32—Lancaster Farming, Saturday, December 16, 1978 ... Penna. fertilizer dealers

* (Continued from Page 1) results on quality control tests, and that in turn

generates negative publicity. The industry is concerned about all of the above, and they maintain that their difficulties do not by any means end there.

The problem is complex and finding answers could be a costly proposition. In the end it will be the farmer who will have to pay for the extra expenses incurred with strict quality standards.

Some fertilizer people argue that the economics involved are presently prohibitive. Also, one of the strongest points made here was that the expense wouldn't be justified since the majority of products are already in compliance with standards. Furthermore, most variations do not cheat the farmer or hurt his crops. But the quest for improvement goes on. It goes

on partially because government regulations

demand it, and also because the industry recognizes its shortcomings. On top of all that, agricultural productivity must be maintained and farmers want and deserve dependable products.

The road to improvement has been marked with potholes of misunderstandings, however.

What was heard here repeatedly during discussions was that the fertilizer people believe

Pennsylvania's Fertilizer Law is not being administered as fairly as it could be. Emphasizing that they see a need for regulations, they are nonetheless quick to defend themselves against charges of dishonesty.

Most shortages in quality guarantees were explained here as being nearly impossible to avoid under present practical circumstances. That being the case, then reason dictates that most violations occur unintentionally. Spokesmen here made it plain that if an individual or firm is indeed adultering products, then

they want to see it stopped as and not enough about our much as Pennsylvania Agriculture Secretary Kent Shelhamer, who championed the Fertilizer Law. It went into effect early this year.

Shelhamer regards Act 86, The Pennsylvania Fertilizer Law, as one of the finest measures for quality assurance to the farmer. He took pride in proposing the legislation which led to the Act, and defends the monetarily program zealously.

While they have no objection to the law itself, some attending dealers here claimed that the administration of it brands them as "chiselers" if a sample comes up with something less than was guaranteed on the lable.

The fertilizer people resent this effect of the law and they are trying hard to amend the record.

Said one: "Maybe we have worried too much about agronomics and the farmer

own image."

Several of the parks ticipating fertilizer dealers here also concluded that even if a sample comes up on the short side with one fertilizer ingredient, it may well be high in another. The net result, they claim, is that the value of the fertilizer is actually present both and agronomically. In reality, the farmer wasn't being cheated, nor were his crops hurt.

On their quest for the top national ranking, the fertilizer men face the nearly insurmountable problem of product separation. While they admit it can be done, they say it would be very costly. They doubt that the farmer would be willing to foot the extra expense.

(Turn to Page 37)





The manner in which fertilizer is handled and stored plays an important role in how an analysis will come out in the laboratory. All procedures during the workshop held at the Webb Super-Gro

Co., Mill Hall, were conducted under the watchful eyes of fertilizer inspectors, dozens of industrymen, and several journalists.

