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# SUPPLEMEENT <br> CURREIT ECONOMIC AMD FINAMCIAL COMOITLOHS 

## Prepared for the Federal Open Harket Committee

The Domestic Nonfinancial Economy
Industrial production declined further by an estimated 2.3 per cent in November. At 122.0 per cent of the 1967 base, the total index was 4.3 per cent below a year earlier. Reductions in output were widespread among consumer goods, business equipment, and industrial materials.

Auto assemblies declined 16 per cent in November to an annual rate of 7.0 million units. As sales of new domestic cars continued well below production, further output cutjacks are being made in December. Production of consumer household goods was reduced sharply further in Hovember and output of nondurable consumer goods eased off further. Production of business equipment declined 1.0 per cent as weaknesses in some equipment industries became apparent. Output of construction products continued to drop.

Production of steel declined in November, in part because of the coal strike, and there were reductions in output of other durable and nondurable industrial materials.

IGUSTRIAL PRODUCTION (Seasonally adjusted)

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Indexes } 1967=100 \\ 1974 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | Per cent changes |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sept. Oct. Nov.  <br> (r) (p) (e) |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Month } \\ \text { ago } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } \\ & \text { ago } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Annual Rate |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | QI |  | QII | OIII |
| Total | 125.6 | 124.9 | 122.0 |  | -2.3 | -4:3 | $-6.6$ | 1.9 | - . 3 |
| Products, total | 123.7 | 123.0 | 121.4 | -1.3 | -3.1 | - 5.8 | 2.6 | . 6 |
| Final products | 122.8 | 122.6 | 120.9 | -1.4 | -2.2 | -6.5 | 3.0 | 2.3 |
| Consumer goods | 129.4 | 128.5 | 126.6 | -1.6 | -5.2 | -11.5 | 2.5 | -. 6 |
| Durable goods | 128.6 | 126.8 | 120.4 | -5.0 | -13.1 | -26.6 | 14.7 | -5.1 |
| Nondurable goods | 129.6 | 129.3 | 129.0 | -. 2 | -1.9 | - 5.2 | -2.2 | 3.1 |
| Business equipment | 132.3 | 132.4 | 131.0 | -1.1 | 2.5 | . 6 | 7.2 | 4.0 |
| Intermediate products | 126.9 | 124.4 | 122.7 | -1.4 | -6.4 | - 4.6 | 1.2 | -4.3 |
| Construction products | 127.5 | 123.7 | 120.2 | $-2.8$ | -10.1 | -5.1 | -2.7 | -7.7 |
| Materials | 128.8 | 128.0 | 122.9 | -4.0 | -6.5 | - 6.4 | -. 3 | -1.6 |

[^1]The Wholesale price index for November rose 1.2 per cent, seasonally adjusted (not at an annual rate), to a level 23.5 per cent above a year earlier. The increase was propelled largely by nigher sugar prices and a further large, but decelerating, increase in industrial commodities.

The index of farm and food products increased 2.5 per cent seasonally adjusted, chiefly as a result of increases for sugar, milk, fresh fruits and vegetables, and meats.

The index of industrial commodities rose 0.9 per cent, seasonally adjusted, paced by increases for machinery and equipment and chemicals. Also higher were prices for furniture and household durables, nonmetallic minerals, metals and metal products, and paper products. Lumber and wood products declined for the seventh consecutive month. Textile products and hides and skins also declined, and the fuels and power group was unchanged.

WHOLESALE PRICES
(Per cent changes at seasonally adjusted compound annual rates) $1 /$

