Approved	March	7,	1986	(10:09	meeting
pp.o.ca			Data		

MINUTES OF THE Sen	<u>ate</u>	COMMITTEE ONAgricul	ture
The meeting was called to o	order by	Senator Allen Cha	at
a.m./ <b>談</b> 類. on	March	6	, $1986$ in room $423-S$ of the Capitol.
All members were present e	except:	Senator Doyen (excused)	
Committee staff present:		Gilliland, Legislative  Revisors of Sta	

Fred Carman, Revisors of Statutes Department (excused)

Conferees appearing before the committee: Jack Dillard, Case-Harvester Company
Dale Amick, Western Retail Implement and
Hardware Association
Tony Franska, Kansas Farmers Union
Bill Fuller, Kansas Farm Bureau
Mary Harper, farm wife, Harper Valley Farms
John Stitz, Catholic Rural Life

The Chairman called the Committee to order and called attention to Committee minutes.

Senator Arasmith made a motion the minutes of March 3 be approved. Senator Gordon seconded the motion. Motion carried.

The Chairman announced the Committee would be taking action on SB 544. He called on Jack Dillard to comment on the negotiations that had taken place between the manufacturers and the dealers of farm equipment.

Mr. Dillard gave copies of a balloon draft of SB 544 with amendments as agreed upon by both the manufacturers and the farm equipment dealers (attachment 1). Mr. Dillard explained that the most controversial section 6 had been striken; in section 3 another clause had been added, that is "h"; lines 0098 through 0123 were deleted; deleted the words "order or" from line 0126. Mr. Dillard explained that the manufacturers did not feel new section 5 was necessary because of federal laws and courts but agreed with it because dealers desired it so that cases could be handled in a state court. Mr. Dillard expressed support for SB 544 as amended and requested favorable action by the Committee.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Dillard and ask Dale Amick to comment on the compromise.

Mr. Amick stated that because of talking together the manufacturers and the implement dealers have gained a better understanding of the problems both sides have during these times of the depressed agricultural economy. He expressed support of all dealers in Kansas who are members of the Western Retail Implement and Hardware Association wholeheartedly support this compromise. Mr. Amick stated he felt SB 544 provides for the pendulum of rights to swing back more to the center; that the bill will preserve competition and will help keep many dealers in business in Kansas. Mr. Amick requested passage of SB 544 as amended.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Amick and expressed appreciation for the two sides working together and together working out a compromise. The Chairman then called for Committee action on SB 544.

Senator Montgomery made a motion the Committee accept the amendments proposed for SB 544. Senator Gannon seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Senator Montgomery made a motion the Committee recommend SB 544 favorably for passage as amended. Senator Warren seconded the motion.

Motion carried. Unless specifically noted the individual remarks recorded herein have not

Unless specifically noted, the individual remarks recorded herein have not been transcribed verbatim. Individual remarks as reported herein have not been submitted to the individuals appearing before the committee for editing or corrections.

## CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE Senate COMMITTEE ON Agriculture,
room 423-S, Statehouse, at 10:07 a.m./\*\* a.m./\*\* on March 6, , 19 86

The Chairman turned the Committees' attention to SB 631. He ask the Committee members who are sponsors of the bill for comment.

Senator Karr stated the bill was drafted because of the feeling that states need to work together on agricultural policies. This bill is similar to the grain compact bill of 1979. Senator Karr said several states have considered legislation similar to this and especially in the state of Nebraska.

Senator Gannon stated this bill would create an arena where states could discuss mutual agricultural problems. He stated the subpoena power, that caused controversary the last time this kind of legislation was discussed, was not included in SB 631.

Senator Warren stated SB 631 is nearly the same as the last one concerning this same area; the main thrust of this bill is to allow several states getting together to work on agricultural problems instead of having to go to the federal level.

The Chairman called on Tony Franska to present the testimony of Ivan Wyatt.

