3 4

5 6

> 7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

I believe that the reasons that are compelling reasons. tradition has dictated in the past are no longer true, especially now we have essentially one man, one vote. This has been voiced by both urban and rural legislators. I myself took the position that I was for bicameralism for political expediency, not because I believe in it on its merits as opposed to unicameralism.

However, I think if we can say that is a consideration but talk to the merits right now of unicameralism versus bicameralism, then decide whether this jeopardizes the adoption of a constitution in this state, let's first discuss unicameralism.

Number one, you have a second look through the second House that gives an extra check or balance. The other possible and, I think, a questionable argument is that by virtue of having two bodies you may have two sets of representation based on two different bases, one could be a multiple unit district, another a single unit district.

If that is felt to be good, we could go to

I can only see two real arguments for bicameralism