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Nov ' } 73 \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Nov. ' } 74 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dec. ' } 72 \\ \text { to } \\ \text { June' } 73 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { June }{ }^{17} \\ & \text { to } \end{aligned}$ Dec. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dec. } 73 \\ \text { to } \\ \text { June' } 74 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { June ' } 74 \\ & \text { Sept. ' } 74 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sept. } 174 \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Oct. ' } 74 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Oct. } 174 \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Hov. } 74 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All commodities | 23.5 | 20.2 | 10.9 | 18.2 | 35.2 | 29.4 r | 14.6 |
| Farm and food products | 15.0 | 45.8 | 10.4 | -11.5 | 59.2 | $61.5 r$ | 29.9 |
| Industrial commodities | 27.4 | 10.6 | 10.9 | 34.0 | 28.3 | 13.4 | 10.3 |
| Crude materials | 31.3 | 23.0 | 40.4 | 44.3 | 29.1 | -5.2 | -3.1 |
| Intermediate materials | 30.7 | 12.2 | 11.7 | 38.0 | 32.2 | 12.6 | 9.0 |
| Finished goods | 21.7 | 6.3 | 7.1 | 24.5 | 22.7 | 23.5 | 8.8 |
| Producer | 22.6 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 20.0 | 31.8 | 29.1 | 16.6 |
| Consumer, excl.food Nondurable, excl. | 21.3 | 6.7 | 8.1 | 26.8 | 13.5 | 20.8 | 4.9 |
| foods | 25.6 | 8.5 | 11.3 | 35.6 | 19.1 | 15.6 | 6.2 |
| Durable | 14.4 | 4.5 | 2.8 | 13.2 | 15.6 | 37.0 | 2.7 |
| Consumer finished foods | 15.4 | 27.0 | 18.5 | -1.1 | 29.4 | 51.0r | 42.1 |
| Note: Farm and food prod <br> 1/ Not compounded for | ucts incl one-month | ude farm <br> th change | produc es. | and pro | essed f | ds and | eds. |

The surge in sugar prices was a major factor in the sharp rise in the farm and food index and in the increase in the overall $4 P I$ last month. For example, if the sugar and confectionery group were excluded from the farm and food products index, the index would have declined 0.4 per cent, unadjusted, and would have been about unchanged, seasonally adjusted. If the sugar and confectionery group were excluded from the total WPI, the increase would have been 0.3 per cent, unadjusted, and an estimated 0.5 per cent, seasonally adjusted.

UHOLESALE PRICES
(Percentage changes)

*Sugar and confectionery group in processed foods and feeds.

## CORRECTIONS

Part I: Table I-8, line 4 from bottom of the table, Housing starts, private, QIII 1974, the figure should be 81.0 (not 16.0 ) per cent compound annual rate.

Part II: Page 4, line 3 from the bottom, the figure should be 3.4 per cent (not 3.2 ).

Part II: Page 6, line 7 of full paragraph, the figure should be 14 per cent (not 15 ).

IHTEREST RATES

|  | Highs | Lows | Sov. 18 | Dec. 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Short-Term Rates |  |  |  |  |
| Federal funds (wkly. avg.) | 13.55(7/3) | 8.81 (2/27) | 9.34(11/20) | 8.86(12/11) |
| 3-month |  |  |  |  |
| Treasury bills (bid) | 9.74 (8/23) | 6.93(2/6) | 7.52 | 7.38 |
| Comm. paper (90-119 day) | $12.25(7 / 17)$ | $7.75(2 / 22)$ | 8.88 | 9.00 |
| Barkers' acceptances | $12.50(8 / 15)$ | $7.75(2 / 26)$ | 8.85 | 9.00 |
| Euro-dollars | 14.38(7/16) | 8.25(2/18) | 9.88 | 10.25 |
| CD's (NYC) 90-119 day Most סften quoted new | 12.00( 9/4) | $7.68(2 / 20)$ | 8.50(11/20) | 8.75(12/11) |
| 5-month |  |  |  |  |
| Treasury bills (bid) | $9.86(8 / 23)$ | 6.80(2/19) | 7.52 | 7.18 |
| Comm. paper ( $4-6 \mathrm{mo}$ ) | $12.13(7 / 10)$ | $7.50(2 / 22)$ | 8.63 | 8.75 |
| Federal agencies | 10.63(8/28) | 7.16(2/19) | 8.08 | 7.61 |
| Most often quoted new | 11.90(8/21) | $7.50(2 / 27)$ | 8.25(11/20) | $8.00(12 / 11)$ |
| 1-year |  |  |  |  |
| Treasury bills (bid) | $9.65(8 / 23)$ | 6.37 (2/15) | 7.23 | 6.75 |
| Federal agencies <br> CD's (NYC) | 10.18(8/26) | $7.01(2 / 19)$ | 8.05 | 7.65 |
| Most often quoted new | $9.75(7 / 17)$ | $7.00(2 / 27)$ | 8.00(11/20) | $8.00 \times 12 / 11)$ |
| Prime municipals | 6.50(7/12) | $3.70(2 / 15)$ | 4.40(11/22) | 4.60(12/13) |
| Intermediate and Long-Term |  |  |  |  |
| Treasury coupon issues |  |  |  |  |
| 5-years | $8.79(8 / 23)$ | $6.72(2 / 14)$ | 7.61 | 7.26 |
| 20-years | 8.72 (8/26) | $7.40(1 / 4)$ | 7.94 | 7.83 |
| Corporate |  |  |  |  |
| Seasoned Aaa | 9.40(10/8) | 7.73( 1/2) | 8.85 | 8.85 |
| Baa | 10.53(12/2) | 3.54( 1/2) | 10.50 | 10.50 |
| Hew Issue Aaa Utility | 10.61(10/2) | $8.05(2 / 13)$ | 9.17(11/21) | $9.60(12 / 12)$ |
| Municipal |  |  |  |  |
| Bond Buyer Index | 7.15 (12/12 | 5.16(2/6) | 6.53(11/21) | 7.15 (22/12) |
| Mortgage--average yield in FiMA auction | 10.59(9/9) | 8.43 (2/25) | 9.81(11/18) | $9.61(12 / 2)$ |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX A DEMAND DEPOSIT OWNERSHIP SURVEY *

