

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 6

MARCH 18, 1968, TO MARCH 27, 1968

(PAGES 6737 TO 8056)

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:  
H.R. 16129. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. AYRES, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ESCH, Mr. ESHLEMAN, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 16130. A bill to establish a Department of Education and Manpower; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RYAN:  
H.R. 16131. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove certain limitations (added by the Social Security Amendments of 1967) on the payment of benefits to aliens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:  
H.R. 16132. A bill to provide for the cooperation between the Secretary of the Interior and the States with respect to the future regulation of surface mining operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEVILL:  
H.R. 16133. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to area acid and other mine water pollution control demonstrations; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DANIELS (for himself and Mr. PERKINS):

H.R. 16134. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend the authorization of grants to States for rehabilitation services, to broaden the scope of goods and services available under that act for the handicapped, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:  
H.R. 16135. A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day-care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACHEN:  
H.R. 16136. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability payments for certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PURCELL:  
H.R. 16137. A bill to encourage the movement of butter into domestic commercial markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAYLOR:  
H.R. 16138. A bill to impose, under certain conditions, import limitations on metal ores or metals during labor disputes affecting domestic production of such articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:  
H.R. 16139. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to facilitate the provision of reliable, abundant, and economical electric power supply by strengthening existing mechanisms for coordination of electric utility systems and encouraging the instal-

lation and use of the products of advancing technology with due regard for the proper conservation of scenic and other natural resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAGGONER:  
H.R. 16140. A bill to declare and determine the policy of the Congress with respect to the primary authority of the several States to control, regulate and manage fish and wildlife within their territorial boundaries and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WAMPLER:  
H.R. 16141. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from requiring an annual income statement from certain pensioners who are 72 years of age or older; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:  
H.J. Res. 1193. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to designate the month of May 1968, as National Arthritis Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:  
H.J. Res. 1194. Joint resolution authorizing the President proclaim August 11, 1968, as Family Reunion Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTTON:  
H. Con. Res. 725. Concurrent resolution to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DUNCAN:  
H. Con. Res. 726. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS (for himself, and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts):  
H. Con. Res. 727. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to interest on obligations of States and municipalities and other political subdivisions of the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:  
H. Con. Res. 728. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:  
H. Con. Res. 729. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:  
H. Con. Res. 730. Concurrent resolution to secure repayment of certain obligations

owed to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:  
H. Res. 1108. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the question of restoration of diplomatic relations with Egypt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:  
H.R. 16142. A bill for the relief of Cosimo Rega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:  
H.R. 16143. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Battista Giambanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:  
H.R. 16144. A bill for the relief of Osvaldo Giacomello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:  
H.R. 16145. A bill for the relief of Stefano Guercio, his wife Elvira Guercio, and their minor children Rosaria Guercio and Guiseppe Guercio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16146. A bill for the relief of Ionnis Yakalos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:  
H.R. 16147. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Vittore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:  
H.R. 16148. A bill for the relief of Mekeril Amiri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16149. A bill for the relief of Candida Lo Gatto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:  
H.R. 16150. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Vancheri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:  
H.R. 16151. A bill for the relief of Jozef Lugosi also known as Josef Lipt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:  
H.R. 16152. A bill for the relief of Anthony Smilko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

266. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of Philadelphia, Pa., relative to recommendations of the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

267. Also, petition of Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica, relative to importation of Latin American products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Federal Meat Inspection

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1968

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Federal Meat Inspection Amendments Act of 1967 was one of the most significant pieces of consumer-protection legislation ever signed into law. I am honored to have been able to play an important role in the development of the legislation. I am also grateful to the millions of Americans who felt as I did on

the issue and made the wishes of the consuming public clearly known to the Congress.

Credit for the enactment of this landmark legislation must also be given to the excellent analysis of the meat inspection situation and the coverage given congressional consideration of the matter by newspapers throughout the country. One series of articles, authored by Paul M. Branzburg and published by the Louisville Courier-Journal and Times, was particularly outstanding. I commend Mr. Branzburg for his excellent reporting and analysis, and I commend the Louisville Courier-Journal and Times, for presenting its readers with an oppor-

tunity to examine such factual presentations of a situation jeopardizing the health and well-being of every American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that articles by Mr. Branzburg be reprinted in their entirety in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal and Times]

STATES MUST PLUG IT BY 1970: DESPITE NEW U.S. LAW, MEAT-INSPECTION GAP EXISTS

(By Paul M. Branzburg)

Sixty-two years ago, author Upton Sinclair wrote about "meat stored in great piles"

at Chicago packinghouses "and thousands of rats would race on it. . . . The packers would put poisoned bread out for them, they would die and then rats, bread and meat would go into the hoppers together."

Last summer, a federal meat inspector reported that the beef cooler, boning room and product-holding room of an intrastate meat-processing plant in Northern Kentucky was "all contaminated from accumulated grease and filth."

In the slaughter room, the inspector wrote, "the walls, ceiling, floors were filthy, fly-covered; in fact, everything visible was badly in need of a thorough cleaning."

Sinclair's findings led to passage of the federal Meat Inspecting Act of 1907.

The inspector's report on the Northern Kentucky plant—since closed by state officials—was cited in the drive that led to enactment of the federal Wholesome Meat Act signed by President Johnson Dec. 15.

This new law has one purpose: To protect America's consumers by forcing the states to tighten quality safeguards on all meat, wherever processed, wherever sold.

In Kentucky, for example, meat produced for sale in other states is examined rigorously by federal inspectors. But meat produced for sale within Kentucky may or may not be inspected at all.

The housewife in a Kentucky grocery store usually has no way of knowing which meat has been inspected, which hasn't. Several million pounds of uninspected meat were sold in just that way last year. Yet, for all the housewife knows, the steak or chop or sausage she buys may have come from a sick animal; or may have been processed in a slaughterhouse among descendants of the same rats that so disturbed Upton Sinclair 62 years ago.

