

ture a division of responsibility, perhaps exclusive, perhaps not. But I suggest it is a thought we should all consider. I would therefore, oppose the amendment. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the delegate desire to speak in favor? Delegate Marion.

DELEGATE MARION: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the eminent Chairman of the Committee on the Legislative Branch and to Delegate Schloeder, my friend and colleague, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment.

Delegate Schloeder and I, when we were campaigning together for election as delegates to this Constitutional Convention had occasion on many times to discuss this very issue with groups of citizens whose votes we were seeking. We came to speak on opposite sides of the question even though I began by feeling that I leaned toward bicameralism. The more I discussed and debated the issues, I came to realize that logic should outweigh tradition.

Senator Norris back in Nebraska some thirty-some years ago stated the case for unicameralism there. He said this, "A state should be a business institution and not a political machine. Its government should be conducted on business principles. It should transact its business much as does a great corporation with the governor as the president, the legislature as the board of directors, and the people as the stockholders."

I do not think any great one billion dollar corporation would conceive of conducting its business, certainly not efficiently, with a bicameral board of directors.

Delegate Scanlan quoted Mr. Justice Holmes: "The life of the law is not logic but experience". But what has been the experience of our state legislatures in too many of the last years? About two years ago, Newsweek Magazine referred to state legislatures generally as the shame of the states. It made the point that many citizens had lost confidence in their state legislatures. They had given up on trying to find out what went on in their state legislatures and became discouraged and pessimistic about state governments for that very reason.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that a legislature with a double image too often gives citizens the idea it is all done with mirrors.

The argument is placed that there should be checks and balances. I see in this argu-

ment one which produces and encourages irresponsibility, and despite Mr. Bradford Jacobs' qualifications or lack of them as a constitutional authority, his qualifications as a political commentator are well-known. He referred last Friday to the old Annapolis shell game, a game where none can tell from the outside who did what to whom, let alone why.

Another commentator posed the problem in this fashion: "It is common for the members of one house to feel that if there is any error or any bad feature in a bill when it passes, the other house will surely look out for it. Each depends on the other and neither watches as closely as it should."

That remark was made by Governor Norbeck of South Dakota fifty years ago in urging that his State seriously consider adopting the unicameral legislature. The criticism he saw of the bicameral system exists today.

Mr. Chairman, checks and balances would be retained under a unicameral legislature. There is the governor's veto. There is judicial review. There is the process of referendum. But I think far more importantly, there is public accountability clearly focused on legislative action. Because I believe that unicameralism and not bicameralism would enhance prestige, create visibility and focus responsibility, I believe it should be adopted here and now in this State. We are creating a legislature not for the legislators, but for the people of Maryland.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Marion, you have one-half minute.

DELEGATE MARION: With all due respect to George Washington's teacup theory, I would prefer to see us adopt the Mug Theory. If we need to cool it, we exercise a degree of responsibility and put it down. Major change in the machinery of state government requires courage. I urge those people in this Convention who are almost unicameralists to muster that courage to shoulder the responsibility which we would like to see exercised by our state legislature, and vote favorably for Amendment No. 1. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to speak in opposition to the amendment? Delegate E. J. Clarke.

DELEGATE E. CLARKE: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee of the Whole, I rise in opposition to the amendment. A great deal has been said this afternoon about the pressures, influ-