

BOARD OF MANAGERS

HON. ALEXANDER ARMSTRONG
President, National Conference of
Commissioners on Uniform State Laws

HON. WILLIAM B. BELKNAP
Former President of the American
Legislators' Association

HON. DWIGHT H. BROWN
President, National Association of
Secretaries of State

HON. ROBERT L. COCHRAN
Governor of Nebraska and Chairman of
the Governors' Conference

HON. WILBUR L. CROSS
Governor of Connecticut

SENATOR MAUPIN CUMMINGS
Member of Arkansas General Assembly

SENATOR ANDREW J. GRAVES
Member of Tennessee General Assembly

HON. BIBB GRAVES
Governor of Alabama

HON. MARK GRAVES
President, New York State Tax Commission

JUDGE RICHARD HARTSHORNE
Court of Common Pleas, New Jersey

HON. HENRY HORNER
Governor of Illinois

HON. HENRY F. LONG
Commissioner of Corporations and
Taxation of Massachusetts

SENATOR SEABURY C. MASTICK
Chairman of the New York Commission
on Tax Revision

HON. PAUL V. McNUTT
Former Chairman of the Governors'
Conference

SENATOR JAMES O. MONROE
Member of Illinois General Assembly

HON. C. H. MORRISSETT
Tax Commissioner of Virginia

HON. HARRY W. NICE
Governor of Maryland

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONNOR
President, National Association of
Attorney-Generals

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
Member of New York Legislature

SENATOR HENRY PARKMAN, JR.
President of the American
Legislators' Association

SENATOR T. V. SMITH
Member of Illinois General Assembly

HENRY W. TOLL
Executive Director of the Council
of State Governments

HON. ELLWOOD J. TURNER
Member of Pennsylvania
General Assembly

SENATOR GEORGE WOODWARD
Member of Pennsylvania General
Assembly

HON. CLIFF YELLE
President, National Association of State
Auditors, Comptrollers, and Treasurers

CONSULTANT MEMBERS

HON. LOUIS BROWNLOW
Director of the Public Administration
Clearing House

PROF. JOSEPH P. CHAMBERLAIN
Director of the Legislative Drafting
Fund of Columbia University

DR. HAROLD W. DODDS
President of Princeton University

DR. LUTHER GULICK
Director of the Institute of Public
Administration

PROFESSOR SIMEON E. LELAND
Chairman, Illinois State Tax Commission
and President, National Tax Association

PROFESSOR THOMAS REED POWELL
President, American Political
Science Association

HON. ARTHUR T. VANDERBILT
President, American Bar Association

DR. EDWARD D. WHITE
Professor of Public Administration
University of Chicago

COUNSEL JOHN H. WIGMORE
Emeritus, Northwestern
University Law School

DR. WIN E. WITTE
Dean, Department of Economics
University of Wisconsin

THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

DREXEL AVENUE AND 58TH STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Cable Address: COSGO, for Chicago, Denver, and New York Offices

President
GOVERNOR ROBERT L. COCHRAN

Executive Director
HENRY W. TOLL



Vice Presidents
SENATOR T. V. SMITH
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
HON. C. H. MORRISSETT

September 20, 1937

Unicameral Legislation:

In response to numerous inquiries from students, debate coaches and others interested in the unicameral legislature and its operation in Nebraska, the Council of State Governments has gathered information and materials which deal very briefly with the subject. It is in some respects a revision of the study by Hubert R. Gallagher on "Unicameral Legislatures" in 1935 which is now out of print.

The pamphlet makes no pretense of treating the unicameral question completely. For a more thorough examination of the single-house legislature, the books and pamphlets listed in the bibliography should be consulted.

Henry W. Toll.

BX-175

1937

M

THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

Chicago Office (Central Secretariat), Drexel Avenue and 58th Street

New York City Office (District No. 2), 522 Fifth Avenue (at 44th Street)

Philadelphia Office (Dela. River Com'n), Broad Street Station Building

Washington Office (for correspondence), 17th and H Streets, N. W.

Denver Office (for correspondence), 730 Equitable Building

Executive Committee

President
HON. ROBERT L. COCHRAN
Governor of Nebraska

Vice President
SENATOR T. V. SMITH
Member of Illinois
Coöperation Commission

Vice President
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
Member of New York
Coöperation Commission

Vice President
HON. C. H. MORRISSETT
Member of Virginia
Coöperation Commission

Executive Director
HENRY W. TOLL
Former member of
Colorado Senate

The Council of State Governments is a part of the governmental structure of the United States. It has been organized by official legislative action of thirty-five state governments. It is primarily concerned with those governmental problems over which the federal government has no jurisdiction.

Working through affiliated Commissions on Interstate Coöperation (known as Coöperation Commissions), which have been established by statutes in twenty-nine states, and by resolutions in six states, the Council

seeks to develop better coördination and more active coöperation between groups of states in the various regions of the United States, and also between the 48 states as a whole. It also seeks to bring the state governments into better adjustment with the federal government—and with county and city governments.

It serves as the official research agency and clearing house for the Governors' Conference, the American Legislators' Association, the National Association of Attorney-Generals,

and the National Association of Secretaries of State.

The twenty-five members of the Council's Board of Managers include members of the Executive Committees of the Governors' Conference and of the American Legislators' Association, the presidents of the other Associations named below, a delegate from the Commission on Interstate Coöperation of each state contributing to the Council's support, and ten members at large, two of whom are elected by the Board each year.

THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

Chairman: HON. ROBERT L. COCHRAN, *Governor of Nebraska*

Secretary: HON. CARY A. HARDEE, *former Governor of Florida*

THE AMERICAN LEGISLATORS' ASSOCIATION

President: HON. HENRY PARKMAN, JR., *former State Senator of Massachusetts*

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEY-GENERALS

President: HON. HERBERT R. O'CONNOR, *Attorney-General of Maryland*

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECRETARIES OF STATE

President: HON. DWIGHT H. BROWN, *Secretary of State of Missouri*

Nationwide Commissions of the Council:

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON CONFLICTING TAXATION

Chairman: HON. SEABURY C. MASTICK, *Chairman of the New York Commission on Tax Revision*

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON CRIME

Chairman: JUDGE RICHARD HARTSHORNE of *New Jersey*

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Chairman: HON. WILLIAM J. ELLIS, *Commissioner of Institutions and Agencies of New Jersey*

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: HON. ELLWOOD J. TURNER, *Member of Pennsylvania General Assembly*

Regional Commissions of the Council:

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

Chairman: HON. THOMAS A. LOGUE, *Secretary of Internal Affairs of Pennsylvania*

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE OHIO BASIN

Chairman: SENATOR JAMES O. MONROE, *Member of Illinois General Assembly*

Interlevel Commissions:

THE INTERLEVEL COMMISSION

Chairman: HENRY W. TOLL, *Executive Director of the Council of State Governments*

A board composed of officials of federal, state, and local levels of government.