#### U.S. STANDARDS HIGHEST

Some states do have mandatory inspection of all meat. Such a law will go into effect July 1 in Indiana. But no state, in the opinion of many who pressed Congress for the 1967 law, comes even close to the high U.S. standards required for meat that crosses state lines.

Under the new law, the states have two years to create inspection programs for meat processed and sold intrastate that are at least the equal of federal standards for meat in interstate commerce. If they fail to do this—with a possible one-year extension if the Secretary of Agriculture is convinced they're trying—they will become subject to U.S. inspection.

What this means for Kentucky, then, is either a federal take-over in December 1970 at the latest, or passage by the current General Assembly of an acceptable meat-inspection act. Gov. Louie B. Nunn reportedly has pledged to push for the required legislation. No timetable has been suggested for implementing such a law. But its cost to the state has been estimated to run as high as \$1 million annually—with the U.S. hopefully putting up half.

In any event, the shopping housewife can't hope for complete, guaranteed safety for an indefinite period of time. And that means a continuation, for now, of many of the conditions that federal inspectors reported finding last summer in visiting meat plants in 37 states. For example:

In Cincinnati, an inspector wrote, "the table, shovels, tubs, tank, trucks, etc. were dirty from poor clean-up" at an intrastate slaughterhouse. "The stuffer inside plunger was dirty and contaminated." In another area of the plant, "all the equipment, the walls and ceilings were covered with loose fat, blood, and accumulated filth."

In Indiana, a federal inspector visited the state's "largest nonfederally inspected slaughtering and meat processing plant" on July 27, 1967. In the pork and beef cutting room, "the equipment was contaminated and

rusty. . . . The equipment, such as splitting saws, the hog viscera table and all the associated equipment on the floors were badly in need of cleaning." The conditions were similar in the beef holding coolers, the sausage department and the shipping and receiving docks.

In Pennsylvania, a federal official found one intrastate packing operation which he termed "one of the most deplorable plants I ever saw. Not a clean area in the building. . . . The files were so numerous it was next to impossible to carry on a conversation with the operator."

In Louisiana, an intrastate packinghouse was described by a federal inspector as a "old and visibly filthy. All of the walls are stained with greenish slime. . . . The grinder, chopper, mixer and all other utensils used in the manufacture of meat products are old, rusty, and dirty and appear repulsive. Contamination of the food products produced at this plant is inevitable."

In Oklahoma, a meat plant was described by a federal official as a "revolting. . . . The walls were covered with grime, grease and mold. One beef carcass had an infected brisket and another had a large knee joint which appeared to be arthritic. . . . A butcher was boning out a beef round which had sour bone and the meat near the bone was greenish colored."

Testimony such as this from one federal inspector after another, plus public pushing by such consumer spokesmen as Betty Furness and Ralph Nader, is given much of the credit for passage of the new U.S. law.

But some sour notes remain. Officials in a number of states have complained that some of the federal inspection reports were slanted on Washington's orders, to win passage of the law. Despite Agriculture Department denials that this was so, some states are currently debating whether to seek a congressional inquiry.

In Kentucky, for example, officials of the state Department of Health were angered that the federal inspector who visited Northern Kentucky didn't ask them about the plant he found "all contaminated from accumulated filth and grease" and with "filthy, fly-covered" walls.

#### LITTLE TO CHEER ABOUT

In truth, the Health Department officials claim, they already were planning to close down the place and later did so.

Kentucky consumers can take some consolation from that achievement, whatever its cause, although mountains of unsavory inspection reports on plants that haven't closed offer little reason to cheer.

But the new Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 does offer some immediate relief, helping to bridge the gap between now and late 1969. It does give the U.S. Department of Agriculture the power to seize and condemn adulterated meat at intrastate plants; and it also allows federal officials to place under immediate federal inspection any intrastate plant currently producing adulterated meat or meat food products "which would clearly endanger the public health."

However, the Agriculture Department does not yet have the manpower to efficiently patrol the nation's 15,000 intrastate slaughterers and processors.

At the moment, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has done little more to expand its meat inspection personnel than to authorize its Consumer and Marketing Service to hire 75 additional meat inspectors.

The goal is to hire about 500 additional meat inspectors and other personnel by June 30, 1968. But this is easier said than done. Of the 3,300 federal inspectors, nearly 800 are veterinarians. And veterinarians are in scarce supply. So are men with the background and experience to become lay meat inspectors.

Although the delayed effect of the new

federal law and the shortage of personnel pose obvious problems, there is a brighter side.

Only 16 per cent of the commercial slaughtering for meat is done in nonfederally inspected plants, although 19 million animals are involved. And only 26 per cent of the nation's meat supply is processed (cut up and packaged) in intrastate plants, although they produce 8.75 billion pounds of meat each year.

Moreover, of course, the mere fact that a plant is not federally inspected is not a sure sign of filth and contamination there.

In mid-1967, there were 14,832 nonfederally inspected facilities—compared with 1,969 federal plants—and 5,555 had some form of state sanitation inspection.

Another way to assess the extent of the problem is to look at the state laws governing meat inspection.

Nine states have no laws covering meat inspection, before and after slaughter, although they may have general laws about plant sanitation or food-package labeling.

Thirteen states, including Kentucky, have voluntary meat inspection programs. These leave it up to the packer to decide if he will participate.

#### SANITATION INSPECTIONS REQUIRED

Twenty-six states—Indiana will become the 27th on July 1—have mandatory meat inspection providing for inspection of animals before and after slaughter.

Also, 25 states, including Kentucky, have laws providing for mandatory sanitation inspections of meat processing facilities. In Indiana, such inspections have been carried out under the state Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and the state Public Health Code's Sanitary Food Law.

