

PRESIDENT: Senator Lamb, do you have a comment on that amendment?

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. President, members, I'm trying to keep up with these...

PRESIDENT: 2707.

SENATOR LAMB: ...various amendments which we are just now receiving. On page 4, is that right? Line 15, strike 30 and insert 60. Then it would read, as I see it, monthly basic local exchange rates may be changed by a telecommunications company effective after, then it will be 60 days notice instead of 30 days notice to all affected subscribers. Okay, that's right? Okay, thank you.

PRESIDENT: Any further discussion on that particular amendment offered by Senator DeCamp? Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, I want to point out there is another portion of that amendment that I think you ought to notice. I agree the 30 days was ridiculous. I think you ought to notice also on page 5 of the amendment, line 17, I will read it to you. I think it's important. If a proper complaint signed by no less than 5 percent, and that is now different, of the affected subscribers is presented to the commission within 60 days from the date notice of the rate change was sent to subscribers. I would suggest that, unless I misunderstand the amendment, Senator DeCamp, that all of this activity must be completed within that same 60 days from the time notice were given. I would suggest that most of the subscribers will not even recognize there has been a rate change until they received a bill. So it's very likely that half of the time will have expired or more prior to the time they even recognize they have had a rate change. That leaves them with a very minimal amount of time. I guess I'm going to say at this time, I think the time is here to call a spade a spade. We are not going to make this amendment any better by trying to correct the obvious inequities in the bill. What you're trying to do is to put enough coats of sugar on a strychnine capsule so you can swallow it, but the results of the capsule are going to be the same. It is going to be devastating and it's going to be fatal so I would suggest that we stop this nonsense. I guess I'm just going to oppose the amendment because I