

bill because in the NCAA bill we're talking about job action or action by an organization which is not a state agency which in...certainly in the Tarkanian (phonetic) case which resulted in, or could result in the loss of employment by Tarkanian and that, the application of that particular rule or rules like it implemented by the NCAA could have egregious effects or onerous effects on individuals and I think the due process argument is a good one for that in that bill. However, if we look at Section 18 of LB 224 on page 12, I don't see a due process argument in Section 18. What we're saying is that the university can not necessarily keep an agent off the premises. All we're saying is that the agent, athlete agent shall strictly adhere to the specific rules of each separate electing institution with regard to the time, place and duration of the interviews. It doesn't say that the registered agent cannot be there and meet with student athletes. I don't see that as being the kind of regulation that raises to the level of violation of constitutional due process. Going then secondarily to the argument Senator Chambers raises about the only wealthy agents, and I think it is a valid point and whenever we regulate anything we have to be careful that we're not restricting unduly the market for individuals who may act as agents and any time we get into regulation, obviously that is a concern and I think Senator Chambers in raising that issue raises an issue that should be raised in regulation type legislation but I don't think, and I'm looking at Section 13 and maybe Senator Chambers has some other sections that he is discussing, but Section 13 that requires a \$25,000 bond certainly is not an onerous bond provision and many attorneys or other individuals with sports background, I would think, could meet that requirement of procuring a \$25,000 bond without too much trouble and thereby act as a sports agent as long as the other criteria are met. Then going to Section 12, and again, Senator Chambers may have some other objections on that point, but that's the one that I thought he was mentioning, going to Section 12, on the application process, I think that's just a judgment call by everybody on the body, in the body whether they feel that those...that type of information is invasion of privacy or not invasion of privacy. And I don't think then, if we do amend or change any portion of those, or any of those subsections, it certainly isn't fatal to the bill and is not a reason not to advance the bill. And having looked at those subsections, I don't...

PRESIDENT: One minute.