

who is against change for the sake of change. I am truly amazed to hear these people talk for the unicameral system. I think under the present system we have thrived, in fact I think we have thrived extremely well, to the extent that I find that I can hardly find chores for my son to do around my home because of the extremely high economic standards that we have achieved.

I would regret and I will protest change for the sake of change.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do any other delegates wish to speak on the question?

*(There was no response.)*

If not, the Chair will recognize successively Delegate Hanson and Delegate Gallagher for ten minutes each for rebuttal.

Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

We have engaged now for sometime in debate on this question. It is not my desire to prolong the agony of decision, but there are a few comments to which I should like to respond and some things of which I would like to remind the delegates.

We are told that the shortcomings that exist in the bicameral legislature are not indigenous to the bicameral system but are mere byproducts of it. I would suggest that any of the other reforms sought by the Committee that can be achieved with unicameralism can probably be achieved with much greater swiftness with unicameralism after these many years of admitted delay. We can have the benefits both of a body that is clearly visible to the public and responsible to it, and a body which will attract outstanding citizens to public service because of its elevated prestige in state government.

I am impressed with the concessions which the bicameralists have made, but while, of course, logic is on the side of unicameralism—only a shade, but nonetheless we bask in that shade—I am also interested in the history of the bicameralists who would seem to suggest from analogy to Nebraska, which we all admit is not analogous, of course, but would seem to suggest by analogy to the way in which unicameralism came into being in that great State, sandwiched between repeal of prohibition and an amendment for pari-

mutuel betting, that somehow the adoption of unicameralism in Maryland would add to drinking and gambling.

I think this is perhaps not the intention of the remark, but it seems to be the implication of it. It is true, as some have said here today, that bicameralism can flourish in a system of equal representation. I think there is no doubt of it, any constitutional authority to the contrary notwithstanding. But I think it is also true that a system of equal representation will be greatly enhanced through one which promotes effectively, directly, and clearly a high sense of public responsibility by every member of the legislative body.

Let us recall to you the arguments with which we began this debate: first, that we can have all the reforms necessary to the legislative branch and indeed improve upon those in a unicameral system; second, that there is a need in Maryland in state government for a much stronger and far more effective legislative branch, and finally that there is a greater chance for more strength and unity in a unicameral system, an argument which has not even been suggested to be in error by the bicameralists.

We have suggested that the legislative process would be more clearly understood and that each individual member of the legislature would be more clearly accountable to his constituents in a unicameral body. We have not heard refutation of this argument.

We have suggested that a unicameral body could increase the prestige of the legislature and thereby tend to attract more able citizens to its service. We have not heard discussion of this point.

What we have heard is that bicameralism is traditional and we are willing to concede that bicameralism is traditional. We have heard that bicameralism somehow prevents hasty legislation. But we repeat the argument and the facts to the contrary. We pointed out in the Minority Report, that hasty legislation is encouraged in the second house by bicameralism if a bill is given effective and decent consideration in the first house, it cannot reach the second house until it is too late to be given careful and deliberate consideration.

We have pointed out that 80 percent of all bills die in the house of their origin, which shows that the house of origin does a much better job of weeding out bad legislation than does the other house to which it is ultimately referred.