



THE HUNTING SHACK, INC.

4406 Rathbun Ln. Stevensville, MT. 59870-6139

Phone: (406) 777-2106 Fax: (406) 777-3908

Email: mail@thehuntingshack.com Web Page <http://www.thehuntingshack.com>

EXHIBIT 8

DATE 3-9-05

HB S21

Senate Bill 90

Testimony of William E. Campbell, President

The Hunting Shack, Inc.

In hearing, before the Senate, State Administration Committee. January 25, 2001

- I) Introduction
 - a) William Campbell.
 - i) President and Majority Owner The Hunting Shack, Inc.
 - ii) Member of the "National Federation of Independent Businesses" who also support this legislation.
 - iii) In business 33 years.
 - iv) Law Enforcement ammunition Distributor for:
 - (1) HS Munitions, Inc.
 - (2) CCI/ Speer.
 - (a) For the Rocky Mtn. region.
 - (3) Winchester.
 - (a) For the Rocky Mtn. region
 - v) Distributor, or dealer of many other shooting supplies such as:
 - (1) Sierra Bullets.
 - (2) Hornady Bullets.
 - (3) Sole Distributor of CCI/Speer loading components in the US to the manufacturing community.

II) Our Position.

a) We are in support of SB-90.

i) Engaged in bidding for contracts in and out of state for many years.

(1) These out of state contracts would include:

(a) State of Colorado

(b) State of California

(c) State of Utah

(d) State of Texas

(e) State of Idaho

(i) As well as many other State, County, and Municipal contracts.

ii) Found that our business inside of Montana is small due to the limited amount of Law Enforcement in the state. (Less than 1%)

iii) Our experience is that most small businesses within Montana that sell to government, must bid out of state to survive.

iv) Due to reciprocation of in state preference, we have lost millions of dollars worth of out of state contracts.

v) Even in states where we are the sole factory distributor, and have bid less than other bidders, we have lost bids due to this.

vi) Businesses who bid for government contracts would be reluctant to move to Montana under the current law that includes "In State Preference".

vii) Businesses currently here often must move to other states where they do not suffer the reverse discrimination of bidding preference.

viii) Businesses such as ours who want to stay in Montana would be more competitive for business in other states.

II) Conclusion.

a) We support the passage of SB-90 as drafted.

b) We will not loose an appreciable amount of business within Montana.

c) We will gain a significant amount of government business from outside Montana.

Respectfully Submitted,



William E. Campbell

Negative Effects of Bid Preferences on a Montana Business

In 1999, Intelicom Inc. lost the opportunity of over \$150,000 worth of business from the State of New York as a direct result of retaliatory legislation against Montana who has what they call "discriminatory jurisdiction." We refer to this "discrimination" as "contract preferences." This lost opportunity translates into 1 and 1/2 jobs the people of Montana did not receive that year as a price to keep this legislation. This was for only one company for business lost in only one state for only one year. New York is an extreme case, but the potential volume of business is significant for a small growing Belgrade, Montana company where every contract counts. In fact, we barely broke even that year after spending 2 years trying to get their business.

Most states that we do business with have reciprocal penalties tacked on to our bid that give us a bidding disadvantage. This bidding disadvantage not only gives a bidding advantage to their in-state bidders, but is also a bidding disadvantage for us against bidders from other states who do not have this bidding penalty added because they have no preference laws to reciprocate against.

A superficial view of this issue may lead one to believe that a preference law gives Montana residents a greater advantage over out-of-staters with respect to state bidding. A larger view reveals that we are so busy trying to figure out how to split up our relatively small pot of money within the state, we are ignoring a huge opportunity to bring a lot more money into Montana from other states.

Like it or not, we are increasingly faced with having to find more ways to be competitive in a national and worldwide economy. Facing thirty-four (34) other states who penalize us from doing business with their state governments is not what anyone can call business friendly policy for the state of Montana. It is a discouragement for businesses to stay here, especially if a company is completely barred from doing business with one of the largest markets in the country.

There has been a lot of talk about improving business climate in Montana to provide better, higher paying jobs. As well meaning as the preference legislation was originally, it has, unfortunately, become a bane to our economic well-being.

~~Revising~~ this law will not only provide more opportunity to stimulate our state's economy, it will reduce the cost of administration by eliminating the special handling required by our state procurement when these preferences are claimed on bids.

Respectfully,



Trygve F. Dahle III, President
Intelicom Incorporated



STATE OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ALBANY, N. Y. 12232

JOSEPH M. BOARDMAN
COMMISSIONER

GEORGE E. PATAKI
GOVERNOR

April 7, 1999

Mr Lonnie Bos
Intelicom, Incorporated
P O. Box 239
Belgrade, MT 59714-0239

Dear Mr Bos,

Thank you for your recent bid on Portable Truck-Mounted Variable Message Signs. Unfortunately, I must inform you that I have recently become aware of a circumstance which will prohibit the State of New York from awarding a contract to Intelicom.

Specifically, a New York State Statute known as the Omnibus Procurement Act of 1992 (amended 1994), provides that if a bidder's principal place of business is located in a state that penalizes New York State vendors, and if the goods or services they offer will be substantially produced or performed outside New York State, the Omnibus Procurement Act of 1994 amendments (Chapter 684, Laws of 1994) requires that they be denied contracts that they would otherwise obtain.

According to information on file with the New York State Department of Economic Development, the State of Montana maintains a preference to in-state suppliers in its procurement programs. This in-state preference serves to deny award of Montana contracts to certain out-of-state (including New York State) businesses attempting to do business in your state. Since Intelicom's principal place of business is located in Montana, I have no choice but to deny award of this contract.

I regret that this action became necessary, but please understand that I must abide by New York State Statute. I might suggest that you contact your State Senator or Assemblyman in hopes of persuading the State of Montana to change its procurement practices so as to remove in-state preference laws. If you wish further information regarding this statute, contact Ms. Katherine Loucks, Division for Small Business, Empire State Development, One Commerce Plaza, Albany, New York 12245. Ms. Loucks can be reached by telephone at (518) 473-0499.

Regretfully,

CHRISTOPHER J. MAGIN
Purchasing Agent, NYSDOT