ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



FLOOR DEBATE ON
HOUSE BILL 1903 AND
SENATE BILL 654

DATE:

May 1, 2003

LOCATION:

The Capitol

Tallahassee, Florida

TRANSCRIBED BY:

MARY ALLEN NEEL, RPR Notary Public, State of Florida at Large

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC. 2894-A REMINGTON GREEN LANE TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32308 (850) 878-2221

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

7 **PROCEEDINGS** 2 THE SPEAKER: Read the next bill. 3 THE CLERK: By the Committee on Business 4 Regulation and Representative Mayfield, House Bill 5 1903, a bill to be entitled "An act relating to 6 regulation of telecommunications companies." 7 THE SPEAKER: Representative Mayfield. 8 REPRESENTATIVE MAYFIELD: Thank you, 9 Mr. Speaker. 10 Members, we started questions on this bill yesterday, and we TP'd it, and we were waiting for 11 the Senate Bill to come over. And at this time. 12 Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a motion that we 13 move to substitute and consider Senate Bill 654 in 14 15 lieu of House Bill 1903. 16 THE SPEAKER: All right. Representative 17 Mayfield moves to substitute and consider Senate Bill 654 in lieu of House Bill 1903. All in favor say yea, 18 19 opposed nay. 20 Show it adopted. 21 Read the Senate Bill. Read the Senate 22 Bill. 23 THE CLERK: By the Committee on Communications and Public Utilities and Senator 24 25 Haridopolos, Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 654,

1 a bill to be entitled "An act relating to regulation 2 of telecommunications companies." 3 THE SPEAKER: Representative Mayfield moves the rules be waived and Senate Bill 654 be read a 4 second time by title. All in favor signify by saying 5 6 yea, opposed nay. 7 Show it adopted. 8 Read the bill. 9 THE CLERK: By Senator Haridopolos, 10 Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 654, a bill to be 11 entitled "An act relating to the regulation of 12 communications companies." 13 THE SPEAKER: All right. Representative 14 Mayfield, you've explained the bill; is that correct? 15 REPRESENTATIVE MAYFIELD: Yes, sir. 16 Mr. Speaker --17 THE SPEAKER: Do you want to further explain the bill? 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE MAYFIELD: We spent some 20 time on the explanation of this yesterday, but I'll 21 just run through a couple of points. 22 Members, this bill will give the PSC full authority to oversee a measured, three-step process to 23

get us into an effective competitive marketplace at

the local exchange level. It retains PSC oversight

24

1	over vital customer protection. It's going to expand
2	the Lifeline program to 125% of the federal poverty
3	level and expand that Lifeline opportunity to 25% of
4	the subscriber base across the state.
5	And the most exciting thing I think about
6	this bill, members, what it does, it fences off
7	intrusive regulation from emerging technologies like
8	voice-over-internet.
9	Mr. Speaker, that's what the bill does.
10	THE SPEAKER: Are there questions? Are
11	there amendments?
12	THE CLERK: None on the desk, Mr. Speaker.
13	THE SPEAKER: Show the bill
14	Representative Clarke has a question.
15	REPRESENTATIVE CLARKE: Thank you,
16	Mr. Speaker.
17	Representative Mayfield, I would like to
18	clarify that what this bill actually does is, it moves
19	the rate-setting authority back to the Public Service
20	Commission from the Legislature.
21	THE SPEAKER: Representative Mayfield.
22	REPRESENTATIVE MAYFIELD: Thank you,
23	Mr. Speaker.
24	Representative Clarke, that's exactly what

it does. It moves the political process one step away

1 from rate changes or possible rate changes. It sets forth provisions which will require the Public Service 2 Commission to sit in judgment and to determine two 3 factors: One, will the petition to change rates 5 create competition in the local marketplace; and two, 6 will it be beneficial to residential customers. 7 Before any changes can take place, that has to be 8 determined by the PSC. 9 THE SPEAKER: Representative Clarke for a 10 follow-up. 1.1 REPRESENTATIVE CLARKE: Thank you, 12 Mr. Speaker. Does this process with the Public 13 Service Commission involve public hearings and time 14 for the public to make their voices known? 15 THE SPEAKER: Representative Mayfield. 16 REPRESENTATIVE MAYFIELD: Absolutely. 17 Representative Clarke. It is a completely open 18 process which the Public Service Commission will 19 follow. It has to conduct hearings. It is completely 20 open. 21 THE SPEAKER: All right. Are there other 22 questions? Representative Allen for a question. 23 REPRESENTATIVE ALLEN: Thank you, 24 Mr. Speaker.

Representative Mayfield, it is my

understanding, and I just want to make sure I'm correct on this, that the Lifeline provision inside the bill that came over from the Senate actually increases by nearly a million those around the state that would actually be able to have those vital local services known as Lifeline, and it did extend the equation. Is that accurate?

THE SPEAKER: For an answer, Representative Mayfield.

