

might have done the same thing, judging from the attention you and I are getting at the moment, that your amendment either was so good that they're scurrying to draft legislation to replace that in anticipation that it will pass, or perhaps some other result. I'd like to.... And, Senator Chambers, I'm sorry because of the way I came up, I'm not speaking on your amendment, and I will. If the body chooses to do so I will. But I do want to take a little bit of time to try to focus a little of the discussion back towards the resolution. Evidently, a number of people want to still discuss it, as was shown by the vote to continue debate. In Transportation this afternoon we are going to have a public hearing on a bill that's going to do some major work in the area of efficiency that does affect the Public Service Commission in some respects. It also is going to impact the Department of Motor Vehicles, Department of Revenue, Department of Roads in an effort to try to consolidate some of these things. Because as many speakers have said today and Friday, it's true, we have seen a real change in the area of the Public Service Commission and not necessarily all at the state level. Much of the changes come from Congress in the area of deregulation, airlines, trucking, a variety of things. And, yes, this state did take a big step in 1985 or '86 in the area of telephone deregulation. But what people need to understand is the issue here is not getting rid of the Public Service Commission as a regulatory body. The issue here is do you take them out of the constitution. And, quite frankly, as much change is taking place, particularly in Congress at the moment, there's a huge telecommunications bill that's ready to be passed, or on the verge of doing that. What that's going to require of the state we don't know, but I can guarantee you that it will require a lot from the state in terms of regulation. It would be a mistake, and if people are voting for LR 41CA to get rid of the Public Service Commission totally, that is a mistake. That's something you should not do, because there is going to be the need for some regulation. The key is, does it need to be stated in the constitution? Do we need to, in effect, what I call hamstringing ourselves by putting that in concrete? Saying there shall be a Public Service Commission I think is a flexibility that we need to have. And we need to be able to, in this Legislature, tailor whatever regulation is going to come, and maybe not necessarily have it to be a constitutionally protected office. The issues are because they're in there does that mean they must be full-time? Perhaps we want more commissioners in areas of specialty. Maybe we want it to be an