

1 how the lobby has affected either of the two systems.
2 This argument is one that goes both ways. I may have it
3 out of order here, but the argument for bicameralism is
4 that with a legislature of two houses, you cannot corrupt
5 two houses at the same time, or it is very unlikely. The
6 unicameralists say this has happened; that is no argument.
7 But, aside from corruption, a legislature under a bicameral
8 system, you have to have the lobbyists reach both chambers.
9 Aside from the issue of corruption, you have to reach both
10 chambers to get your legislation through, so the bicameral
11 system gives you two chances to stop the lobbyists.

12 The unicameralists say that may be true, but
13 most of the legislation we want to produce is positive
14 legislation which the lobbyists are opposed to. So, all
15 they have to do is reach one person or one house and stop
16 the legislation. This way, you can say the unicameral
17 system gives only one chance to block legislation rather
18 than two chances, and you reduce the power of the lobbyist.
19 It depends here whether you are looking at the lobbyist
20 as a proponent of legislation or opponent of legislation
21 and, as to which way you go on this, you take your pick