# TITLE NEWS

THE OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE AMERICAN LAND TITLE ASSOCIATION ®



## "OUR 62nd YEAR"

MARCH, 1969

## *PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE*

MARCH, 1969

I hope you will agree with me that the 1969 Mid-Winter Conference was most successful.

Those who attended will, I am sure, realize that ALTA has embarked on a course differing from that followed in the past.

While it was thought that the "single purpose" policy, a draft of which had been sent to members after the Portland Convention, would be finally approved at the 1969 Mid-Winter Conference, I am sure everyone now believes that the changes suggested by the Standard Forms Committee should be carefully considered. Hopefully, final approval will take place at the 1969 Annual Convention.

The discussion on rating bureaus was most interesting. I wish to thank the members of the panel and in particular, Fred B. Fromhold, the Moderator.

Of great interest were the addresses by Dr. Beryl Sprinkel, Professor Ray J. Aiken and Raymond A. Jensen.

I firmly believe that the members who attended have greatly added to their knowledge, and the members who did not attend have missed a great deal.

It is not too early to plan to attend the Annual Convention to be held in Atlantic City, New Jersey, September 29 through October 1.

Sincerely,

Gordon M. Burlingame

# TITLE NEWS

THE OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE
AMERICAN LAND TITLE ASSOCIATION

EDITORIAL OFFICE: Premier Bldg., 1725 Eye St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006 202-296-3671



*Volume 48*

*Number 3*

*1969*

On The Cover: Members of the Executive Committee and Convention Chairman Frank McDonough discuss plans for the 1969 Annual Convention. For information regarding the Convention and the Post-Convention Tour to the Bahama Islands see page 23.

GARY L. GARRITY, *Editor*
DONAILEEN C. WINTER, *Assistant Editor*

# MORTGAGE CREDIT—1969

**By SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN, D-ALA.**

**ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

**Senator John Sparkman (D-Ala.) received his A. B., M.A., and LL.B. degrees from the University of Alabama. He was elected to Congress in 1936. In 1946 he took his seat in the Senate and is now chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee.**

*(Editor's note: The following article is based on an address presented by Senator Sparkman, Chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee, at the National Association of Homebuilders Convention in Houston during January.)*

Every American surely must feel a keen sense of accomplishment in that we have done what no other nation—what no other people—has ever done. We have in a short—very short—seven year span sent three human beings around the moon and successfully returned them home.

In praising and congratulating those at the Houston Space Center and all others who made this historical journey into space possible, I cannot help but think of my own home—Huntsville, Alabama and the important part it played in this great happening. I cannot help but be proud of the fact that it was the old Redstone Rocket made in Huntsville—even though it may now be the Model-T of rocketry—that thrust us into the Rocket age. Furthermore, the vehicle that hoisted the Apollo 8 into space was the mighty Saturn—the most powerful rocket in all the World—was dreamed up, designed, built and tested at the Marshall Space Flight Center at my home town—Huntsville.

Speaking of the rocket age and the moon, I wonder just how many of you enterprising homebuilders are already plotting to put housing on the moon and are now concerned about the supply of mortgage credit there!

This brings me, of course to the main topic of our discussions today; that is, mortgage credit. Not on the moon, mind you, but here on earth!

Of all the factors affecting your industry, mortgage credit, the lack of it, is the one subject which has received the most concentrated attention and effort over the years. Certainly this is true of the last two decades. Yet, with all that has been done, with all the actions that we have taken, we do not seem so far to have found a solution to provide for a stable flow of mortgage money.

Today, many of you are worried about the outlook for housing production in the coming twelve months because of the present situation in the mortgage market and in our economy in general.

When our economy heats up it seems it strikes more directly at home production than it does at any other major industry. And, it cannot be denied that we are in an inflationary trend.

The ever higher cost of living is eroding consumer buying power; lumber prices are on the rise and are boosting the cost of homes; interest rates remain high, and inflows into mortgage lending institutions are not what we expect them to be. In fact, we are presently experiencing some of the highest costs we have seen in the last 20 years.

Naturally, all of these matters are causing us concern, but I, for one, am optimistic about the outlook for housing production in 1969, and the decade ahead. Frankly, I believe when we look back this time next year—and another ten years hence—we will find that some of the fears we have today were false. Let me explain my reasoning.

First, the fiscal control; that is, the income surtax charge instituted during mid-1968, has not reached its full impact as yet. Second, although government spending has been cut significantly—and we hope will continue to be held down—the full impact of these cuts has not been felt in our economy. Third, the last monetary action taken, that is, the increase in the rediscount rate and the sale of government bonds in the open market by the Federal Reserve Board are just beginning to have effect. Fourth, the increase in family formations which will place huge demands on the housing market in 1969 and the 70's are just beginning to be felt.

When the full and total effect of all these things take place — which I believe will be very soon — many of the fears we have today will abate. I therefore think 1969 will be a better than average year for housing production. I will also say that I do not believe it will be very long before we will be producing housing at an annual rate of at least two million starts.

In other words, I believe we will soon experience a "cooling off" in the economy, and this will permit us to move ahead at a rapid pace.

Very shortly now, we can expect some of the provisions of legislation enacted last year to be implemented, and these provisions, I believe, will be most helpful and beneficial in making new sources of money available for housing.

Let me give some examples of the provisions to which I refer.

As you know, the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act, among many, many things provided the machinery for the secondary market operation of the FNMA to become privately owned and privately financed. At the same time, a new government corporation—known as "Ginnie Mae" was formed. I sometimes feel that the "spinning off" of FNMA per se generated so much interest that many overlooked one of the most important features written into the new GNMA functions. I refer to the provision which authorizes the GNMA to guarantee obligations issued by both the new FNMA and private financial institutions holding portfolios of government supported mortgages, that is, FHA, VA, and Farmers Home mortgages. This new authority is particularly significant in that it presents the potential for channeling large amounts of private capital, heretofore not readily available for mortgage investment, into the mortgage money market. For several years now we have talked about tapping various pension and retirement funds for mortgage investments.

In the past, those controlling and managing these funds have not been particularly interested in investing in mortgages because of the voluminous amount of work and expense involved in handling and servicing mortgage portfolios. With GNMA now being able to guarantee, let us say, a certificate or obligation backed by a block of $5 million of mortgages, managers of pension, retirement, and other funds will find they can conveniently invest in the mortgage market without the cumbersome burden of portfolio management. Certainly, I believe this arrangement will help provide literally millions of dollars of investment capital for mortgages and capital that have not heretofore been generally available for mortgage investment.

The 1968 Act contains another provision which will also help channel "new" money into housing. I refer to the Title creating the National Housing Corporation with limited partnership. This title was suggested by the President's Commission on Urban Housing which was headed by Mr. Edgar A. Kaiser and therefore might be called the Kaiser Amendment.

