Minutes for August 22, 1956.

To: Members of the Board

From: Office of the Secretary

Attached is a copy of the minutes of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on the above date.

It is not proposed to include a statement with respect to any of the entries in this set of minutes in the record of policy actions required to be maintained pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act.

Should you have any question with regard to the minutes, it will be appreciated if you will advise the Secretary's Office. Otherwise, if you were present at the meeting, please initial in column A below to indicate that you approve the minutes. If you were not present, please initial in column B below to indicate that you have seen the minutes.

	A	В
Chm. Martin	(W)	-11/0
Gov. Szymczak		× W
Gov. Vardaman	x	` <u> </u>
Gov. Mills	*	
Gov. Robertson	×	
Gov. Balderston		* CCB
Gov. Shepardson	Coll	

Minutes of actions taken by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on Wednesday, August 22, 1956. The Board met in the Board Room at 10:00 a.m.

PRESENT: Mr. Martin, Chairman

Mr. Vardaman

Mr. Mills

Mr. Robertson

Mr. Shepardson

Mr. Carpenter, Secretary

Mr. Kenyon, Assistant Secretary

Mr. Thurston, Assistant to the Board

Mr. Riefler, Assistant to the Chairman

Mr. Thomas, Economic Adviser to the Board

Mr. Leonard, Director, Division of Bank Operations

Mr. Young, Director, Division of Research and Statistics

Mr. Solomon, Assistant General Counsel

Mr. Masters, Assistant Director, Division of Examinations

Mr. Horbett, Associate Director, Division of Bank Operations

Mr. Noyes, Adviser, Division of Research and Statistics

Mr. Conkling, Assistant Director, Division of Bank Operations

Mr. Molony, Special Assistant to the Board

Mr. Eckert, Chief, Banking Section, Division of Research and Statistics

The following matters, which had been circulated to the members of the Board, were presented for consideration and the action taken in each instance was as stated:

Letter to Mr. W. R. Birge, Chief, Federal Reserve Issue and Redemption Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Treasury Department, Washington, D. C., reading as follows:

Reference is made to the Board's letter of November 7, 1955, giving a list of representatives of the Division

of Bank Operations who are authorized to sign requisitions upon the Comptroller of the Currency for the shipment of Federal Reserve notes. Please add the name of J. J. Connell, Chief, Reserve Bank Operations Section, who is authorized to sign such requisitions for the Director, Division of Bank Operations.

Mr. Connell's specimen signature appears below.

Approved unanimously.

Memorandum dated August 13, 1956, from Mr. Leonard, Director, Division of Bank Operations, stating that the provision of \$4,500 contained in the 1956 budget of the Division for fees to the Consulting Architect to the Board for reviewing plans for Federal Reserve building Projects had proved to be low, and requesting that the provision be raised to \$6,500.

Approved unanimously.

Letter to Mr. Stetzelberger, Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, reading as follows:

Reference is made to your letter of August 14, 1956, advising of the proposal of The Provident Savings Bank and Trust Company, Cincinnati, Ohio, to move its Madison-ville Branch office in Cincinnati from 5911 Madison Road to 6001 Madison Road a distance of approximately 200 feet.

We concur in your view that the proposal constitutes a mere relocation of an existing branch in the immediate neighborhood without affecting the nature of its business or customers served, and, therefore, the approval of the Board is not necessary.

Approved unanimously.

Letter to Mr. Denmark, Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, reading as follows:

Reference is made to your letter of August 8, 1956, submitting with a favorable recommendation a request of Columbus Bank and Trust Company, Columbus, Georgia, for

permission under Section 24A of the Federal Reserve Act to invest not exceeding \$1,280,000, including architect's fees, for the purpose of constructing a new five-story bank building on the site of its present main office banking premises.

The Board has given consideration to the information you have submitted and approves the additional investment of not exceeding \$1,280,000 by Columbus Bank and Trust Company in banking premises with the understanding that a reserve of \$500,000 is to be established immediately against the account and that thereafter an accelerated program of depreciation is to be inaugurated with respect to banking premises and furniture and fixtures. Please advise the trust company accordingly.

Approved unanimously.