Mr. Franska gave copies of Mr. Wyatt's testimony to the Committee members (attachment 2). Mr. Wyatt's testimony expresses support for SB 631. Also he requested the original lines of 150 through 171 be put back into the bill. He requested passage of SB 631.

In answer to a Committee question, staff answered that the lines removed had been lines that caused controversary the last time this legislation was considered.

The Chairman thanked  $\operatorname{Mr.}$  Franska and called on  $\operatorname{Bill}$  Fuller to testify.

Mr. Fuller expressed the need for expanding our agricultural markets and for regaining markets that we used to have both of which would help return some prosperity to agriculture. He encouraged review of programs already in place in our state, and questioned are our needs not being met within these organizations now and could current programs be expanded and is Kansas now providing adequate resources both in dollars and personnel to do the job with the programs we have. He also stated Kansas belongs to Mid-America International Agri-Trade Council and the Regional Multi-State Non-profit Corporation. Mr. Fuller said we do have problems and if these existing organizations cannot address our problems then maybe SB 631 offers another chance, but he questioned if a new organization could do any more than the organizations we already have. Mr. Fuller said if this proposed new organization has a goal of setting prices for grain then the Farm Bureau organization would be against the plan. Mr. Fuller stated if our problems cannot be addressed by the organizations that we already have that the price of \$50,000 for this proposed program is quite reasonable when we know that agriculture in our state deserves more funding than it at present receives.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Fuller and called on Mary Harper to testify.

Ms. Harper gave copies of her testimony to the Committee (attachment 3). Ms. Harper expressed support for SB 631 with the hope that control of production and marketing can be regained so as to help return solvency to our state. Ms. Harper stated she felt several states could work together better and stated the State Department should stay out of our marketing.

The Chairman thanked Ms. Harper and ask if anyone else that was present would like to testify.

John Stitz stated he felt this kind of proposed organization would be helpful for Kansas. He expressed support for SB 631.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Stitz and declared the hearing closed on SB 631. Page  $\frac{2}{2}$  of  $\frac{3}{2}$ 

### CONTINUATION SHEET

MINU	JTES	OF 7	THES	enate	COMMITTE	E ON .	Agriculture	
room	423_	<u>s</u> , :	Statehouse,	at 10:07	a.m./🎉 n.	on	March 6	 9 <u>86</u>

The Chairman called the Committees' attention to SB 687. He stated that Kenneth Wilke, Francis Kastner, the Pharmacists Association and Raney Gilliland had met together and come to an agreement concerning SB 687. The Kansas Food Dealers Association has agreed to only a change being made in line 0152 of SB 687 as compared to amendments offered on March 4. The change being that the bill would become effective upon publication in the Kansas Register rather than publication in the statute book. The Chairman ask Ms. Kastner to comment on the agreement.

Ms. Kastner commented that she had learned that compromise was the way of the legislative process and at the meeting held regarding SB 687 the compromise had been to only change the effective date of the bill and that she agreed. With this change the dealers she represents who sell only general use pesticides will not have to pay registration fees for another year.

In response to Committee questions, Harland Priddle stated that registration of both general use pesticides and restricted pesticides would be best for complete records, and then in case of a recall, dealers are known and could be notified quickly of a recall. He stated he did not feel SB 687 was in the best interest of all and that EPA has been contacted and their feeling is that all should be registered, but they will not say anything if a state only registers restricted pesticide dealers.

The Chairman announced that the Committee would be meeting in a special meeting upon adjournment of the Senate the next day. He then adjourned the Committee at 11:02 a.m.