THE TAX REVISION COUNCIL

Chairman: CONGRESSMAN ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, *Chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means*

To improve coöperation in the tax field, the Council of State Governments, in conjunction with the Federal Government and organizations of local officials, established the Tax Revision Council in 1935. Among the federal members are the Secretary of Treasury, the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

gmcc 186944
JF541
.C6

UNICAMERAL LEGISLATURES

Bills for the establishment of a unicameral legislature fell in legislative hoppers this year in greater numbers than ever before. Among the states which received these one-house proposals were: Arkansas, California (3 bills), Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa (2), Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio (6), Oklahoma (2), Oregon (2), Pennsylvania, Texas, Washington (2), Wisconsin, and Wyoming. In every instance the bill was defeated or died in committee.

No attempt has been made to analyze the details of the various bills. The outstanding provision in practically all of them has been the elimination of the upper body, a reduction in the size of the lower house, and a rearrangement of districts. Several would have required a non-partisan election. Prevalence of the proposals and increasing interest in the unicameral question indicates that legislators in other of the 47 bicameral states will hear more of the single house legislature in the future.

The text of the unicameral amendment adopted in Nebraska on November 6, 1934 is as follows:

FOR AN AMENDMENT to the Constitution of the State of Nebraska relating to the legislative authority thereof.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEBRASKA:

That Section 1 of Article III of the Constitution of Nebraska be amended to read as follows:

Sec. 1. Commencing with the regular session of the Legislature to be held in January, nineteen hundred and thirty-seven, the legislative authority of the state shall be vested in a Legislature consisting of one chamber. The people reserve for themselves, however, the power to propose laws, and amendments to the constitution, and to enact or reject the same at the polls, independent of the Legislature, and also reserve power at their own option to approve or reject at the polls any act, item, section, or part of any act passed by the Legislature. All authority vested by the constitution or laws of the state in the Senate, House of Representatives, or joint session thereof, in so far as applicable, shall be and hereby is vested in said Legislature of one chamber. All provisions in the constitution and laws of the state relating to the Legislature, the Senate, the House of Representatives, joint sessions of the Senate and House of Representatives, Senator, or member of the House of Representatives, shall, in so far as said provisions are applicable, apply to and mean said Legislature of one chamber hereby created and the members thereof. All references to Clerk of House of Representatives or Secretary of Senate shall mean, when applicable, the Clerk of the Legislature of one chamber. All references to Speaker of the House of Representatives or temporary president of the Senate shall mean Speaker of the Legislature. Wherever any provision of the constitution requires submission of any matter to, or action by, the House of Representatives, the Senate, or joint session thereof, or the members of either body or both bodies, it shall after January first, nineteen hundred and thirty-seven, be construed to mean the Legislature herein provided for.

That Section 5 of Article III of the Constitution of Nebraska be amended to read as follows:

Sec. 5. At the regular session of the Legislature held in the year nineteen hundred and thirty-five the Legislature shall by law determine the number of members to be elected and divide the state into Legislative Districts. In the creation of such Districts, any county that contains population sufficient to entitle it to two or more members of the Legislature shall be divided into separate and distinct Legislative Districts, as nearly equal in population as may be and composed of contiguous and compact territory. After the creation of such districts, beginning in nineteen hundred and thirty-six and every two years thereafter, one member of the Legislature shall be elected from each such District.

The basis of apportionment shall be the population excluding aliens, as shown by next preceding federal census. In like manner, when necessary to a correction of inequalities in the population of such districts, the state may be redistricted from time to time, but no oftener than once in ten years.

That Section 6 of Article III of the Constitution of Nebraska be amended to read as follows:

Sec. 6. The Legislature shall consist of not more than fifty members and not less than thirty members. The sessions of the Legislature shall be biennial except as otherwise provided by this constitution or as may be otherwise provided by law.

That Section 7 of Article III of the Constitution of Nebraska be amended to read as follows:

Sec. 7. Members of the Legislature shall be elected for a term of two years beginning at noon on the first Tuesday in January in the year next ensuing the general election at which they were elected. Each member shall be nominated and elected in a non-partisan manner and without any indication on the ballot that he is affiliated with or endorsed by any political party or organization. The aggregate salaries of all the members shall be \$37,500 per annum, divided equally among the members and payable in such manner and at such times as shall be provided by law. In addition to his salary, each member shall receive an amount equal to his actual expenses in traveling by the most usual route once to and returning from each regular or special session of the Legislature. Members of the Legislature shall receive no pay nor prerequisites other than said salary and expenses, and employees of the Legislature shall receive no compensation other than their salary or per diem.

That Section 10 of Article III of the Constitution of Nebraska be amended to read as follows:

Sec. 10. The Legislature shall meet in regular session at 12:00 o'clock (noon) on the first Tuesday in January in the year next ensuing the election of the members thereof. The Lieutenant Governor shall preside, but shall vote only when the Legislature is equally divided. A majority of the members elected to the Legislature shall constitute a quorum; the Legislature shall determine the rules of its proceedings and be the judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its members, shall choose its own officers, including a Speaker to preside when the Lieutenant Governor shall be absent; incapacitated, or shall act as Governor. No member shall be expelled except by a vote of two-thirds of all members elected to the Legislature, and no member shall be twice expelled for the same offense. The Legislature may punish by imprisonment any person not a member thereof who shall be guilty of disrespect to the Legislature by disorderly or contemptuous behavior in its presence, but no such imprisonment shall extend beyond twenty-four hours at one time, unless the person shall persist in such disorderly or contemptuous behavior.

That Section 11 of Article III of the Constitution of Nebraska be amended to read as follows:

Sec. 11. The Legislature shall keep a journal of its proceedings and publish them (except such parts as may require secrecy) and the yeas and nays of the members on any question, shall at the desire of any one of them be entered on the journal. All votes shall be viva voce. The doors of the Legislature and of the Committees of the Whole, shall be open, unless when the business shall be such as ought to be kept secret.

That Section 14 of Article III of the Constitution of Nebraska be amended to read as follows:

Sec. 14. Every bill and resolution shall be read by title when introduced, and a printed copy thereof provided for the use of each member, and the bill and all amendments thereto shall be printed and read at large before the vote is taken upon its final passage. No such vote upon the final passage of any bill shall be taken, however, until five legislative days after its introduction nor until it has been on file for final reading and passage for at least one legislative day. No bill shall contain more than one subject, and the same shall be clearly expressed in the title. And no law shall be amended unless the new act contain the section or sections as amended and the section or sections so amended shall be repealed. The Lieutenant Governor, or the Speaker if acting as presiding officer, shall sign, in the presence of the Legislature while the same is in session and capable of transacting business, all bills and resolutions passed by the Legislature.

That Sections 12 and 28, of Article III, and Sections 9 and 17, of Article IV, be and the same hereby are repealed, effective as of January 1, 1937.

The following article which was carried in State Government depicts some of the problems which faced Nebraska's legislators as they went about the business of making practical a political theory.

