so it would be known by those who read the press report the following day, both indicated and some members of the House of Delegates on the Committee that they favored unicameralism particularly in respect to some of the Supreme Court decisions in regard to one man, one vote.

There were other members of this Committee
that felt that bicameralism was in order. The arguments
given on each side will be summarized as follows:
Those who believe -- by those members of the State
Legislature Committee -- those who believed in unicameralism
stated that as they saw it, there was no need for having
further review on the part of the State Legislature
in respect to a bill that was proposed. That one House
could deal with it. That, as a matter of fact, time
would be saved as they saw it and also time in Committee
hearings. Quite often there were Committee hearings
by both Houses and that would be unnecessary.

Those who favored bicameralism believed that it had worked well, they believed that there would be opportunities for some second thoughts and they indicated