There are also municipal and county meat inspection systems throughout America. In Kentucky, meat inspection programs administered by the local departments of public health are in effect in Jefferson, Fayette, McCracken, Warren, Davless and Kenton counties.

But the fact that a state or city has a meat inspection system is not a sure sign of cleanliness. All the states involved in the federal reports that have been cited in the article, have either mandatory or voluntary inspection laws.

An official of the U.S. Department of Agriculture testified before a House subcommittee last June that "administrators of state meat inspection programs generally admit that they have neither the money nor manpower to conduct an intensive, continuous inspection service for both slaughtering and processing operations."

And Rep. Thomas S. Foley, D-Wash., had this to say in testifying before a Senate subcommittee.

"I said on the House floor that if there was a member from any state in the United States who believes that his own state meat-inspection standards were equal to the standards of the federal system of meat inspection, he should speak up.

"No one spoke up because no state has such a system."

#### THIRTY-SEVEN INSPECTORS CHECK KENTUCKY PLANTS: U.S. RULES COVER ANIMALS FROM FARM TO TABLE

The federal meat-inspection standards that all states must conform to by Dec. 15, 1970, cover everything from the health of animals to be slaughtered to the amount of fat allowed in hamburger.

In Kentucky, 37 inspectors enforce these regulations in 21 federally inspected plants, working under the Meat Inspection Division of the Agriculture Department's Consumer and Marketing Service.

Twenty-one of the inspectors work full-time at Louisville's three federally inspected plants that have both slaughtering and

processing operations. Thirteen are assigned to Klarer of Kentucky Inc., and Fischer Packing Co.

These men must assure adherence to a long and complicated collection of regulations. Very generally, the rules provide for:

Easily cleanable equipment and facilities. Package labels approved by the Meat Inspection Service.

Examination of animals before and after slaughtering.

Reinspection after products have already been inspected and passed, to insure wholesomeness.

Conformance to content standards. For example, "Hamburger . . . shall not contain more than 30 per cent of fat."

Central to the entire process is examination before and after slaughter.

Inspection beforehand is made in the pens on the premises of the establishment in which the animals are about to be killed. It consists mainly of visual inspection of each animal.

After this examination, the animal is either passed for slaughter, tagged "U.S. Condemned" (unfit for consumption because it's diseased or dying), or tagged "U.S. Suspect."

The last category is used for animals suspected of having a disease that would cause condemnation of part or all of the animal on post-mortem examination. The tag remains with the carcass until post-mortem examination, when a final disposition is made by a veterinarian.

#### AFFECTED PARTS REMOVED

Nationally, between July 1, 1965 and June 30, 1966, 105 million animals were given federal examination before slaughter, with 9,531 condemned and 160,254 marked suspect.

Post-mortem examination is perhaps the best check against a diseased animal being passed for consumption. It is made only minutes after slaughter, and includes examination of the lymph glands, kidneys, heart, liver, lungs of every animal.

In fiscal 1966, 104.9 million carcasses were inspected after slaughter in interstate plants and 104.7 million were passed for food. Also, millions of animals were tagged for various diseases but passed for food after removal of the affected parts.

In addition, to slaughter-house examinations, federal meat inspection extends to checking on the sanitation of processors who ship interstate. Often the large slaughterers are also processors. But many processors, such as sausage manufacturers and beef boners, are not slaughterers. (In Louisville, eight processors have federal sanitation inspection.)

#### ONLY SIX COUNTIES CHECK PROCESSORS: MILLIONS OF POUNDS OF UNINSPECTED MEAT ARE SOLD IN KENTUCKY

(By Paul M. Branzburg)

Several million pounds of the meat sold in Kentucky last year went directly from processor to consumer without any health official ever checking to make sure that it was clean and free of disease.

Kentucky has no meat inspection law. And only six of the state's 120 counties have inspection laws of their own. Thus, in the other 114 counties, meat counters often display meat from cattle or hogs that has never been examined for disease.

This will change, of course, because of enactment in December of the federal Wholesome Meat Act. That law gives the states two years to adopt intrastate inspection standards at least as tough as those employed in interstate meat commerce by the U.S. government. The alternative, for states that don't comply is a full-fledged federal takeover of all inspection.

Kentucky's Gov. Louis B. Nunn reportedly has pledged to push in the current General Assembly for a state compliance law. One

hurdle is the estimated cost: up to \$1 million annually, with the federal government hopefully paying half.

Present Kentucky statutes do require sanitation inspections, to make sure packing-house premises and equipment are kept clean. But only one state official is assigned full-time to such duties. Even with occasional help, he is unable to see that the average intrastate facility is inspected more than two or three times yearly.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that 18 per cent or 94 million pounds of the commercially slaughtered meats produced in Kentucky in 1966 came from plants without federal inspection.

Of the approximately 190 "nonfederal" establishments in the state that either slaughter or process meat, or both, only 35 have state-supervised veterinary inspection.

Although many of Kentucky's intrastate meat plants run clean, sanitary operations, some have practices that may constitute health hazards.

#### STATEMENTS RAISE QUESTIONS

Consider these statements from randomly selected reports made by state health officials after visits to Kentucky packing-houses:

"The bacon slicing machine, light fixtures, and bacon press needed cleaning of grease and dust." (Sept. 15, 1967).

"Approximately 3,000 lbs. of salt bacon was contaminated with mouse pellets." (June 21, 1967).

"No soap was available in lavatories for use by employees . . . Cigarette butts were found on the floors in all processing areas, which indicated that employees were smoking while processing meat products." (May 10, 1967)

"Employee licking fingers to open sausage sacks at stuffing machine." (Dec. 5, 1967)

In these instances inspectors were checking only to insure that equipment and facilities of the plants were clean and that their products contained no unauthorized additives and were labeled properly.

Examination of animals to make sure they are neither diseased nor dying is conducted in intrastate plants only in the six counties with local laws requiring this and at plants planning to ship into those counties.