Very briefly, the title creates a nationally chartered private corporation and authorizes the corporation to form limited partnerships. The limited partnerships can be made up of any persons, groups, organizations or businesses interested in providing the financial backing for housing — in other words, "angels"—but who, on the other hand, do not have any expertise in housing activities and matters. The parent corporation furnishes the expertise—the know-how—in building, managing and operating the housing and the limited partners own the project. Tax depreciation, profits and other benefits of ownership pass through the parent corporation to the partners. The theory is that private enterprise organizations and businesses that want to do something about housing people, but who know nothing about the ins and outs of management and operation will now be encouraged to invest in housing. The carrot held out to the so-called "angels" is the benefits derived from depreciation allowances and other tax benefits of ownership found in existing tax laws. In addition, the 1968 Act also contains a provision permitting the so-called "angels" to recoup their initial investment upon the sale of a project.

This explanation is, of course, an over-simplification of the new Title, but what makes this proposition so unique and interesting is that it uses existing tax depreciation laws to attract funds for housing. Very frankly, I believe we will see a great deal of new money flowing into housing through this plan.

Now I have been told that some homebuilders are somewhat concerned about the Kaiser Amendment, primarily because they feel that builders in general will be shut out and will not be able to participate in the program.

I have been assured by those who worked on the Kaiser Amendment, as well as those who have been appointed to carry out the plan, that there is no intent to shut out builders participation in the program. To the contrary, those carrying out the program very much hope that builders will participate as much as is possible in this program.

Believe me when I say that you should by all means look into this program as I think you will find it quite interesting.

The 1968 Act contains still another provision which should be very helpful to home building and the mortgage money market. I refer to that Title in the law which directs the President to set forth a 10-year plan for achieving the construction or rehabilitation of 26 million housing units.

You homebuilders have often advocated that we should establish specific national goals for housing.

Certainly, any housing goals established at Presidential level will necessarily have to deal with the ways and means by which the goals can be accomplished, and this means that particular attention will have to be given toward having the financial resources available to accomplish the aims. I am hopeful that the President's plan and goals will have the effect of eliminating many of the uncertainties surrounding the availability of funds for housing.

In other efforts to help stabilize the flow of mortgage credit, you will recall when legislation was passed last year to permit the Secretary of HUD to fix the FHA interest rate until October 1, 1969, at levels necessary to meet the market, that same legislation authorized the establishment of a Blue Ribbon Committee to study interest rates, and, for that matter, all facets of mortgage credit. It was hoped that such a Commission would find some meaningful solutions to mortgage market problems. Your own Executive Vice President, Nat Rogg, has been appointed to this Blue Ribbon Commission, along with several others expert in the subject of mortgage credit. The Commission is at work, and I am most hopeful that the recommendations and findings of this Commission when they are made in March this year will provide some ready answers to mortgage market problems.

Let me turn now to another subject. It has been suggested that I might gaze into my crystal ball and give you some idea of what may be anticipated by way of 1969 housing legislation.

Before I do this I would like to say that I have now been interested in and working in the area of housing legislation for about 32 years —in fact, during my entire time in the Congress. And I can truthfully say that I believe some of the greatest innovations in housing legislation have been made within the last eight years.

At least, to my way of thinking, more was done in this period than was ever done before in our nation's history to develop tools for meeting the housing needs of our people and to promote homebuilder interest in these needs. Let me mention some of these innovations:

1. FHA 221(d)(3) regular and BMIR programs of 1961 to help house middle income families.

2. The Rent Supplement program of 1965 to help house low income families.

3. The FHA insurance program for the development of new communities of 1966 (and)

4. The Home Ownership and rental programs of 1968 for lower income families in both urban and rural areas.

Then, of course, there were such innovations as the Low Public Housing Turn Key program and the Public Housing Lease program.

All of these, plus many other amendments to existing housing laws have not only been aimed at getting the housing job done, but also at using private enterprise as much as is possible to do the job.

With that brief statement on what has been done, now let me turn to 1969 housing legislation.

Of course, this year we must extend all FHA and other housing programs which are now scheduled to terminate on October 1, 1969.

Let me assure you these programs will be extended.

As usual, we will, no doubt, be called upon to clarify and amend existing programs to make them more workable, and, certainly, we will continue to give close attention and consideration to any and all proposals and recommendations aimed toward overcoming problems in the mortgage money market.

Quite frankly, I have not been briefed thus far on what the new Administration has in mind by way of 1969 housing legislation. It is my understanding, however, that the new Administration proposes to study all existing programs to determine their usefulness before making any recommendations to Congress.

Very candidly, I do not believe we need any further *new* housing legislation at present. Certainly, we already have enough tools to do the job. What I really think we must do is for Congress to get behind the existing programs, appropriate the funds needed to make them operative and then vigorously administer the programs so as to make them serve the housing needs of this country.

# FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

**By REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, R-N.J.**

**ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

**Congressman William B. Widnall (R-N.J.) received his Ph.B. degree from Brown University in 1926 and an LL.B. degree from the New Jersey Law School (now part of Rutgers) in 1931. First elected to public office as a member of the New Jersey House of Assembly in 1946, and later elected to Congress, he is now ranking Republican on the House Special Housing Subcommittee.**

*(Editor's note: The following article is based on an address presented by Congressman Widnall, ranking Republican on the House Special Housing Subcommittee, at the National Association of Homebuilders Convention in Houston during January.)*

It is understandable that your industry is curious and perhaps even apprehensive over the course of future policies affecting housing. Offhand, I can't think of any industry which is more profoundly affected by the course of action of the federal government.

Adding to that feeling of uncertainty is the fact that we have elected a Democratic Congress and a Republican President. Since election day, many analysts have pointed to what they expect will be a sharp conflict between the White House and Congress, over, among other things, federal housing programs and the future conduct of domestic economic policy. Personally, I think recent experience in Washington indicates quite the opposite will prevail.

In the first place, with respect to questions affecting your industry, there is broad agreement among both Democrats and Republicans in the House and Senate as well as those who inherit the mantle of leadership in the Executive Branch.

It seems clear that there is widespread agreement on the monumental size of the task before us and recognition of the fact that recent housing production has been altogether too small to attain even our most modest national goals.

Moreover, out of the turbulence and sometimes bitter debate that accompanied enactment of the rent subsidy and model cities programs have come positive resolution and a degree of bipartisanship unmatched in any other area of the domestic legislative scene.

The conflict within Congress and between Congress and the Executive Branch which these issues generated has produced in Washington a curiosity, awareness and dedication to the search for solutions that reach far beyond the Congressional housing subcommittees and the Department of HUD.

How else can one explain the ease of passage of the 1968 Housing Act in the relatively conservative 90th Congress; an Act that contained many startling new—indeed, some programs that in the liberal 89th Congress would have been tagged radical.

Just as Republicans in recent years were able, with the cooperation of certain key Democrats such as Senator Sparkman, to emphasize such things as home ownership, code enforcement and low income lease housing in exchange for providing the margins of victory for certain White House programs, it would not be at all surprising for the Nixon Administration to adopt various legislative suggestions in the field of housing put forth by Congressional Democrats.