Letter to the Board of Directors, Fidelity Trust Company, Indianapolis, Indiana, reading as follows:

Pursuant to your request submitted through the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, the Board of Governors approves the establishment of a branch by Fidelity Trust Company in the quarters presently occupied by the Bankers Trust Company, 138 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, in connection with a proposed merger of the Fidelity Trust Company and Bankers Trust Company with a change in corporate title to "Fidelity Bank & Trust Company." This approval is given provided (a) the merger is effected in accordance with the agreement of merger dated June 18, 1956, (b) the branch is established within six months from the date of this letter, and (c) the approval of the State banking authorities is in effect at the time the branch is established.

Approved unanimously, for transmittal through the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago.

Letter to the Board of Directors, Fruita State Bank, Fruita, Colorado, Fruita, Colorado, approving, subject to conditions of membership numbered 1 and 2 contained in the Board's Regulation H, the bank's application for membership in the Federal Reserve System and stock in the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City.

Approved unanimously, for transmittal through the Federal

Reserve Bank of Kansas City, with a letter to the Reserve Bank containing the following paragraph:

The report of examination for membership made as of July 9, 1956, disclosed several public and business accounts carried in savings deposits which did not conform to the definition of "Savings Deposits" as set out in Regulation Q. It is noted this matter has been discussed with the management of the bank and that it was indicated the deposits would be transferred to conforming types of accounts.

With a letter to the Board dated August 10, 1956, Mr. Raymond
T. Bowman, Assistant Director for Statistical Standards at the Bureau
of the Budget, enclosed drafts of statements by the Budget Bureau on
the status of consideration of eight bank reporting requirements listed
in Appendix 1(c) of the Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Paperwork
Management, Part II, "The Nation's Paperwork for the Government: An Experiment." Comments on the drafts, which were requested by August 20,
had been prepared and distributed to the members of the Board prior to
this meeting along with a proposed letter to Mr. Bowman which would transmit the comments and state that the Board had no disagreement with the
Budget Bureau's approach on the various items. The letter would also
state that the Board would continue to cooperate with the Budget Bureau
and the Banking Committee of the Advisory Council on Federal Reports to
improve banking statistical reports and to alleviate the burden of their
preparation.

At the request of the Board, Messrs. Horbett, Conkling, and Eckert discussed the objectives of the work being undertaken by the Bureau of the Budget and the Banking Committee of the Advisory Council on Federal Reports, which represented an outgrowth of studies by the Hoover Commission designed to reduce the burden of statistical reporting to various agencies of the Government. Messrs. Conkling and Eckert also summarized interagency meetings which they had attended at the Budget Bureau, at which consideration was given to revising or eliminating the eight specified reports, including a proposal that reports of earnings and dividends be obtained on an annual basis. The comment to the Budget Bureau on this point would indicate that the Board would be willing to consider an annual reporting on Form F. R. 107, provided quarterly or semiannual data could be obtained for statistical purposes on a condensed form from all member banks or from an adequate sample of such banks or, as an alternative, if reports on the present form or a similar form were obtained from the largest banks and a sample of other member banks. their comments, Messrs. Conkling and Eckert indicated that discussions at the meetings which they attended cast some doubt on whether the authors of the Task Force Report had a full appreciation of the various uses made of the respective statistical reports.

Governor Vardaman made a statement in which he expressed concern regarding any procedure requiring the Board to secure approval from the

Budget Bureau for reports which it wished to obtain, stating that in his opinion such a procedure tended, at least in principle, to restrict the freedom of the Board to procure data needed in the discharge of its responsibilities, particularly in the field of bank supervision. He suggested that this was a matter which might be taken up with the committee headed by Senator Robertson which is currently engaged in a study of the Federal statutes pertaining to banking and credit.

Chairman Martin commented that although he agreed with Governor Vardaman that the Board should maintain a position which would assure the availability of the statistics that it considered necessary, he felt at the same time that it was valuable to the Board to have the opinions of persons outside the System regarding the value of various statistical series, and that the Board should be able to vindicate the work which it was doing in the statistical area. He suggested that it seemed entirely proper for the Board to cooperate fully with surveys such as the one now being made in the light of the work of the Hoover Commission, although in the final analysis the decision as to whether various statistics should be collected was one which should rest with the Board itself. He went on to say that the Board should support its staff fully in the defense of work deemed essential to the Board's needs, and that it might develop that more reports actually should be obtained than at present. Nevertheless, he considered it valuable to the Board to have its reports subjected to criticism from time to time.