Jefferson, Fayette, McCracken, Warren, Daviess and Kenton have their own meat-inspection regulations.

In these counties, lay inspectors check each animal and hold any considered to be a possible health hazard for examination by county veterinarians. But the plants being checked pay all or part of the salaries of the lay inspectors, and state health officials say this can cause problems.

Three packers with meat inspection come under the supervision of the Louisville-Jefferson County Health Department.

They pay the department 45 cents for each cow slaughtered and 23 cents for each calf, sheep, swine or goat. The health department then uses this money—plus some of its own—to pay three lay inspectors who work at those slaughter houses.

In Paducah (McCracken County), meat inspection is entirely financed by the packers. They pay into an inspection fund 50 cents a head for beef and 35 cents a head for hogs.

In Bowling Green (Warren County), meat inspection is done by three local veterinarians who are paid by the packers.

"We don't have the money to pay them (the veterinarians) ourselves," says Warren County sanitarian Elmer Boies. "This is one of the bad things about the regulations."

#### MAY BE RELUCTANCE

"It's the best we can do," he adds. "But knowing the vets we have, I don't feel this would sway them one bit. In other words, we haven't seen any evidence that it has."

Shelby Johnson, director of the Office of Environmental Services of the Kentucky Department of Health, is not so sure. "There is a reluctance of inspectors to do the full job they should do when the packers are paying for it," he says.

Another problem in the six counties with meat inspection laws is that some county sanitation personnel become too friendly with slaughterers and processors because of long years of working together.

Dr. Ewell P. Conyers, the man in charge of state sanitation inspections, says that "It may be that the city inspectors aren't as stringent" as state health officials.

"Also," he adds, "If you go to the same place over and over, you may tend to overlook things. It's not good when the inspectors get to know the processors. They ought to change inspectors every once in a while."

#### STATE PERMITS REQUIRED

But state officials also say there are some difficulties in enforcing Kentucky's sanitation laws in meat plants.

All Kentucky slaughterers and meat processors must have state food and drug permits in order to operate. In order to qualify for these permits, which are re-issued each year, the meat plants must pass state sanitation inspections.

Obviously, checking on the cleanliness of equipment and facilities at some 190 meat plants and 65 ham processors in the state is a big job. And the Office of Environmental Services of the Kentucky Department of Health does not have sufficient personnel to inspect them with great frequency.

#### OTHER OFFICIALS EASE LOAD

Although Dr. Conyers receives some assistance from two or three other men, they are unable to appear often at 255 plants scattered throughout the state.

"We like for one of us to get into a place at least twice a year," says Dr. Conyers. "But if you've had trouble with the place, you go back more frequently."

In the six counties with meat inspection laws, his load is eased by the county sanitarians, county veterinarians and full-time lay inspectors who make before-and-after slaughter examinations.

The state Health Department is empowered to refuse re-issuance of a state food and drug permit to an unclean meat establishment, thereby putting the company out of business.

The department also can arrange for a commonwealth's, county or city attorney to proceed against a slaughterer or processor with an "unclean, unhealthy and unsanitary condition" for various fines and even imprisonment.

But such actions are infrequent.

#### SOME PASS INSPECTION: 20 SANITATION REPORTS RAISE DOUBTS ABOUT PROCESSING-PLANT CLEANLINESS

Twenty 1967 sanitation-inspection reports, selected at random, indicate the variety of conditions—good and bad—existing in intrastate slaughterhouses and meat-processing plants in Kentucky.

Violations ranged from flaking ceiling paint and cleaning water that was too cool, to mold in a meat saw and bacon contaminated with mouse pellets.

Here is a summary of the 20 inspection reports made by sanitation officials of the Kentucky Health Department:

#### WESTERN KENTUCKY

A sanitation report was obtained for each of seven plants in seven different counties of Western Kentucky.

Two plants had only relatively minor violations of the state sanitation law. The other five had problems such as dirty meat hooks, unclean meat saws, meat slicers and cutting

blocks. At two, no soap was available in the rest room or at the kill room wash basins.

In one plant, "cigarette butts were found on the floors in all processing areas, which indicated that employes were smoking while processing meat products."

At another, the water for cleaning equipment was 40 degrees cooler than the allowed minimum temperature.

At a third, more care was "needed in dressing of the hogs to remove loose hair, claws and other parts from the hog carcass."

#### JEFFERSON COUNTY AREA

The report covered a medium-sized ham-curing establishment in a county adjacent to Jefferson County. "Conditions were very acceptable," the inspector wrote after his visit there Sept. 22, 1967. He listed no violations.

#### CENTRAL KENTUCKY

Five sanitation inspection reports were obtained for meat establishments in the Blue Grass area.

Conditions at two well-known meat establishments in this area were generally satisfactory. However, in late 1967, an inspector at one of them wrote, "rat pellets and spilled bull meat binder observed on floor behind sacked ingredient materials." At the other, the inspector found open uncovered lard cans and an employe licking his fingers to open sausage sacks at the stuffing machine.

Two other plants had multiple violations for dirty facilities and equipment. The unsanitary conditions extended to saws, grinders, doors, walls, smoke racks, cutting boards and even the ceilings.

The last of the five plants had no significant problems.

#### NORTHERN KENTUCKY

Three inspection reports were obtained for Northern Kentucky.

All three plants have had multiple violations for dirty equipment.

State inspectors do not deem them in particularly bad condition, but two of the plants are fairly large. At one of them equipment such as the slicing machine and bacon press was dirty; and the ceiling was flaking paint at the other.

#### EASTERN KENTUCKY

Four reports were obtained for meat plants in the eastern end of the state.

