

provide service in areas where they can skim the cream. As long as you keep artificially high rates between Omaha and Lincoln...

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR DECAMP: ...or between Omaha and Grand Island, and that is the only place where they are going to provide service, then you are allowing them, at the expense of the whole rest of the state, to dictate a multibillion dollar policy so they can make a profit of very few dollars relatively speaking. That is all you are creating with this system, not deregulation, but such a complicated regulatory scheme that you will never get competition. Proof? Proof? Read the amendment. The first thing the amendment does which it didn't do yesterday, which Senator Schmit discovered he had to do if he was going to even attempt to implement this, and please listen, the first thing the amendment does, the first thing the amendment does is to create \$400,000 of new taxes that are imposed upon the phone bills so that they can turn it over to the regulatory commission, the PSC, for new regulation.

PRESIDENT: Your time has expired.

SENATOR DECAMP: That is the program for deregulation that Senator Schmit is offering in this amendment. I would love to deal with the balance of it, but with my limited five minutes, I can only point out this much at this point.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. May we have order in the Chamber please. (Gavel.) The Chair recognizes Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, unfortunately we have the same difficulty with this amendment that we have had with the discussions of 835. These are late blooming notions although most of this bill was around for a long time, 1119. I support this amendment in contradistinction to the DeCamp amendment because it maintains a clear principle, a principle that I can adhere to. Competition is a regulating force. I ascribe and believe in Adam Smith's invisible hand, where it exists, it can be trusted to provide low cost efficient services. However, where competition does not exist, you have monopoly interests and those I don't think can necessarily be trusted to perform the public's will, to perform in the public's best interest. You don't have a governing mechanism, an oversight. Now in competition, you have Adam Smith's invisible hands. Where you have a monopoly, you don't have a governing