

that if averaging is good now, why do we stop it in 1991? If you look at the amendment, the DeCamp amendment, on page 7, there starting in line 6, it says "In setting rates for interexchange services, telecommunication companies that provide such services shall continue to average their rates for all such services on a statewide basis until August, 1991." I am striking just those words "until August, 1991,". Senator DeCamp mentioned that rates are going to go up and I think we all agree. We all agree they go up but why the magic date of 1991 that we suddenly are going to change the ball game. We are going to change the rules. I don't think there is a good case for that. I think if averaging is a good thing from now to 1991, it certainly should be looked at again if you want to look at it in a special bill, not just automatically make it sunset. This is something that you may not be looking at in 1991. Some of us may not be here in 1991, but at this point, if averaging these long distance rates is good for now, I suggest that we should eliminate this deadline of 1991.

PRESIDENT: Senator Lamb has offered his amendment and I have these lights on from the past debate possibly, but I will go through them to see if you wish to speak on the Lamb amendment. Senator Landis, then Senators Conway, Abboud, and DeCamp.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I support the Lamb amendment. Senator Johnson described what we are about here as a leap of faith and this is part of the leap of faith. It establishes I think the other side of the chasm, if you will, about how far we have to go and what kind of protections we will have until then, and it is a leap of faith that I don't want to make generally, that is to say the DeCamp amendment. This, too, moves the DeCamp amendment closer towards the realm of the possible, the acceptable, but it doesn't go far enough, and yet in the event we have to live with 835, I would like this amendment to be here. This leap of faith that Senator Johnson talks about has been attempted to be defined and quantified and outlined before in the Arthur Anderson study I referred to yesterday. Even with the Lamb amendment, and as improving as it is, this will be too great of a leap of faith for some of us. For example, even with the Lamb amendment, there is no lifeline provision in 835 as suggested by this study. There is no overall statement of public policy which is suggested by this study. There is no economic study that justifies the plan as is suggested by Arthur Anderson. There is no resolution of the issue of the preservation of universal service which is suggested by this study. There is no phase