REPRESENTATIVE MAYFIELD: Yes,
Representative Allen, it does. The subscriber base is expanded by 25% from what it currently is. And this is going to ensure that telephone services are provided to those who really are the truly most needy in our state. All the provisions for assistance are still going to be in place, and it is substantially enhanced under this bill.

THE SPEAKER: Representative Prieguez.

REPRESENTATIVE PRIEGUEZ: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

But isn't it also true, Representative Mayfield, that once parity is reached -- and that can be in two years -- that at that point in time, Lifeline stops, and everything above what is currently protecting the poorest people in the State of Florida

at that -- those credits that they receive from 1 2 Lifeline will end right there and will not continue, 3 and basic rates will go up? Isn't that also true, Representative Mayfield? 4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Of course it is. 5 (Laughter.) 6 7 THE SPEAKER: Representative Mayfield. 8 REPRESENTATIVE MAYFIELD: Mr. Speaker, I 9 would like to yield to Representative Ritter for an 10 answer to that question. 11 THE SPEAKER: Representative Ritter. 12 REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: Thank you, 13 Mr. Speaker. 14 There's nothing in the legislation that says that Lifeline consumers' phone bills will be 15 16 automatically frozen after parity is reached. There's 17 nothing in the legislation that suggests that that is 18 the case. 19 Representative Robaina. THE SPEAKER: 20 REPRESENTATIVE ROBAINA: Thank you, 21 Mr. Speaker. 22 Representative, in this process, are we not 23 taking this out of the political arena and placing it 24 in the hands of professionals who have the expertise

to consider these complex issues? Is that not

correct? 1 2 Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 3 THE SPEAKER: Representative Mayfield. 4 REPRESENTATIVE MAYFIELD: Representative Robaina, that's exactly what one of the goals of this 5 bill is, is to place the evaluation of technical, 6 7 extremely technical presentations and petitions 8 regarding rate adjustments in the hands of engineers and those that are technically proficient to be able 9 10 to analyze this. That's one of the best things about this bill and one of its primary goals. 11 12 THE SPEAKER: All right. Are there other 13 questions? 14 Are there amendments on the desk? 15 THE CLERK: None on the desk, Mr. Speaker. Show the bill will roll over 16 THE SPEAKER: 17 to third reading. 18 Now Representative Mayfield moves that the 19 rules be waived and Senate Bill 654 be read a third time by title. All in favor signify by saying yea, 20 21 opposed nay. 22 Show it adopted. 23 Read the bill. 24 THE CLERK: By Senator Haridopolos, 25 Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 654, a bill to be

٠..

entitled "An act relating to regulation of telecommunications companies."

THE SPEAKER: Is there debate on the bill?

Is there debate on the bill?

Representative Prieguez.

REPRESENTATIVE PRIEGUEZ: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want you to pay as close attention as possible. I would like to premise all my remarks first by saying that I believe, I honestly believe that there are some, and perhaps a lot of members in this Chamber that in good conscience could vote for this bill for some of the things that it may do. Those things that it may do, in my opinion, are not guaranteed in any way, shape, or form, but notwithstanding that, I believe that some could in good conscience vote for this bill.

Having said that, I'm going to talk a little bit about the reasons why I think that folks should not vote for this bill, and I think that those reasons are powerful, for all of you here to strongly consider how it is that you're going to vote on this legislation.

And I'm going to begin by going to Section 15 of the bill. And Section 15 is about the criteria

that need to be fulfilled by the phone companies when they petition the Public Service Commission. They have to fulfill, according to the legislation, certain criteria that would allow for a rebalancing of the rates so that the whole purpose of this legislation can occur. And I'm going to go over those criteria so you can see and hear for yourselves how nebulous and vague they really are and how easily attainable they truly are, because I want to remind everyone, the whole purpose of this is to rebalance rates. Okay? So it wouldn't — if the whole purpose of this is to rebalance rates, then they're not going to make it tough. The criteria will not be tough to make these things happen.

Number one -- and I'm really going to focus on number one. It removes the subsidies that will make local residential competition more attractive.

Now, remember, when we rebalance rates, it means that long distance will go down because of the reduction in access charges, but there must also be increased competition on local service. Local service is controlled for the most part by three very big companies, Bellsouth, Verizon, and Sprint.

The only way that true competition can occur at the basic service level is in three ways.

The first way is, they would have to build a network and infrastructure on their own. So think about that. What has taken BellSouth, Sprint, and Verizon to do over the years, God knows how many years, they would have to do that. These new companies would have to lay the wire up and down the State of Florida so that they could compete against BellSouth, Verizon, and Sprint. So that's pretty tough, in my opinion. That's number one.

1.2

Number two, they could lease unbundled network elements. And number two and number three are sort of combined, lease unbundled network elements and lease minutes from the incumbent companies, and for the sake of argument, the three big companies, minutes for them to sell.

Now, let's think about this for a second.

Let's think about this for a second. If this bill passes, a company that wants to compete against BellSouth at the local level, it has to -- under this law, they have to go to BellSouth and negotiate with BellSouth the use of their lines to be able to compete against BellSouth, and to be able to compete against Sprint, and to be able to compete against Verizon.