Governor Vardaman responded that he had no objection to criticism of the reports obtained by the Board, and that he agreed with the statement made by Chairman Martin. His only concern, he said, had to do with a possible relinquishment of the Board's right to make the final decision through requirements providing that any reports desired by the Board would be subject to the approval of another Government agency.

Governor Robertson stated that the items under discussion did not deal with the problem of bank supervision in the sense that he understood that term. Rather, he said, the problem was one of procuring statistical information from banks. It was a matter of how such information was obtained, including the frequency and extent of the reports. He considered it valuable to have these matters subjected to scrutiny by parties outside the System, not only at infrequent intervals but on a regular basis. He agreed that the Board, in the last analysis, should make its own decisions but he felt that full cooperation should be extended in a review of statistical information such as the one in progress. In response to a statement by Mr. Young that the proposed letter to the Budget Bureau and its enclosures could be strengthened by various editorial changes, Governor Robertson questioned whether it was necessary to make such changes at this time. As he understood the matter, the material now being collected by the Budget Bureau would not be the basis for a decision as to what procedures the Board would follow. Instead, the

Budget Bureau would consider the points of view of the interested agencies and then make a recommendation, at which time the Board would have an opportunity to make such comments as it desired.

With regard to the procedure that would be followed by the Budget Bureau, Mr. Noyes said it was not definite whether the Board would have another opportunity to comment. It appeared that the Director of the Budget Bureau might proceed to make recommendations to the President, and that the President might then confirm the recommendations.

In a discussion of this point, Chairman Martin said that he would see no objection to a strengthening of the proposed letter and its enclosures in any way that the staff deemed desirable, but that he did not think the importance of the matter should be exaggerated. If certain recommendations should be approved by the President, it would of course be difficult to refuse to accept them, but if necessary the Board would have to follow its own judgment. The Chairman went on to stress the advisability of following a "middle course", pointing out that it is necessary to have the support of the banking and financial community in order to obtain cooperation in the furnishing of satisfactory statistics while, on the other hand, the Board must obtain information essential to the fulfillment of its responsibilities.

Governor Shepardson made a statement in support of the language in the proposed comment to the Budget Bureau concerning the reporting of

earnings and dividends of member banks, pointing out that the statement would insist on quarterly or semiannual data in some abbreviated form. If the Board's requirements could be met in this way, he felt that it was logical to offer cooperation in reaching a compromise.

At the conclusion of the discussion, unanimous approval was given to a letter to Mr. Raymond T. Bowman, Assistant Director for Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget, reading as follows, with the understanding that the staff was authorized to make such changes in the enclosures to the letter as might be deemed advisable in the interest of presenting the Board's position accurately:

This refers to your letter of August 10 enclosing drafts of individual statements on the status of "targets" listed in Appendix 1(c) of the Task Force Report on Paperwork Management, Part II, The Nations Paperwork for the Government: An Experiment.

Because of the August 20 deadline at your Office, we have not circulated the drafts to all interested persons at the Board and our response is of necessity in somewhat general terms. However, as indicated in the attached comments covering the eight listed reports, the Board has no disagreement with your approach on these various items. It will continue to cooperate with your office and the newly organized Banking Committee of the Advisory Council on Federal Reports to improve banking statistical reports and to alleviate the burden of their preparation.

Messrs. Horbett, Conkling, and Eckert then withdrew from the meeting.

At the request of the Board, Messrs. Solomon and Masters commented on a memorandum from the latter dated August 16, 1956, copies of

which had been sent to the members of the Board prior to this meeting. recommending that the Board authorize unedited copies of reports of examination of The Continental Bank and Trust Company, Salt Lake City. Utah, to be furnished under proper safeguard for the confidential and temporary use of witnesses on behalf of the Board in the proceeding against the member bank under section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act. It was Mr. Solomon's opinion that the circumstances made it reasonable to follow the recommended procedure and that the pertinent provisions of the Federal Reserve Act granted sufficient authority to proceed in the manner suggested. Mr. Masters said he did not feel that such a procedure would be inconsistent with the provisions of the Board's Order in this case which placed a qualification around the release of information regarding the names or identities of persons indebted to the member bank. He said that the reports would be made available to the witnesses only to give them information regarding the bank's condition and the witnesses Would be subject to the restrictions in the Board's Order. He pointed to the desirability of acquainting the witnesses fully with the bank's condition and expressed doubt whether this could be accomplished satisfactorily by the use of a report of examination from which information identifying borrowers had been eliminated. He also said that in supplying the unedited reports of examination, which would not include the confidential sections, attention would be drawn to the confidentiality of

8/22/56

-11-

the reports and the restrictions surrounding the use of information contained therein.

