

is tacked on to LB 60 then we've got to kill the bill because we don't want to give up our voluntary check-off programs. I have suggested to them that we let LB 60 rest this particular year and that we use the summer to try and work some middle ground on this particular issue. But I think there are couple of check-off programs who feel very strongly that LB 60 may help them in their approach, especially to the 1985 farm bill, in providing input to the Congress on how they may draft that legislation. So I can see their points. However, I can tell you that I am opposed to the idea of changing the mandatory check-off program at this particular point. I think the Agriculture Committee has made a statement to this body that they chose not to enact Senator Haberman's earlier piece of legislation. I think we should leave that matter rest and go on with this particular issue and decide, up or down, what we want to do with the proposal in front of us which is to allow check-off programs to use check-off funds for the purpose of influencing legislation. I hope you will give it serious consideration before you adopt or reject the Haberman amendment. But it certainly, I think, moves against the grain of what we are really talking about, and that being influencing legislation.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Rogers, please.

SENATOR ROGERS: Mr. President and colleagues, I would have to oppose Senator Haberman's amendment. He mentioned just because some other states have refunds I see no reason why Nebraska has to do something just because some other states do. We've talked about what other states do on taxation and numerous other things. I think that is a mighty poor argument. Senator Haberman mentioned how the beef producers had voted, through their ASCS office. When they went that route to vote for a check-off I had made the comment several times, when I was director on the National Livestock and Meat Board, that that was a mighty poor place to go to vote because you had a lot of farmers thought that it was connected with or hooked up with the government at that time. That is one of the reasons that it was nationally...that it was defeated at that time. You'll always have some producers that won't be that keen about check-off, but you will have a majority of them. You have a small minority here, I am sure, that are opposed to a check-off, but yet they will reap the benefits from the check-off that the rest of the producers contribute to that.