Now, where does that make sense? How will that work? How will these companies, you know, just

open themselves up to competition by allowing the use of their own lines, their own lines that they've -- you know, it has cost them God knows how much money to lay out? So that's why I think that number one criteria that needs to be met by these companies is so very difficult.

Number two, benefit residential consumers. It's going to have to benefit residential consumers. How will the PSC know what residential consumers are going to be helped by this and how many will be hurt? Because there will be people that will be hurt. There will be people that will pay more in their basic service. There's no question about that, folks. No one can deny that. So there's no determining factor to that.

Number three, induce enhanced market entry, also very vague.

Number four, move switched network access rates to parity in two to four years. That's the whole purpose of the bill, to make that happen so that there's a rebalancing of the rates by lowering the access charges, and the basic rates will go up. And number four, by it being revenue neutral, again, the basic rates will go up. The companies will not be able to make more money once the access charges go

down. Everything -- so something's got to give.

Either from one place or the other, something has got
to give, and it's going to give in the basic service.

so, you know, that's my -- that, I guess, is my summary on Section 15. And the whole point of the matter is that it's going lead to increased rates, increase basic service.

Now, number two, Senator Argenziano a month ago sent a very detailed letter to the Public Service Commission about, you know, the whole legislation.

And, you know, the legislation remains in that current state for all intents and purposes. And, you know, I'm just going to point to a couple of questions.

Number one, one of the first questions is,
"Is it correct that PSC approval of a LEC's petition
to reduce its interstate switched network access rate
in a revenue neutral manner must result in increases
in the LEC's basic local service rates?" And the
answer is, "The resolution of each petition will
depend upon the record developed in each proceeding.
The bill does state to immediately implement a revenue
category mechanism consisting of basic local
telecommunications service revenues and interstate
switched network access revenues to achieve revenue
neutrality." Again, the revenue neutrality means that

the basic rates will go up.

Another question, "Is it true that the PSC has no authority under this legislation to initiate basic local rate adjustments of any kind on its own motion and that its sole authority to address basic local rates or access fee adjustments would be on the petition of a local exchange telecommunications company?" The response, yes.

At the very, very end, at the very, very end, rates will be uncontrolled, period, period, if everything is followed through the way the telecommunications companies want it to be followed through. And I've already showed you and demonstrated to you how there will be no way that the PSC will be able to stop that, because after all, this is the very purpose of the legislation that we're debating today. It is the very purpose of it, so I think that's very important.

Am I correct -- one more question from that letter. "Am I correct in understanding that there is no possibility that the PSC could lower basic local service rates pursuant to this section of the legislation?" The response again is yes.

Let me dovetail from what I just explained to you all right now to the whole issue of parity,

because that's one of the steps in the road map to get to where the telecommunications companies want to get to. Parity is when a big company's interstate long distance is the same as the intrastate long distance, and it's supposed to happen in two to four years. And the way that occurs, folks, is that, number one, it lowers the access fees, and that leads to the raising of basic rates.

1.3

You reach the parity. At that point, you reach the parity when it's the same cost for one as for the other. The companies then elect to have the ability to raise either 6% if there's no competition at the basic service level or 20% if there is competition. And currently there is at least one other company that is competing, so it could go up automatically to the 20%.

They go before the PSC, and they do -- they basically get to do whatever they want. If they all -- listen to this very carefully. If they lower the access fees enough, there will be complete deregulation. And, you know, I've said that before, but I'm going to reiterate. There will be complete deregulation in everything. Ladies and gentlemen, everything will go up. The basic rates will go up. There will be, of course, no control over the long

1.2 1.3

distance, and everything will be -- everything will be open to absolutely no control by the Public Service Commission at that point in time.

Let me talk about it one more time, and I may mention a question that I asked Representative Mayfield about the Lifeline. And this is in Section (c) of the bill. Lifeline, after they reach parity, which can be in two years, Lifeline will only cover so much. After that, after that, it will not continue to rise in a comparable measure with what basic rates will go up.

Read from the bill. Any local exchange telecommunications company customer receiving Lifeline benefits shall not be subject to any residential basic local telecommunications service rate increases authorized by 364 until such time as the local exchange telecommunications company reaches parity as defined in Statute 364, or until the customer no longer qualifies for the Lifeline benefits established by this section, or unless otherwise determined by the Commission upon petition by a local exchange telecommunications company.

So clearly, there is nothing here that prevents Lifeline customers from continuing to be covered as they are right now once basic rates start

going up. I mean, there's absolutely no question about this.

And once again, ladies and gentlemen, I want to return one more time to the whole argument of competition. I think that everyone here can agree that the biggest selling point from the telecommunications companies has been that we need this because it will bring competition. So let's think about that for a second. The telecommunications companies want more competition. They want more competition.

Heck, you know what I may do? Next year I may pass a bill so that there are more seafood processors on the Miami River processing lobsters.