NEBRASKA LAUNCHES UNICAMERAL

By Charles D. Green

Former State Senator of Nebraska

(Reprinted from State Government, January, 1937)

Nebraska set a new style for state capitol architecture when it built its magnificent state house, rising to skyscraper height above the city of Lincoln and the prairies that roll away in all directions. Other states, some cities, approved the departure and emulated the skyscraper plan for public buildings, even before the original was completed. Now Nebraska is engaged in another, even more significant, undertaking which may set a new style in state government. Forty-three men comprising the personnel of the new single-chamber state legislature are up to their necks in a practical test. They are testing a theory advanced as a remedy for what ails state government.

Hundred-year recess

This is the first return to any form of unicameralism in the United States since the procedure was abandoned a century ago by Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Vermont. Conducted in a spotlight of nation-wide publicity, the Lincoln test of the merits of unicameralism versus bicameralism may go far to settle what has heretofore been an academic debate. No one relies for an answer upon the results of the

first session. Even foes of the one-house system are willing to give it the test of time for which the plan's chief proponent, United States Senator George W. Norris, asked, before passing judgment. Friends of the unicameral system are confident Nebraska's forty-three lawmakers will prove that government can be improved by changing the system and that other states will follow Nebraska's lead.

Neither side can find much to support its arguments for or against the single-chamber plan in the first month's achievements under the golden dome of the state house at Lincoln. To the credit of those members who are unfriendly to the innovation, let it be said that they at the outset joined in a determination to exert every effort to make the session a success. Monkey wrenches were taboo. This unwritten rule, inspiring a natural caution to proceed slowly, coupled with the fact that the pioneering aspect of the novel undertaking presented serious complications in itself, would be adequate explanation for any slowness in action which might become apparent.

Non-partisan means non-partisan

Senator Norris' address was the only bow made to the historic character of the occasion. "Uncle George" warned the legislators to be wary of sabotage from without, said theirs was the task of fulfilling the people's expectation of "an administration free from any partisan bias, political prejudice, or improper motives."

As if to reassure him, the twenty-two "Democrats" and twenty-one "Republicans" nominated and elected on a non-partisan ticket, proceeded to elect Charles J. Warner, veteran Republican Senator of the two-house era, speaker. Senator Warner won out over W. F. Haycock, majority leader of the heavily Democratic House of 1935. The first test vote, on how the members would perform in their new non-political status, was strictly without partisan cleavage.

Senators all

First week of the session was devoted almost entirely to adoption of rules concerning committees, and creation of other necessary legislative machinery. First major task of the session was settlement of the intriguing question of the title by which unicameral lawmakers would be designated. Would it be senator, representative, legislator, or unic? The forty-three settled it without ado by decreeing that henceforth they and their successors shall be titled senators, and the legislature, the senate.

Fifteen committees are enough for Nebraska's first single-chamber legislature, the forty-three members decided. Committee memberships range in number from a minimum of five to a maximum of eleven. The usual sizes are five, seven, and nine, however. Only two committees have eleven members. These two are Appropriations and Agriculture. Following is a list of committees, senators who are chairmen, and number of members:

Appropriations, Frank J. Brady, eleven; Agriculture, E. M. Neubauer, eleven; Banking and Insurance, Leland M. Hall, seven; Claims and Deficiencies, R. M. Howard, five; Commerce and Communication, W. R. Johnson, nine; Drainage and Irrigation, Harry L. Pizer, seven; Education, O. Edwin Schultz, nine; Enrollment and Review, Robert M. Armstrong, five; Government, P. L. Cady, nine; Judiciary, Charles A. Daffoe, nine; Labor, and Public Welfare, Lester L. Dunn, nine; Public Health and Miscellaneous, William E. Worthing, seven; Highways, Frank S. Wells, seven; Revenue, Willis F. Haycock, nine; and Legislation and Administration, Fred L. Carsten, five.

Actuated by their desire to proceed slowly but surely, the Nebraska Senators were not content to rely upon the minimum safeguards against haste written into the Constitution. Instead, the members adopted a series of rules designed to insure the fullest consideration, in committee and on the floor, of all legislation. The rules were designed also to give the public full opportunity to appear for or against legislation at a time when public sentiment would be most effective.

After second reading of a bill, it is referred to the proper committee for public hearing. The rules adopted by the legislature for this initial session provide that notice of such a public hearing must be given five days in advance of the dates scheduled.

Legislative brakes

The rules require that majority and minority reports be filed with the legislature by the committees on every bill reported out, in every case where there is a split in committee. After it is reported out, a bill is taken up for consideration in Committee of the Whole in the orthodox fashion. After consideration in Committee of the Whole, a bill must then be placed on legislative file for three days to permit debate and amendments.

The next step provided by the rules takes a bill to the Committee on Enrollment and Review, from which the bill is returned to the legislature for review of any changes made by, or recommendations of, the committee. Five days must elapse after a bill is first referred to this committee before it can be brought up for vote on passage.

Another rule provides that a bill must be on legislative file at least two days before final vote can be taken.

Gradual start

The rules adopted by the legislature are far more stringent than the inhibitions written into the Constitution. The unicameral amendment as adopted would allow a bill to come up for vote on passage five legislative days after its introduction and when it had been on file but one legislative day.

Few bills are expected to be introduced during the first month of the session. The Senators are expected to gather speed, however, as they become more sure of their footing.

Considerable controversy is to be expected when the senators grapple with child labor, unemployment insurance, fair trade practices, delinquent taxes, and three measures to revise the state's election system. All these produced brilliant fireworks displays two years ago.

Ballot Reform

What Nebraska's reform legislature will do with the proposals to reform the ballot cannot be predicted. Nebraskans now elect seven administrative state officers on the political ballot: Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, Secretary of State, Treasurer, Auditor, Attorney-General, and Railway Commissioner. One bill

would shorten the political ballot to Governor and Lieutenant-Governor, substitute a Comptroller for Auditor, and make the office non-political. The other offices would be made appointive. A second bill differed only in that the Auditor would be retained on the political ballot. A third bill, loaded with political dynamite, proposed to make all county offices non-political.¹

Enthusiasm for the short ballot has grown steadily in Nebraska, but similar measures got nowhere in the session two years ago. The fact that the voters last fall amended their constitution to abolish the office of Land Commissioner may lend support to the election reform bills.

Executive cooperation

One of the chief objections advanced against the Norris unicameral system was the provision for electing the legislature on a non-political basis. A legislature without party responsibility and party leadership was certain to cause friction with a governor, any governor, elected on a party platform with partisan commitments, it was argued. Every legislative session sees disagreements and misunderstandings between the legislative and executive branches of the government. Whether a non-political, one-house legislature is more productive of dissension than the orthodox system is a question whose answer must await the passage of time. Certain it is that the greatest of amity between the legislature and Governor R. L. Cochran marked the first few days of the session.

Governor Cochran let it be known at the outset that he intended to take no part in legislative affairs, such as pre-session races for major posts, adoption of rules, and other organization matters. The Governor offered his cooperation to make the session as successful as possible and emphasized that the non-political spirit of the legislature would be observed by his department scrupulously. The legislature responded in a spirit of genuine cooperation. Any signs of truculence on the part of any members with an exaggerated idea of the legislature's isolated independence were quickly buried beneath the general desire to work with the chief executive for the good of the state.