COMMITTEE: SENATE AGRICULTURE

DATE: March 6, 1986

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)	ADDRESS	COMPANY/ORGANIZATION
Dale Amick	JEFFERSON CILY Mo	WESTERN RETAIL IMPLEMENT ASSN.
TONY C. FRANCKA	Strong City Ks.	KS FARMERS UNION
JOHN STITZ	Kec. Ks	CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE
John Blytha	Menhetten	Ko Ferm Bureay
Mary Harper	Healy	self
Manry Mantola	To petra	Kansas Co. op Council
Bot Welly	Topeka	LS Independent College Assin
MIKE BEAM	TOPEKA	Ks. LUSTK. ASSA,
Harland Buddle	Topeke	la Stat- Bel 4 (eg
Bee Inder	Manhattan	\$5. Jarm Burean
Howard Make	Hurchesors	VAW6
Joe Lieber	Fts peka	As Co-op Council
Chris Wilson	Hutcheyson	KS Grain & Feed Mrs Assin
Kuthy Peterson	Topeka	Com. 2K5 Form Organista
Raymond Is and	my	K5 Tamer Union
Gelel Wright	Topeka	Ho Credit Che League
Grances fastrer	Topoka	Ks Food Dealers
		/
		,

0021

## SENATE BILL No. 544

By Committee on Agriculture

2-3

AN ACT to regulate and govern business relations between manufacturers of agricultural equipment and independent 0018 retail dealers of those products. 0019

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas: 0020

Section 1. The-legislature-of-this state-finds that the retail 0022 distribution and sales of farm equipment to the farmer consumer through businesses which are independent from and not affili-0023 ated-with-or-controlled by the manufacturers of such products, benefits the economy of this state by providing services to the farmer which are superior to those which would be provided by manufacturei-owned retail outlets and insuring that all manufacturers of farm-equipment-will have access to retail-outlets, thereby encouraging competition among manufacturers. The purpose-of-this-act is to preserve these economic benefits-to-theagricultural economy of this state through regulation of the business relations between farm-equipment-manufacturers and 0033 farm equipment dealers.

Sec. 2. As used in this act: 0034

- (a) "Farm equipment" means equipment including, but not 0035 0036 limited to, tractors, trailers, combines, tillage implements, bailers and other equipment, including attachments and repair parts therefor, used in planting, cultivating, irrigation, harvesting and marketing of agricultural products, excluding self-propelled machines designed primarily for the transportation of persons or property on a street or highway.
- (b) "Farm equipment manufacturer" means any person, 5043 partnership, corporation, association or other form of business 0044 enterprise engaged in the manufacturing, assembly, wholesale, 0045 sale or distribution of farm equipment, including any person,

or

The purpose of this act is to prevent arbitrary or abusive conduct and to preserve and enhance the reasonable expectations for success in the business of distributing farm equipment.

0046 partnership or corporation which acts for or on-behalf of such a 0047 manufacturer, assembler, wholesaler or distributor in connection with the sale of hum equipment.

- (c) "Farm equipment dealer" or "farm equipment dealership" means any person, partnership, corporation, association or other form of business enterprise primurity engaged in the retail 0052 sale or service of farm equipment under a dealership-agreement.
- (d) -"Dealership-agreement" means-a-contract-or-agreement, 0054 either expressed or implied; whether oral or written, between a 0055 farm equipment manufacturer and a farm equipment dealer-by 0056 which the farm equipment dealer is granted the right to sell, 0057 distribute or service the manufacturer's furn equipment regard-0058 less-of-whether-the-farm-equipment-carries a trade-name, trade-0059 mark, service mark, logotype, advertising or other commercial (0060 3rmbot, and in which there is a continuing commercial relation-0061 ship between the farm equipment manufacturer and the farm 0062 equipment dealer-
- (c)-"Continuing-commercial-relationship"-means-any-rela-0064 tionship in which the farm equipment dealer has been granted 0065 the right to self-or-service farm-equipment-manufactured-by the 0066 farm-equipment-numufacturer-for-a-period-of three-or-more 0067 consecutive months.
- Sec. 3. No farm equipment manufacturer, directly or through 0069 any officer, agent or employee may terminate, cancel, fail to 0070 renew or substantially change the competitive circumstances of a 0071 dealership agreement without good cause. For the purposes of 0072 this subsection, good cause means and includes the failure by a 0073 farm equipment dealer to substantially comply with essential 0074 and reasonable requirements imposed upon the dealer by the 0075 dealership agreement, provided such requirements are not dif-0076 ferent from those requirements imposed on other similarly situ-0077 ated dealers either by their terms or in the manner of their 0078 enforcement. 1