Hell, I want more competition too on the Miami River — heck. Excuse me. I want more competition on the Miami River. Representative Russell, he has a pool company. I'm sure he would be in favor of 10 more pool companies showing up in his neighborhood, and so on and so forth.

How could we assume for a second that this makes any kind of sense whatsoever, that these folks really want more competition? It just -- to me, it doesn't make any sense. And I will argue to you that what we have now is the best for the people in the

State of Florida.

number one, we have very, very, very low basic phone service, very, very low. Be it artificial or not, we have it very low. And number two, we have an incredible amount of options when we make long distance phone calls. I, when I'm calling from my landline at home and I'm calling my sister in San Diego or a client in New York, I dial 101 for state to state, and then I dial the long distance number, and I get charged 8 cents per minute 24 hours a day. And there are a myriad of these companies, a myriad of these companies that offer those services for pennies per minute 24 hours a day.

So why -- what would be the purpose of competition? If competition is going to reduce the price and is going to make it more competitive and is going to make all these prices go down as people are alleging, why do that if we already have it? Why pass this legislation if we have the best world, we're blessed to have the best world, the best of both worlds right now, no long distance and no basic service?

So I really want you to think about this carefully. I want you to, you know, concentrate on

2 vour mind. And the majority of my arguments have come 3 from a public policy perspective. For one second I'm 4 5 going to talk about politics. A couple of months ago, maybe it was a month ago, Representative Bense said, 6 "Folks, don't worry about voting for certain bills, 7 because there might be a mailer coming your way. You 8 9 don't know which mailer it's going to be. You don't 10 know where it's going to come from, but don't be a mailer." 11 12 But I'm here to tell you, this is a mailer. You're staring at it right in the face. 13 is a mailer, because it's not the right thing to do. 14 15 Last year I did the wrong thing. Last year 16 I voted for this, and I regret it. I looked away, and 17 I regretted it. This year I'm not going to look away. 18 Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. 19 (Applause.) 20 THE SPEAKER: Is there further debate? 21 Representative Slosberg. 22 REPRESENTATIVE SLOSBERG: Thank you. 23 Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition of this bill. 24 I have a problem. My problem is that we

the things that I'm saying and think about that in

1

25

3

can't even use our offices in our district in Boca

Raton. My district is North Broward and South Palm Beach County. And the reason that we can't use our telephones in the Boca Raton office is because of the fact we've been getting so many calls about this bill, in opposition to this bill. I have 54,000 senior citizens in my district, and many of them don't have the computers where they can just send us whatever they feel on the computer. Instead, they pick up their phones. And we could barely use our phones, we've had so many complaints about this bill.

The problem is that my senior citizens, it's a big increase to them, whatever it is, because of the fact that they're just on a fixed income. And the bottom line here is that I want to go home, I want to get off that airplane in Palm Beach County, and I don't want weapons of mass destruction waiting for me when I get off that plane. So I have to do the right thing for my district and the citizens of the State of Florida, and I'm against this bill.

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: Representative Ritter.

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: Thank you,

Mr. Speaker. First, I promise not to be as long as the first speaker on this bill.

If I needed a 100% guarantee on everything

I voted for on the floor of this House, there wouldn't be anything I would be able to cast a vote on. Much of what we vote on is based on what the sponsors tell us, and we take a leap a faith often when we vote on things, hoping that what we are told they do will be actually what they do.

There are only two guarantees in this life, as we all know, death and taxes. If our Speaker had his way, there would only be one guarantee, and that would be death. But there are only two guarantees in life, death and taxes. So I choose to take this leap of faith that my constituents will actually see a reduction in their phone bill.

I never thought that the day would come when I would listen to a member of the majority party tell me that deregulation was bad. I've been here for seven years, and all I ever hear is free market, deregulation, competition, those are good things. So when the Chair of Business Regulation tells me that deregulation is a bad thing, again, this is one of those times where I scratch my head and I wonder what's doing on here.

Deregulation is a good thing. Bringing competition in is a good thing. And I'm not suggesting that competition is brought in because

that's what the industry told me to say. I'm suggesting that competition is a good thing because it will directly benefit my constituents, and your constituents as well. I want more competition, and this is a good way to do it.

1.7

In closing, let me say this. If you are worried about the politics of this bill, let me suggest that many of the things that have been done on the floor of this house during this session are far more damaging that what is being done in this particular piece of legislation. If you are worried, please do not worry about this piece of legislation. You are lowering rates for your constituents.

And as for those of us who live in South Florida and have elderly constituents, first of all, might I suggest that many of our constituents have computers, and they are e-mailing us on many things, including prepaid tuition. And might I also suggest that many of our elderly constituents have families who live out of state, and our constituents make numerous long distance phone calls to those people who live in the Northeast predominantly, and those constituents will see a direct reduction in their phone bills as a result of this piece of legislation. This is a good bill.