History in the making

Members of the legislature and close observers agree that the unicameral system is still in the experimental, evolutionary state. Rules and customs adopted at the first session may serve as precedent, but are not necessarily permanent. Experience gained from the initial session may dictate changes. Few expect the unicameral legislature, in operation, to precipitate the dire evils feared of it. Nor do most people anticipate it will be the panacea some have labeled it.

¹A proposed constitutional amendment to be submitted at the November, 1938 election would make the Secretary of State, the Attorney-General, and the Treasurer appointive, and would provide four-year terms instead of two for the Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, Auditor, and state Superintendent of Schools.

NEBRASKA'S UNICAMERAL ADJOURNS
The session in retrospect
(Reprinted from State Government, July, 1937)

With the first session of the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature a matter of history, the way is open for an appraisal of the results of the first experiment with a one-house state legislature. The term "experiment" is used with some misgiving. Senator George W. Norris, "father" of the unicameral, dislikes the word used in describing what he has referred to as his contribution to the state which has honored him so often. Nevertheless, those who are friendly to the plan, as well as those inclined to skepticism, look upon it as an experiment. Only the strongest supporters of unicameralism in Nebraska claim the first session justified the state's voters in abandoning the traditional bicameral legislature. Likewise, only the firmest believers in orthodox political science claim the first session proved that a one-house lawmaking body is a failure by comparison. The great mass of citizens, as well as the most experienced observers, lying between these two extremes, yet look upon the unicameral as an experiment, with its full strength, its greatest weaknesses, to be demonstrated.

STATE GOVERNMENT, in this article, presents a symposium of appraisal of the recent session. It has been Governor Cochran's duty to pass upon all legislation enacted by the unicameral. Senator Norris, sponsor of the new plan, states his views of the accomplishments of the first session of the legislature which he labored to establish. Two of those participating in the symposium are among the 43 men comprising the Nebraska Senate, as it was officially designated. Senator Emil M. Von Seggern is publisher of one of his state's most successful county seat weeklies, The West Point Republican. Senator O. Edwin Schultz of Elgin is a successful farmer. Like Senator Von Seggern, Senator Schultz is serving his second term in the Legislature, having participated in three sessions.

The fifth participant in this discussion is Mr. Kenneth Keller, veteran Lincoln newspaper-man. Mr. Keller covered the unicameral session for his paper, The Lincoln Star.

The participants' statements follow:

GOVERNOR ROBERT L. COCHRAN

Much credit is due the forty-three members who sat in Nebraska's first unicameral legislature. Theirs was a difficult task; faced not only with the problem of putting into operation an untried system of lawmaking, they were confronted also with a large number of legislative questions. The chief difficulty, perhaps, that developed arose from the non-political character of the legislature. This resulted in a lack of responsible leadership, which intensified the difficulties. The members of the legislature, however, applied themselves to their task earnestly and succeeded in a way to reflect credit upon them.

It is impossible to pass sound judgment on the merits of a unicameral legislature with so little practical knowledge of this method of lawmaking. Time and experience alone will afford us a proper basis upon which to judge the single chamber legislature as against the bicameral system. In my judgment, it will require several sessions of the unicameral legislature before an intelligent appraisal may be made of it. It is possible that experience will recommend some modification of the present arrangement in Nebraska.

U. S. SENATOR GEORGE W. NORRIS

In my opinion, the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature which recently adjourned has demonstrated beyond the possibility of a doubt the great superiority of the one-house legislature, as compared with the old two-branch legislature. There has not been an instance during this session where this legislature could have indulged in the old familiar dodge of "passing the buck" from one house to the other, and from both houses to the conference committee. Every member had an increased responsibility and realized as never before the responsibility of his position. The possibilities are that the next unicameral legislature will be superior to the present one for the reason that the people will have had an opportunity to vote out of office any member who, in their judgment, has proved false to his trust.

Any person who expected the millennium to follow the setting up of the one-house legislature will of course be disappointed. There has been considerable criticism of this legislature, some of it honest, constructive, some of it selfish, and some of it without any foundation whatever. However, honest men and women who realize that perfection cannot be had in any body of men are satisfied, and think it is far superior to the record made by any previous legislature in the history of Nebraska.

SENATOR EMIL M. VON SEGGERN

That a unicameral legislature can function has been demonstrated by the Nebraska Legislature, the first of its kind. This experiment in legislating obviously charged the members of the first session with the duty of blazing a trail. They had to adopt rules that fitted into the new plan, rules which would provide checks and balances better than those of the two-house system.

In order to be safe, the legislature decided to go slowly. Though the system of legislating had been changed, human nature had not. The same kind of legislation was demanded, the same kind of bills introduced, as in previous years. Anticipating this, the 43 members adopted rules to prevent hasty legislation, to provide safeguards against those known human weaknesses. As a consequence, in their zeal, the Senate leaned the other way, and the rules as finally adopted proved to be obstacles to reasonable dispatch in consideration of measures.

The constitution provides that six legislative days must elapse from the time a bill is introduced before it can be voted upon for passage. The Senate rules extended this time to 12 days. Even with all rules suspended on behalf of important bills at the close of the session, adjournment sine die was delayed an entire week. Under the two-house system, bills were rushed through both houses in one day in the hectic last days.

Much could be said pro and con on the subject of lobbying. It is important to remember that while the lobbyist had fewer lawmakers to deal with, which may have made it easier for him, he could not avoid placing his friends on the spot. His allies on the floor were plainly known in the unicameral, and not concealed as in the two-house sessions. Thus the lobbyist was brought out in the open and occupied the same spot as his lawmaking allies.

The problems which confronted the unicameral were much the same as those faced by its predecessors; so the proposed solutions were very much the same as formerly. This affords a reasonable basis for comparison. When everything is considered, the facts will show that the unicameral handled these problems as effectively as did previous sessions, if not more so.

On the other hand, much progressive legislation which failed in the two-house session many times was enacted by the unicameral. Included in the progressive measures voted were submission of a constitutional amendment for a short ballot and a legislative council.

It seems to be the general opinion that a one-house legislature is desirable. If the future shows necessity for change, it will not be reversion to the two-house system, but improvement of the one-house plan.

SENATOR O. EDWIN SCHULTZ

In discussing the success of the unicameral legislature, one should consider first the arguments advanced for the plan's adoption. Its proponents insisted it would do away with the evils of the conference committee; cost less; no member would be able to shirk his responsibility; legislation would be speeded; personnel would be of a higher type and better legislation would result.

Definitely, what evils the conference committee may have had are done away with. Instead, however, organized minorities exerted pressure unknown before. It is conceded generally, by members as well as others, that many bills of a special nature were enacted by the unicameral body which would have died in a two-house session.

As predicted, each member had to face responsibility squarely on each measure. There was no opportunity to vote one way on a bill, and trust to the other house to take the opposite course.

There is no doubt that the membership of the unicameral was of a higher type. It is questionable, however, if the legislative product was of a better grade. Many bills, which failed of passage in previous sessions, encountered little difficulty with the unicameral. These measures were of the special interest brand.