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this section, a farm 0080' equipment manufacturer shall provide a farm equipment dealer 0081 at least ninety-days' prior written notice of termination, cancel-0082 lation or nonrenewal of the dealership agreement. The notice

(d) "Dealership agreement" means an oral or written agreement of definite or indefinite duration between a farm equipment manufacturer and a farm equipment dealer which provides for the rights and obligations of the parties with respect to the purchase or sale of farm equipment.

In addition, good cause shall exist whenever:

- (a) The farm equipment dealer has transferred an interest in the farm equipment dealership with the manufacturer's consent, or there has been a withdrawal from the dealership of an individual proprietor, partner, major shareholder, or the manager of the dealership, or there has been a substantial reduction in interest of a partner or major stockholder without the consent of the manufacturer.
- (b) The farm equipment dealer has filed a voluntary petition in bankruptcy or has had an involuntary petition in bankruptcy filed against it which has not been discharged within thirty (30) days after the filing, or there has been a closeout or sale of a substantial part of the dealer's assets related to the farm equipment business, or there has been a commencement or dissolution or liquidation of the dealer.
- (c) There has been a change, without the prior written approval of the manufacturer, in the location of the dealer's principal place of business under the dealership agreement.
- (d) The farm equipment dealer has defaulted under any chattel mortgage or other security agreement between the dealer and the farm equipment manufacturer, or there has been a revocation or discontinuance of any guarantee of the dealer's present or future obligations to the farm equipment manufacturer.
- (e) The farm equipment dealer has failed to operate in the normal course of business for seven (7) consecutive days or has otherwise abandoned its business.
- (f) The farm equipment dealer has pleaded guilty to or has been convicted of a felony affecting the relationship between the dealer and manufacturer.
- (g) The dealer has engaged in conduct which is injurious or detrimental to the dealer's customers or to the public welfare.

Sec. 4.

(h) The farm equipment dealer has consistently failed to meet the manufacturer's requirements for reasonable market penetration based on the manufacturer's experience in other comparable marketing areas.

0083 shall state all reasons constituting good cause for termination,

0084 cancellation or nonrenewal and shall provide that the dealer has 0085 60 days in which to cure any claimed deficiency. If the defi-0086 ciency is rectified within 60 days the notice shall be void. The notice and right to cure provisions under this section shall not apply if the reason for termination, cancellation or nonrenewal is 6089 for: (1) Commission of a felony, reflecting upon the relationship 0090 tetween the dealer and manufacturer; (2) insolvency; (3) the are arreace of an assignment for the benefit of creditors, or (4) 0092 tamkrupter of the farm equipment dealer. If the reason for (X)93 tennination, cancellation or nonrenewal is nonpayment of suns 0094 three the farm equipment manufacturer, the farm equipment 1005 dealer-shall be entitled to written notice of such default, and 0096 shall have 10 days from the date of delivery of notice in which to 0097 remedy-the-default from the tlate of delivery of the notice. (c) - It is a violation of this act for any farmed upment dealer to 0099 transfer assign or sell any interest in a farm equipment dealer-3100 ship agreement evidenced by a writing to another person, unless 0101 the farm equipment dealer shall first notify any farm equipment 0102 manufacturer who is a party to such written dealership agree-0103 ment-of such intention by-written notice, sent-certified mail-0104 stating in the notice of intent: the prospective transferee's name. 0105 address, statement of financial qualification and business expe-0106 rience-during-the-previous-five-years. The farm-equipment manufacturer-shall, within-120 days after receipt of such noticeeither approve in writing to the farm compment dealer such saleto the proposed transferce or, by written notice, advise the farm equipment dealer-of-the-unacceptability of the proposed transferee, stating-material reasons relating to the character, financial Ability-or-business-experience-of-the-proposed-transferee, taking-0113 into consideration the interest to be acquired by the transferee. No farm equipment manufacturer shall refuse to accept the 0115 prospective transferee unless such refusal is based on reason. 0116 able, material grounds relating to the character, financial ability 5117 or business experience of the proposed transferee If the farm 1118 equipment manufacturer does not reply within the specified 120 1119 days, approval shall be deemed to be granted. No nansfer

