|                                     |  | A                | Approved                    | Date                   |             |
|-------------------------------------|--|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| MINUTES OF THEH                     | OUSE COMMITTEE   | ON <u>AGRICU</u> | LTURE AND SI                | MALL BUSINESS          |             |
| The meeting was called to           | order by <u>Represe</u>                                  | entative Cli     | fford V. Car<br>Chairperson | mpbell                 | at          |
| <u>9:05</u> a.m./ <b>§</b> .‰. on _ | February 18  |                  | , 19_8.7in roo              | om <u>423</u> —S of th | ne Capitol. |
| All members were present            | except: Representa<br>excused.                           | _                | Goossen, and                | d Dean, who we         | ere         |
| Committee staff present:            | Norman Furse, Re<br>Raney Gilliland,<br>Pat Brunton, Com | Legislativ       | e Research I                |                        |             |

Conferees appearing before the committee: Sam Brownback, Kansas Secretary of Agriculture

Ivan W. Wyatt, President, Kansas Farmers Union

Chris Walker, Kansas National Farmers Organization

James S. Maag, Director of Research, Kansas Bankers Association

Victor J. Olson, Vice President, First State Bank, Burlingame

Hearings were held on HB 2254 - fourteen day notice of terms of sale of agricultural land.

Sam Brownback testified in favor of the bill stating this was a personal appeal and not that of Board of Agriculture or the Governor. He urged acceptance of this bill and further stated it can help both debtor and creditor, Attachment I.

Ivan W. Wyatt gave testimony supporting HB 2254, Attachment II.

Chris Walker gave brief testimony supporting HB 2254. He stated that perhaps it would save a family homestead.

James S. Maag testified against HB 2254 recommending that the bill be reported adversely, Attachment III.

Victor J. Olson testified against HB 2254 asking that the committee kill the bill, Attachment IV.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:01 a.m.

The next meeting of the House Agriculture and Small Business Committee will be Thursday, February 19, 1987, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 423-S.

COMMITTEE: HOUSE AGRICULTURE AND SMALL BUSINESS DATE: February 18, 1987

| NAME (PLEASE PRINT) | ADDRESS        | COMPANY/ORGANIZATION |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Chyp Wheelen        | Topeka         | McGill & Associates  |
| 4 Harling           | · Wachena      |                      |
| Reth Bauman         | Wathers        |                      |
| Cluck Stones        | Topeka         | KS Bankers Assoc.    |
| VICTOR J. OLSON     | BURLINGAME, KS |                      |
| 3 Mountael          | Torcely        | BOA                  |
| Iranh. Wgat         | M'Charson      | Ks Farmers Union     |
| Chris It alker      | mayetta        | To. NFO              |
| Lauria Hanteman     | Toneha         | KBA                  |
| SimMano.            | 11             | KDA                  |
| Soul Wilght         | Lopika         | KCUL                 |
|                     |                |                      |
|                     |                |                      |
|                     |                |                      |
|                     |                |                      |
|                     |                |                      |
|                     |                |                      |
|                     |                |                      |
|                     |                |                      |
|                     |                |                      |
|                     |                |                      |
|                     |                |                      |
|                     |                |                      |
|                     |                |                      |
|                     |                |                      |
|                     |                |                      |

## Statement in Support of 14-Day Notice Given on Upset Price House Bill 2254

## by Sam Brownback

This is a personal appeal and not that of Board of Agriculture or the Governor.

## Essence of Proposal:

If creditor states price will bid, debtor or even other purchasers will have opportunity to arrange financing to possibly purchase land. Gets more money to creditors, quicker and land back into private hands.

# Present System:

No one knows upset price until day of the sale.

Difficult to arrange financing.

If combine with tract selling, arrangements can be made ahead of time with family, friends, investors or other lenders to allow for downsizing without hurting the creditor.

I urge your acceptance of this bill. It can help both debtor and creditor.

State ment

Ivan W. Wyatt, President Kansos Formers Union

14B-2254 (Providing 14 day notices of creditor Bid) before

The House Committee on Agriculture Swell Businesses

Feb 18, 1987

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. I am Ivan Wyatt, President Konsos Farmers Union.

We support HB-2254.

It seems that almost out of courtery to the defendant owner, the creditor would notify them of their intended bid on a fore closed land sole.

In most, if not all cases the creditor bid would be a bil to cover the loon and would not be an investment bid It is hard to rationalize why the bid amount would need to be secretive.

If the bidding of the land sale is to be an open competitive bid, especially on smaller parcels of land, a notification of the amount the creditor bid could very well cause more bidders to become

Feb. 18, 1987

involved in the land sale, there by en honcing the sale to every ones beingt.