The unicameral received most of its criticism from the length of the session, and rightfully so. The checks provided in the law and the rules against hasty legislation are desirable and proper. In my opinion, the cause of the delay lies with the standing committees--their failure to report out important legislation. Chicken feed bills were turned out while important measures languished until late in the session and then were sped through without proper consideration. The unicameral has not overcome this objectionable feature of the bicameral legislature.

Why not require that important measures be reported out within a certain number of days--bills such as the budget, social security, law enforcement, and other matters of general importance? All bills should be classified as to their importance, and considered in that order.

It is my opinion that there is nothing in the way of rules or procedure employed by the unicameral legislature that could not have been practiced by the two-house legislature. I think the most satisfactory feature of the unicameral is its non-political character. Absence of the party whip allows consideration of measures on their merit, and not because of partisan necessity.

It is impossible to pass final judgment upon the success or failure of the unicameral after but one session. It will require two, or even three to determine whether the experiment will prove successful.

KENNETH R. KELLER

Like the fellow who believed the salesman when he said, "This radio will give you perfect reception" a great many Nebraskans were due for inevitable disappointment with their unicameral legislature. It worked all right--fine in fact. But some of the static was still there. They simply haven't learned how to tune it.

The unicameral legislature was oversold. When a great majority shouted for the change back in 1934, the opposition was silenced. With inauguration of the new plan, the people expected a super-human governmental device, largely through newspaper ballyhoo. Scribes said: "This is Senator Norris' child. This is swell."

Almost everybody forgot that the streamlined legislature was composed of just ordinary men--lawyers, farmers, merchants, and a doctor and a banker or two thrown in to give a consultive flavor.

As the first session drew to a close after four and a half months, almost every senator when asked for his criticism replied: "We should have a larger senate, anyway fifty senators, perhaps a hundred."

It is doubtful if these senators wanted to make the change immediately. Probably they would be willing to continue the experiment as it is for at least two more sessions.

Whatever else can be said, the unicameral legislature moved the session from hotel rooms to the capitol.

The non-partisan character of the legislature made it difficult for many of the members. Many were party leaders in their communities, yet they were able to pull themselves away from the party magnet. It is true, the old party split showed up occasionally, but due perhaps more than anything else to the fact that in the legislature were a few party war-horses of years of battle.

Here are some statistics which may be of value in affording a comparison between a single chamber and a two-chamber legislature:

	1935 bicameral	1937 unicameral
Cost	\$202,500	\$150,000
Bills introduced	1,056	581
Bills passed	192	210
Vetoes	6	18
Length of session	110 days	98 days

In all probability, future sessions will be shorter, since a month was required to organize the first unicameral.

But look at the vetoes. It cannot be denied that the senators put more responsibility upon the governor, hence gave him greater power. The first unicameral looked to the governor to act as "the other house." That may wear off in time, but it is doubtful.

As for the lobby, it had power, plenty of it in this first session; but everybody knew it. One of the important lobbyists said: "It's different working with the unicameral, but it isn't easier."

The unicameral made a great improvement in committee work. Every senator was a member of at least two committees--some three. Every senator had a committee meeting every day, but only one. On the other hand, the procedure on the floor left much to be desired.

If you are thinking of equipping your state with a unicameral legislature, please remember that new dining room furniture does not give the family better table manners. Papa and Mama Taxpayer, though, should find it easier to spot the dirty hands against the snowy linen.

An analysis of the faults and virtues of the unicameral as a legislative body based on Nebraska's experience is revealed in an article by H. T. Dobbins in the Lincoln Sunday Journal and Star, Lincoln, Nebraska, on May, 16, 1937. The survey, which also discusses some of the legislation enacted, follows:

UNICAMERAL AS AN INSTRUMENT OF LEGISLATION

No final evaluation of the unicameral legislature as an effective instrument of government can be based upon the conduct and record of the first session just closed. The experiment is too new, and one session is not conclusive of the debated question of whether it is so much of an improvement upon the bicameral system as to warrant permanent retention.

In the first place, it was not officered or led by anyone conversant with the unicameral plan of handling the business in setting up law making. This meant that a great deal of time had to be consumed in setting up a set of rules particularly applicable to the task in hand.

In the second place, two-thirds of the membership had seen service in previous legislatures operating under the two house plan, and many approached the experiment with more or less bias and prejudice towards it. In the last bicameral members went about the necessary task of preparing for the advent of the unicameral with openly expressed opposition and illy concealed resentment because the people had practically voted many of them out of office. Most of those who came to scoff remained to praise. While no complete canvass of the membership has been made, most members at one time or another have expressed approval of the system, and a number of them insist that the experience of four and a half months is a sound basis for claiming complete success for the experiment after it has been fully tried out. None favors a return to the bicameral.

In the third place, a real effort was made by the leaders in the unicameral to improve the mechanics of lawmaking. It is well within the facts to say that the history of the bicameral is almost barren of any organized attempt along those lines. The electrical voting machines were the idea of the capitol commission, and in the beginning somewhat reluctantly received by the bicameral membership. Some of the rules of the unicameral which make for more precision in legislating might well have been adopted by the bicameral; the fact is they were not even suggested. They emerged at the beginning of the unicameral out of a studied effort made by those who wished to do everything possible to make it a success, and to win for it the approval of the people.

For instance, there existed no barrier to the use by the bicameral of the rules governing the holding of committee hearings. Under the old system there was no such opportunity given for interested parties to appear and no such publicity

given to the deliberations of the committee when taking final action. There was no five days notice of a hearing in the old days and no open doors for the newspaper reporters when the committee met in executive session.

Orderly Legislation.

Those rules, however, that provided for the orderly and supervised progress of legislation under the operation of the unicameral would have been impossible of use by two houses. They are peculiarly and particularly adapted to the one house legislature. After a bill emerges from the standing committee with a favorable recommendation it is placed on general file to be taken up in order when the house resolves itself into committee of the whole. So far the process is the same as that used by the bicameral. But after the bill had been ordered by the bicameral to third reading, it could not be brought back to the floor except for specific amendment.

Under unicameral rules, however, it went next to a committee for review. This involved not only the task of checking it against existing statutes and correcting its phraseology, but where any doubt existed as to its validity, to refer the bill to specially employed counsel. Under the bicameral, the constitutional lawyers in the membership undertook to pass on the question for themselves, and in some cases asked the advice of the attorney general. After the committee on review had revised it, often amending it in important particulars, the bill went to special file, where it was open for discussion and amendment--a second committee of the whole. Earlier in the session a third check was used, bills going to what was known as the legislative file, but this was dropped as slowing up legislation too greatly.

The double check, however, has resulted in instilling care, caution and precision into consideration of bills. One of the serious faults of the bicameral was that often bills were rushed thru, loaded down with amendments that might or might not fit and which quite often resulted in contradictions and confusion. The unicameral method takes all possible precautions against a bill being declared unconstitutional by the courts; the bicameral way resulted in many laws being overturned by the supreme court in spite of the rule that every effort should be made by the courts to uphold validity. This double check system could not be employed by the bicameral without prolonging sessions for weeks and months. Not only would each house have to use it on its own bills but each would have to employ it on the bills sent to it by the other house, and where differences arose between the two houses.

