

Delegates or the Senate, and we assumed they became law only to realize they had been killed in the other house when we were ready to rely upon them when dealing with clients' problems. This failure of communication is basic in the system. There is practically no way to overcome it. You have to have a chart with computer buttons and all kinds of electronic gadgets to keep up with legislation between the two houses.

The bicameralists suggest—this is the crucial part of their argument—that the bicameral system is the basic way of killing hastily, ill-conceived legislation by a cautious other house.

The way it works, however, is, cautious, well-considered legislation is killed by a hasty other house. The truth of that statement is inherent in the way the system operates because the cautious legislation that one house puts through in the 60th or 71st days of its session is generally disposed of in the last ten days on the other side. The statistics that we presented showed that.

Instead of having your coffee poured from the saucer to the cup, you are pouring the coffee from the cup to the saucer. All of the coffee in the cup is poured into the saucer in the last few days of the session, and I submit all of it does not get drunk by the people of the State of Maryland. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hanson?

DELEGATE HANSON: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of other people who indicated a desire to speak under the controlled time. But if the Chair could take some kind of sense of the Committee of the Whole, I think I could reserve the time remaining for rebuttal at the end. Perhaps if the people who have agreed to speak have no objection, they might speak under the uncontrolled time segment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would be disposed in view of the hour to continue the debate with the uncontrolled time, but I do not believe that we could permit you then to come back and have sole rebuttal, Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: I was not suggesting I might have sole rebuttal, but that the Chairman of the Committee on the Legislative Branch and myself might reserve an equal amount of time for rebuttal.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will proceed with uncontrolled time and allow each

of you, at the end of the debate as to which time is uncontrolled, shorter of the time, that the two of you have remaining; I am not sure which that is.

Are there any other delegates who desire to speak either for or in opposition? I think we should take first, delegates speaking for the amendment. Delegate Borom, do you wish to speak for the amendment?

DELEGATE BOROM: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I call to your attention that each speaker in this portion of the debate is limited to five minutes.

DELEGATE BOROM: That is more than anticipated, otherwise. As I listened to some of our experienced legislators talk about the way the system operates, and conference committees, it occurred to me the issue was probably not between bicameralism and unicameralism, but tri, bi, and uni. On the conference committee we have the third level in the governmental system.

One of the reasons I am anxious to speak is that earlier someone alluded to the origin of the unicameral system in Nebraska and the way in which the distinguished Mr. Norris succeeded in having this come through. I would submit, and I think all the former and present legislators would agree, that many good things that have come through any legislative body often have been hidden. I think rather than belittle Mr. Norris for the way he achieved unicameralism in Nebraska, we should commend his ingenuity. The people of Nebraska have not rejected unicameralism after all these years. The advocates of bicameralism are really grasping at straws when they talk about reapportionment, and the effect on the bicameral system. There is no assurance whatever that reapportionment will improve the quality of legislators or will rid us of the hidden manner in which much work gets done in the General Assembly.

I would like to borrow from the Committee's Report the well used expression, one cannot see the forest for the trees. I think this is one of the problems. We talked about the fact that the electorate does not trust the General Assembly. They cannot see the forest for the trees. Too many people there, two bodies, too much good legislation going down the drain in the process—I think if we hang our hats on these arguments, it will be a false hook.

I would further suggest that perhaps the