At a small packinghouse in Southeastern Kentucky an inspector ordered 3,000 pounds of bacon washed because some slabs had been contaminated with mouse pellets. Also, there was a growth of mold in the interior of the meat saw. And, in addition to other dirty equipment, one ham was found with an infestation of dead ham skippers (maggots).

Two other reports from this area were less disturbing. One plant had some equipment and facilities that needed cleaning and the other only had one minor violation.

But at the fourth plant, rodent nesting materials were found in several places. A general cleaning was needed. Wrapped quartered beef was stored on the floor of a cooler. And several hundred packets of seasoning with artificial coloring were ordered returned to the manufacturer.

The state inspector thought the sanitation problem at this plant was significant.

He told the owner there would be another inspection in two to three weeks. The inspector also wrote:

"If, at the time of the next inspection, conditions have not essentially improved, resulting in a better state of sanitation, it is recommended that a notice be sent to . . . informing him of these violations and that if such appeared at the time of the next inspection, he will be afforded a hearing."

In the bureaucracy of sanitation inspection, this is considered a tough response.

#### JEFFERSON COUNTY RULES NO GUARANTEE OF CLEANLINESS: MANY MEAT FIRMS HAVE BLOTS ON THEIR SANITATION RECORDS

(By Paul M. Branzburg)

"There is a lot of meat sold without any supervision (inspection) . . . in isolated parts of the state or in the country," a Louisville-Jefferson County Health Department official said recently. "No one sees it except the individual who kills the animal."

When asked by his radio interviewer if any unsanitary meat is sold here, he swiftly answered no, and explained:

"Because Jefferson County has had for years an ordinance or a regulation in which it says that all meat and meat products shall be inspected before it can be sold."

But the facts are not that simple, and they're not guaranteed to bring smiles to the faces of housewives looking for bargains at the meat counter.

In a drawer of a green filing cabinet in the Health Department offices are hundreds of reports by state and city-county inspectors covering 45 Jefferson County meat slaughterers and processors—wholesalers who cut, grind or wrap meat.

Many of these reports bear the signature of the official who was interviewed on the radio program.

About half of the files would probably support an optimistic assessment of both the Health Department's efficiency and the state of meat sanitation in the county. The other files would not; in fact, they lend ammunition to those whose steady pressure over the years finally led to passage of the federal Wholesome Meat Act in 1967.

That law gives the states two years to apply to intrastate meat processing operations inspection standards as tough as those employed by the federal government on interstate meat commerce. States which fail to comply will lose out: The United States will simply take over inspection for them.

As Kentucky's current General Assembly prepares to grapple with the issue, it can draw on reams of state inspection reports that sketch out the enormity of the meat sanitation problem.

#### RODENT PELLETS OBSERVED

Only six of the state's 120 counties have both meat-inspection and sanitation laws of their own. Intrastate processors in the others are inspected only for sanitary conditions by an undermanned state Health Department. But even those counties which have their own inspectors, thus permitting more frequent visits to slaughterhouses and packing plants, report an often-disturbing pattern.

In Jefferson County, for example, more than a dozen meat processors or markets have major blots on their sanitation records.

Here are some quotations from reports on those and other plants:

"The control of rodents was not satisfactory in that rodent pellets were observed in two or three locations within the establishment, and also there were some holes along the baseboard which indicated rodent entrance ways." (Sept. 28, 1967)

"Frying chickens stored on floor—also near handwash bowl, subject to contamination by splash." (Oct. 20, 1965)

"Baskarts—grinder—patty table—tubs—boning table—meat block—shelves freezer door—doors to beef box—wood shelf used for fresh meat storage—back splash at processing table—all have an accumulation of waste that has collected over a period of time." (Feb. 28, 1967)

"Evidence of mice in room containing compressors and ingredients. Two dead mice in room at time of inspection." (Sept. 7, 1967)

"Some products—breeding compounds and bull beef binder contained weevils." (Oct. 5, 1967)

"The following equipment is not being adequately cleaned: slicer, tenderizer, grinder,

meat tubs, three-compartment sink has accumulation of grease and waste in corners and on sides, shelf in walk-in box, meat hooks and rails on walls." (May 24, 1967)

"Home slaughtered beef in beef box not clean. Covered with hair, dirt and fecal material." (Dec. 30, 1964)

"Twenty (containers of) meat binder—insect infested." (June 7, 1967)

"Bull beef flour stored on floor in toilet room vestibule." (Feb. 24, 1965)

"There were four locker drawers in the processing area containing sausage seasoning, etc. In addition to the sausage seasoning, the drawers also contained numerous mice pellets and putrid meat particles." (May 13, 1963)

Each quotation comes from the file of a different slaughterer or processor.

Some are far more serious than the usual sort of violation found and noted by a sanitation inspector. "Temperature in storage freezer was 6 degrees F. instead of zero degree F.," is more typical of inspection report entries.

#### JEFFERSON HAS OWN REGULATIONS

Also, an isolated quotation only tells about a single violation rather than general conditions at the time of the inspector's visit. It also fails to reveal the cleanliness of the plant over a period of years.

But such entries do raise the possibility of contaminated meat at a particular plant at a particular time. And this is in spite of local and state regulations which, by Kentucky standards, are a stringent combination.

Jefferson County, like five other counties, has its own meat-inspection regulations. And, like the state, Jefferson has a law aimed at ensuring proper sanitation in meat plants. Any packinghouse operator outside the county must meet Jefferson's standards in order to sell his meat here.

Each of the three intrastate slaughterhouses in Jefferson County has a fulltime lay inspector who checks daily on the cleanliness of the plant's equipment and facilities, and examines each animal for disease before and after it is killed. Any animal or carcass considered to be possibly unfit is held for a final decision on its use by a veterinarian who visits each plant daily.

But the lay inspectors are paid indirectly in part by the meat firms they examine. Unlike federally inspected plants which get inspection cost-free, Louisville slaughterers must pay the City-County Health Department 45 cents for each head of cattle examined and 23 cents for each calf, sheep, swine or goat.