any reason set forth in subsections (a) through  $\frac{2}{3}$  of section 3

assignment or sale of a majority interest in a farm equipment dealership or dealership agreement shall be valid unless the transferce agrees in writing to comply with all the requirements of the dealership agreement them in effect.

Sec. 4. (a) It is a violation of this act for a farm equipment manufacturer to coerce, or attempt to coerce, any farm equipment ment dealer to order-or accept delivery of any farm equipment, parts or accessories therefor, which the farm equipment dealer has not voluntarily ordered.

(b) It is a violation of this act for a farm equipment manufacturer: (1) To condition, or attempt to condition, the sale of any farm equipment of a requirement that the farm equipment dealer also purchase other goods or services; except that nothing herein shall prohibit a farm equipment manufacturer from requiring the dealer to purchase all parts reasonably necessary to maintain the quality of operation in the field of any farm equipment used in 0136 such dealer's trade area; (2) to coerce or attempt to coerce any 0137 farm equipment dealer into a refusal to purchase the farms equipment manufactured by another farm equipment manufacturer; or (3) to discriminate in the prices charged for farm equipment of like grade and quality sold by the farm equipment manufacturer to similarly situated farm equipment dealers, except that nothing herein shall prevent differentials which make only due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such farm equipment is sold or delivered, by the farm equipment manufacturer.

Sec. 5. Any term of a dealership agreement, either expressed of implied, which is inconsistent with the terms of this act shall be void and unenforceable and shall not waive any rights which are provided to any person by this act.

Sec. 6.—From and after the effective date of this act, inclining of the equipment manufacturer shall open a retail farm equipment of this state and operate it with company personnel, employees, a subsidiary company, commissioned agent or under a contract with any person, firm or corporation managing a farm equipment dealership on a fee armingenent with the farm

5.

6.

0162

0169

0173

0181

0157 equipment manufacturer. The fann-equipment dealership shall 0158 be operated by an independent farm equipment dealer who is 0159 neither affiliated with, dominated or controlled by the farm equipment-manufacturer-Notwithstanding the preceding-provisions of this section. 0161

(a) - A-farm-equipment-manufacturer who-currently operates a retail-farm-equipment dealership in this state with company personnel, -employees, a -subsidiary -company, -commissioned 0165 agent, or under a contract with any person, firm or corporation managing a store on a fee arrangement with the farm equipment manufacturer-may continue to operate such business until July-1,-0168 1988:

(b) - An equipment manufacturer or affiliate may own, namage or operate un-equipment dealership for a term not to exceed 18months after the lawful termination or cancellation of a farm-0172 equipment dealership-pursuant to the terms of this act.

(e) -An-equipment-manufacturer may participate in the ownership, management or operation of an equipment dealership under a-written agreement with un independent equipmentdealer if, under such an agreement, the independent equipment dealer has made a significant investment in such equipment dealership and has the right to acquire full ownership, management and operation of such equipment dealership anon-satisfaction of reasonable terms and conditions.

4dl-A-farm-equipment-manufacturer-may even and operate aretail-farm-equipment-dealership-in-any-trade area-for such-timeperiod as such manufacturer-cannot find an independent farm-स्पानंभ्रमस्पार-dealer to own and operate a retail farm equipmentdealership to represent such manufacturer.