Faults and Virtues.

Senator Norton, backer of the unicameral when an issue before the voters and the chief rule maker, says that the faults of the unicameral are the faults of the bicameral, while its virtues are its own. In a large measure this seems to be true. Nevertheless there are serious criticisms made by those who doubt its superior virtues. Most of these attach to the conduct of the membership rather than to the system.

The unicameral passed more laws than any bicameral in 16 years, where it was expected to stress quality rather than quantity. Nearly twice as many bills were introduced than had been predicted. While this number was but a little more than half the number introduced at the last bicameral, it was more than the senate of 33

members sponsored. It was expected that because of the smaller membership the session would last no longer than three months. It has lasted longer than did most bicamerals. Because of the larger salaries it was supposed that the unicameral would remain in session long enough to give full consideration to every bill. Nearly a hundred died in committees without action being taken on them.

Criticisms that attach directly to the system is that as members are elected on a non-political ballot there is an absence of the leadership that marked sessions made up of men elected as partisans. The effectiveness of party leadership, however, lay in the ability to crack the party whip on recalcitrant members and to quote the party platform as a reason for supporting a pending measure. This was not a guarantee of the worth of the legislation; it was largely the supplying to the governor of an instrument by which his will could be impressed upon the legislature. The unicameral has often heeded the advice of the governor, but in reaching that decision it was exercising the will of the legislature. In most cases the governor was able to justify the course he pointed out.

There was less leadership in the unicameral than in most of the bicameral predecessors. That lack will be made up for the future by the operations of the legislative council, a body of 15 members who will meet between sessions and in addition to gathering information for the use of members will outline a legislative program that should result in the elimination of the unimportant and stress the important.

Power of the Lobby.

Perhaps the most serious criticism of the unicameral system is that it renders the lobby more efficient. The lobby, in the minds of the public, is made up of those representing corporate interests intent upon securing added special privileges or preserving those they already possess. This in numbers is the smallest part of the actual lobby. At the present session they asked for little or nothing, and they had little to defend against in the form of legislation aimed at their interests.

Nearly 200 lobbyists registered at this session. They included representatives of labor organizations, trade associations, professional societies, firemen and policemen mostly from Omaha, public officials, farm organizations, business groups, women's organizations, and men who proclaimed themselves as members of the people's lobby, self elected. The charge that the unicameral passed more class legislation as the result of the operations of these pressure groups and organized minorities is substantiated by the record. The new bills passed included legislation desired by farmers in the form of soil conservation and bindweed eradication programs; the lawyers got more jobs with the state; the funeral directors secured a regulatory setup; the truckers got a regulatory bill; the automobile dealers secured a little NRA; the merchants secured bills forbidding sale of goods below cost and forbidding sales less than those fixed by trademark owners; the cosmetologists, dentists and doctors got a decrease in yearly registration fees; millions were appropriated as did the last bicameral to old age assistance, help for the blind, crippled children, child welfare and maternity cases; labor got unemployment compensation; debt ridden were aided by a chance to pay delinquent taxes without interest and continuance of moratorium; the teachers got a tenure of office bill and certification with number of certificates greatly reduced; the architects and engineers were given authority to set up examining board; co-operatives and public power projects were given added powers and privileges; banks, building

and loan associations and insurance companies were not forgotten; liquor interests fought off legislation they did not want.

The explanation usually heard is that the small number of members--43, with the constitution limiting the number to 50--it was easier for lobbyists to work because they could make a larger number of contacts and scrape up a better acquaintance with members. The state senate, under the bicameral, was made up of ten less members. The house had 100.

Log rolling was not banished under the unicameral. It was merely curtailed. The trades were between members of one house only; under the old system two houses gave a wider field for more effective log rolling. The small number of members made friendships easier, and on the floor members were frequently addressed as "Charlie" and "Bob" and "Bill" instead of the formal "the gentleman from so-and-so."

Other Side of Picture.

On the other side of the slate stand some noteworthy achievements aside from improving the mechanics of legislation. Laws were passed that should result in greater safety and fewer casualties on the highways of the state. Penalties for drunken drivers were made more effective. A highway patrol of 40 men was created to secure better enforcement of traffic laws and rules. Motor transports carrying petroleum products are banned from the highway at times when their presence adds to the hazards of travel, and regulations provided that should improve transport driving from the safety angle.

The people will be given an opportunity by constitutional amendment to simplify their form of state government by reducing the number of elective state officers, increasing their terms of office and providing for their recall. A constitutional reviewer has been created to protect against unconstitutional legislation. A legislative council to formulate legislation in advance of a session has been created. Counties were given an up-to-date budgeting system, and county offices will be forced to set up a uniform system of accounting. A state planning board has been created, and authority given for local boards of the same type.

The most outstanding reform accomplished by the unicameral system is the elimination of the conference committee, a most powerful instrument in legislation by the bicameral. This carried along with it the abolition of the ancient practice of buck passing as between the two houses, mingled with which was the scheme whereby a member of one house satisfied clamoring constituents by getting passed in his branch some bill they wanted but which he did not, and then going over to the other house and aiding in its slaughter.

A Vanished Power.

It is inevitable under either system that the final consideration of the more important bills is delayed until the closing weeks or days. These are always controversial, and excite opposition outside and inside the legislature. They are seldom disposed of at one committee hearing. They are debated longer and more often amended than the general run of bills. Seldom did the work of one house meet complete approval of the other under the bicameral.

Where these differences could not be reconciled conference committees were named. This added still further to the delay, and at the same time to the power of

the conference committee to mold bills to its own liking. Out of weariness of the strife or because of the urge to get home, the work of the conference committee was usually approved. This, in essence, gave to a small group, usually six members, meeting in secret, the power of legislating for two large groups composing the two houses. It was a dangerous power, not much misused in Nebraska altho the main reason given by Senator Norris for championing the unicameral.

The smaller number of members tends to secure a higher average of ability, due largely to their selection from larger areas. The elimination of politics banished the party caucus. It also largely wiped out party consideration in the treatment of bills. By giving each member greater personal responsibility it has made possible greater exercise of personal freedom of opinion. By reducing the number of committees the importance of the tasks assigned each is increased. Personnel should be more stable because of the inducements for men to seek to be returned to membership. The cost of a session has been reduced a third. Two-thirds of the membership and not the governor alone control the question of whether such an emergency exists as justified a special session. Greater continuity is secured by a permanent clerk and the between sessions activities of selected groups.

By reason of that continuity law making takes on somewhat the aspect of going on without much of a break.

Herewith are reproduced from the Book of the States, Volume 2, three comparative tables of state legislatures which may serve as worthwhile background and reference material on the subject.

