

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Agriculture and LivestockThe meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Bill Fuller at \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson9:00 a.m. ~~pm~~ on February 7, 1984 in room 423-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Committee staff present:

Raney Gilliland, Legislative Research Department  
Norman Furse, Revisor of Statutes Office  
Kathleen Moss, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, who welcomed guests who are participating in the Young Stockmens' Conference. He then distributed copies of a memo from Darrell Ringer, American Agriculture Movement requesting that HB 2415 (relating to minimum pricing) be removed from the table and scheduled for hearings. He also asked for legislation calling for a moratorium on foreclosures, an extension of the redemption period and for a removal of deficiency judgment. (See Attachment 1.) In addition, he asked for consideration of a legal services proposal calling for legal assistance for individuals with pending foreclosures.

The Chairman reminded the Committee members that there had been a joint House and Senate Ag Committee meeting last year concerning agriculture in the classroom. He said he felt the Committee should have a briefing on the progress of the program and what the needs may be for getting the program in the school system. He called on Helen Bausch, President of the Foundation of Agriculture in the Classroom, to discuss the activities of the Foundation.

Ms. Bausch distributed a brochure (Attachment 2) and told the Committee that efforts are being made to see that children understand that the backbone of the economy is agriculture. A task force of teachers is being gathered throughout the state to work with the Agriculture Department and the Education Department to develop educationally correct materials. They need funds to pay these teachers and in this the Committee could be helpful. They are also seeking other funding. They feel that \$50,000 will fund the pilot program. One of the tools they are using is "Agri-Puppy", who goes everywhere and knows everything. He is to be filmed for TV and when the programs are aired it should gain attention.

There was discussion about developing a Resolution in support of Agriculture in the Classroom, stressing the importance and need of this type of program. The Chairman appointed a sub-committee to work with him and with Rep. Marvin Smith: Rep. Roenbaugh, Chairperson, Rep. Polson and Rep. Teagarden.

The Chairman called for discussion and action on HB 2682, Rep. Niles' bill limiting authority to spend grain commission funds. Rep. Niles reviewed her bill and there was discussion about the provisions. There was discussion about the constitutionality of the bill, and the Chairman appointed the following sub-committee to make recommendations: Rep. Niles, Chairperson, and members: Representatives Solbach and Long.

Rep. Polson distributed copies of a newspaper clipping concerning the use of fumigants in grain preservation. (See Attachment 3.)

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 A.M. The Chairman reminded members that moisture meters would be discussed at the next meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for February 8, 1984, 9:00 A.M., Room 423-S.



P.O. BOX 356 • QUINTER, KANSAS 67752  
February 3, 1984

Memorandum To: Members of House & Senate  
Ag Committees

From: Darrell T. Ringer, State Spokesman AAM

In President Reagans recent State of the Union Address, he completely forgot to mention the condition of agriculture, this nations largest industry, which finished the year at 56% of parity (2% lower than 1932 in the depth of the great depression. This is why recently I introduced the following proposals to the Kansas House Agriculture and Livestock Committee.

1. HB2415 The Minimum Price Bill, which is tabled in the committee should be brought off the table for serious discussion then sent to the House Floor for statewide debate. (This is a Bill which would allow producers to vote in a referendum as to whether they wished to establish 90% Parity floor price on certain commodities.)
2. Moratorium on all farm and home foreclosures, rural and city as well to stop the devaluation of property for the duration of this depression.
3. Extention of Redemption Period; (Foreclosed property currently has a six month redemption period.) Agriculture operates on an 18 month cycle and six months is simply not enough time to get reorganized.
4. Removal of Deficiency Judgement, both parties had money invested when the investment went sour, both parties should shoulder the loss. As it now stands a bank can foreclose, then after the sale if there's not enough money retrieved to satisfy the loan, attorneys fee, and etc., the lender can hound the borrower for the rest of his life by garnishing wages or taking deficiency judgement on other property. This is legal slavery and must be stopped!

Another proposal that merits your consideration is one put forth by Kansas Legal Services, with the endorsement of Attorney General Bob Stephan calling for the addition of two attorneys and three paralegals to assist individual farmers in developing a defence case to protect their rights in a foreclosure, and to conduct community education workshops on credit issues. I would also like to suggest that one attorney and two paralegals be placed in either Hays or Oakley and that one attorney and two paralegals be placed in either Garden City or Dodge City area. The cost was estimated at \$125,000-\$150,000 dollars, which would be a very small price to pay for evening up the sides in these tough economic times.

Your serious and timely  
consideration of the above  
matters is urgent.  
Thank you.

*Darrell T. Ringer*

*Attch. 1*

---

## Why agriculture in the classroom?

Since the beginning of time, one of man's most important labors has been to work with the earth in order to provide life-supporting food and fiber. Daniel Webster said, "Let us never forget that cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man." To support this belief, agriculturists and educators have begun forming groups in several states who are working toward a greater emphasis on agriculture in public schools. They believe that helping today's youth to understand the nation's largest and most important industry will lead to a better informed public tomorrow.