Governor Mills expressed the view that the recommendation should not be approved, stating that in his opinion the furnishing of the unedited reports of examination to witnesses not officially connected with bank supervision would tend to prejudice the Board's case, especially if the case were joined with a section 30 warning against two of the bank's officers, a procedure which he had questioned at the meeting of the Board on August 9, 1956, in connection with the proposed issuance of warnings to those officers. It was his position that the Board should approach the section 9 proceeding on the basis of principle and that if the matter were handled otherwise the Board would lose in stature before any court to which the matter might be taken. It was his conception that the expert witnesses would be persons called upon to testify in an area in which they were familiar and that they would testify out of the background of their experience. He questioned injecting into this picture the personalities of the particular case and said he was apprehensive of a charge of bringing personalities into the matter.

With respect to the comments made by Governor Mills, Mr. Masters said that it was somewhat difficult for him to speak for Mr. Powell, Special Counsel to the Board, who, as indicated in the memorandum, was of the view that unedited copies of the reports of examination should be made

available to the Board's witnesses for study during the preparation of their testimony. He gathered, however, that it was Mr. Powell's desire to supply each witness with the reports to acquaint the witness with the condition of the bank and enable him to answer questions while on the witness stand regarding the need of the bank for additional capital. Mr. Masters said he had the impression that in Mr. Powell's belief it was quite important to follow this procedure. In reply to a question by Governor Vardaman, he said that Mr. Powell was now selecting witnesses, that he understood the total number would be rather small, and that some of them were likely to be commercial bankers.

Governor Vardaman expressed agreement with the position taken by Governor Mills. He called attention to the statement in Mr. Masters' memorandum concerning the likelihood that witnesses appearing in behalf of the Continental Bank at the forthcoming hearing would have been furnished unedited copies of the March 12, 1956, report of examination which Continental had in its files, and said that in his view the Board's decision should not be influenced by that point. He felt that a Federal supervisory agency should not be in the position of releasing information in the manner requested and went on to say that although he would not want to do anything to hamper the conduct of the case, it was his view that a persecution of individuals should not be involved in the section 9 proceeding.

Governor Robertson suggested that there was a great deal of difference between furnishing unedited copies of the examination report to bankers called as witnesses and to other witnesses who were not bankers. He did not consider Continental free to provide unedited copies of such reports to witnesses appearing on its behalf because those reports are furnished solely for the confidential information of the bank itself and a statement is included with the report that its contents may not be disclosed to parties outside the bank. He then proposed as a possible solution of the problem an agreement between Counsel for the Board and Counsel for Respondent which would determine the extent to which edited and unedited copies of the examination reports were to be made available to witnesses for either side. Such an agreement, he said, could provide that unedited copies be given to nonbanker witnesses and edited copies to banker witnesses, and that evidence at the hearing would exclude all edited information.

Governor Vardaman said that if such a stipulation were reached between Counsel, that would be quite a different proposition and would place the matter in a somewhat different light.

Chairman Martin referred to the basic purpose of the hearing, that is, to determine the adequacy or inadequacy of the member bank's capital, and suggested that it would be difficult to prove a capital inadequacy if witnesses on behalf of the Board were not furnished appropriate data

concerning the subject bank. Without such information, he said, it would appear that the expert witnesses for the Board could be asked only to comment on the problem of capital in general terms and without specific relationship to this particular bank, while in actuality the Board was dealing with an individual case and a particular banking institution. If the witnesses were to be asked to comment on the capital situation of this bank, it seemed to him that it would be proper for them to have available the information contained in the reports of examination. However, because of the conflicting points of view stated at this meeting, he felt that the Board should not make a decision until it had given Mr. Powell an opportunity to explain in person the reasons underlying his request that the unedited reports of examination be made available to the witnesses who were to appear at the hearing on behalf of the Board.

