

eral system permit easy news coverage and searching publicity. Increased public understanding is an inevitable result. The development of legislative leadership is facilitated where legislators are concentrated in one chamber, and this concentration of leadership simplifies the working relationships between the governor and the legislature.

**REBUTTAL OF OBJECTIONS
TO UNICAMERALISM**

Unicameralists reject the criticism levied by the bicameralists. The one major objection to unicameralism is the fact that a review by the second chamber is eliminated. As noted before, unicameralists counter with an attack on the general worth of the review given by bicameral systems; point out the lessened need for a second legislative review with the growth of legislative councils, professional bill-drafting services, and executive leadership; and claim that the experience of Nebraska has proved in fact that there is no need for review. Should it still be felt, however, that a second legislative review is needed, unicameralists point out that it can be provided for under their system.

One proposed review method requires that certain categories of legislation be passed in two different sessions before becoming effective. This requirement of a second passage could be imposed even where there may be an intervening election. Because of the delays involved, this approach is feasible only with respect to fundamental issues where the need for a wide and lasting consensus is vitally important.

Another proposed approach, feasible for ordinary measures, is for the legislature to choose, when it first convenes, a portion of its membership to sit in a separate revising chamber as is now

done in unicameralist Scandinavian countries.⁴⁰ All major questions and all conflicts between the two houses are handled by a majority vote of the two houses in a common session. In short, the second chamber can suggest revisions, but has no power to enforce them over the wishes of the elected legislature. This, it will be recognized, is in effect the British system where the House of Lords can suggest revisions, but no longer has the power to prevent the passage of legislation.

This method of providing for a review of the work of the elected legislature bears a noticeable resemblance to the "Virginia Plan" advanced in the Constitutional Convention of 1787. That plan, favored by James Madison among others, provided for a lower house elected by the people, with an upper house chosen by the lower house.⁴¹ Since the upper house would be chosen by the lower house, even though the choice was from nominations submitted by the various state legislatures, the upper house under the "Virginia Plan" could not be expected to prevail in a conflict between the two.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing summary of arguments advanced for and against bicameralism and unicameralism tips heavily in favor of unicameralism. This reflects the fact that people who write on the subject—political scientists and other persons primarily with academic backgrounds—heavily favor unicameralism. The most

⁴⁰ McDaniel, *No One Misses the Landsting, But—*, 49 AM. SCANDINAVIAN REV. 268 (1961).

⁴¹ H. THORNTON, LEGISLATIVE ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES (BICAMERALISM V. UNICAMERALISM) 4 (Okla. State Legislative Council, Constitutional Survey Committee Study No. 8, 1948).