#### MUST CHECK 45 PROCESSORS

The integrity of the inspectors is defended by local health officials, but a state Health Department official insists that "there is a reluctance of inspectors to do the full job they should do when the packers are paying for it."

Outside the slaughterhouses, the task of protecting Jefferson Countians from bad meat falls mainly to a City-County Health Department sanitarian. Helped only occasionally by one of several other men in the department, the sanitarian is responsible for checking on the cleanliness of 45 intrastate meat processors here.

The state sanitation law also applies to Jefferson County intrastate meatpackers. But the shortage of manpower for policing plants is even more crucial on the state level than in the county. One state health official is in charge of making sanitation inspections about 190 establishments with slaughter and/or processing operations and about 65 ham processors. Occasionally he receives help from other state health workers.

Anyone who violates the meat and fish chapter of Louisville's food laws is subject to fines and even imprisonment. However, such action is infrequent: No fines have been

imposed on meat establishments here in the past five years.

"What we usually resort to is just closing the place down and ordering them to clean up," explained one Health Department official. However, records for the same five years show that only one plant has been told to do this.

**SOME VIOLATIONS REPEATED**

Health Department officials defend their enforcement record by arguing that they ought not to regulate with a blackjack but should serve as educators and develop "an atmosphere of mutual respect."

A study of reports from local inspectors indicates that in many cases slaughterers and meat processors have responded to this attitude. But in some other plants the same violations have occurred repeatedly over a period of years with no crackdown.

The inspection reports for one wholesale meat company in Louisville are an example of this.

This establishment processes a complete line of fabricated meat products and sells them primarily to restaurants. On May 25, 1964, an inspector wrote: "Plastic meat containers not being thoroughly cleaned." On May 28, 1965, he reported "some meat containers not being thoroughly cleaned each day."

Since that time, reports of September and December 1965; February, April, May September and December 1966; and February and October 1967 note unclean meat containers or others that cannot be easily cleaned because of their construction.

**"SOME MEAT SPOILED"**

On April 29, 1966, an inspector reported: "Beef rails and walls need cleaning. Wall area by beef box door in disrepair. Some baskets used as meat containers not lined. Cardboard box (used) contains beef trimmings. Cardboard used for beef binder. These boxes are not cleaned."

On May 23, 1966, a state inspector wrote: "Meat that has been boned had sawdust and dirt on it. Cardboard boxes and chicken crate was (sic) directly on meat. Some meat spoiled . . . The equipment is not being cleaned, including the following: sinks, pan racks, electric saw in sales room, knife racks, parts to grinder, refrigerator cases. The back room floor is dirty."

"The sink in the back room is rusty and cannot be cleaned thoroughly. Several meat pans have cracks and are bent, thus cannot be cleaned thoroughly. . . ."

The state inspector noted that the owner of the plant was told "that the violations must be corrected and that he must operate his establishment in a sanitary manner in the future."

**SHORT IMPROVEMENT NOTED**

In subsequent inspections in June and September, conditions were found to have improved substantially. Then on Nov. 15, 1966, an inspector reported:

"Some beef trimmings contaminated with sawdust. Cardboard boxes of meat stored on beef trimmings. Also, pans stored with bottoms coming in contact with contents of pans beneath."

"Meat grinder and saw (retail) not being thoroughly cleaned each day. Accumulation of waste around top of pre-washing sink. Accumulation of grease on tops of entrance doors. Baskets used for storage not easily cleanable."

In the reports of December 1966 and February, March and May 1967, similar violations were found. The last report studied, written on Oct. 5, 1967, notes:

"Some beef trimmings has small amount of sawdust on them. . . . Containers of meat stored so that bottom of containers rest on meats stored below. . . . Some products—breaded compounds and bull beef binder contained weevils. These were destroyed at time of inspection."

**ACTION UNDER STATE LAW: WHY ONE MEAT FIRM WAS CLOSED DOWN**

Meat-plant inspectors in Jefferson County can move against violators not only under city-county law, but also under state statutes.

That's because they make recommendations to the state Health Department on whether state food and drug permits should be reissued to the intrastate meat plants which they inspect.

But action to remove a threat of contaminated meat doesn't occur or take effect immediately.

A case in point is that of Federal-Provision Co., 1217 Fern St., in Louisville, which was closed down recently by the state Health Department.

For several years the small manufacturer of ground beef patties, minute steaks, loins and chops for restaurants was the subject of one bad inspection report after another.

On June 1 and 14, 1965, inspectors noted that the electric meat saw was not being dismantled and cleaned each day. In the second report, the inspector wrote that the owner had been given four days to correct the violation with the threat that if the saw wasn't cleaned, the state food and drug permit would not be reissued. Four days later, an inspector found "operation satisfactory."

**REPORTS IMPROVED, FOR A WHILE**

However, four months later in October, an inspector found pork loin ends starting to decompose and ordered their destruction. He also noted that the plant was not rodent proof and that the meat patty machine and electric saw were not being dismantled and cleaned each day.

In November 1965, an inspector wrote: "Cleavers and knives stored in cardboard box. Mouse dropping in bottom of box. Evidence of rodents in establishment."

For awhile the reports were generally good. But on Jan. 19, 1967, an inspector recorded that "grinder, saw, tenderizer, shelf over grinder, not clean."

Finally, the Louisville-Jefferson Department of Public Health requested the state Health Department to withhold the state food and drug permit until a state inspector could look at the plant.

On Sept. 28, 1967, the state inspector found that "control of rodents was not satisfactory in that rodent pellets were observed in two or three locations within the establishment, and also there were some holes along the baseboard which indicated rodent entrance ways."

**Some of the other violations noted were:**

"Tenderizer blades and patty machine had not been completely cleaned of meat residues since their present use."

