

cultural products. In fact, without the Vickers amendment I would find it hard to support the bill at all and I suspect others feel that way too. Certainly as has been pointed out, if times change and it is necessary to do it, well with 25 votes we can put that into the law at some time in the future if that is what becomes necessary. But I just cannot accept the thought that we are going to mandate this collection from individual growers, livestock, and then turn around and perhaps have it used for lobbying efforts for...you know it doesn't limit it to exports or embargoes. It could be used for a whole host of things and as agriculture as competing within itself as it is, I think it would be patently wrong to permit that kind of activity with mandated checkoff funds so I would hope the body would keep this bill for the purpose that it ought to have and support the Vickers amendment and keep the political implications of the checkoff clean as it ought to be.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Koch.

SENATOR KOCH: Mr. President, I move the previous question.

PRESIDENT: Yes, we don't have any furthermore...we had the one on and the light went off so I guess, Senator Koch, thank you but we won't need any. Senator Schmit, did you want to speak again? All right so we are ready for closing anyway so, Senator Vickers, you may close.

SENATOR VICKERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President and members, perhaps one of the differences is that there are some of us that are in the livestock industry that understand a little more about politics perhaps than some of us that are not involved in politics and also in the livestock industry. Senator Schmit mentioned what happened back in the '70s and I well remember that. I'm not quite recovered yet, and as a matter of fact, perhaps getting even worse. But I also recall back in the '70s there were members of the industry went back to Washington. I looked back back at the glass doors a little bit ago and there were some people back there that were there as a matter of fact. They were there representing this industry, not using dollars that were raised with a tax but using dollars that were donated by members who voluntarily became members of various organizations representing this industry. It seems to me that if we, the members of this industry, need this money or need this provision so that we can use these dollars to influence legislation, then I guess I would ask the question, what are all these people doing back of the glass doors today. They are down here representing that industry, some of them down here on their own obviously, some of them here representing specific organizations but, nevertheless, they are here lobbying