Nevertheless, in recent years, it has nearly become a political cliche to glibly describe the major difference between Republicans and Democrats as being one of method rather than goals. Even with respect to the method of achieving future housing goals, however, there seems to be substantial agreement. Two weeks ago, both the Senate Majority leader, Mike Mansfield, and Senator Edmund Muskie agreed that we may have passed too much legislation and that the critical need in 1969 is to reorganize and to take a good look at all the programs recently enacted. Speaking in a similar vein, in the October issue of *Homebuilding*, then candidate Nixon said, "The most pressing need for the next Administration will be to take immediate inventory of the housing programs now available with a view toward evaluating which ones should receive priority and funding."

Having said this, one should not interpret my remarks as pointing to four or eight more years of the same. From my recent talks with top Nixon administration appointees, I can tell you that the key emphasis of the next Administration will be production.

Now that we have identified the problems and enacted the programs, it's time that we roll up our sleeves and produce.

And we in the federal government had better wake up to the fact that an industry, exposed to the brunt of domestic economic adjustments, unable to plan more than a few months ahead for a healthy growth in medium and high cost housing, can hardly be expected to devote its full energy and resources to our nation's pressing need for dramatic increases in construction of low income housing.

Nor can we attain our goals by avoiding such pressing issues as labor shortages, materials cost and paralyzing code retrictions. Politics is the art of the possible and many of the housing programs already enacted never would have emerged from committee had some of these issues been tackled. With the need for new legislation temporarily relieved, however, the time has come to take a long, hard look. On the question of local zoning and codes, perhaps the solution can only be at the local or regional level. But we in Washington can and must provide leadership.

A few years ago many would have said a national consumer credit code would be impossible to attain. After many years of hard work, we may be on the brink of realizing that goal in an area of local prerogative every bit as sensitive as building codes.

On the question of labor, it's up to both the federal government and your industry to state the case that the demand for housing is such that more, not less, employment at all levels can be attained with increased and more efficient production.

Furthermore, I'm weary of those in the Congress and elsewhere who point to your industry and ask for technological innovation; for increased emphasis on better and lower cost housing. The truth of the matter is that much of the technology already is at hand, but is prohibited from being usefully and profitably employed.

Here we are in the heart of the world's greatest space industry complex, where a solid state circuit board the size of a thimble can be produced and placed in orbit around the moon, but where construction of prefab and stack sack concrete homes costing $5,000-$7,000 would be in violation of all but a few local jurisdictions.

At the top of the Nixon priority list of actions needed to increase the production of housing is the discontinuation of economic policies that have and will continue to threaten us with *decreased* housing.

Here in Texas, it is perhaps appropriate to recall one of the more colorful expressions of the incumbent Administration when President Johnson referred to self disciplinary measures in terms of our having to "bite the bullet". Well, you people bit the bullet good and hard in 1966 and you're starting to chomp down on that chewed-off slug here in 1969.

To an extent, a gradual and controlled increase in prices can generate enthusiasm for home buying, but the present inflationary spiral is such that a recurrence of the 1966 disintermediation of the credit markets once again looms as a possibility.

I was pleased that President Nixon told your industry last October that his Administration "will not stand idly by and allow a repetition of the policies and mismanagement that brought on the tight-money crisis of 1966 and precipitated a near collapse of the building industry."

Nevertheless, monetary adjustments are by their very nature slow.

A question of extreme importance which in my opinion requires resolution at an early date is realistic adjustment of the FHA and VA interest ceilings. The present 6¾ per cent ceiling, set by administrative action, is no longer an effective market rate as evidenced by the approximate 7 point discounts registered in recent FNMA auctions. Discounts at such a level again, just as they did in the credit crunch of 1966, will dry up the government insured and guaranteed mortgage programs as insurance company lenders pull out of the market and as sellers of existing housing refuse to see their equity absorbed by financing costs of the prospective purchaser. The resale market will go dead and the new homes market will be adversely affected as trade-up deals wither away.

We should not have to learn this hard lesson another time.

I am not an advocate of high interest rates for mortgage credit. Like it or not, mortgage interest rates have to be competitive if there is to be a flow of needed funds into that market. If we learned anything at all from the 1966 credit crunch, it should be that we do the home buying public a disservice when we maintain unrealistic rate ceilings which choke off the flow of funds to the mortgage market.

Sometimes I marvel that it takes us so long to learn. Years ago, we solved the problem of adjusting a government program to the financing demands of the private investment market. I refer to the simple formula in the Public Housing Act under which the level of annual federal contributions can respond to the demands of the private market. As you may recall, this is a flexible ceiling under which federal contributions can be contracted for at a level of 2 per cent over the going federal rate, which in essence is the average yield on government securities with 15 or more years to run to maturity. This flexible ceiling has proved workable and not once has it been impossible to fund a public housing project because of changes in interest rates in the private investment market. We ought to borrow from and profit by that experience.

Latitude for administrative adjustment of the FHA and VA mortgage interest rate ceilings exists in the law. Last year, Congress enacted P.L. 90-301, out of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, which until October 1, 1969 authorizes the Secretary of HUD to set the maximum interest rates on FHA programs at a level he finds necessary to meet the mortgage market. He takes this action in consultation with the VA Administrator in order that the two programs may be kept on a comparable basis. Under last year's authority, the interest rate ceilings were raised to 6¾ per cent by administrative action.

That legislation also provided for the establishment of a 15-member Commission, of which I am a member, to study mortgage interest rates and to make recommendations to assure the availability of an adequate supply of mortgage credit at a reasonable cost to the consumer. The Commission is to report by April 1, 1969 to enable the President, Congress, and the Secretary of HUD to take action before the October 1, 1969 expiration date of the waiver of the statutory interest ceilings. This Commission has met twice and will meet again on January 22, 1969. I see no reason why the Commission should not, in the very near future, make a recommendation with respect to the interest rate ceilings to be implemented by administrative action.

There is a suggestion which I think is worthy of consideration by the Commission. Under the proposal, a flexible interest rate ceiling would be established for the FHA and VA programs. This flexible ceiling would be the average yield on long term marketable U.S. government securities plus 2½ percentage points. Such yield would be adapted from the same "Going Federal Rate" that is used for public housing. This is calculated for HUD by the Secretary of the Treasury and certified to him every six months as of the end of May and November. The average rate is adjusted to the nearest ⅛ per cent. The ceiling rate is effective for the succeeding six-month calendar period.

This formula would have produced a 5 per cent ceiling rate for FHA and VA mortgages for the six months ending December 31, 1954; 6 per cent for the six months ending June 30, 1958; 6⅝ per cent for the six months ending June 30, 1960; 6¼ per cent for the six months ending December 31, 1961; 7⅛ per cent for the last six months of 1966; 7⅞ per cent for the entire year 1968 and 7⅞ per cent for the first six months of 1969.

