

1        respective arguments, that the extreme expense, the  
2        gross waste of time, the high cost without value of the  
3        bicameral method, was one which we no longer could follow.

4                For example, take the regular working day, to  
5        get some insight into the working of our bicameral system  
6        which we are now saying that we want to hold on to: Not-  
7        withstanding the reduction of committees in each of the  
8        respective houses, both bodies divide themselves into  
9        committees and those committees are corresponding ones. A  
10       matter is scheduled for hearing before the house, and  
11       because it happens to be a question which is less than  
12       glamorous, one which involves some technical detail,  
13       some expertises, a group of experts travel to Annapolis  
14       when the scheduled hearing is set. A group of people  
15       accompany them because of their interest in the matter.  
16       They mill in the floors and about the corridors, and finally  
17       in the late hours of the evening or the early hours of  
18       the morning they come before the committee, and because  
19       it is a committee, for example, of 32, and the late hour,  
20       there are only 10 or 12 members then present to hear.

21                THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Clagett, you have 20