in language not exactly duplicated in either of the bills
that came through either house, and there is no chance to
amend this afterwards.

So, then the legislators vote for the bill and they say, I had to vote for it. It was either this or nothing. This is not true, unicameralists say, with a unicameral legislature. There the legislator is publicly accountable for his vote and he has to defend it on the ground of its merits, not that he had to take it or leave it, or so on, and if he votes consistently in line with a lobbyist, this will soon become obvious.

MR. SCANLAN: I notice a sentence here, "It is not uncommon for a Nebraskan legislator to denounce a lobbyist by name on the floor of the house." We have had that experience in Maryland. I don't think that is any particular virtue of the legislators in a unicameral system.

DR. WHEELER: I think there is an obvious argument behind this often made in the defense of unicameralism, which is simply, this is a more simple structure and more easy to keep your eye on things. For example, I suppose,