Within such maximum ceiling rates competition among mortgage lenders would determine actual mortgage rates charged home buyers, just as competition makes such determination of rates in the far more extensive conventional mortgage market. The formula appears to be a workable one for the government housing program and automatically would eliminate the deep discounts which periodically have plagued the home buyer and seller and have upset the FHA and VA programs.

The proposal strikes me as a compromise with reality and recognizes the fundamental fact that restrictive piece-meal price control will not work in an otherwise free market. With the prime rate at seven per cent with high grade corporates at over seven per cent yields and with the bellwether long-term Treasury 4¼ per cent bonds of 1987/92 above a six per cent yield, we should stop deluding ourselves that a 6¾ per cent rate ceiling for the government housing programs will work in this period of extremely high interest rates.

If the Commission would recommend such an approach to maximum ceiling rates for the government housing programs and it was quickly put into effect by the Secretary of HUD, there could be a trial period before the October 1, 1969 ceiling rate reversion date. We well might find that we have the answer to this most troublesome problem.

I hope that these current high

interest rates will not prevail for a long period of time and I would think that we might administratively impose a restriction in the government-assisted mortgage programs that the mortgagor, after a reasonable period of time, could refinance without penalty his mortgage when the interest level declines.

Finally, with respect to new housing legislation, I am inclined to agree with the recommendations in the Brookings Institute report "Agenda for the Nation." In that book, Anthony Downs wrote a piece on "Moving Toward Realistic Housing Goals."

Among many other conclusions reached by Mr. Downs is the following:

"The principal challenges to federal government regarding housing will necessarily involve major new legislation . . . the really tough challenges will be effectively administering existing and new programs, and persuading key non-Federal actors to carry out their roles in attaining federal housing goals."

Mr. Downs states flatly that "administration and leadership — rather than housing legislation — will be the crucial tasks which the President and his Administration must undertake with unprecedented effectiveness."

On the subject of housing goals, I am also of the opinion that "housing targets should be both more realistic and more flexible." I support annual housing goals and also a long term commitment to housing production. But I recognize how difficult it will be to meet goals which the nation may not have the capacity to produce, and therefore, I hope the new Administration will establish housing production goals only after consultation with a business advisory committee.

So let us attempt the possible, the sensible, in order that this nation and its people can better their lot in practice as well as in theory. Let us look at our array of programs, identify that which is working and that which is not, discard the tattered hopes pridefully supported in unreality, throw out the dreams that have become nightmares, and form a partnership in homebuilding that a hundred years from now we can point to as the outstanding standard of achievement of our time.

FLEXIBLE CEILING RATE FOR FHA & VA MORTGAGES BASED ON MARKET YIELDS ON LONG TERM GOVERNMENTS PLUS 2½ PERCENTAGE POINTS

| Year | Percent Ceiling Jan.-June | Percent Ceiling July-Dec. |
|---|---|---|
| 1954 | 5⅜ | 5 |
| 1955 | 5⅛ | 5⅜ |
| 1956 | 5⅜ | 5½ |
| 1957 | 5¾ | 5⅞ |
| 1958 | 6 | 5⅝ |
| 1959 | 6¼ | 6⅝ |
| 1960 | 6⅝ | 6⅝ |
| 1961 | 6⅜ | 6¼ |
| 1962 | 6½ | 6⅜ |
| 1963 | 6⅜ | 6½ |
| 1964 | 6⅝ | 6⅝ |
| 1965 | 6⅝ | 6⅝ |
| 1966 | 6⅞ | 7⅛ |
| 1967 | 7¼ | 7¼ |
| 1968 | 7⅞ | 7⅞ |
| 1st six months, 1969 | 7⅞ | |

# MORTGAGE MARKET CAUGHT IN THE WEB OF ECONOMIC MISMANAGEMENT

**By OLIVER H. JONES**
**Executive Vice President**
**Mortgage Bankers Association of America**

*Reprinted with permission of the Mortgage Banker*

We stand at the threshold of the greatest housing boom this nation has ever seen—but we will not cross that threshold until we set our financial markets in order.

The cumulative evidence of a strong demand for housing has seldom been so clear:

. . . the bulge in the population among the house-buying age groups generates a demand that has not been satisfied by housing construction in recent years.

. . . during the past four years, the ability to buy housing has improved as the increase in personal income alone nearly equaled total personal income of the early postwar years.

. . . financial savings of individuals now exceed postwar levels—levels that set the stage for a consumer buying spree.

. . . both of these remarkable achievements are largely the result of persistent and record increases in the supply of money and credit.

. . . the volume of housing production of the past two years, despite high interest rates, deep discounts, and reluctant lenders, confirms the assumption that much more might have been achieved if financial conditions had been reasonably stable.

. . . and, if this is not enough to project an imminent boom in housing, consider the implications of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. A beneficent government has promised to help private investors place homeownership and adequate housing within reach of those who have not shared in the increase in personal income and savings.

All of this is projected to add up to the construction of 26 million housing units over the next ten years. This goal will not be achieved, nor will a housing boom take place, if we fail to learn that money serves the economy best when it links the present with the future—without distortion.

Of course, monetary creation can be used to stimulate current demand. That fact is clear in the evidence of the early 'sixties and, indeed, in the full span of economic history since man first adopted precious metals as a medium of exchange. That same history tells us that money's current value cannot be separated from its future value without tearing the economic fabric it is designed to hold together.

Under any scheme of economics —new, old, or just middleaged, a market system or a state-controlled system—money is the connecting link between today's world where goods and services are being produced, and tomorrow's world where they are sold; between the sacrifice of today's spending power by savers, and the return of that spending power tomorrow. A year ago that connecting link was weakened by fear and uncertainty —by unanswered questions.

Would the nation submit itself to fiscal discipline in the form of a tax increase? Would it come in time? Would the Federal Reserve again find it necessary to apply monetary restraint with the shattering impact of a lead foot? These questions plagued the nation's financial markets and caused many to fear that money would not be available at any cost. Borrowers raced to the market to cover future as well as present needs only to validate their judgment and push interest rates higher and higher.

The tax increase did come this year, but it came after the economy had already reached the boiling point and after prolonged debate. As a result, it failed to remove the fears that polluted the air. Some doubted that the size of the increase and the accompanying reduction in expenditures would have the necessary effect. The Federal Reserve, on the other hand, feared that the tax increase would cause the economy to hesitate in its upward path. Although that is exactly what was intended and what was needed, the Federal Reserve moved to ease rather than restrain the overheated economy. Once again, the economic managers came perilously close to snapping the monetary link altogether.

The danger is no longer fear and uncertainty, it is increased certainty—certainty that every slight weakness in the economy will be vigorously attacked by further injections of money and credit. Whether this position is correct or not, its implications are dismal.

