

but the tax could be raised to bring in that amount of money and that could fund a tremendous lobbying effort and I, again, concur with the philosophy Senator Vickers espoused that the bill should not be used for lobbying purposes and I urge you to adopt the Vickers amendment.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Sieck.

SENATOR SIECK: Mr. President and members of the body, I am going to oppose this amendment. I feel that the livestock industry wants to have a mandatory checkoff program and I feel we need this authority in the bill in order to work with the Congressional delegation in legislation that could affect the livestock industry in a tremendous way. I feel if we are going to have some money from this industry itself we should protect it. If there is an embargo upon our industry to not allow us to sell meat to other countries or if the export embargo language in some country is detrimental to us, I think we have to work on that and if we have this type of language in the bill it will kind of hamper the operation of the beef industry. So I am going to oppose the amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Barrett.

SENATOR BARRETT: Mr. President and members, I rise in total support of Senator Vickers' amendment. I believe it is a good amendment to 953. In the brief research that I have done I have found absolutely no checkoff board which doesn't have the amendment which, or the language that Senator Vickers is offering on 953. The Grain Sorghum Development Board, the Wheat Board, the Soybean Board, the Corn Board, all of them have this prohibition in the language which prohibits funds from being used to influence legislation. I think Senator Vickers has a very good amendment. I would urge the body to support the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Schmit, you are next up. No further discussion so, Senator Schmit, you are next.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would just like to point out that the Wheat Board operated for twenty-five years without the restriction that is provided by the Vickers amendment. It had no problems and I am sure there were no complaints. I never heard them if there were. I want to point out that there is a specific provision in the statute, in the bill as we have drafted it that prohibits participation in an election but I want to point out a very excellent example of why I think we need or we cannot have the Vickers amendment. Many of you will