

March 31, 1982

LB 953

course, have complete access to this body and it only takes 25 members to change the bill, to change the statute.

PRESIDENT: One minute, Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: I assure you that will happen. It has happened in the past and it will happen again. Therefore, I must oppose the Vickers amendment and ask that it not be adopted.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Wagner.

SENATOR WAGNER: Mr. Speaker and members, I rise, too, to oppose the Vickers amendment. Last Friday night I met with I think about five farm bureau organizations, five different counties, and one of the bills that we talked about was 953 and I told them where I stood because I supported the bill the way it is and I gave them kind of a shot at me. But I think what came out of this was the fact that those counties, after discussing it with them and my concern about the embargo and if you can't kind of like halfway defend ourself against some of this legislation that may come out on the federal level, that it was my consensus there that these people really didn't have much for a feeling in relation to really opposing 593 (sic) in its original form. So after that discussion and so forth like that, I would...it is my feeling that I very definitely will support the bill and I would certainly oppose the Vickers amendment.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I rise to support Senator Vickers' amendment. I think it is just simply patently wrong on a mandatory tax on the livestock industry as any checkoff is and I appreciate you can argue that the governmental subdivisions may do it but a fund that is established for the development of markets, use of the product I think ought to be limited to that and as a livestock grower if I want the lobby, and certainly I would agree the need is there, but if I want to lobby then I ought to be providing those monies voluntarily through the various organizations that exist. I might look differently on the provision I suppose if there was a refund where you could object through a refund with the lobbying activities that might go on but neither would I support a refund. Let me make it that clear because I understand the complications that would result from that that it should be mandatory. So since it is mandatory then I think it only is right, proper and fair that the Vickers amendment is attached and the funds are truly utilized for what all checkoff funds were initially always envisioned to be and that is the development of market for those agri-