() ()

In closing, let me say this. And I said it yesterday, but I believe it bears repeating. My parents live in my district. They are my most vocal constituents. For those of you from my county who know my dad, you know he doesn't hesitate to pick up the telephone or come to my house and speak to me whenever he needs to on a piece of legislation. They are residential consumers, basic service, single line. If I thought that this bill would raise my parents' phone bill, I would not support this piece of legislation. I do not believe that my parents will see an increase in their bill as a result of this piece of legislation, and I am supporting it, and I would hope the members of this body would do the same.

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: Representative Littlefield.

REPRESENTATIVE LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen, economic theory argues that a prerequisite for a dynamic economy is defined by the opportunity for individuals or firms to compete in order that new technologies, efficiencies, and more viable business plans can emerge. And if you look at this bill, it does that.

Now, that's important for us to know in the State of Florida, because Florida is the home of some

of the world's leading telecom providers. This bill will help to eliminate unnecessary regulation of new technology and encourage those providers to invest in new technology that will give consumers new services, new products, not to mention all of the jobs that will be created in the State of Florida. The technology explosion that we have seen over the years is because there has been competition.

I remember the first cell phone that I bought. It was about the size and weight of a brick. Now all of us in this Chamber have cell phones or computers that we can put in our pocket. I was grateful when I bought my first computer that I had a pickup truck, because it took a pickup truck to carry all of the boxes that I had for that first computer that I bought. But because of competition, I now have a computer on my desk here that has more storage in it than ever before. My personal computer that I have at home is about half this size with as much memory on it because of competition.

And I think that it's important to create competition so that consumers have the benefit of choice. And we have heard over and over again in our policy that when you give people choice, you empower them. And I simply say, power to the people, vote for

this bill. And this bill -- let me -- just one more point, and I'm finished. And I promise I also will not go as long as the first one who spoke in opposition.

This bill, when you look closely at it, you will find that the Public Service Commission is serviced or given a clear blueprint as to how to make the residential market more competitive while protecting the residential consumer.

And so, members, I ask you to vote for this bill. And, Governor Bush, wherever you are, I ask and encourage you to sign this bill when it arrives at your desk.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: Representative Fiorentino.

REPRESENTATIVE FIORENTINO: Thank you,
Mr. Speaker. Most of us won't talk as long as
Representative Prieguez because he knew the
information. He read the bill, and he had a lot of
facts.

I rise in disagreement with this bill. I understand your intentions of helping the telephone companies. They certainly were at my office and lobbying me too. I understand that there's a lot of reasons that they say they need it.

One of the comments I made to them, I don't mind paying the extra for my bells and whistles. Yes, I have call waiting, I have DSL, and that's fine. I also am not on a fixed income. Somewhat, yeah, I make so much money, and that's all I get, but I'm not on \$400 a month as my seniors are at home. \$8 to a senior is medication. \$8 to a senior is half of their already phone bill.

Think about it. I heard some kids up here

-- I say kids, they're in their 20s -- that said,

"What's 20 bucks?" Well, to them it's a bar tab on a

Friday night. But to my seniors back home, that's

their medication. That's some of their weekly food

bill. Those are important issues. \$20 to a senior is

a large amount of money, and we need to think about

that, when you're only dealing with \$400 a month.

Look what happened. Each one of you stood up about medically needy. How many phone calls did we get that said, "I can't spend down to 450," because they don't even get that much. And now you're willing to raise their rates 20%? I don't think we can do that.

You talked about deregulation. No, that's not what we want to do. Look at California and their electric. Deregulation would not help this, I think.

The other -- the biggest problem I have for my seniors is this one. The PSC is here in Tallahassee. I don't know about you, but when I fight the wastewater utility companies, it's very hard for me to get my seniors to drive up here to do that, and they do not hold their hearings down in your district, people. They hold them up here, and that makes it very difficult for them to get up there.

You are going to be raising your rates, your basic rates for your seniors. There will be parity in two years, and those Lifelines will be limited, and we will have seniors that will be coming out of the woodwork at us.

It's easy to vote yes on this bill because it gets the burden off of our shoulders, but that's not the right thing to do for the people in the State of Florida. I hope you vote against the bill.

THE SPEAKER: Further debate?
Representative Reagan?

REPRESENTATIVE REAGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe this bill is good for the State of Florida and good for Florida residential telephone customers. It gives the authority to the Public Service Commission to make the hard decisions about

competition and local rates.

I also like the idea that we're giving the Public Service Commission the authority respond to changing circumstances as local competition further develops. These are the issues that the Public Service Commission is better able to handle than we are.

I urge all members to vote for this good bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: Representative Wishner.

REPRESENTATIVE WISHNER: Thank you,

Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this piece of

legislation.

I guess it has already been said pretty much about the issue of competition. And it's funny, because everybody is focusing on the major telecommunications companies in Florida, but everybody is forgetting about all those optional companies that are out there that offer services cheaper. And why is that? That's because of competition.