Agreement having been expressed that the Board should hear Mr.

Powell before reaching a decision, Governor Robertson suggested that before such time Mr. Powell be contacted and the possibility mentioned to him of arranging a stipulation of counsel on both sides regarding the use of the examination reports.

Governor Mills stated that he would be opposed to making such a suggestion. Should the progress of the case reach a point where it was found that the witnesses on either side were being handicapped in giving

Dig

their testimony by the fact that they were not familiar with the material in the examination reports, he felt that a decision could then be made. On the other hand, he did not feel that a stipulation should be arranged until such a point was reached.

With reference to a suggestion which had been made that in this proceeding the Board was concerned primarily with its authority to determine the inadequacy of a bank's capital and require corrective steps, Governor Shepardson said it was his understanding that at this stage the Board was holding a hearing to develop information on the basis of which it would decide whether this particular bank was adequately capitalized. Depending on developments, the Board might then be faced with having the matter taken to the courts and a determination made of the Board's power to require additional capital. If this was the case, he felt that there was a basis for having the Board's witnesses properly informed, since they were going to testify whether in their opinion the Continental Bank had adequate capital. He suggested that if the Board was to have a basis for a capital determination, it must have information developed at the hearing on which to base that decision.

Governor Mills responded by suggesting that the Board's witnesses should be called upon for opinions on the responsibility of banks, and to what extent that responsibility required a private investment of capital to furnish a cushion against possible losses. On that basis, he said,

the witnesses' testimony could be confined to judgments which would not have to relate to the intimate details of the operations of the particular bank whose capital position was in question.

Governor Vardaman expressed agreement with Governor Mills' position. He said that if, in the course of the case, Respondent introduced detailed information relative to the contents of the examination reports and the bank's loan and investment portfolio, he could see where the Board's Counsel might take appropriate steps to offer testimony in rebuttal. However, he felt that the Board should not present its case on the basis of detailed information and that it would be preferable to try the case on the broad principles involved.

Following further discussion, it was suggested that Mr. Solomon advise Mr. Powell informally that the matter of furnishing the Board's witnesses copies of unedited reports of examination of Continental had been discussed by the Board, that certain questions had arisen, and that the Board had decided not to take action on the matter until he (Mr. Powell) could meet with the Board and present his views.

There was unanimous agreement with the suggested procedure.

In this connection, Governor Robertson suggested that it would be desirable to have Mr. Powell explain to the Board at the earliest Possible date the manner in which he proposed to conduct the case involving The Continental Bank and Trust Company so that basic decisions might be made with respect to procedure.

Chairman Martin agreed with Governor Robertson, stating that the points where opinions differed should be drawn up, discussed, and resolved, if possible, so that the conduct of the case might then be turned over by the Board to its Special Counsel.

There was unanimous agreement that it would be advisable to have Mr. Powell meet with the Board for the purpose stated by Chairman Martin and Governor Robertson.

Reference then was made to a memorandum from Mr. Solomon dated August 16, 1956, copies of which had been sent to the members of the Board, recommending that the notice of hearing issued in the matter of The Continental Bank and Trust Company be published in the Federal Register together with the later orders making the hearing public and changing the date of the hearing to October 3, 1956.

Following comments by Mr. Solomon which brought out that the recommended publication in the Federal Register would be in line with the procedure followed by most Government agencies in connection with similar hearings, the recommendation contained in his memorandum was approved unanimously.

Mr. Masters then withdrew from the meeting.

Reference was made to telegrams received from the Federal Reserve Banks of Boston, New York, Atlanta, and St. Louis last week and on Monday

of this week advising of the establishment without change, subject to the Board's approval, of the rates of discount and purchase contained in the schedules of the respective Banks. Attention also was called to a telegram from the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia dated August 16, 1956, advising of the establishment of a discount rate of 3 per cent, rather than 2-3/4 per cent, subject to the approval of the Board of Governors.

Following reference to the discussion of the discount rate at the meeting of the Federal Open Market Committee yesterday, question was raised whether telegrams should be sent to the Reserve Banks that had advised of the reestablishment of existing rates of discount and purchase indicating approval by the Board of such action. It was pointed out that although the sending of such telegrams would be in accord with customary practice, their transmittal was not legally necessary since the existing rates of the respective Banks would continue in effect in the absence of Board action.

