

1. seems to me to be a pure straw man --

2. DR. MICHENER: Straw man, in the sense that it  
3. is no longer valid.

4. MR. SCANLAN: It hasn't been valid for 150  
5. years.

6. DR. MICHENER: But it is not a straw man. The  
7. reason I mentioned it is that historically this is the  
8. argument that led to the strong arguments for bicameralism.

9. MR. SCANLAN: It would not be an argument for  
10. bicameralism today.

11. DR. MICHENER: What happened was the original  
12. arguments died and other arguments were substituted for  
13. them.

14. MR. SCANLAN: I want to make clear this is not  
15. an argument today that would justify it.

16. DR. MICHENER: I say the argument is no longer  
17. made today. As a matter of fact, the other argument which  
18. has been made up until very recently is that the two houses  
19. permit representation of two different interests or inter-  
20. ests in two different chambers and, of course, historically,  
21. this is the one that has been the strong argument in the