Revised data for the demand deposit ownership survey for the third quarter of 1974 indicated slower growth in gross IPC demand deposits (not seasonally adjusted) at all commercial banks. This slowdown continues the weakness reflected in the second quarter data, and is also consistent with changes in $M_{1}$ over the two quarters (Table 1). Although the data are not seasonally adjusted, comparison with third quarter data for earlier survey years, and with the mean change in deposits calculated over the third quarters for the years 1970-74, indicates that changes in demand deposits in each ownership category were weaker than historical experience would have suggested (with the exception of foreign IPC deposits). Although the third quarter weakness was spread across ownership categories, Table 2 indicates that IPC demand deposit growth of nonfinancial businesses and households were especially weak at non-weekly reporting banks.

[^2]Table 1
CHANGE IN LEVEL OF GROSS IPC DEPOSTTS BY OWNERSHIP
CATEGORY, ALL COMMERCIAL BANKS 1/
(Billions of dollars, not seasonally adjusted)

| Year | Financial business |  |  |  | Nonfinancial business. |  |  |  | Households |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | QI | QII | QIII | QIV | QI | QII | QIII | QIV | QI | QII | QIII | QIV |
| 1970 | n. a. | n.a. | -- | . 3 | th. a. | n. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 2.7 | 4.6 | n. a. | n.a. | 2.4 | 2.2 |
| 1971 | 1.0 | -. 2 | -. 2 | . 6 | -6.4 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 6.9 | . 8 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| 1972 | 1.7 | -2.3 | -- | . 9 | -5.8 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 8.4 | -3.9 | 5.7 | 2.6 | 2.4 |
| 1973 | -. 2 | -. 1 | . 2 | . 2 | -7.1 | 3.8 | 1.7 | 7.8 | -. 3 | 2.2 | 1.8 | . 9 |
| 1974 | -. 2 | -. 6 | -. 3 |  | -7.7 | 3.7 | 2.1 |  | . 6 | . 8 | . 7 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { QIII--Mean } \\ 70-74 \end{gathered}$ | . 6 | -. 8 | -. 1 |  | $-6.8$ | 4.0 | 2.5 |  | -. 7 | 2.6 | 1.7 |  |


