complexity, the greater problems we are facing, I would
be inclined to have two scrutinies of every issue rather
than one. Checks and balances, I think there is a check
and balance that we have, it doesn't happen often, but
many times, if for only convenience, one house will pass
a measure knowing full well the other house will take a
better look at it.

This ought not be the only reason why we should continue the two-house system, but until I have been a product of or at least have seen more evidence of the fact that a unicameral system works better than this one, I personally would be inclined to continue with what we have and it is only because I suppose most of us like to keep the status quo. It's very easy to keep what we have, but a little difficult sometimes to step into something that you are unfamiliar with, and I think it has worked well and I would hope that before it is changed we have a little more precedent than just the Nebraska background.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are glad to have Mr. Mandel with us, Speaker of the House, and if you care to break