

in your memory, Senator Chambers?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, I can't say...I can't answer the question the way you ask it but just a couple of years ago some players were involved with their tickets. I forget whether they gave them to people they shouldn't have or sold them or something like that, but the whole state was in an uproar because they felt the punishment imposed by the NCAA was unfair, that it was overly harsh and all of those things. There was a lot of publicity in the newspapers, on television and everywhere attacking the NCAA. The university had meetings with them and, based on the heavy outcry, the NCAA backed down. Well, if the NCAA is, in fact, a regulatory agency, if every, as we might say, requirement of their laws had been complied with and the punishment was imposed, they should not have withdrawn it simply because of public pressure. So it indicates that they are as much a political body as a regulatory body. It happens that Nebraska is a strong enough school in terms of the money that it produces to have achieved what it did, with the assistance of the news media and others. But if it were a different school in this state that didn't have that kind of power, and there are other schools that are associated with the NCAA, the outcome may not have been that way and they wouldn't have had recourse, because the NCAA...the university didn't get that changed by appealing it.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Senator Chambers, you're getting all of time again.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'll give you some of mine when I get it if you need it.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Okay, fine. How many states have passed this kind of a bill? Do you have...are there a number of states that have done this, Senator Chambers?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, because it hasn't occurred to other states because the decision came down in December of last year, December of 1988.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Could this...could the passage of this bill in any way be construed, Senator Chambers, as a limiting factor on the NCAA and their oversight of the institutions?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, not at all. It wouldn't limit that at