|  | Foreign |  |  |  | Al1 other |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | QI | QII | OIII | QIV | QI | QII | OIII | QIV | QI | OII | QIII | QIV |
| 1970 | n. a. | n.a. | -. 2 | -. 1 | n.a. | n.a. | . 4 | - 3 | n.a. | n.a. | 5.3 | 7.3 |
| 1971 | . 1 | -. 1 | -. 1 | . 1 | . 3 | -- | -. 8 | 1.0 | -4.2 | 4.9 | 2.1 | 9.7 |
| 1972 | -- | -- | -- | . 1 | 1.6 | -1.3 | . 4 | . 9 | -6.3 | 7.1 | 7.0 | 12.6 |
| 1973 | . 2 | . 3 | . 1 | . 3 | -. 5 | -- | . 2 | . 4 | -8.0 | 6.3 | 4.0 | 9.7 |
| 1974 | -. 2 | -. 1 | -. 1 |  | -1.4 | . 1 | -. 1 |  | -8.9 | 3.8 | 2.2 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { QIII--Meain } \\ 70-74 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 | -. 1 |  | 0 | -. 3 | 0 |  | -6.8 | 5.5 | 4.1 |  |

I/ Changes are based on daily averages of last-month-in-quarter to last-month-in-quarter, not annualized. Data are before deduction for cash items in process of collection.
Figures may not add to totals due to rounding.

Table 2

THIRD QUARTER CHANGE IN LEVEL OF GROSS IPC DEMAND DEPOSITS
BY OWNERSHIP CATEGORY, AT WEEKLY REPORTING BANKS VS. NON-WEEKLY REPORTING BANKS 1/ (Billions of dollars, not seasonally adjusted)

| Year | Financial business |  |  | Nonfinancial business |  |  | Households |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | WRB | Non-WRB | TOTAL | WRB | Non-WRB | TOTAL | WRB | Non-WRB | TOTAL |
| 1970 | -. 1 | . 1 | 0 | . 9 | 1.8 | 2.7 | . 9 | 1.6 | 2.4 |
| 1971 | -. 3 | . 1 | -. 2 | . 4 | 1.5 | 1.9 | . 2 | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| 1972 | -. 4 | . 4 | 0 | 1. 8 | 2.2 | 4.0 | . 5 | 2.1 | 2.6 |
| 1973 | . 3 | -. 1 | . 2 | -. 1 | 1.8 | 1.7 | . 1 | 1.7 | 1.8 |
| 1974 | -. 2 | -. 1 | -. 3 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 2.1 | . 3 | . 4 | . 7 |


| Year | Foreign |  |  | All other |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | WRB | Non-WRB | TOTAL | WR.B | Non-WRB | TOTAL | WRB | Non-WRB | TOTAL |
| 1970 | -. 2 | 0 | -. 2 | . 2 | . 2 | . 4 | 1.7 | 3.7 | 5.3 |
| 1971 | -. 1 | 0 | -. 1 | -. 5 | -. 3 | -. 8 | -. 2 | 2.4 | 2.1 |
| 1972 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 2 | . 2 | . 4 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 |
| 1973 | . 1 | 0 | . 1 | . 3 | -. 1 | . 2 | . 7 | 3.3 | 4.0 |
| 1974 | 0 | -. 1 | -. 1 | 0 | -. 1 | -. 1 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 2.3 |

If Changes are based on daily averages of last-month-in-quarter to last-month-in-quarter, not annualized. Data are before deduction for cash items in process of collection. Only data for total and weekly reporting banks are reported; thus figures for non-weekly reporting banks are residuals.
Figures may not add to totals due to rounding.

Loan demand was reported to be weaker or unchanged from three months earlier at the large majority of respondents to the Quarterly Survey of Changes in Bank Lending Practices taken November 15. Only 8 of the 124 responding banks predicted that loan demand would be stronger in the coming three months, while 53 banks were predicting moderation in loan demand. The weakening in demand that was being experienced and is expected for the coming quarter contrasts with the two previous surveys in which most banks had reported thet credit demands from business customers were stronger and expected to intensify. The strengthening of loan demand anticipated in the May survey was borne out by subsequent loan growth, but following the August survey, growth of business loans has slackened sharply relative to the pace earlier in the year.