Thank you

February 18, 1987

TO: House Committee on Agriculture and Small Business

FROM: Kansas Bankers Association

RE: HB 2254 - An Act Relating to Execution Sale of Certain Agricultural Land

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

The Kansas Bankers Association appreciates the opportunity to appear before the Committee on the provisions of  $\frac{HB}{2254}$ . We strongly believe this is unnecessary legislation which will only diminish even further the willingness of creditors to extend financing to their agricultural customers. We have seen at the federal and state level in recent years a constant stream of legislation which makes it difficult, if not impossible, for creditors to protect their collateral on agricultural loans. The Family Farm Rehabilitation Act of 1986, Section 1324 of the 1985 Food Security Act and the new Chapter 12 bankruptcy act are only the most recent examples. These legal impediments to contractual rights have steadily reduced the number of banks, insurance companies and other lenders who are willing to extend agricultural credit.

Many Kansas bankers have written to the KBA expressing strong opposition to  $\frac{SB}{2254}$  and to  $\frac{SB}{56}$  which contains similar provisions. You will be hearing oral testimony from Kansas bankers who have been involved in agricultural lending for many years as to their reasons why  $\frac{HB}{2254}$  is unsound legislation, but we would also like to share with you the comments of one Kansas banker which also reflects the thinking of many Kanss ag bankers about this bill. In his letter to the KBA he states:

"....the lender surely should not be further burdened in his efforts to finally foreclose and salvage what is left of his security. farm debtor presently has and should only have the right to bid in at the foreclosure sale what he thinks the land is then worth. lender presently has and should retain the same right, most especially as regards existing farm credit extended on the basis of the law then The lender and borrower should at least be on equal in effect. The lender should have until the time of grounds in this regard. sheriff's sale to develop prospective customer's for the mortgaged land and try to limit his losses, possibly by providing financing for the purchaser of such land at the auction. The lender will be placed at a substantial disadvantage by being required to notify the debtor fourteen days in advance of the sale as to what price the lender will bid in the land at the sale. Why not require the debtor to similarly notify the lender as to his bid price also? The lender should retain

Office of Executive Vice President • 707 Merchants National Building Eighth and Jackson • Topeka, Kansas 66612 • (913) 232-3444

House Committee on Agriculture and Small Business February 18, 1987 Page Two

his right to analyze the number, type, net worth and proximity to the land of the bidders appearing at the auction and to then make a determination as to how hight to carry the bid. In many instances the lender will let the bid go at less than the amount of credit outstanding if he at that time feels that the bid price is as much as he would be able to realize for the land at private sale. I submit, however, that the lender should have the right to bid in the land at sheriff's sale for whatever price he might determine to bid at the time and to carry the land in inventory for a reasonable time in order to try to obtain a higher price and reduce a portion of his losses. The lender has already lost a substantial portion of his loan or the land would not be in foreclosure."

There are also several technical and procedural questions which are not addressed in the bill. For instance, what constitutes "notice" and what proof must the creditor show that proper notice was sent? What is the time frame for the debtor to bring action to void the sale? What if the purchaser, if he is someone other than the creditor, assumes possession of the land immediately after the sheriff's sale and makes improvements on the property prior to the time the sale is voided on the action of the debtor? Would the creditor then be liable for further damages to the purchaser? The bill is also silent as to what happens after the sale is voided and the purchaser has been reimbursed. Has the creditor forfeited his entire interest in the mortgaged land or can he institute further proceedings for the sale of the land? How would such a situation conflict with the provisions of K.S.A. 60-2414(o) which prohibits second sales?

Thank you for the opportunity to express our viewpoint on this legislation. Because of the questions and reasons states above, the Kansas Bankers Association strongly recommends that HB 2254 be reported adversely.

James S. Maag Director of Research

JSM/ljs

### HOUSE BILL 2254

Testimony

239

Victor J. Olson
Vice President & Agri. Rep.
First State Bank
Burlingame, Kansas 66413
February 18, 1987

#### GREETINGS

MEGOTIATIONS FIRST

LOST

Partnership

Marriage

Voluntary workout arrangements - Still GNE TEAM

Class 4 to class 2 --- 2 years

Joint Cooperation: Farmers & Bankers

Aural America: Friends, Neighbors, Chruch Members.

Lodge Brothers, etc...

FORECLOSURE - Divorce

Last resort - All else has failed

Rural Banks - Wait too long

Court ordered procedure

Public auction - Level playing field

NOW HAVE SEPERATE TEAMS

Debtor - Lawyer

Banker - Lawyer

Meighbor bidders

Public auction - MOT A SEALED BID SALE

Bank: Bid Loan + Interest

Bank: Bid estimated/appraised value

Can raise that bid in auction process

DEBTOR'S RIGHT TO VIOD SALE

Futher restricts the Banks flewibility

Montgage Monatonium Act - 3 years

Clear title

Chapter 12

High numbers of Farm-Bank Failures

Violates "Right of Contract"

Could be Unconstitutional

Could provide debtor with one last "JAB" at the Bank

REAL BOAL OF BANKS

Recorvey of bank's assets & customers deposit

LET US ALL REMEMBER AND LIMDERSTAND

We don't have the resorces to save all the farmers

Mill HB #2254 right here in this committee

Allow us the opportunity to help those whom we can Foreclosure: Always the LAST RESORT

AMERICA: Land of Opportunity

We all take risks

Success

Failure