You know, it's funny, because just recently in Florida, we got a new mobile company that came here. I think it's called T-Mobile or something like that. It hasn't been in Florida that long. That's

because -- they came to Florida because they created competition, and they felt that they could provide the same service that other companies are providing at a lower rate. And what is wrong with that? As a businessman, I always look for the best service at the lowest rate I can get. That's what my customers are also looking for. And what's wrong with that?

1.6

The other side of it is, we're all pooh-poohing the issue of the PSC and whether or not they should be the ones that are in charge of regulating the rates in Florida. Why not? They're the experts. Those are the ones that analyze the facts, that run the numbers to see whether or not the company should be able to raise their rates. There's nothing wrong with that.

We come up here for 60 days to pass legislation, and I don't think we want to be bogged down with running numbers, looking at financial statements, trying to figure out what's best. I don't think we want to have our committee members, our committee workers, the staff here running -- for 60 days running numbers to figure out whether or not rates should be raised or not. We should leave it to the professionals, and that's what this bill is going to do. And for us to turn around and try to threaten

or scare the people of Florida, and especially our
senior citizens, which are going to benefit greatly by
this, you know, we shouldn't do that.

The other thing about it is real simple.

If it's bad, we come back next year and we fix it. We do a glitch bill. If we see that what they're doing is not doing the best for the people of Florida and it's hurting our citizens, then we all should come back here and fix it and bring it back to where it belongs so it can't continue if that's the case.

But you know what? Don't shut off competition. That is not the right thing to do for us, and it's not the right thing for us to do on behalf of the citizens of Florida. So let's look at this, and let's make sure that we understand that this is good.

You know, there's all of kinds of new things that are coming out, cable, wireless. People can talk on the phone through their computers. And there's all kinds of innovations that are taking place. Why do we want to stifle that, which could cause actually the cost of telecommunications to go down with more competition and other abilities to communicate?

So I urge you to support this bill.

1 Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: Representative Henriquez.

REPRESENTATIVE HENRIQUEZ: Thank you,

Mr. Speaker.

I wasn't going to speak today, but I felt compelled to stand up and say, members, finally, this is -- this bill, its time has come. You know, probably the first tough vote I took in this Legislature in 1998 was on this issue under Chairman Luis Rojas. And those of you that were here remember that bill and how close we were to passing it that year, and it was TP'd I believe eight times in the Florida House. I think that's some kind of a record.

we've been running from this issue for years and years and years, and the papers have been writing about this issue for years and years and years. It's time for us to step forward, take the step, pass the bill. It's a better bill than it was last year, which many of you voted for. And have some courage. So little political courage we seem to see up here sometimes. And let's move forward.

Those seniors, I have those seniors as well. I'm going to hear from them. They'll be able to access Lifeline. This bill will help them.

And like Representative Wishner said, we

can always come back and fix it if there's a problem
or if we find that we've made a mistake. The Governor
is on board, thankfully. Okay? There won't be a rug
pulled from under us this year. Let's pass this bill
and be done with it. Let's move forward so we don't
have to come back next year and debate this issue
again.

Thank you, members.

THE SPEAKER: Representative Garcia.

REPRESENTATIVE GARCIA: Thank you,

Mr. Speaker.

I guess I want to start off my remarks with what Representative Prieguez closed off with, saying that this is going to be a mailer. Well, you know what? I didn't get elected based on the fact that my decisions down here were going to be a mailer or not. I think that I got elected -- I ran for office because I believed that I wanted to help my people. I know that I want to help my people and do the right thing. It's not about being a mailer not being a mailer.

We've worked on this bill for three years, at least since I've been here. This is a good product. It's a better product than it was when I first got up here. We have to be statesmen in this

body and have some courage and look into the future and realize what that future is.

g

Representative Littlefield, you're absolutely right when you talk about the cell phones. Who would have thought that cell phones, that we were going to have laptop computers on our desktops? Who would have ever thought that?

This is what this bill does. It gives the ability for more competition. Forget about the phone ringing. I'm getting rid of my local landline right now because I don't use it anymore. It's always on the cell phone. And when the time comes, we're going to have more wireless services going all around the place. And this is what we're trying to do with this bill, is promote more competition.

At the end of the day, our seniors are going to be taken care of. They are. Don't let anyone tell you that our seniors are going to be thrown under the bus like a lot of people are saying in this Legislature. That's not going to happen. And that's why I feel comfortable in voting for this bill.

And you know what? If it is a mailer against me, I think I did the right thing. I did the right thing in looking at Florida and saying where

does Florida want to be in the next 10, 15 years from now. And this is what this bill does. It gives us the ability to move forward, move into the future with brighter pastures.

So, Representative Prieguez, I appreciate your comments, but you know what? I'm not scared of those mailers, because I know I'm doing the right thing.

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: Further debate?

Representative Richardson.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To speak in favor of the legislation.

And I think that all of you who know me in this Chamber know how passionately I fight for the people that I represent here in District 8 and across the State of Florida, many of whom are not the ones that — most of whom are not the ones that live in the gated communities or the polished subdivisions. They are my next-door neighbors, and I have to look them in the face every morning when I get up to leave for work.

