

people's elected representatives feel that they need this buffer between themselves and the electorate. I do not know why they feel they need this buffer, but nevertheless I am concerned that they feel they need the two houses in order to hide some of what they may be doing.

I am very concerned that the electorate does not have the opportunity to know exactly what its legislators are doing, really does not have the opportunity to reach them effectively. Part of my experience has been on the other end. I am not a politician. I have been with groups of people who made the effort to reach their elected representatives. I think it provides a system for built in frustration for the electorate. One must have endurance and will power. He does not have the financing the lobbyist has nor the skill. For this reason, much of what he would like to see the General Assembly pass, really gets overlooked. I would suggest that the bicameral system prevents government for the people rather than provides government for the people.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any delegate who desires to speak in opposition to the amendment? Delegate Schloeder.

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I see the arguments being put forth by the unicameralists it breaks into two areas. One is the historical argument. As a student of history and political science, I understand the main thrust of unicameralism was an attempt to provide an answer to gerrymandering and malapportioned legislatures. I would submit that the recent Supreme Court decisions on reapportionment have put to rest that argument. Even that constitutional expert, Mr. Bradford Jacobs, would agree that the 1966 legislature of this State was a very good step in the right direction. It would seem to me that the historical argument is no longer a feasible one or valid one. I think the second argument, as I understand it, is an argument for visibility, responsibility, accountability and efficiency.

I would also submit, as people have already done this afternoon, that these things, and I agree with all of them, are best achieved not by a unicameral legislature, but rather by just those things; by visibility through smaller election districts and through a greater responsibility on the part of the press. I think responsibility, accountability, and efficiency can all be more effectively achieved through the other reforms that are presented in this, what I think on the whole is a fine legislative article. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment? Delegate Wagandt, do you desire to speak in favor?

DELEGATE WAGANDT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Wagandt.

DELEGATE WAGANDT: I would call attention to just one point. In 1922 the voters of Baltimore City approved a charter amendment to change the City Council from a bicameral to a unicameral body. It is my understanding that this has been the pattern throughout this century for the large metropolitan centers to change from a bicameral to a unicameral legislative body.

I am aware of no movement to readopt bicameralism wherever the people of a particular city have had the chance to taste the advantages of a one-house legislative body.

Dr. Burdette has quite rightly pointed out that a city council exercises far fewer powers than a state legislative body. So I would then turn your attention to this Constitutional Convention. Here we are participating in perhaps the most important deliberative body in Maryland to sit during the last one hundred years. Careful attention is being given to every word, for our work may live another hundred years.

I pose this question. Would anyone here suggest that the work of this Convention be sent across the hall to the Senate Chamber to have another elected body go through the same process that we have just done? If your answer is no, then I suggest you join us in support of unicameralism. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to speak in opposition to the—Delegate Byrnes.

DELEGATE BYRNES: I would like to, if I could, Mr. Chairman, inject what I hope is a new through into this dialogue. Many of us concerned over the rapidly mounting intergovernmental relations problems we are facing in all States—have a great deal of difficulty adjusting ourselves to regional concepts. We have a great deal of difficulty adjusting ourselves to the national-state relationships. I would suggest that if it is possible in the future the Senate or House adjust their rule so that one house becomes responsible for one area of state responsibility and the other house responsible for a different area.

I suggest that there could be in the fu-