The moderation in the intense pressure for credit led to some easing in their practices relating to interest rates charged at onethird of the respondents. Much of the easing occurred at the smaller banks (under $\$ 1$ billion in deposits) on the panel, with 40 per cent of such banks reporting easing of rates. Three-quarters of the large banks on the panel indicated firmer or unchanged interest rate policies. Since the prime rate at major banks fell well over 100 basis points between the survey taken in September and the most recent survey, the unchanged or firmer policies reported must be interpreted relative to other short-term rates, particularly the commercial paper rate, which fell much more than the prime rate in the interval between surveys. Apparently, the banks reporting firmer interest rate policies- 25 in all--are not lowering their rates as rapidly as market rates have dropped.

In the nonprice terms of business lending, there was essentially no easing, and in some indicators of nonprice terms, further tightening had occurred at many of the respondents. Such tightening was reported by over 30 per cent of the respondents on compensating balance requirements, over 40 per cent on standards of credit worthiness in the evaluation of loan applications, and more than half on policies regarding use of the proceeds of the loan, particularly with respect to loans for speculative and :'non-productive" uses. The tightening of the terms of lending follow severe tightening indicated in the May and August surveys.

Nonprice terms of lending to financial businesses also have become more firm in the last three months. The tightening was most obvious in policies concerning new or larger commitments, with more than 40 per cent of the respondents reporting firmer policies in this area.

There was virtually no easing in the restrictive policies toward mortgages adopted earlier in the year, and a substantial minority of the banks became more restrictive in limiting mortgages in their portfolios.

[^3]

| ANSW QUE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ER ING } \\ & \text { STION } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MUCH } \\ & \text { FIRMER } \\ & \text { POLICY } \end{aligned}$ |  | moderately FIRMER POLICY |  | ESSENTIALLY UNCHANGED POLICY |  | MODERATELY EASIER POLICY |  | MUCH EASIER POLICY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BANKS | PCT | BANKS | PCT | BANK 5 | PCT | BANKS | PCT | BANK 5 | PCT | BANK S | PCT |
| 124 | 100.0 | 15 | 12.1 | 28 | 22.6 | 81 | 65.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 124 | 100.0 | 24 | 19.4 | 37 | 29.8 | 61 | 49.2 | 2 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 |

LENDING TO "NONCAPTIVE" FINANCE COMPANIES TERMS AND CONDITIONS:

| INTEREST RATES CHARGED | 124 | 100.0 | 2 | 1.6 | 16 | 12.9 | 85 | 68.6 | 21 | 16.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COMPENSATING OR SUPPORTING BALANCES | 124 | 100.0 | 6 | 4.8 | 16 | 12.9 | 102 | 82.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| ENFORCEMENT OF BALANCE REQUIREMENTS | 124 | 100.0 | 13 | 10.5 | 21 | 16.9 | 90 | 72.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| ESTABLISHING NEW OR LARGER CREDIT LINES | 124 | 100.0 | 26 | 21.0 | 28 | 22.6 | 67 | 54.0 | 3 | 2.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | ANSW OUE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ERING } \\ & \text { STION } \end{aligned}$ | CONSIO LE WIL | ERABLY S ING | MODER LES WILL | ately SS ING | ESSEN UNCH | tially ANGED |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TELY } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { ING } \end{aligned}$ |  | RABLY ING |
| WILLINGNESS to make other types of loans | BANKS | PCT | BANKS | PCT | BANKS | PCT | BANK S | PCT | BANKS | PCT | BANK S | PCT |
| TERM LOANS TO BUSINESSES | 124 | 100.0 | 15 | 12.1 | 21 | 16.9 | 86 | 69.4 | 2 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
| CONSUMER INSTALMENT LOANS | 123 | 100.0 | 5 | 4.1 | 20 | 16.3 | 93 | 75.5 | 4 | 3.3 | 1 | 0.8 |
| SINGLE FAMILY MÓRTGAgE LOANS | 121 | 100.0 | 19 | 15.7 | 20 | 16.5 | 80 | 66.1 | 2 | 1.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MULTI-FAMILY MORTGAGE LOANS | 120 | 100.0 | 26 | 21.7 | 20 | 16.7 | 74 | 61.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| ALL ©ther mortgage loans | 122 | 100.0 | 23 | 18.9 | 26 | 21.3 | 73 | 59.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| PARTICIPATION LOANS WITH CORRESPONDENT BANKS | 123 | 100.0 | 10 | 8.1 | 14 | 11.4 | 90 | 73.2 | 9 | $7 \cdot 3$ | 0 | 0.0 |
| LOANS TO BROKERS | 123 | 100.0 | 10 | 8.1 | 16 | 13.0 | 95 | 77.3 | 2 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 |

