 1962 when the drafting subcommittee met weekly and the full Committee monthly until the Code was completed in December 1962.

Union wanted the phrase "without unnecessary delay" changed to "forthwith" in the section on taking an accused before a magistrate after arrest. The State's Attorneys Association wanted to lodge the discretion to reveal grand jury proceedings in the state's attorney instead of the court. Numerous other minor amendments were suggested of which the judiciary subcommittees adopted eighteen before reporting the bills back to the respective judiciary committees. Unlike the substantive Code, the judiciary committees did not adopt identical amendments, so bills with minor differences were sent to the floors of the respective chambers. The greatest attack against a specific provision of the proposed code of procedure was launched on the floor of the House against the ten percent deposit bail provision.

The bail bondsmen were powerful people around the courthouse and jails, and their campaign contributions to both state's attorneys, legislators and sheriffs were appreciated by those elected to office. By the morning of the second reading, the Bail Bondsman Association representatives had called or seen practically every legislator in the House. Moreover, on the prior day, the Illinois Sheriffs Association had convened a special meeting in Springfield and adopted a resolution opposing the ten percent deposit provision. In view of this opposition, it was decided that the bail provision would have a greater chance of success if couched in terms of a two-year trial period and used as an alternative method of making bail instead of the exclusive method. Observation over two years, it was felt, would provide sufficient experience to determine if it worked well and should be renewed in 1965; otherwise, the ten percent deposit provisions would expire. Although much lobbying was necessary the ten percent provision was maintained in the Code with the two-year experimental clause incorporated.¹¹ On the following day the House passed the Code and the Senate soon followed.

III. CONCLUSION

The two new Codes have generally worked out well in Illinois during the years since passage. Admittedly, as long as there is crime in the large volume that mobile urban populations seem to generate, no system of criminal justice is going to be perfect. However, in the opinion of this reporter, if the criminal law is to be respected (whether it is obeyed or not), it should impose

¹¹ Because of the very favorable experience with the ten percent deposit bail provision during 1964, it was renewed at the 1965 legislative session, but it was made the exclusive method of making bail. Thus, Illinois no longer has professional bail bondsmen, and the state is by far the better for it.

Another important function of the law professor-reporter is to be available to legislative committees and others who are interested, including representatives of the news media, to explain the substance of the code and commentary. Having originated the preliminary draft, participated in all subcommittee and committee discussions modifying and changing it into its final form, and written the commentary, the draftsman-reporter is easily the one most familiar with the entire legislative package. He can quickly and easily refer a questioning legislator from one section to another, which may qualify or supplement the first. It is seldom that any other member of the drafting committee can do this.

Whether the reporter should be the sole spokesman for the drafting committee in guiding a code through the legislature, as was done in Illinois, presents a different consideration. From my experience, legislators seem to have an innate distrust of professors. They are quick to resent any indication of "lecturing" them, and it seems difficult for them to accept the idea that a professor has any understanding of what goes on "in the outside world." However, if the professor-reporter has been active in bar association and professional activities, and has a wide acquaintance with the legislators involved, he is certainly the best qualified to speak specifically and favorably about the code. Yet, even if the chairman of the drafting committee, as the most prestigious member of the committee, assumes the role of spokesman, the reporter should be ever at his side and available for comment and explanation of the various provisions.