## What will the Kansas Foundation for Agriculture in the Classroom do?

The Foundation in Kansas has three standing committees. They are: Materials, Curriculum and Distribution.

The Curriculum Committee is working on a national level with the other states who have similar foundation groups. Together they are developing a national "core curriculum" which will determine where the greatest areas of need for new agricultural information are.

After the national "core curriculum" is developed, the Materials Committee will develop new materials to meet these needs or gather several of the existing programs and materials. They may include: slide sets, films, video cassettes, tapes, books, magazines, lesson plans, class projects and suggestions for trips to a farm or an agribusiness.

Once the Foundation, with the advice and assistance of Kansas educators, has chosen materials or programs for use in the classrooms, they will be tested on a pilot program basis throughout the state during the 1983 - 84 school year.

As successful programs are identified, the Distribution Committee has a big responsibility. This committee will see to it that the materials and pro-

grams are placed in schools and that educators understand the purpose and procedure for using it. This will be accomplished through in-service training for participating instructors.

## Who will this benefit?

The Kansas Foundation for Agriculture in the Classroom will be developing educational materials for grades K - 12. In addition to the exposure being provided to students, it is hoped that others including teachers, parents and administrators will develop a better understanding of agriculture, thus becoming better producers, and consumers of agricultural commodities.

## What will young people learn from these efforts?

The Foundation, through its program development will address seven areas of education. These are:

- The economics of agriculture
- Agriculture and world food production and distribution
- Agriculture and history
- The geography of agriculture
- Agriculture and technology
- Careers in agriculture
- Major agricultural policy issues

This group was formed for two reasons; to provide for Kansas students an understanding and appreciation of the food chain, which is the foundation of human life, and to promote the well being of agriculture as a necessary forerunner to the well being of America.

## Will these new programs and materials create a new curriculum?

NO. The work being done by the Foundation is designed to *supplement* not add to existing public school curricula. Agriculture can successfully be

taught as a part of math, science, history, current events and economics and business courses. The national "core curriculum" is simply a framework from which the state-wide groups will develop these supplemental materials.

## How was the Foundation organized?

The United States Department of Agriculture invited representatives of our state to participate in a planning meeting during the summer of 1982. These state leaders chose a twenty-one member task force (now a foundation) in October to carry out the project for his state. The USDA serves as an organizing agency, yet allows each state to function independently in implementing its own programs.

## Who serves on the Kansas Foundation?

The Kansas Foundation is made up of farmers, and individuals who represent the Kansas Legislature, the State Departments of Agriculture and Education, agricultural industries, public schools, trade associations, professional groups and colleges and universities.

## How can the people of Kansas help?

First, people can help the work of the Foundation by informing themselves about the purpose and the plan of the group.

Second, the work of the Foundation will be aided by people willing to support the use of these new materials and programs in their local school districts.

Third, share developed materials and ideas with the Foundation.

Accomplishing this will cost money. Rather than seek already scarce state funding, the Foundation is attempting to gather financial assistance from private and industrial sources.

---

**Members of the  
Kansas Foundation for Agriculture  
in the Classroom**

- Robert Anderson  
Natl. Assn. of Elem. School Principals
- Helen Bausch  
United Farm Wives
- Dr. Harold Blackburn  
Kansas Dept. of Education
- Dale L. Carey  
Kansas State Brd. of Education
- Dr. Calvin Drake  
Kansas State University
- Steve Fisher  
State 4-H Youth Programs
- Michael L. Goolsby  
Farmland Industries, Inc.
- Mr. Dee James  
Future Farmers of America
- Dr. Gene Kasper  
Kansas Board of Regents staff
- Nancy Lindberg  
Kansas-Natl. Education Assn.
- Loreen Locke McMillan  
Board of Agriculture Staff
- Don Montgomery  
Kansas Senator, 21st District
- Barbara L. Moyer  
Kansas Farm Bureau
- Les Olsen  
Kansas Dept. of Education
- John C. Oswald  
State Board of Agriculture
- JoAnn Pottorff  
Kansas Assn. of School Boards
- Nancy Spiegel  
W.I.F.E.
- Clayton Stultz  
Kansas Dept. of Education
- Linda Swiercinsky  
(Member-at-Large)
- Randall D. Tosh  
Kansas Co-op Council
- Dave Woolfolk  
Federal Land Bank Assn. of Manhattan-Abilene



**Foundation  
for Agriculture  
in the  
Classroom**

“A partnership of agriculture and education serving Kansans”



Atch. 2

In 1896, William Jennings Bryan said,  
*“Burn down your cities and leave our farms and  
your cities will spring up again as if by magic,  
but destroy our farms and the grass will grow in  
the streets of every city in the country”*

We invite you to join us in sharing with the  
young people of Kansas, the importance of  
agriculture to this state, this country and to the  
world!