2. FOR THESE FACTORS, FIRMER MEANS THE FACTORS WERE CONSIDERED MORE IMPORTANT IN MAKING DECISIONS FOR APPROVING CREDIT REQUESTS, AND EASIER MEANS THEY HERE LESS IMPORTANT.

SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX C MONTHLY LOAN COMMITMENT SURVEY OCTOBER 31, 1974 *

The most recent Monthly Loan Commitment Survey taken at 137 large banks at the end of October indicates that total unused commitments increased substantially during October, but not enough to compensate for the decline in September; in October unused commitments remained below the year's peak reached in August. However, it is apparent from the twelve months of data now available in the monthly commitments survey that unused commitments, while large, have not been growing as rapidly as loans made under commitments.

Total unused commitments to commercial and industrial fims, nonbank financial institutions, and for mortgages grew at a not seasonally adjusted annual rate of 3.7 per cent between November 1973 and October 1974, while loans made under comaitments in such categories grew 20.5 per cent. Commitments to nonbank financial institutions at the 137 responding banks were essentially unchanged in the period, and commitments for mortgages fell at almost a 30 per cent annual rate. Thus, the 8.2 per cent growth of C\&I unused commitments accounted for all the growth in unused commitments. With the relatively slow growth of unused commitments, the utilization ratios (the proportion of loans outstanding under commitment to total commitments) have risen steadily in nearly all categories of loans reported on the survey. However, with a current ratio of 50 per cent, the potential for takedowns at these banks is substantial.

Though not keeping pace with loans made under conmitments, the stock of unused commitments at mojor banks continues to be very large--despite the evidence from the Lending Practices Surveys and discussions with bankers that commitments policies became extremely restrictive in the spring and remain so. In the present atmosphere in financial markets, corporate borrowers place a high value on formal commitments for credit from major banks, and the banks are reported to be raising fees for commitments in response to the demand. However, the data thus far available do not provide an adequate basis for evaluating the effectiveness of these policies. The weakening in economic activity that is expected to continue for some time will likely act as a brake on the pace of takedowns in the short-term, but as economic activity picks up, the stock of unused commitments will likely again place a heavy burden on banks to meet the credit needs of their business customers.

[^4]

NUMBER OF 8 ANKS 137

[^5]NOT FOR
QUOTATION OR pubitcation

MONTHLY SURVEY OF BANK LOAN COMMITMENTS
AT SELECTED LARGE U.S. BANKS $1 /$
(AS OF OCT. 31, 1974 )
TABLE 2 - LOANS UNDER COMMITMENTS 2/
(DOLLAR AMOUNTS IN BILLIONS)


NUMEER OF BANKS
137

1/ BANKS PARTICIPATING IN THE MONTHLY LOAN COMMTTMENT SURVEY ARE SELECTED WEEKLY REPORTING BANKS WITH TOTAL DEPOSITS OF $\$ 100$ MILLION OR MORE
2/ LOANS UNDER COMMITMENTS ARE DEFINED AS ALL LOANS UNDER COMMITMENTS CURRENTLY OR PREVIOUSLY IN FORCE, LESS REPAYMENTS OF THE PRINCIPAL. THE REPORTEO DATA ARE OISTORTFT BY YAKEDOWNS OF LDAN COMMITMENTS BY OVERSEAS BRANCHES OF US BANKS AND LOAN SALES.