"The three-compartment sink used for washing meat processing equipment was very rusty and unsuitable for use."

"Rat pellets were observed along walls . . . behind slicing machine and a hole in the lower molding of the wall which would allow rodent entry."

The inspector concluded that "the facilities are certainly not suitable for the processing of meat and the sanitation that was observed was not considered to be adequate."

He therefore gave the owner 90 days to "either find new satisfactory facilities or to cease operations." In a later letter from the Kentucky Department of Health, the owner was told that the deadline was Jan. 1, 1968.

Shortly before the deadline, however, the company asked for and was granted an extension to Jan. 15. The owner claimed he was trying to find a new location and needed a little more time. On Jan. 15 he finally closed down.

**KENTUCKY PUSHED TO ENACT MEAT-INSPECTION LAW**

(By Paul M. Bransburg)

Faced with federal legislation ordering it to shape up, Kentucky is moving to tighten

its control over intrastate slaughterhouse and meat processors.

There are indications that a bill to accomplish this will be introduced soon in the General Assembly.

Gov. Louie B. Nunn met recently with several Kentucky meat-packers and reportedly told them he wanted a state meat-inspection law. He is said to have told the group that he doesn't intend to wait for a federal takeover in this field.

Also, one of Nunn's legislative aides and several Kentucky Agriculture Department officials, including Commissioner Robert Miller, were busily taking notes when a federal official discussed requirements of the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 at a recent meeting of meat-packers in Cincinnati.

The federal law gives all states two years to develop an inspection and sanitation program for plants doing business only within state boundaries. The requirements must be "at least equal" to U.S. standards now applied to interstate operations.

Therefore, if by December 1969 Kentucky "has failed to develop or is not enforcing" such a program, the U.S. secretary of agriculture will declare, after consultation with Nunn, that all meat-packers in the state are henceforth subject to federal meat-inspection regulations.

If Kentucky has not complied but is in the process of taking effective action the secretary of agriculture may grant a one-year extension if he "has reason to believe that the state will activate" an acceptable program in the following 12 months.

Since Kentucky does not have a mandatory meat-inspection law, the current session of the Kentucky General Assembly will have to pass an acceptable meat act or federal inspection will become inevitable in December 1969.

Assuming that Nunn pushes through an acceptable law, the cost of making sure that Kentuckians are eating good meat is going to skyrocket.

The state now has a mandatory sanitary-inspection statute. But the Health Department has only one man assigned full-time to making sure that equipment and facilities of intrastate packinghouses are clean. As a result, most such plants are inspected only about twice a year.

Dr. R. J. Henshaw, acting state veterinarian in the Kentucky Agriculture Department, estimates that an intrastate meat-inspection program meeting federal requirements would cost about \$750,000 annually. Other state officials think the figure would go over \$1 million.

At present, the state's non-federal packers spend about \$90,000 a year on inspection. They pay part or all of the salaries of inspectors enforcing local laws in six Kentucky counties. This is rather small when compared with the sums spent by some states: California, \$1.6 million; Indiana, \$620,000; Illinois, \$1.1 million. These are state appropriations.

Fortunately for Frankfort budget planners, about half of the cost of a new state meat-inspection program could come from Washington. The Wholesome Meat Act provides that the federal government may pay up to 50 per cent of a state's expense in developing and administering a meat-inspection program.

**U.S. COSTS WILL RISE**

Whether Kentucky will receive the full 50 per cent of costs depends on how much Congress appropriates for meat inspection. The federal inspection program cost \$47 million nationally last year. Eventually, the cost of the new federal program will be another \$15 million to \$40 million annually.

It's probable that the job of supervising a new Kentucky meat-inspection law will be given to the Agriculture Department rather than to the Health Department, which oversees the present sanitation statute.

"It seems to me that the U.S. Department

of Agriculture doesn't seem to want to cooperate with state departments of health as much as with state departments of agriculture," says Shelby Johnson, an administrator of the Kentucky Health Department.

"Also, state meat inspection is traditionally under the state department of agriculture. If a law can be better carried out by the Kentucky Department of Agriculture, I can see no reason why they shouldn't be able to do it."

DR. HENSHAW'S WISH

In addition the acting state veterinarian, Dr. Henshaw, said:

"It wouldn't be good if the Kentucky Department of Agriculture just wrote a bill and then just went to the packers and told them, 'This is it.' Instead, I would rather they'd write a bill they agree on themselves and then just come to me. That, I think, is what is happening now."

There is every reason to believe that Kentucky meat-packers would cooperate with either federal or state agriculture officials in a new meat-inspection program; they have no other choice.

A reflection of this fact can be found in the lavish praise that organizations representing meat-packers are now bestowing on the Wholesome Meat Act.

"A GREAT ASSET"

"This act has done a very excellent job—more than has been given it credit," said Aled D. Davies, vice president of the American Meat Institute, at a recent AMI-sponsored meeting of Kentucky, Ohio and Indiana meatpackers in Cincinnati. The AMI is America's largest meat organization. Its membership consists of 365 national and local packers and processors.

"I am not one of those who believes that the end of the world has come with this bill," Davies continued. "On the contrary, it will be a great asset to this industry. We have all been aware that there are fringe areas in this industry that are not too good. This bill will be good for us."

"I think we've got to be honest and admit that the 60 years since the passage of the Meat Inspection Act of 1907 has been a long time. The states have had 60 years to bring their inspection systems in line with the federal system. . . . But, unfortunately, some did not."

There was no applause from the 150 slaughterers and processors in the audience, but neither were there any boos. Davies, like the rest of the meat industry, was eating crow, but he was doing it gallantly.

Only months before, in July 1967, Davies had told a House agriculture subcommittee that "we question whether anything is actually accomplished by changing the wording of the Meat Inspection Act. Under it, the United States had developed the finest meat inspection program in the world."

