It is said that a bicameral legislature is more difficult to corrupt than a unicameral legislature, the theory being, I suppose, it is more costly to corrupt two houses than one.

With a bicameral legislature, and presumably with the larger number of persons who would be represented when adding both houses together, one would presume that there would be more legislators for the populace to know, so that the opportunity for personal contact on the part of the constituents with those who represent them, both in the upper house and the lower house, would be greater than if one had a unicameral body which had an aggregate body less than the total number of both the House and the Senate in the bicameral General Assembly.

Another argument made for bicameralism is it allowed for differentiation in two chambers of different interests, such as rural and economic interests. In this respect I might say, anticipating a further section of the report, that it was the desire of the Committee on the Legislative Branch not to have the Senate district serve geographically as an identical base with that of the