

1 it breaks into two areas, one the historical argument. I
2 think it is purely historical as a student of history and
3 political science. That, as I understand it, the real
4 main thrust of unicameralism was an attempt to provide
5 an answer to gerrymandering and malapportioned legisla-
6 tures. I would submit that the recent Supreme Court deci-
7 sions on reapportionment have put to rest that argument.
8 Even that constitutional expert, Mr. Bradford Jacobs would
9 agree the 1966 State legislature of this State was a very
10 good step in the right direction. It would seem to me
11 that historical argument is no longer a feasible one or
12 valid one. I think the second argument, as I understand
13 it is an argument for visibility, for responsibility for
14 accountability and for efficiency.

15 I would also submit, as people have already
16 done this afternoon, that these things, I agree with all of
17 them, are best achieved not by a unicameral legislature,
18 but rather by just those things, by visibility through
19 smaller election districts, through a greater/responsibil-
20 ity, I think the responsibility, accountability, and
21 efficiency can all be far greater achieved through the