And I'm supporting this legislation, members, because I think it's the right thing for us to do. It's the right thing for the State of

Florida. Sometimes we have to experiment in order to know if we can do things better. We experiment in this chamber all the time. We experiment with privatization. We experiment with other issues. And hopefully we are smart enough that if the experiment doesn't work or if the experiment needs to be fixed, that we will bring it back and fix it or change it if it needs that, and if it's working, allow it to work. That's what I think is the case with this legislation.

one of the things that we fail to remember and has not been mentioned here today is that these same companies that we're talking about, the telecommunications companies, hire thousands of Floridians that are citizens of this state that purchase the same telephone service that we're talking about and will be paying those same rates. Now, would we suggest that the companies are going to place an undue burden on those very same employees that they hire in those companies?

I have faith that Lifeline, although it won't be a silver bullet, that it will provide relief for many of our senior citizens and many of those who are low income in our state. I've gotten a commitment from the companies to work together between now and next session to make sure that we more broadly

advertise the Lifeline service to bring more people on board that may be eligible for Lifeline, and I'm satisfied with that. I'm comfortable that I can -- after we take this vote that I can look at my neighbor tomorrow morning and say that I did the right thing for her, for my other neighbors, and for the State of Florida.

1.2

So, members, I would encourage you to vote for this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: Representative Rubio, in debate.

REPRESENTATIVE RUBIO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members.

I want to first begin by telling you I am tremendously honored to serve in this body with men and women like Representative Fiorentino and Representative Prieguez, who are friends of mine. Representative Prieguez is a district neighbor, who I know in their hearts, like so many of us here, are brought here out of a sense of public service and care deeply and passionately about the men and women we represent. I think we all do, quite frankly.

One of the toughest things in this process is in the time we spend here, our passion for serving

those we represent I think sometimes inflates,
disproportionately so, our confidence in the ability
of our laws to do so. We live in a country that's
based on a free market, a free market economy, where
prices are better set not by government regulation,
but by the marketplace in which we live.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I think that's what this bill asks us to do, is to have confidence in the free market in which we've all shared and which has made people who have come to this country with not a penny in their pocket accumulate great wealth. And it's not a thing of shame. It's a thing of beauty that this country has been able to accomplish that because of our free market economics. And that's not easy, because the passion that so many of you of here for your -- you see a bill that you think potentially could lead one day to decisions being made by another body that could result in rate increases for your constituents, and you're concerned. And we share that concern. we're also convinced, those of us who support this legislation, that that will not be the case, but rather, we place our faith in the economic model that has built this nation and the state and made it great.

And I'll tell you what else this bill takes into account. And I've listened to the debate

carefully. I will tell you that I was not convinced this morning in which direction I would go, because I wanted to listen carefully to the debate. But this bill does one other thing. It takes into account monumental changes, monumental changes in the marketplace of technology. There is no one here today who could look at the technological advances before us at this moment and have predicted them 10 years ago, and you cannot predict where we will be 10 years from now. In fact, the great technological changes of the last 10 years are what fueled the '90s and the economic growth that existed in this country.

And what this bill basically tells you is that the days of local service where people just had a home line and used that are perhaps fading away, and there are growing changes in technology, and people will use alternative methods of communicating.

And so after carefully thinking, I'm going to support this bill today. I am convinced that the free market forces that operate in our economy will serve to regulate. And if they do not — let me be clear. If they do not, if we return a year from now or two years from now, if we survive that onslaught of mailings, Representative Prieguez, three years from now, if we return and then we find that things have

not have worked out that way and that this model that has worked for 227 years is suddenly broken down in Florida because of the decision we've made, then I think each of us who will be back will reserve the right to make a change. And I'll be the first one to lead that charge.

But I think this is an idea that has been debated now for three years. It has been studied. It has been altered. It has been changed to accommodate the concerns of people like Representative Prieguez, people who are passionate like Representative Fiorentino. I think we need to give this idea a chance. If it ends up not working out, we have the right and the opportunity to change it, and we will.

And the last thing about the mailers, I will tell you that it doesn't matter what decision you make here, you're going to get a mailer.

(Applause.)

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker and members, those mailers will accuse you of doing things you didn't even know existed. As long as they get your name right.

And at the end of the day, I think

ultimately your constituents will re-elect you and

judge you not on your vote on one bill or one critical

moment, but the way you represented them on a daily basis, not just when you're here pushing buttons, but back home when you're helping them with their day-to-day decisions, and I hope you'll take that into account as well.

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: Further debate?
Representative Domino.

REPRESENTATIVE DOMINO: Thank you,

Mr. Speaker. I would like briefly to rise in support

of this legislation.

Much of the discussion of those who oppose this legislation have thought of telecommunications in a very static manner. They think of a phone, making a phone call. But the new telecommunications is one of data transmission so that we can get data and we can get video as well as voice. Data transmission generally is going to come through digitization, which has already happened. And for that to really take full bloom, we need to have the broadband Internet technology develop. There's a technology, for example, called voice-over-internet protocol. It basically takes and digitizes what someone says, puts it into small packets, and then ships it over thousands of miles at virtually no charge. This is

the kind of technology that must be encouraged.