Sec. 7. If any farm equipment manufacturer violates any 0186 provision of this act, a farm equipment dealer may bring an 0188 action against such manufacturer in any court of competent 0189 jurisdiction for damages sustained by the dealer as a conse-0190 quence of the manufacturer's violation, together with the actual 0191 costs of the action, including reasonable attorney fees, and the 0192 dealer also may be granted injunctive relief against unlawful 0193 termination, cancellation, nonrenewal or substantial change of competitive circumstances. The remedies set forth in this section shall not be deemed exclusive and shall be in addition to any other remedies permitted by law. The attorney general is also empowered to enforce compliance with this act by institution of a civil suit for injunctive relief.

0199 Sec. 8. This act may be cited as the Kansas agricultural 0200 equipment dealership act.

9201 Sec. 9. This act shall take effect and be in force from and 9202 after its publication in the statute book.

including proceedings under the Kansas Consumer Protection Act

#### STATEMENT

0F

# IVAN W. WYATT, PRESIDENT KANSAS FARMERS UNION

BEFORE

THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

ON

SB-631

(INTERSTATE COMPACT ON AGRICULTURAL GRAIN MARKETING)

MARCH 6, 1986

MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

WE RISE IN SUPPORT OF SB-631.

IN 1978, KANSAS INITIATED THE IDEA OF A MULTI-STATE COMPACT, BECAUSE OF PROBLEMS FACING MIDWEST FARMERS IN THE AREAS OF INTERNATIONAL GRAIN MARKETING.

ON DECEMBER 18, 1978, LEGISLATORS FROM SOME 15 STATES MET IN THE STATE'S CAPITOL TO DRAFT LANGUAGE FOR AN INTERSTATE COMPACT.

HOWEVER, IT WOULD NOT BE UNTIL APRIL 19, 1979, THAT THE COMPACT WOULD BE SIGNED INTO LAW.

WHAT WE THOUGHT WERE BAD TIMES THEN HAVE TURNED OUT TO BE THE "GOOD OLD DAYS".

DURING THE GOOD OLD DAYS OF THE LATE 1970'S, WE WEREN'T HEARING WORDS OF "FORECLOSURE", "BANKRUPTCY", VOLUNTARY CONVEYANCE", "BANK FAILURES", ETC. NOW DAYS THESE WORDS ARE COMMON PLACE.

SINCE EARLY IN 1981 WE'VE SEEN THE PRICE OF WHEAT GO FROM ABOUT \$4.40 PER BUSHEL IN WICHITA TO \$2.93 (2-26-86).

IT IS OBVIOUS THERE IS SERIOUS TROUBLE NOT JUST IN KANSAS, BUT IN THE BREAD BASKET OF THIS NATION.

AS WE'VE HEARD DURING RECENT DEBATE THIS SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE, THERE ISN'T TOO MUCH THE STATE OF KANSAS ACTING ALONE CAN DO TO RECTIFY MANY OF THESE PROBLEMS.

3/06/86 Sen. Ag

attachment

SB-631 SETS THE STAGE FOR THE BEGINNING OF A MULTI-STATE EFFORT TO ADDRESS SOME OF THESE PROBLEMS FACING THE AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITY.

IN THIS COMMITTEE LAST WEEK WE HEARD THE PRESIDENT OF THE STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE SAY THE BOARD DOES NOT HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO DEAL WITH THIS CRISIS, BUT HE CONTINUED, SAYING AT THE STATE LEVEL WE CAN'T DO ANYTHING -- UNLESS THE STATES WORK TOGETHER.

IN LINES 145 THROUGH 149, PAGE 4 OF THIS BILL THE STAGE IS SET.

THIS EFFORT TO FORM A MULTI-STAGE COMPACT SHOULD HAVE BROAD, NON-PARTISIAN SUPPORT.

THE INITIATION THIS TIME FOR A COMPACT HAS COME NOT FROM KANSAS, BUT HAS COME ABOUT BY THE EFFORTS OF A REPUBLICAN WHEAT FARMER, SENATOR LOREN SCHMIDT OF NEBRASKA.