# Prefer Worms to EDB in Your Cereal?

By KEITH C. BARRONS

News that Florida and possibly other states are banning the sale of cereal products found to contain an EDB (ethylene dibromide) impurity of as little as one part per billion makes one wonder if a genuine public health risk exists or if this is just another media event. Federal officials are scrambling to address the issue. Do toxicity data really support the destruction of valuable food because of extremely small traces of this impurity?

For nearly half a century, EDB has been used for protecting stored corn, wheat and other grains from insects. How long since you opened a package of a cereal product only to find it wormy? Such an experience was once commonplace. Flour and other food products derived from grain often became badly infested within weeks after purchase. Eggs and/or larvae of various moths and beetles came along as an unwelcome bonus. Now losses in storage and the aesthetic nuisance of insect infestations on kitchen shelves have been tremendously reduced. Further, we have been spared the the possible health risk of toxins associated with insect fragments and their excrement in our food.

If we are to be blessed with abundance around the calendar and not just at harvest time, grain must be stored, and those inevitable "lean years" require reserves over a considerable period. Our sizable carry-over of grain from a bumper 1982 crop is all that is keeping food prices from escalating today in the face of the drought-plagued short corn harvest of 1983.

Nature decrees that all materials of plant origin will be attacked by one or more organisms of destruction unless man does something about it. Today, stored grain is less threatened because of improved technology, one facet of which is fumigation with appropriate volatile chemicals. One of these, EDB, has proved particularly useful, often in combination with other compounds, for grain protection in farm storages.

The recent Medfly problem in California is a reminder of the utmost importance of preventing foreign insect invaders from gaining a foothold. Importation of fruit is therefore sometimes restricted unless it is treated prior to shipment to destroy pests that may be present. EDB has been a useful fumigant for this protection for many years, so fruit, too, is caught up in the latest controversy.

When EDB's utility for grain protection was first discovered, chemical analysis following application indicated no residue at the lower limits of detection then possible—about 1 part per million. Toxicological data emphasized the need for great care in handling the fumigant but gave no hint of a health problem should there be undetectable traces remaining in food.

But recent research in two directions

has changed this picture. First, analytical chemists have perfected their techniques to permit detection down to 1 part per billion or one-thousandth of the earlier limit. Second, long-term dietary feeding studies with laboratory animals at relatively high doses indicate that EDB may have carcinogenic properties.

Also, since the early use of this fumigant, Congress has amended our food laws with the addition of the Delaney clause that decrees that no foreign substance will be allowed "... if it is found after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of the safety of food additives, to induce cancer in man or animals. . . ." Our present concern hinges on that word *appropriate*.

Some authorities believe that even though a compound does cause cancer in laboratory animals when administered over a long period at relatively high levels in the total diet, the mere traces we may ingest are prevented from harming us by the body's natural defense mechanisms. They point out that we are perpetually exposed to many natural carcinogens in trace amounts. Others are convinced that even though relatively high doses are required to induce cancer in laboratory tests a trace of certain unnatural materials in food may cause an occasional cancer, such as one in 10,000 or more persons. Neither view can be proved correct. It would require impossible numbers of test animals to statistically establish a hazard from the miniscule amount sometimes present in foods, a few parts per billion of EDB in cereal products, for example.

So we are faced with the choice of:

(1) outlawing any food that contains an identifiable trace of a suspect substance regardless of the magnitude of the dosage required to induce cancer in long-term feeding studies, or

(2) establishing a tolerance, a permitted level, that will provide a wide margin for safety but still allow us to reap the benefits of a product that helps assure abundance.

So much for facts; now for an opinion. An unconditional interpretation of *appropriate* may have made sense when the Delaney amendment was passed but now that chemists can come close to "finding anything in anything" a reconsideration seems apropos. If an extreme interpretation is adhered to—if nothing may be used in the production, preservation, processing or packaging of food that shows any indication of carcinogenicity in laboratory tests, regardless of the dosage required—we will most certainly be exchanging a highly problematical risk for the greatest hazard of all—inadequate food in healthful variety. One after another of the chemical tools that have made significant contributions to food supplies will be outlawed and no longer available to a world whose popula-

tion is almost certain to double before births and deaths reach a balance.

Since its early use, EDB has protected billions of bushels of grain from destruction, some of it in countries where hunger would inevitably increase if losses occurred in storage. With few exceptions, the lowest level of this chemical in the complete diet of rats to show evidence of carcinogenicity exceeded the traces found in cereal products on market shelves in Florida by more than 1,000 to 1. Considering that these foods constitute only a portion of the human diet and that much of any EDB present would be vaporized on baking or cooking, the risk in their consumption fades into insignificance.

I believe it is time to rethink the Delaney clause. Certainly an appropriate interpretation of toxicological data is one that recognizes the margin for safety provided by a wide spread between the lowest level having an effect on laboratory animals on the one hand and those that may be present in foodstuffs on the other. Certainly it is inappropriate to allow highly problematical and miniscule risks to completely overshadow proven benefits.

Mr. Barrons, retired from Dow Chemical Co., writes on pesticide matters.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, FRIDAY, JANUARY 13, 1984