The future value of money is determined as much in the minds of men as it is determined by the economic facts of the world in which we live. When a few expect money to decrease in value over a prolonged period or when many occasionally expect money to decrease in value, economic facts will often sweep their expectations aside and correct their errors in judgment. But when many expect money to decrease in value over a prolonged period, their expectations become self-validating.

Here lies the most critical element in forecasting the outlook for 1969. After 94 months of continued expansion, few expect or can believe that so strong an economy can ever slow down. After 94 months of continuous monetary expansion and 40 months of continuous inflation, few expect, or can believe that the current inflation can or will be stopped. This belief, now so widely held, can completely snap the monetary link. If it does, we can be sure that the housing picture in 1969 will fall short of boom proportions. If we convince everyone that inflation is here to stay, the mortgage market, as well as other fixed interest debt instruments will be dead!

We do not need to get involved in metaphysical arguments about what inflation is, or what causes inflation—cost-push, demand-pull, or merely inept government policies. The results are the same. Traditional long-term investors (1) seek havens in short-term markets, (2) demand interest yields and protection devices against repayment that are designed to cover the cost of being repaid in cheaper dollars, or (3) simply shift to equity investments.

Mortgage bankers understand the economics of these changes because they have and are living with them. What happened to the prudent life insurance investor that was so long a mainstay of the home mortgage market? You know that he is reaching for yield and, in so doing, is increasing his risks. He may say that he is disenchanted with home mortgages as investments, but what he is really saying is "inflation is here to stay. Therefore, I must obtain a hedge against cheaper dollars that I cannot obtain in home mortgages."

We can argue against the wisdom of this decision, but to what purposes? Inflation persists only to tell the investor that his judgment is correct.

Mutual savings banks have followed a similar pattern. They have been less successful in breaking old lending practices only because they are relative newcomers in long-distance lending on commercial properties. If inflation continues to be a consensus forecast, they too will be looking for equity participation.

Pension funds, which mortgage bankers have wooed so ardently for so long, are now lost to the fixed interest rate market, for they too are looking for appreciation that can be achieved in common stocks.

Here we are on the verge of a boom in housing, at a time that follows a record outpouring of money and credit, and the home mortgage is outclassed by the competition. This sorry state of affairs is the direct result of too much money and credit for too long. It can and it must be reversed; but how?

1. We can stop fine-tuning the economy with clumsy tools and inadequate knowledge.

2. We can let the rough edges of economic adjustment convince in-

vestors that inflation is a now-and-then failure in our economic machine, that is not to be tolerated, and certainly not to be nurtured.

3. We can acknowledge that the cost of setting matters right will be an increase in unemployment.

These leave difficult choices for a new Administration. We are reminded repeatedly that our strife-torn cities cannot stand the strain of additional unemployment. One economist flatly claimed that the trade-off of unemployment for price stability is "a simple solution by simple-minded persons." This economist flatly claims that the method we have been using does not work and, indeed, fails to help those most in need.

What really happens when monetary and fiscal policy is used to stimulate employment? At some unknown level of under-utilization of productive capacity, production and employment are stimulated. Subsequently, housewives are drawn into the work force, skilled workers find ample opportunities to moonlight, labor costs rise and producers invest in labor-saving equipment. Finally, the impact is felt on prices.

Nowhere in this sequence is the unskilled and untrained brought into the economic stream. Nowhere does an increase in his productivity impinge upon pressures that build price increases. Instead of alleviating the festers in our cities, they are made worse by widening the gap in their standards of living and the rest of the populace.

It would be infinitely better to use monetary and fiscal policy to maintain price stability and a moderate level of unemployment, while strengthening the monetary link, and to attack the problem of employing the unskilled and untrained directly. We hear at every turn of the lack of skilled workers—construction, appliance repairmen, auto mechanics, and so on. Why not solve this problem and the unemployment problem directly, instead of floundering in a sea of money that threatens the savings and annuities of every citizen, that threatens the ability of the affluent as well as the poor to buy or rent adequate housing. Why not train and educate the unskilled and make them productive members of society? A continuous and liberal monetary policy will not do that job!

What does all this mean for the mortgage market in 1969? To answer that question, let's make some bold assumptions.

1. Assume that the Federal Reserve's recent recognition of the error of its ways will halt the expansion of bank reserves and let the economy tighten.

2. Assume that there is a significant probability that the Federal Reserve may even make an overt and clear move towards restraint as soon as the Treasury's financing is out of the way.

3. Assume that the new Administration will follow through and end this fairy tale that all can be solved by creating money.

If none of these events take place, I feel certain that the imbalances that threaten the monetary link will force corrective action—no matter how distasteful it may be to the economic managers. In short, if steps are not already being taken to remove the urge to bet on inflation, they will be taken in the next few months.

The results will be a further

hardening of mortgage yields, but the impact of restraint on the mortgage market will not be as dramatic as it was in the fall of 1966. After all, business and consumers have been actively building liquidity.

If the reversal towards restraint is truly convincing, and borrowers as well as lenders are forcefully reminded that inflation is not a way of life, we can expect improvement in the mortgage market in the first quarter of 1969.

Two principal factors will bring about that improvement. First, the Treasury will be a net supplier of funds in the first quarter in contrast to a $15-billion-a-year annual borrower in much of last year. Second, corporate borrowers will be less eager borrowers. They are already using only 84 percent of capacity. If the beat-inflation motive is removed, current predictions of corporate expansion in 1969 will not materialize.

These shifts alone can release $20 billion to $25 billion for other credit users; e.g., the mortgage market. Mortgages are taking off credit in excess of a $20-billion annual rate today, in a good year the net increase in mortgage debt outstanding may reach $30 billion. Clearly, the volume of credit that can be released by a monetary and fiscal policy that strengthens the monetary link can improve conditions in the mortgage market.

These shifts can produce an increase in mortgage yields of one-eighth to one-quarter before the end of this year and a decline of one-half or more late in the first quarter.

They can generate an increase in housing starts of 1,650,000 units, perhaps more. Sixty percent or more of these starts will be in apartments. The tidal wave towards equity participation and the pressure of rising land and construction costs will not be turned off as quickly as monetary restraint can stop the tide of inflation.

Please note: This optimistic outlook is based upon the assumption that we will not snap the monetary link, that we will restore confidence in the value of the dollar.

The future of our balance of payments position, long-term investments in mortgages, and ability to solve the nation's housing problems lies in the balance. I have every confidence that this nation will make that assumption a reality. When we do, we can cross that threshold into the housing boom we have been expecting since the early 'sixties.