[^6]NOT FOR QUOTATION OR PUBLICATION

MONTHLY SURVEY OF BANK LOAN COMMITMENTS
AT SELECTED LARGE U.S. BANKS $1 /$
(AS OF OCT. 31, 1974)
TABLE 4 - NEH COMMITMENTS
(DOLLAR AMOUNTS IN BILLIONS)


I/ BANKS PARTICIPATING IN THE MONTHLY LOAN COMMITMENT SURVEY ARE SELECTED WEEKLY REPORTING BANKS WITH TOTAL DEPOSITS DF $\$ 100$ MILLION OR MORE.

Following two days of Cabinet deliberations, on December 12 the German government announced measures to restimulate the faltering domestic economy. In a joint press conference of the Ministers of Economics, Finance and Labor the government presented a package which includes substantial investment incentives, increased assistance to the unemployed, and use of part of the countercyclical funds held on deposit with the Bundesbank. As described by the kinisters, the main features of the new program are summarized below:

1) Investment Incentives. A bonus of 7.5 per cent will be paid to enterprises ordering investment goods or commencing projects for the seven months between December 1, 1974 and June 30, 1975. In order to assure swift impact on the economy, goods so ordered must be delivered by July 1, 1976, and qualifying construction projects must be completed by July 1, 1977. An exception will apply to delivery of goods on major energy projects, where delivery will be permitted as late as July 1, 1978. The investment bonus method is reported to have been chosen in preference to tax credits, since the latter might have little incentive effect for enterprises currently losing money and having little if any tax liability. This measure will require special legislation.
2) Government Investment. The Federal Government, using a portion of the countercyclical funds to be drawn from special deposits held with the Bundesbank, will spend DM 1.13 billion in priority sectors such as construction and energy. Projects will be chosen for their immediate impact and low followup costs. This portion of the program will supplement the DM 950 million in sectoral assistance, primarily to construction, announced in September.
3) Labor Assistance. A further DM 600 million will be spent by the Federal Labor Office to combat rapidly rising unemployment, which in November reached almost 800,000 out of a labor force of 23 million. Seasonally adjusted, the German unemployment rate has climbed steadily this year, from 1.6 per cent in January to a level of 3.8 per cent in November; and the number of workers on short-time reached 461,000 in the same month. Under the new program, employers who hire the unemployed prior to May 1. 1975, will receive special incentive payments over a six month period. In addition, the Federal Labor office will provide relocation incentives to unemployed workers and make available supplementary benefits to workers on short-time for a period of two years, as ageinst the one year period presently in effect.
[^7]The estimated cost during 1975 of the programs outlined above is DM 1.73 billion, which will be met by the government's drawing DM 3.5 billion of the countercyclical funds raised through the now-expired temporary stability surcharges on investment expenditures and on personal income taxes. The drawing represents about one-third of the DM 10 billion in such funds. The difference between the drawing and cost of the December 12 program will reportedly be applied to the budget deficit for 1975, which for the Federal and State Governments is now estimated to total some DM 50 biliion.

With the meesures announced on December 12, overall German policy has clearly shifted toward combating the recessionary influences which have deepened throughout 1974. The stimulus provided by the package is meant to take effect quickly, and will supplement previously announced tax reform measures going into effect in January, 1975, and the recent easing of monetary policy, as described in the December 11 Greenbook. In early December the Bundesbank Central Council also announced, for the first time, a target of 8 per cent growth for the monetary base during 1975.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In some cases, original copies needed to be photocopied before being scanned into electronic format. All scanned images were deskewed (to remove the effects of printer- and scanner-introduced tilting) and lightly cleaned (to remove dark spots caused by staple holes, hole punches, and other blemishes caused after initial printing).
    ${ }^{2}$ A two-step process was used. An advanced optical character recognition computer program (OCR) first created electronic text from the document image. Where the OCR results were inconclusive, staff checked and corrected the text as necessary. Please note that the numbers and text in charts and tables were not reliably recognized by the OCR process and were not checked or corrected by staff.
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[^5]:    1/ BANKS PARTICIPATING IN THE MONTHLY LOAN COMMITMENT SURVEY ARE SELECTED WEEKLY REPORTING BANKS WITH TOTAL DEPOSITS OF $\$ 100$ MILLION OR MORE.
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