WE WOULD RAISE THE QUESTION OF THE REASONING FOR STRIKING ALL OF SECTION C OF THE ORIGINAL BILL BEGINNING ON PAGE 4.

A SIMILAR BILL ON THE HOUSE SIDE, HB-2915, RETAINS THIS LANGUAGE.

IN 1979, THE KANSAS LEGISLATURE PLACED THIS LANGUAGE IN THE ORIGINAL COMPACT BY A 67 TO 57 VOTE WITH 6 MEMBERS NOT VOTING ON THE HOUSE SIDE, AND BY A 24 TO 14 VOTE ON THE SENATE FLOOR.

SINCE THAT TIME WE HAVE HEARD GROWING COMPLAINTS FROM FOREIGN CASH BUYERS OF OUR GRAIN COMPLAIN OF HIGH AMOUNTS OF NON-MILLABLE PORTION OF WHEAT SHIPMENTS FROM THE U.S. THAT COST THEM FROM \$9.00 TO \$19.00 PER TON SHIPPING COSTS.

FOR SEVERAL YEARS WE'VE HEARD TALK OF THIS PROBLEM, AND ALL WE HAVE GOTTEN BACK IS "BUCK PASSING" BY THE GRAIN TRADE BACK TO THE FARMER AND LOCAL ELEVATOR OPERATOR.

A 1984 WHEAT QUALITY STUDY BY THE STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE

AND THE WHEAT COMMISSION SHOWS THE PERCENTAGE OF FOREIGN MATERIAL IN KANSAS

WHEAT LEAVING KANSAS WITH ONLY ONE-TENTH OF ONE-PERCENT.

HERE WE HAVE PROOF OF SAMPLES TAKEN FROM RAIL CARS ARRIVING AT TERMINAL MARKETS FROM KANSAS ELEVATORS IN EXCELLENT SHAPE, YET ARRIVING AT FOREIGN PORTS WITH HIGH AMOUNTS OF UNMILLABLE FOREIGN MATERIAL.

THESE TWO AGENCIES HAVE ALREADY IDENTIFIED A PROBLEM COSTLY NOT ONLY TO THE KANSAS WHEAT FARMER AND THE KANSAS ECONOMY, BUT ALL AMERICAN WHEAT PRODUCERS.

I THINK IT IS TIME THE LEGISLATURE DEALS WITH THIS PROBLEM OF FOREIGN MATERIAL ENTERING OUR GRAIN SOMEWHERE BETWEEN THE KANSAS BORDER AND THE FOREIGN PORTS OF ENTRY.

WE KNOW FROM PAST EXPERIENCE ANSWERS TO THIS QUESTION WILL NOT COME FORTH VOLUNTARILY, THEREFORE, WE WOULD URGE THE MEMBERS OF THIS AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE TO RESTORE LINES 150 THRU 171 TO SENATE BILL 631.

THANK YOU

I am Mary Harper and I come in support of SB 631. Our family farm produces wheat, one of the most important food and feed grains.

I feel this would help open and maintain an avenue of communication with other grain producers. We have been told that other states wish to cooperate in this and, if so, all the grain states would investigate all possibilities of grain marketing and uses.

I believe if all grain producing states made a concerted effort to develop, investigate and regulate our business we surely would benefit.

I have long believed that there are many outside entities who have far more control and influence over our grains than we producers, and believe a thorough investigation of our markets and marketing would benefit us all.

I believe our grain, as soon as we have to sell, is used to control international markets and agreements over which we producers have no control. Perhaps if a commission of grain states investigated and promoted grain uses, and looked into the possibility of intrigue by multinational marketers we could regain some control. We certainly believe we must control our production and marketing if we are to regain any sort of solvency in our state.

Thank you.

3-6-86 Sen. Ag. attachment 3