# WHAT A LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY REQUIRES....

By DONALD J. SCHUENKE

***In his address to the Wisconsin Title Association at its Annual Convention in October, 1968, Mr. Schuenke pointed out that "what a life insurance company requires in its policies should be no different than what any other consumer of your product requires." He assumes that "the casual user of title insurance demands the same consideration as the volume user."***

Investments of insurance companies are regulated by statutes. Investments in Real Estate, either as owner or lender, would not satisfy the requirements of the insurance code unless some evidence of title or evidence of first lien is obtained. This can be done in two ways, either by an abstract of title brought down through the recording of the mortgage or deed of conveyance together with an opinion of an attorney approved by our company to effect that the mortgage is a first lien or the deed is a valid conveyance of title, or by a title insurance policy guaranteeing either of the foregoing. While there are two ways to accomplish the evidence of lien or title I would guess that in 95 per cent of our cases we use title insurance as opposed to abstracts and attorney opinions. Our company policy, with a few exceptions, is to obtain title insurance protection in every case of a loan or purchase, in the full amount of the loan or purchase price

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

*Donald J. Schuenke, assistant general counsel, The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, has been with that company since January, 1963. His duties include the legal aspects of investment transactions in which real property is the primary security, and legal matters relating to the acquisition, leasing, operating and sale of company-owned real property.*

*A native of Milwaukee, Schuenke was graduated from Marquette University with a Ph.B. in 1950. He served in the Air Force from 1951 to 1955 and received his law degree from Marquette's Law School in 1958. Prior to joining Northwestern, his experience included real estate leasing, acquisition and property tax specialization with Standard Oil of Indiana.*

*Schuenke is a member of the Wisconsin and American Bar Associations, the American Life Convention, and the American Land Title Association.*

of the property. This policy results in approximately 222 million dollars in title insurance purchased by or on behalf of our company annually. When we purchase property we usually negotiate a provision to the effect that the seller furnish title insurance and therefore the choice of a title company is up to the seller. In the case of a loan, the borrower furnishes a policy acceptable to us.

It is clear then that while our company is the insured on a volume of title insurance, the choice of the title company or title agency is not usually ours. While we do not place the insurance, once this has been done we do deal directly with the agent who will issue the policy.

Our company will accept the policy of any title company which issues an ALTA Revised 1962 policy not in excess of an amount established by our company. The maximum policy limits are set by our company and are consistent with the financial strength of the issuing company. Any coverage in excess of such maximum amount must be reinsured in amounts and with companies approved by us. Such reinsurance, of course, must be evidenced by a facultative reinsurance agreement—ALTA Form (1961).

Now what do we look for? What does the consumer look for in a title insurance policy? It would be boring to reiterate the covenants of the form policy and why they are necessary because you know the policy form better than I do. I believe it is sufficient to say that we must have the ALTA Revised 1962 form —extended coverage for owners policies. In addition to the policy form we look for three things from a title agency: number one is service; number two is accurate service and number three is prompt service.

For a moment forget you are in the title insurance business and imagine yourself as dealer for a major oil company operating a gas station as one of hundreds of dealers throughout the country or better yet, a grocer in a nationwide chain selling a standard brand item which is fair traded. Why would a consumer buy from you as opposed to other sellers of the same product? I submit that one of the principal reasons is service. Why does a consumer use Lawyers Title or Chicago Title or Minnesota Title or any company to obtain an ALTA form policy? There may be all kinds of reasons including the fact that your brother-in-law is the agent for a particular company, but when given a free choice, one of the principal reasons must be service. You should also consider that the agent in another city or in another state dealing with the same national consumer may be gaining or losing business for you because of his performance and you may be affecting his business as well.

I would like to list the most common breakdowns in service as they appear to me in most cases simple matters which can be easily cured. These are not listed in any order of priority or volume of occurrence. They are:

1. Failure to furnish a Commitment To Insure addressed to the lender. Often the seller orders an Owners Policy and a commitment is issued in the name of the purchaser; sometimes the lender gets in the picture later and is furnished with nothing more than a copy of the Owners Commitment. This, of course, is not satisfactory and required time consuming correspondence with the agency and delays. Quite often the Commitment To Insure is not on the ALTA standard form. I think some agencies have "Preliminary Reports" forms of "Title Insurance Binder" forms to last through 1975 which must be used up first.

2. In most cases the wheels of progress are slowed considerably by the practice of title agencies' capsule manuscripting of easements and restrictions. More often than not the Commitment To Insure—under Schedule B will contain a series of easements for utilities sometimes as follows:

> "Easement over and across the captioned property as shown on the instrument recorded in the Office of the Register of Deeds for Dane County, Wisconsin, as Document # 1227162";
> or
> Reservations for streets as follows: "Subject to reservations for Maine Street as disclosed on a certified survey Map No. 165 and Warranty Deed dated April 1, 1965, recorded in Volume 796, page 446 of Deeds, as Document # 2127434."

In most cases, unless we specifically ask for copies of the easements, deeds and recorded plats, they are not furnished. Of course, without sufficient information, to determine the effect of the easement, reservation or restriction it is impossible to proceed with the investment.

It seems to me that with the copying equipment most agencies have they should automatically furnish copies of such instruments. I suppose this is one clear advantage in having the abstract available. I should point out though that it is not necessary to furnish the voluminous subdivision easements and restrictions in total, provided when they are identified in the Commitment which clearly states that there are no violations of such subdivision easements and restrictions and that they contain no penalty or reverter clauses.

3. Omnibus exceptions are the cause of some delay. Sometimes we get a Commitment to Insure which includes an exception under Schedule B to the effect that the policy will not insure any part of the property used, laid out or dedicated for public street purposes. This is not acceptable. In order to be acceptable the exception must be limited to the actual dedication, easement or use. It seems to me that if such omnibus exceptions were contained in the policy and the whole property were used for public street purposes, that a title company will have no liability.

4. There have been few occasions of late that have come to our attention in which a title agency eliminates certain encumbrances (mortgages or deed of trust) from the Commitment to Insure or from the policy itself, based on a personal undertaking of the persons responsible for the encumbrances that it will be satisfied out of the proceeds of the sale or in the case of a construction loan, out of the proceeds of the construction draws. It seems to me that the status of the title, particularly including outstanding encumbrances, must be reported in full. This includes any and all subordinated liens as well. The fact that other debt exists which is secured by the property in question, even though inferior to the first lien, certainly has a bearing on the underwriting of the investment. The cash flow may not be enough to service the debt. In a purchase case it is essential that any outstanding encumbrance be shown so that the funds can be directed to the payment of the encumbrances.

5. There seems to be some confusion, perhaps only with me, between the effect of the automatic treaty group as opposed to the facultative reinsurance agreement. We view the automatic treaty as an arrangement between the issuing companies themselves which, except for the argument of a third party beneficiary contract, affords no comfort to the insured. Therefore, we insist that all cases, when the policy is for a greater amount than approved for the issuing company, a facultative reinsurance agreement in the appropriate amounts and with acceptable companies be furnished. We believe this gives us privity of contract with the insuring companies and the protection that we are looking for.

