

For example, one case that we brought against three small banks in New Jersey, the *Hunterdon County Bank* case, involved the fixing of uniform service charges by these banks.

A consent decree was entered into in this case; there is no question about the facts in the case. They did it openly. They didn't attempt to conceal what had been done. The bringing of this case and the bringing of this consent decree were very widely publicized in banking circles and they resulted in the issuance of an order by the Comptroller of the Currency to all national banks.

That resulted in the institution of an enforcement program by the Comptroller of the Currency and I am certain if you talk to bankers that this case has had a profound effect throughout the banking world even though it was itself a small case.

On the other hand, it is not true that the predominance of our cases have been small or trivial in any sense.

In the automobile field, we have brought cases against General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler. The last administration in the automobile field, I think may have had a case against General Motors, although not involving automobiles, which our cases have; involving automobiles they brought cases against Renault, Hambro, and Volkswagen.

In the communications field we have brought a case against Columbia Broadcasting Co. and against MCA, which was accused of being—and we believe was—essentially a monopoly in the entire talent field.

As I say, in steel we have brought cases against United States Steel and against Bethlehem. You can go down the categories, and we have not neglected the big companies. We have no warrant, we have no authority, simply to go into a field and say there are three or four or five big companies, and, therefore, they must be broken up.

However, we have not avoided bringing cases against big companies, either.

Where we have found big companies engaged in activities that were anticompetitive, antitrust suits have been instituted, and certainly the big companies are watched more carefully with respect to merger activities.

We have a case against the Ford Motor Co., because of its acquisition of Autolite assets, which involves spark plugs and certain other automobile parts.

Senator PROXMIRE. I will have some more questions; my time is up.

Chairman PATMAN. Federal agencies, Judge, are required to report only in the case of procurements made at \$10,000 or more, where identical bids are found in line items valued at \$2,500 or more. How significant is this latter exclusion? It seems to me it invites splitting of a bid of, say, \$10,000 in five pieces where you expect identical bids so as to avoid reporting.

Mr. LOEVINGER. I am not able to answer altogether on this, Congressman Patman.

Chairman PATMAN. Suppose you answer, then, for the record when you look at your transcript.

Mr. LOEVINGER. I am not sure I can give a much better answer later. These things were worked out in cooperation and consultation with the procurement agencies.

We have no reason to believe that the procurement officer of Defense and GSA were anything other than highly cooperative and doing their very best to help us work out practical limits and practical criteria for securing the best possible reporting.