THE LEGISLATORS
Number, Terms, and Party Affiliations

STATE	SENATE					HOUSE					Total Number of Legislators
	Demo- crats	Repub- licans	Other	Total	Term	Demo- crats	Repub- licans	Other	Total	Term	
Alabama	35	35	4	106	1	...	107	4	142
Arizona	19	19	2	50	1	...	51	2	70
Arkansas	35	35	4	98	2	...	100	2	135
California	15	25	...	40	4	47	33	...	80	2	120
Colorado	28	6	1 va- cancy	35	4	49	15	1 va- cancy	65	2	100
Connecticut	26	9	...	35	2	100	167	...	267	2	302
Delaware	5	11	1	17	4	16	10	9	35	2	52
Florida	38	38	4	95	95	2	133
Georgia	51	51	2	203	2	...	205	2	256
Idaho	33	11	...	44	2	50	9	...	59	2	103
Illinois	32	17	2 va- cancies	51	4	85	68	...	153	2	204
Indiana	38	12	...	50	4	77	23	...	100	2	150
Iowa	22	28	...	50	4	54	54	...	108	2	158
Kansas	15	25	...	40	4	51	74	...	125	2	165
Kentucky	26	12	...	38	4	67	33	...	100	2	138
Louisiana	39	39	4	100	100	4	139
Maine	4	29	...	33	2	27	124	...	151	2	184
Maryland	18	11	...	29	4	95	23	2	120	4	149
Massachusetts	14	26	...	40	2	103	135	2 va- cancies	240	2	280
Michigan	17	15	...	32	2	60	40	...	100	2	132
Minnesota	Nonpolitical election			67	4	Nonpolitical election			131	2	198
Mississippi	49	49	4	140	140	4	189
Missouri	31	3	...	34	4	105	45	...	150	2	184
Montana	29	27	...	56	4	81	21	...	102	2	158

STATE	SENATE					HOUSE					Total Number of Legislators
	Demo- crats	Repub- licans	Other	Total	Term	demo- crats	Repub- licans	Other	Total	Term	
Nebraska	Nonpolitical election			43	2			Unicameral			43
Nevada	11	3	3	17	4	30	9	1	40	2	57
New Hampshire	8	16	...	24	2	176	188	54	418	2	442
New Jersey	10	11	...	21	3	39	21	...	60	1	81
New Mexico	23	1	...	24	4	47	2	...	49	2	73
New York	29	22	...	51	2	73	76	1 va- cancy	150	1	201
North Carolina	48	2	...	50	2	112	8	...	120	2	170
North Dakota	14	34	1	49	4	25	88	...	113	2	162
Ohio	31	5	...	36	2	105	33	...	138	2	174
Oklahoma	44	44	4	114	3	...	117	2	161
Oregon	12	18	...	30	4	38	21	1	60	2	90
Pennsylvania	34	16	...	50	4	154	54	...	208	2	258
Rhode Island	26	15	1	42	2	54	46	...	100	2	142
South Carolina	46	46	4	124	124	2	170
South Dakota	22	23	...	45	2	37	66	...	103	2	148
Tennessee	29	4	...	33	2	81	18	...	99	2	132
Texas	31	31	4	150	150	2	181
Utah	22	1	...	23	4	56	4	...	60	2	83
Vermont	22	8	...	30	2	204	39	5	248	2	278
Virginia	40	40	4	99	...	1 va- cancy	100	2	140
Washington	40	5	...	45	4	93	6	...	99	2	144
West Virginia	24	6	...	30	4	82	12	...	94	2	124
Wisconsin	9	8	16 Pro- gressive	33	4	31	21	48 Pro- gressive	100	2	133
Wyoming	16	11	...	27	4	38	18	...	56	2	83
Totals	1210	476	25	1821	...	3821	1613	125	5690	...	7511

LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS

State	Years in which sessions are held	Days on which sessions convene	Regular date of Convening 1937	Sessions Limit-Days		What is a day?	
				Regular	Special	Defined as a "calendar day" by:	Defined as a "meeting day" by:
Alabama	Odd*	Second Tues. in Jan.	No Session	50	30	...	Court
Arizona	Odd	Mon. after first Tue. in Jan.	January 11	60	20	Court	...
Arkansas	Odd	Second Mon. in Jan.	January 11	60	15	Court	...
California	Odd	First Mon. after 1st day in Jan.	January 4	None	None
Colorado	Odd	First Wed. in Jan.	January 6	None	None
Connecticut	Odd	Wed. after 1st Mon. in Jan.	January 6	150	None
Delaware	Odd	First Tues. in Jan.	January 5	60	30	Custom	...
Florida	Odd	Tue. after 1st Mon. in April	April 6	60	20	Custom	...
Georgia	Odd	Second Mon. in Jan.	January 11**	60	None	Custom	...
Idaho	Odd	First Mon. after Jan. 1st	January 4	60	20	...	Court
Illinois	Odd	Wed. after 1st Mon. in Jan.	January 6	None	None
Indiana	Odd	Thur. after 1st Mon. in Jan.	January 7	61	40	Custom	...
Iowa	Odd	Second Mon. in Jan.	January 11	None	None
Kansas	Odd	Second Tues. in Jan.	January 12	50	None	...	Custom
Kentucky	Even	First Tues. in Jan.	No Session	60	None	...	Constitution
Louisiana	Even	Second Mon. in May	No Session	60	30	...	Custom
Maine	Odd	First Wed. in Jan.	January 6	None	None
Maryland	Odd	First Wed. in Jan.	January 6	90	None	Custom	...
Massachusetts	Annual	First Wed. in Jan.	January 6	None	None
Michigan	Odd	First Wed. in Jan.	January 6	None	None
Minnesota	Odd	Tues. after 1st Mon. in Jan.	January 6	90	None	...	Constitution
Mississippi	Even	Tues. after 1st Mon. in Jan.	No Session	None	None
Missouri	Odd	Wed. after 1st Mon. in Jan.	January 6	None	None	...	Court
Montana	Odd	First Mon. in Jan.	January 4	60	None	Custom	...
Nebraska	Odd	First Tues. in Jan.	January 5	None	None
Nevada	Odd	Third Mon. in Jan.	January 18	60	20	Custom	...
New Hampshire	Odd	First Wed. in Jan.	January 6	None	None
New Jersey	Annual	Second Tues. in Jan.	January 12	None	None
New Mexico	Odd	Second Tuesday in January	January 12	60	None	Custom	...
New York	Annual	First Wed. in Jan.	January 6	None	None

State	Years in which sessions are held	Days on which sessions convene	Regular date of Convening 1937	Sessions Limit-Days		What is a day?	
				Regular	Special	Defined as a "calendar day" by:	Defined as a "meeting day" by:
North Carolina	Odd	Wed. after 1st Mon. in Jan.	January 6	None	20
North Dakota	Odd	Tue. after 1st Mon. in Jan.	January 5	60	None	Court	...
Ohio	Odd	First Mon. in Jan.	January 4	None	None
Oklahoma	Odd	Tue. after 1st Mon. in Jan.	January 5	None	None	...	Custom
Oregon	Odd	Second Mon. in Jan.	January 11	40	20	Custom	...
Pennsylvania	Odd	First Tue. in Jan.	January 5	None	None
Rhode Island	Annual	First Tue. in Jan.	January 5	60	None	...	Custom
South Carolina	Annual	Second Tue. in Jan.	January 12	None	None
South Dakota	Odd	Tue. after 1st Mon. in Jan.	January 5	60	60	Court	...
Tennessee	Odd	First Mon. in Jan.	January 4	75	None	...	Custom
Texas	Odd	Second Tue. in Jan.	January 12	None	30	...	Custom
Utah	Odd	Second Mon. in Jan.	January 11	60	30	Court	...
Vermont	Odd	Wed. after 1st Mon. in Jan.	January 6	None	None
Virginia	Even	Second Wed. in Jan.	No Session	60(1)	30	Custom	...
Washington	Odd	Second Mon. in Jan.	January 11	60	None	Custom	...
West Virginia	Odd	Wed. after 2nd Mon. in Jan.	January 13	60	None	...	Custom
Wisconsin	Odd	Second Wed. in Jan.	January 13	None	None
Wyoming	Odd	Second Tue. in Jan.	January 13	40	None	Custom	...