6. It should be mentioned not as a matter of service, although it should be considered in the same light, that in participating in the closing of a transaction, particularly if it is closed in escrow with the title company, as many conveyances are today, that title agency personnel obtain information that does not become part of the public record. I believe, therefore, that this information should be treated as confidential. Sometimes it is necessary, in order to assemble a large tract of land, to buy small pieces individually when they become available on the market. Sometimes with our company, as I am sure is the case with other large companies, properties are purchased in the name of a nominee or placed in trust for the benefit of third parties. This is done to preserve the anonymity of ownership. In many cases purchasers do not wish the purchase price be made

public for real estate tax purposes or other reasons. I am sure that if someone called the office of a title agent and asked the purchase price of the particular property acquired by our company, or any other purchasers for that matter, that the person making the inquiry would be told that such information is not available and is confidential. However, sometimes persons who have this confidential information through inadvertence by disclosing details of particularly large deals without realizing the breach of confidence, give away these facts, often to the detriment of the purchaser. This happens because it is not thought of as confidential or privileged information. At the coffee shop or on the golf course I am sure many of you have been exposed to some of your friends in the business who may say "guess what XYZ company had to pay for the corner lot of 6th and Main Streets" and revealed the purchase price without thinking of the consequences. XYZ company may be trying to buy the entire block and has paid a considerable premium for the corner, and once this information leaks out the prices of the rest of the block would be increased considerably.

7. Finally, one of the most important things and of course the reason why title insurance is purchased as opposed to abstracts and opinions is for the insurance protection afforded in the title policy. What we really hope that means is that there is positive insurance for losses insured against. In my experience this is not the case. In each and every claim I have pursued, and there have been only a few, the title company has taken the attitude that the liability lies with someone else, an abstracter who reported the title to the title company, a surveyor who has not shown an easement. I have even heard that the responsibility is in the former owner who warranted clear title in his conveyance. It seems to me that as far as the ultimate liability is concerned, this may in fact be the case, but between the insured and the insurance company I would prefer the insurance company through its agent to take the attitude that they are liable for the loss, admit liability and adjust the claim. Thereafter, they may seek recovery from any one else before there is an admission of liability and the claim satisfied.

These are just a few of the observations I have had concerning the service and our company's relationship with the title agencies. You can see that the list of items is very short and generally, on an overall basis, our relationship with the title industry has been a very good one. Most title companies and title agencies have been extremely helpful to me and to our company. Title insurance has made by job much easier.

In some parts of the country, particularly in the rural areas, title insurance has not been the standard acceptable form of title evidence. This appears to be changing rapidly and as title insurance becomes more common in all parts of the country, service will become more consistent and more uniform. The transition from an abstract, which is a report of the record, to the issuance of an insurance binder and corresponding policy acceptable to a consumer is a matter of continuing education.

# ANNUAL CONVENTION PLANS UNDER WAY

Members of ALTA's Executive Committee and staff, and Frank McDonough, general convention chairman, met in Washington, D.C. January 13 to develop plans for the 1969 Annual Convention which will be held in Atlantic City September 28-October 1. The Convention will be held at the Chalfonte-Haddon Hall Hotel. In addition to these preparations, work has begun on the post-convention tour which will send guests to the Bahama Islands.

Post-Convention Tour—A quick grin and then he's off. Native workers in Nassau's straw market are busy producing hats, bags, suitcases, even jewelry.

Present convention events now on the agenda include a workshop for the Abstracters and Title Insurance Agents Section on personnel recruiting and attrition—and a Title Insurance Underwriters Section workshop on marketing.

Convention entertainment will include the Howard Lanham Orchestra for dancing, and a three act show featuring Miss Jean Steele, a former Miss Maryland, Jimmy Joyce from Boston, and a dance group.

Transportation experts suggest that those attending the Convention arrive at the Philadelphia International Airport and travel to Atlantic City by airport limousine. Limousines leave the airport approximately every two hours between 10:30 a.m. and 10:30 p.m. Frequent additional trips will be arranged as traffic demands. The fare is $5.25 per person one way, and the trip takes about 75 minutes.

The post-convention tour will begin on October 2 with a jet flight to the Bahamas. A $295 tour charge covers a twin bedded room, modified American plan, and round-trip air fare. Tour accommodations have

(L to R) Frank J. McDonough, President, West Jersey Title and Guaranty Company, Camden, N.J.; Thomas J. Holstein, President, LaCrosse County Title Company, LaCrosse, Wisconsin; John W. Warren, Vice President, Albright Title and Trust Company, Newkirk, Oklahoma; Alvin W. Long, President, Chicago Title and Trust Company, Chicago, Illinois; Gordon M. Burlingame, Chairman of the Board, The Title Insurance Corporation of Pennsylvania, Bryn Mawr; and William J. McAuliffe, Jr., Executive Vice President, ALTA, discuss plans for the Annual Convention.

been arranged at the Paradise Island Hotel & Villas on Paradise Island.

The trip includes a tour of Paradise Island which has one of the most famous beaches in the world, a boat ride to Nassau and a drive to historic forts with ancient cannons and dungeons. The Bahamas Country Club, beautiful homes and gardens are other attractions for the guests.

From October 4 to 8, guests will be at their leisure. Other features include tennis courts, golf courses, nightclubs, casinos, water sports, and bargain shopping.

Attendance at the 1969 Annual Convention followed by a trip to the Bahamas will provide an attractive working vacation for title men and women. Early planning is suggested.

For additional information on the post-convention tour — see the enclosed pamphlet.

# In Memoriam

## M. RUSSELL McRAE DIES

Word has been received of the death of M. Russell (Mac) McRae, executive secretary-treasurer of the Florida Land Title Association for 13 years. Mac was well known to many ALTA members from his regular attendance at association meetings.


NO SALES TAX OUTSIDE ALABAMA

## CORNELIA G. SCOTT DIES

Mrs. Cornelia Gould Scott, wife of George V. Scott, president of Lawyers Title Insurance Corporation, Richmond, Virginia, died Monday, January 20, 1969. She was a graduate of Abbott Academy in Andover, Mass., and attended Westhampton College of the University of Richmond.

## FLORIDA-GEORGIA COMPANIES MERGE

**Jay R. Schwartz, (seated) President of American Title Insurance Company, reviews the purchase agreement with W. Lawrence White (left) and Melbourne L. Martin, Senior Vice President and General Counsel for American Title.**

American Title Insurance Company, Miami, Florida, has acquired all of the outstanding stock of Realty Title Company, Birmingham, Alabama from W. Paul Woodman and W. Lawrence White, co-founders of the company. The acquisition includes the complete title plant of Realty for all of Jefferson County which includes the cities of Birmingham and Bessemer. Under the present planning the Birmingham company will be merged into American Title and converted into a regional office.

# NAMES IN THE NEWS

DAWSON

SMITH

Lawyers Title Insurance Corporation, Richmond, Virginia, has announced the election of **Robert C. Dawson** of Richmond to senior vice president. **Ralph C. Smith** of Washington, D.C., has been elected vice president. Smith is in charge of the Washington branch office.

FARMER

TUTTLE

**H. Randloph Farmer** has been named director of public relations and advertising. Farmer has been editor of *Lawyers Title News*.