Almost by way of explanation, Davies told the Cincinnati gathering: "Had we stayed in a position of blind opposition, we would have had no influence on the new law."

But if segments of the meat industry profess high regard for the Wholesome Meat Act, they also say that it will cause many problems.

For one thing, it presents every Kentucky meat establishment with a serious dilemma.

On one hand, a meat processor might prefer to participate in a program administered by officials in Frankfort, men with whom he may have some influence. On the other hand, if Kentucky passes a law calling for standards equal to federal regulations, then why not apply for federal inspection itself and gain the right to ship interstate?

Most intrastate meat producers say, however, that they prefer a state program. "We feel that we can work better with the state people than with the federal government," says a slaughterer from Western Kentucky.

"We feel that Kentucky people have a better understanding of our problems."

A WORSE DILEMMA?

Some others question this explanation. "Don't quote me," says a county health official, "but they prefer a state program because they hope it will not be as strict as the federal."

But the meat-packers who prefer state programs face the possibility that their state legislators will simply sit by and let the federal government take over in two years.

"I think this is very unsound," Davies told the meat men from Kentucky, Indiana and Ohio. "It would be an open invitation to federalize everything everywhere and for states to give up their own responsibilities."

However, some Kentucky meat-packers could come under federal inspection before Kentucky passes a law of its own.

The Federal Wholesome Meat Act provides that if the U.S. Department of Agriculture finds any intrastate packer producing "adulterated meat or meat food products . . . which would clearly endanger the public health," it must notify the governor and other appropriate officials.

If state officials do not take action within a reasonable time, the Agriculture Department can declare the establishment subject to federal inspection.

QUALITY NOT CLEANLINESS GUARANTEE: "U.S. CHOICE" IS MEAT GRADE, NOT INSPECTION MARK

"U.S. Choice" and "U.S. Prime" are federal meat grades well known to American housewives. But many of them—and even a few meat retailers—confuse federally graded meat with federally inspected meat.

Inspection and grading are really two different concepts. A great deal of federally graded meat is not federally inspected meat, and vice versa.

There are two federal-inspection marks, both round in shape.

One is stamped with a purple vegetable dye onto carcasses and bears the legend "U.S. INSP'D & P'S'D"—inspected and passed. It is familiar only to those housewives who have purchased a piece of meat that was under a federal inspector's slaughterhouse stamp.

The other federal-inspection mark is used on prepared meat packages of products such as bacon or bologna. It spells out its message: "U.S. Inspected and Passed by Department of Agriculture." This mark can be found on millions of packages and cans sold throughout America.

These two marks certify that the meat comes from animals that were inspected before and after death, that all of the plant equipment and facilities were clean, and that the label on the package is accurate.

Grading marks are shield-shaped and are applied to carcasses in long rows of such marks, so these legends are commonly spotted by homemakers on the edges of steaks.

The grade mark only indicates the quality of the meat—not that it has been subjected to inspection. Often federally graded meat is also federally inspected, but you can have one without the other.

BRAND NAMES NO GUARANTEE

The services of a federal grader can be purchased from the U.S. Agriculture Department at \$8.20 an hour. The grader decides if the meat is Prime, Choice, Good, Standard, Commercial, Utility, Cutter, or Canner by judging the meat's fat content, texture, color, conformation and bone character.

Graders must exercise some judgment, but they distinguish between the various grade levels by following elaborate and complex federal specifications.

A common misconception of American homemakers is that by buying well-known brand names of the large national meat firms they are assured the meat has undergone fed-

eral inspection or checks under standards equal to the federal.

RISK OF SANITATION PROBLEMS

In fact, some of the nation's largest meat firms operate plants exempt from federal inspection because they do not ship across state lines.

Swift & Co. has 12 nonfederal plants, Wilson & Co. 47, Armour & Co. 14, Hygrade Food Products 8, and Hormel & Co. 5. It is unfair to assume that a plant without federal inspection is unsanitary. But there is a greater chance of sanitation problems at such a plant, since it is generally agreed that federal checks are more thorough than state or local examinations which are made under laws that are probably less strict than the federal measure.

The federal system of inspection and grading is efficient and helpful, but it still presents problems for the housewife.

Packaged meat products from federal plants will bear the circular inspection mark. But how can she tell if the hamburger meat or steak in the supermarket has been federally inspected?

It isn't easy. If she is lucky, the store will advertise that its meat was slaughtered and processed under federal inspection. (If the merchant is lying, he risks federal prosecution.) But advertising usually refers merely to grade levels such as "U.S. Choice"—and says nothing about inspection.

Consequently, a cautious homemaker usually is forced to ask her butcher if the meat in his counter comes from a federally inspected plant.

Although it may be difficult to determine which cuts of meat are from federal plants, the labels on meat products packaged or canned in such plants must be worded with exquisite precision.

Ingredients must be listed in order of predominance by weight. And the label must mean exactly what it says. For example, "all beef" frankfurters are made exclusively from beef, while "all meat" frankfurters will be a combination of beef and some other types of meat.

Finally, federally approved labeling designations guarantee that the manufacturer is conforming to rigid content specifications.

These regulations are so detailed that they even provide that pickled pigs knuckles may not be labeled "semi-boneless" unless 50 per cent of the total weight of bones has been removed.

### Release the Blakey Report

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, radio station WBBM of Chicago has acquired a well-deserved reputation for its vigorous and timely editorial commentary. In its broadcast of March 15, it properly called for public release of the Blakey report, which was suppressed at the time the President's Commission on Law Enforcement made its recommendations.

The commentary follows:

RELEASE THE BLAKEY REPORT

Ever since the publication of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement, there has been one exceptional failure in that report. It has been the failure to issue the so-called Blakey papers. These deal with highly specific situations in the world of organized crime. And it has been claimed that a considerable portion of the Blakey report concerns organized crime in Chicago and Cook County.