upon the often stated proposition that people do not know what is happening until one house has passed the legislation. We of the minority believe that this is not a compliment to bicameralism but a serious indictment of it. That it is so difficult for the ordinary citizen to comprehend that he cannot understand what has occurred until one house has acted, and as the facts indicate, that legislation does not get to the second house until it is almost too late for it to be given careful consideration, proves that the facade created by the bicameral system of careful second consideration simply is that, a facade, and does not involve citizens in a full participation in the legislative affairs of their state.

We believe rather that legislation should be under constant review from its initiation and introduction until its final passage.

We think, Mr. Chairman, that the second house is not now, has never been and is not likely to be an adequate safeguard against sloppy legislation. The only adequate safeguard is to provide a strong and a responsible legislature, and so structured that we can expect, within reason, that the behavior of each member will be the most responsible.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions of the minority spokesman for purposes of clarification of the Minority Report?

Delegate Koger.

DELEGATE KOGER: I wonder if your Committee considered how much might be saved in printing bills by printing just for one house?

DELEGATE HANSON: I do not believe that it did. This would be a consideration. I think that the experience of Nebraska, for example, has indicated that not only is there a saving in the printing of bills just in the total number or the duplicates in each house, but that actually fewer bills were introduced when the legislature there converted from a bicameral to a unicameral system.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions of the minority spokesman?

Delegate Byrnes?

DELEGATE BYRNES: Recognizing that one of the values of bicameralism is that the one house considers bills more deeply than the other house, would you think that we could have the unicameral system without a continuous session? That is, referring now to the volume of bills that go before the General Assembly every year.

DELEGATE HANSON: I think it would be possible to have a unicameral system without a continuous session. I think whether we have a unicameral or a bicameral legislature, as the committee report suggests, greater consideration toward flexibility is needed in the ability of the General Assembly to determine its session.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions of the minority spokesman?

Delegate Fornos?

DELEGATE FORNOS: Have you given consideration to the one major problem that has been pointed out in the Nebraska unicameral situation, that they have a non-partisan system?

Certainly you are not advocating that, are you?

DELEGATE HANSON: I am certainly not advocating non-partisanship and I think I can speak with confidence for the other members of the minority in that none of us are considering a non-partisan system of election.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bushong?

DELEGATE BUSHONG: He answered the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there further questions for purposes of clarification? Delegate Bennett?

DELEGATE BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, would Mr. Hanson repeat those figures again on the percentage of legislation that was enacted in the closing days of the legislature?

DELEGATE HANSON: Yes. On page 6 of the minority report, we present a table which indicates that in the ninth and tenth weeks of the General Assembly, which are the last few weeks, in 1966, 82 per cent of all bills passed were enacted, and in 1967, 71 per cent of all bills passed were enacted. On the succeeding page, we indicate that if one excludes local laws, which we think to be a significant exclusion, 45 per cent of the House bills did not reach the Senate until the last ten days, and that in that same session, this year, 34 per cent of the general bills moving from the Senate to the House did not reach the House