1.7

Even the difficulties Representative

Prieguez talked about can be solved by emerging

technology called electronic loop provisioning, which

basically allows local telecom competitors to get

voice and data without going into the consumer's home.

At the end of the day, it is estimated that two-thirds of the advances in our economy since the 1996 deregulation of telecommunications has come from improvements in information technology.

I join with those who say let the markets determine where the competition is going to be. We will all benefit immensely from that.

THE SPEAKER: Further debate? Representative Jordan.

REPRESENTATIVE JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you members.

I do most of my discussion and contributions hopefully in committee, but I'm going to tell you, I've heard enough on this subject until my ears are out of breath. This subject has been up and down and left and right, and I've been talked to by both sides. And I must give credit to the art of persuasion of the people who have presented their points today. You're very powerful.

But I didn't come to this Legislature to worry about mailouts or where you stand. I came to do the right thing. And you can drive bamboo shoots up my fingernails, and I'm not going to vote against something I have strong feelings about, or for it, whatever.

Mr. Speaker, last year the leadership asked us to vote to put the tax exemption on the ballot. I did that, and somebody ran \$20,000 worth of TV ads over a four-day period and called it the Jordan Tax Plan. So it doesn't matter what you do. You must stand for your principles.

I have one regret, Mr. Speaker and makers of this motion. I think if it were not for the possibility of destroying this bill, I would like to amend it. So that we get out of the Public Service Commission business, I would like to put on it the ophthalmologists, the optometrists, the anesthesiologists, and all the other things that we're doing.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the time has come to believe in the free market enterprise, the cornerstone of this free republic, and give this thing a chance, and I will vote for it.

THE SPEAKER: All right. Representative

Ambler.

REPRESENTATIVE AMBLER: Thank you,

Mr. Speaker. I'm going to keep this brief. I'm sure
that will make many of you very happy.

(Applause.)

when I campaigned for the House of
Representatives as a first-time political candidate, I
had one theme, and I'm going to reiterate this to all
of you that have to make a tough vote today.

The people in our districts cannot fall prey to scare tactics. They are relying on us as their elected representatives to educate ourselves on the issues, to ask the tough questions, to get the information we need, and to make the right decisions. It's an issue of trust. If the constituents in your district that elected you to the House of Representatives trust you and your judgment, then feel confident in the vote that you make today and don't be persuaded by scare tactics. And I ask you to take that message back to the constituents in your district. Don't be persuaded by the scare tactics that a vote on this bill is the death knell of certain people that are getting these services.

If you raise something a dollar, even if it results in an increase of a dollar, and they get a

decrease of two or three dollars on other services as a result of competition, that ultimately is a good thing, because the free market system is working.

We are not here as regulators. We are here as policymakers, and you have to feel confident that the people who trusted you now let them trust you in making the right decision.

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: Further debate? Further debate?

Are you ready to close, Representative Mayfield?

REPRESENTATIVE MAYFIELD: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Members, I could never stand here and articulate some of the arguments that have been presented here this morning. You all have done just a phenomenal job of debating both side of this issue.

But I think just a couple of things need to be said in closing with respect to the Lifeline program.

The Lifeline program remains intact. It has been expanded. We're not going to throw poor people or the needy under the bus with phone rates. We've got provisions in this bill which are going to protect them.

This bill is -- its objective is trying to depoliticize the process of ratemaking or rate changes or considerations for rate changes and move us one step back away from that. That's really what the goal of this bill is all about.

Technology is moving so fast in this state. Wireless phone numbers are -- the deployment of wireless phone numbers are going at a rate so fast, people five years from now won't even have a phone in their house. They'll be carrying their phone on their side just like we do.

But, members, look, this bill is about creating competition. It's about creating competition.

Members, I would ask for you to support the bill.

THE SPEAKER: The question now recurs on final passage of Senate Bill 654. The Clerk will unlock the machine and the members will proceed to vote.

All members voted? All members voted? All members voted?

The Clerk will lock the machine and announce the vote.

THE CLERK: Ninety-three yeas and 20 nays,

1.6

1	Mr. Speaker.
2	THE SPEAKER: So the bill passes.
3	(Conclusion of consideration of House Bill
4	1903 and Senate Bill 654 on May 1, 2003.)
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	·
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

STATE OF FLORIDA:

5 | COUNTY OF LEON:

I, MARY ALLEN NEEL, do hereby certify that the foregoing was transcribed by me from an audiotape, and that the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 46 are a true and correct transcription of the aforesaid proceedings to the best of my ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or financially interested in the foregoing matter.

DATED THIS 20th day of October, 2003.

MARY ALLEN NEEL, RPR 2894-A Remington Green Lane Tallahassee, Florida 32308

(850) 878-2221