* Once every 4 years; 1931, 1935, and so forth.

**A 10 day session begins second Monday in January. Recess until second Monday after July 4 unless by concurrent resolution of the legislature an earlier date is set--in 1937, January 25.

(1) May be extended up to 30 days by 3/5 vote in each house.

SALARIES AND COMPENSATION OF THE LEGISLATORS

STATE	Salaries*		Compensation
	Regular Session	Special Session	Allowance for Transportation
Alabama	\$4 per day	\$4 per day	10¢ a mile
Arizona	\$8 per day	\$8 per day	20¢ a mile
Arkansas	\$1000-2 years	\$6 per day	10¢ a mile one way
California	\$2400-2 years	Mileage only	5¢ a mile, one round trip (1)
Colorado	\$1000-2 years	15¢ a mile
Connecticut	\$300-2 years	10¢ a mile
Delaware	\$10 per day	\$10 per day	10¢ a mile(2)
Florida	\$6 per day	\$6 per day	10¢ a mile
Georgia	\$7 per day	\$7 per day	10¢ a mile, one round trip
Idaho	\$5 per day	\$5 per day	10¢ a mile, one round trip
Illinois	\$3500-2 years	Actual mileage(3)
Indiana	\$10 per day	\$10 per day	20¢ a mile, one round trip
Iowa	\$1000-2 years	Not over \$10 day	5¢ a mile
Kansas	\$3 per day(4)	\$3 per day(4)	15¢ a mile, one round trip
Kentucky	\$10 per day	\$10 per day	15¢ a mile(5)
Louisiana	\$10 per day	\$10 per day	10¢ a mile(6)
Maine	\$600	\$5 per day	\$2 for 10 miles one way
Maryland	\$5 per day	\$5 per day	20¢ a mile(7)
Massachusetts	\$2000 per year	Determined at session	\$4.20 a mile (once)
Michigan	\$3 per day(8)	10¢ a mile, one round trip
Minnesota	\$1000-2 years	\$10 per day	15¢ a mile, one round trip
Mississippi	\$1000-2 years	\$7.50 per day	10¢ a mile, one round trip
Missouri	\$5 per day(9)	\$5 per day	10¢ a mile
Montana	\$10 per day	\$10 per day	7¢ a mile
Nebraska	\$1744.18-2 years	None	Actual traveling expenses, one round trip
Nevada	\$10 per day	\$10 per day	10¢ a mile for shortest route by rail
New Hampshire	\$200 per year	\$3 per day-15 day limit	10¢ a mile round trip once a week
New Jersey	\$500 per year	None	Transportation
New Mexico	\$5 per day	\$5 per day	10¢ a mile
New York	\$2500 per year	10¢ a mile, one round trip

STATE	Salaries*		Compensation Allowance for Transportation
	Regular Session	Special Session	
North Carolina	\$600 per year	\$8 per day-20 day limit	
North Dakota	\$5 per day	\$5 per day	10¢ a mile, one round trip
Ohio	\$2000 per year	None	3¢ a mile
Oklahoma	\$6 per day ⁽¹⁰⁾	\$6 per day	10¢ a mile, one round trip
Oregon	\$3 per day	\$3 per day	\$3 for 20 miles
Pennsylvania	\$2500-2 years	\$500 per session	5¢ a mile round trip once a week ⁽¹¹⁾
Rhode Island	\$5 per day	None	8¢ a mile
South Carolina	\$400 per year	\$10 per day	5¢ a mile, one round trip
South Dakota	\$5 per day	\$5 per day	10¢ a mile ⁽¹²⁾
Tennessee	\$4 per day	\$4 per day	Actual mileage
Texas	\$10 a day ⁽¹³⁾	\$10 per day	\$2.50 for 25 miles
Utah	\$4 per day	\$4 per day	10¢ a mile
Vermont	\$400-2 years	\$4 per day	20¢ a mile
Virginia	\$720 each session	\$360 per session	10¢ a mile, ⁽¹⁴⁾
Washington	\$5 per day	\$5 per day	10¢ a mile, one round trip
West Virginia	\$500 per year	None	Mileage
Wisconsin	\$2400-2 years	None	10¢ a mile
Wyoming	\$10 per day	\$10 per day	Mileage only

*Compare with session table for limit to length of sessions.

- (1) Regular sessions only.
- (2) \$25 for postage regular session, \$10 special session.
- (3) \$50 per session for postage, etc.
- (4) Not to exceed \$150 for regular, or \$90 for special, session.
- (5) \$20 for House and \$35 for Senate.
- (6) Two round trips allowed for regular sessions; one round trip allowed for special sessions.

- (7) In terms of fixed amounts for each member.
- (8) For elected term.
- (9) 70 day limit.
- (10) \$2 day after 60 days.
- (11) \$150 for postage regular session, \$50 for postage special session.
- (12) \$200 expense a year.
- (13) \$5 a day after 120 days.
- (14) Distance computed by nearest mail route.

From numerous references on the subject of unicameral legislatures, the Council of State Governments has selected the following brief group as among the best:

1. Unicameral Legislatures - The Eleventh Annual Debate Handbook - Vol. I and Vol. II (supplement) - Bower Aly, (August, 1937)
Lucas Brothers, Columbia, Missouri. \$.75 (?) each
2. Modernizing Our State Legislatures - A. E. Buck (1936)
American Academy of Political & Social Sciences
3457 Walnut Street, Philadelphia. \$.50
3. The One House Legislature - John P. Senning (1936)
McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York \$1.50
4. Unicameral Legislatures - Bryant Putney (June, 1937)
Editorial Research Reports
1013 Thirteenth St., N.W. Washington, D. C. \$.50
5. Unicameral Legislatures (Reference Shelf, Vol. 11, No. 1)
H. B. Summers (1936)
6. Unicameral Legislatures in Practice: The Nebraska Legislative System (Reference Shelf, Vol. 11, No. 5) - H. B. Summers, 1937. Both #5 and #6 published by H. W. Wilson Co., 950 University Ave., New York, N. Y. \$.90 each

The books by Aly and Summers are in the form of debate handbooks and should be especially valuable. Both carry extensive bibliographies as do the Buck and Senning books.

Combination of some of these books may be secured by a Cooperative Purchase Plan, information for which may be secured from Mr. H. G. Ingham, Chairman, the Committee on Debate Materials & Interstate Cooperation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.