

that is said against unicameralism by persons within this group is that a clear superiority over bicameralism may not have been factually proved. Persons holding this reservation appear to be in the minority within the group. Some persons comment that analyses to date are not conclusive because a modernized, updated bicameral legislature has not been tried. Inducing an existing legislature to reform its procedures may be more difficult, however, than effecting a wholesale revision of the legislature itself. The suggested bicameral improvements—such as joint committee hearings and, possibly, joint committees—actually are partial moves towards unicameralism, for the real work of legislatures is done in committees and not on the floor of the houses.⁴² In view of this, unicameralists ask why reform should stop with halfway measures.

Most practicing politicians favor bicameralism. Even here unicameralists suggest that this may be due not so

much to the merits of the case as to a fear of the personal political consequences of the transition to unicameralism. Nebraska legislators who have had experience with both systems—and who thus survived the transition—overwhelmingly prefer unicameralism. A survey in 1961 of 68 present and former Nebraska legislators showed that only four wanted a return to bicameralism.⁴³ Earlier, one legislator who had served four years in the Nebraska lower house and two years in the Nebraska Senate under bicameralism, and who had voted against unicameralism, stated that unicameralism was a decided improvement over the previous bicameral system.⁴⁴ This legislator, C. Petrus Peterson, had also served as speaker of the unicameral assembly, and was intimately acquainted with the practical workings of both systems.

⁴³ Hanson, *The One-House Legislature*, Baltimore Sun, Dec. 13, 1964, § D, at 3, col. 1.

⁴⁴ Carter, *supra* note 23, at 113.

⁴² Shepard, *supra* note 2, at 359.