

any reason to do it. We are interfering in the right to contract for a period of time. We are limiting the rights of both the consumer and the business. So why we would want to intervene and limit that right at this point is...to me is just not reasonable and doesn't get at the point that Senator Nelson is talking about, the being able to revoke within three days, giving the consumer notice of what the terms and conditions of the contract are, holding the money in escrow for a period of time for new clubs. Those are all reasonable. Why we would want to get into telling, as a State Legislature, telling two parties that they cannot enter into a contract for more than one year, I think, is bad precedent, and it cuts both ways. So even though this is a small point and I am trying not to, by making it, Senator Nelson, trash the concept that you are bringing because I believe some of it is certainly accurate, but this is very highly regulating to start with. But then to get involved in that process, in the contracting process by limiting a term that could be beneficial to both parties seems to me to be not in...is not good public policy, and I am not bringing this to you because of any health club that said to me take that section out. It just doesn't make any sense to limit that term. The reason that this amendment limits the impact of this bill to clubs that are less than seven years, more than seven years in existence, there is no particular magic to that. And I doubt very much if there is any particular support in the body right now to do that, but I do think we need to think a little bit about what we are requiring these parties to do. And I think when we get too much involved in telling two parties how they can contract, I think we get into trouble. Another concern that I would have, though, if I was a consumer is what are the rights, what are my rights if the contract is assigned. What are my rights if the contractor...if the contract is assigned? If I am a consumer and the contract is assigned and the club closes, does the bill say anything about that? I don't know. I guess it does. Senator Nelson is shaking her...that is a good point. That is something that probably we can put into a law that makes sense. That is protecting the consumer. But to get into the problem of or the issue of contracting and putting a limit on duration is interfering, I think, in the material parts of the contract that where I can see no reason given, at least in the debate so far, that ought to be done. I am going to withdraw the amendment that I have at this point. There is...I have one more amendment which, basically, and I won't say anything more about it, which strikes Section 17 for the reasons that I have given just now in my argument for this amendment.