The Board of Directors also has promoted three members of the home office legal department. **Roger L. Tuttle** was elected assistant counsel; **Joseph M. Parker, Jr.,** title officer; and **Richard Cocke,** assistant title officer.

PARKER

COCKE

In other elections, **Jack C. Stone** and **Carl B. Hall** of Birmingham, Alabama, were named Birmingham branch manager and Alabama state counsel respectively. **John H. Welsh** of Detroit was elected assistant vice president and **Forrest L. Damon** of Cleveland was named title officer.

STONE

HALL

 

WELSH DAMON

**Thomas E. Horak** has been elected manager of the Chicago office, and **Russell D. Webb,** manager of the Hartford, Connecticut, office.

 

HORAK WEBB

On January 1, 1969, Lawyers Title opened a new branch office in Columbia, South Carolina. The new branch, the Company's first in that state, is managed by **David S. Mellichamp,** who is immediate past president of the Carolinas Land Title Association.

MELLICHAMP

* * *

JOSEPH

The appointment of **Fred Joseph** as vice president-sales has been announced by Ohio Title Corporation, Cleveland. Joseph will be responsible for all of Ohio Title Corporation's 30 branches and offices located throughout the state.

* * *

The Exon Land Title Co., Inc., Lake Andes, South Dakota, has been sold to **Mr. and Mrs. Terry Holden.** The Exon family entered the abstract and land title business in 1893.

* * *

 

KELLY SWEENEY

Commonwealth Land Title Insurance Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, has announced the promotions of **Edward Joseph Kelly** and **Robert L. Sweeney** to assistant title officers. Kelly supervises the search and examination of titles to real estate in Bucks County, and Sweeney is a title examination specialist in Delaware County.

* * *

CATHEY

BURNETT

American-First Title & Trust Company, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, has made the following promotions: **John R. Cathey,** vice president; **Ralph W. Burnett,** secretary and cashier; **Gerald P. Thomason** and **Ronald W. Packham,** assistant vice presidents and

RICE

assistant secretaries. The employment of **B. B. Rice** in the trust and escrow department also was announced.

* * *

**Robert B. McCurdy** has been elected a vice president of Title Insurance and Trust Company, Los Angeles, California. McCurdy has also assumed the position of manager of data processing information services.

* * *

Mississippi Valley Title Insurance Company, Jackson, Mississippi, has announced the election of **Harry L. Snider, Jr.,** as president of Arkansas Abstract & Guaranty Company of Little Rock, a Mississippi Valley agent.

SNIDER

* * *

**Mrs. Philip N. Cheaney,** wife of the president of Broward County Title Company, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, puts the finishing touches on lunchpail handbags which she made as Christmas gifts for each female employee associated with the company 15 years or more. The handbags were decorated with document titles, company seal, portions of promotional material and other materials used by the company in the line of business.

MRS. CHEANEY

# MEETING TIMETABLE

## 1969

**March 5-6-7, 1969**
MID-WINTER CONFERENCE
American Land Title Association
The Drake Hotel
Chicago, Illinois

**April 3-4-5, 1969**
Arkansas Land Title Association
Coachman's Inn
Little Rock, Arkansas

**April 17-18-19, 1969**
Oklahoma Land Title Association
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

**April 24-25-26, 1969**
Texas Land Title Association
Texas Hotel
Fort Worth, Texas

**May 4-5-6, 1969**
Iowa Land Title Association
Holiday Inn
Sioux City, Iowa

**May 8-9-10, 1969**
Utah Land Title Association
Park City, Utah

**May 8-9-10-11, 1969**
Washington Land Title Association
Tyee Motor Hotel
Olympia, Washington

**May 9-10, 1969**
Tennessee Land Title Association
Downtown Holiday Inn
Chattanooga, Tennessee

**May 21-22-23, 1969**
California Land Title Association
Fairmont Hotel
San Francisco, California

**May 22-23-24, 1969**
New Mexico Land Title Association
White Winrock Motor Hotel
Albuquerque, New Mexico

**May 25-26-27, 1969**
Pennsylvania Land Title Association
Shawnee on Delaware, Pennsylvania

**June 11-12-13, 1969**
Illinois Land Title Association
Drake Hotel, Chicago

**June 12-13-14, 1969**
Colorado Land Title Association
Steamboat Springs, Colorado

**June 18-19-20-21, 1969**
Oregon Land Title Association
Gearhart Motor Inn
Gearhart, Oregon

**June 25-26-27-28, 1969**
Michigan Land Title Association
Hidden Valley
Gaylord, Michigan

**June 26-27-28-29, 1969**
Idaho Land Title Association
The North Shore Motor Hotel
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

**June 27-28, 1969**
South Dakota Land Title Association
Holiday Inn
Aberdeen, South Dakota

**June 30-July 1, 1969**
New Jersey Land Title
Insurance Association
Seaview Country Club, Absecon

**July 13-14-15-16, 1969**
New York State Land Title Association
Whiteface Inn
Lake Placid, New York

**August 14-15-16, 1969**
Montana Land Title Association
YoGo Inn
Lewistown, Montana

**August 21-22-23, 1969**
Minnesota Land Title Association
Edgewater Motel
Duluth, Minnesota

**August 22-23-24, 1969**
Ohio Title Association
Atwood Lodge
Dellroy, Ohio

**September 4-5-6-7, 1969**
Missouri Land Title Association
Plaza Inn, Kansas City, Missouri

**September 11-12-13, 1969**
North Dakota Land Title Association
Plainsman Hotel
Williston, North Dakota

**September 12-13, 1969**
Kansas Land Title Association
Lasson Motor Hotel
Wichita, Kansas

**September 12-13, 1969**
Nevada Land Title Association
Las Vegas, Nevada

**September 28-29-30, October 1, 1969**
ANNUAL CONVENTION
American Land Title Association
Chalfonte-Haddon Hall Hotel
Atlantic City, New Jersey

**October 9-10-11, 1969**
Nebraska Title Association
Lincoln, Nebraska

**October 16-17, 1969**
Dixie Land Title Association
Calloway Gardens
Pine Mountain, Georgia

**October 26-27-28, 1969**
Indiana Land Title Association
Stouffer's Inn
Indianapolis, Indiana

**October 30, November 1, 1969**
Florida Land Title Association
Causeway Inn Resort
Tampa, Florida

**October 30, November 1, 1969**
Wisconsin Land Title Association
Holiday Inn
Eau Claire, Wisconsin

**December 3, 1969**
Louisiana Land Title Association
Royal Orleans Hotel
New Orleans, Louisiana

## 1970

**April 1-2-3, 1970**
MID-WINTER CONFERENCE
American Land Title Association
The Roosevelt Hotel
New Orleans, Louisiana

**October 4-5-6-7, 1970**
ANNUAL CONVENTION
American Land Title Association
Waldorf-Astoria Hotel
New York, New York

American Land Title Association