It having been noted that Governor Szymczak was due to return to his office tomorrow, the suggestion was made that no action be taken pending a further discussion of the discount rate situation at another meeting of the Board.

There was unanimous agreement with this suggestion. Chairman Martin reported having been advised informally that
the Federal Reserve Bank of New York had received questions from member
banks in New York City regarding the possibility of an increase in the
maximum rate of interest payable on time deposits, such banks indicating
that under current money market conditions they were faced with the prospect of losing time deposits in substantial volume, including particularly deposits owned by foreigners.

In a brief discussion of the matter, during which reference was made to the Board's request that the subject of rates on time deposits be placed on the agenda for the next meetings of the Presidents' Conference and the Federal Advisory Council, Mr. Thomas stated that pursuant to the request made at the meeting of the Board on June 27, 1956, he had been preparing, and now had in draft form, a memorandum dealing with various aspects of the question. In the circumstances, it was suggested that Mr. Thomas complete and distribute his memorandum as soon as possible with a view to consideration of the subject by the Board in the light of the memorandum.

There was unanimous agreement with this suggestion.

Governor Robertson presented the following draft of letter to Mr. H. Burke Horton, Chief, Damage Assessment Division, Office of Defense Mobilization, and after summarizing interagency discussions and discussions

within the Board's staff relating to the request for the services of Mr. Grimwood, Economist in the Division of International Finance, as referred to in the letter, he recommended that the letter be approved:

In accordance with the arrangements discussed with you and Dr. Coker, the Board will make available to the ODM Damage Assessment Center for a period of not to exceed six months the services of Mr. Gordon B. Grimwood, an economist of the Board's staff. This is with the understanding that the arrangements will be reviewed at the end of three months and that the assignment is for work in Washington, D. C.

The Board will continue to pay the salary of Mr. Grimwood during the period of his services with the Center. It is understood that the Office of Defense Mobilization will pay transportation and per diem expenses for any incidental travel while Mr. Grimwood is assigned to that office.

This arrangement follows the preliminary study made by Mr. Schwartz of the Board's staff following Mr. Cooley's letter of January 30, 1956, and Mr. Grimwood's assignment to the Center for a short period in connection with Operation Alert 1956.

The letter was approved unanimously.

The meeting then adjourned.

Secretary's Note: During the day Governor Shepardson approved the following items on behalf of the Board:

Memoranda from appropriate individuals concerned recommending actions with respect to the Board's staff as follows:

Appointments

Shirley Ann Barham, as Clerk-Stenographer in the Division of Personnel Administration, with basic salary at the rate of \$3,415 per annum, effective when she assumes her duties. 1

Wilhelmina K. Steele, as Elevator Operator in the Division of Administrative Services, on a temporary basis for a period of six months, with basic salary at the rate of \$2,600 per annum, effective September 17, 1956.

Transfer

Barbara E. Brande, from the position of Clerk-Stenographer in the Division of Research and Statistics to the position of Secretary in Governor Vardaman's Office, with an increase in basic annual salary from \$3,415 to \$3,670, effective August 26, 1956.

Salary increases, effective August 26, 1956

		Basic annua	Basic annual salary		
Name and title	Division	From	То		
01	ffice of the Secretary				
Margaret J. Molster, Ser Sudelle Rice, Records Cl		\$4,210 3,670	\$4,345		
Re	esearch and Statistics				
Mary T. Gregory, Clerk Virginia Johns, Clerk-Stenographer		3,260 3,755	3,345 3,840		
	Bank Operations				
Mabel E. Wike, Statistical Clerk		3,600	3,685		
Examinations					
A. W. Hammons, Jr., Assi	stant Federal	4,795	4,930		
Reserve Examiner L. B. St. John, Assistance Examiner	t Federal Re-	5,710	5,845		

^{1/} Pursuant to the program for recruitment of stenographic personnel approved by the Board on April 24, 1956.

Salary increases, effective August 26, 1956 (continued)

Name and title	Division	Basic annua From	l salary To	
	Examinations			
Hanvey Stanford, Assistan Reserve Examiner	t Federal	\$6,115	\$6,250	
Administrative Services				
Beverly A. Carter, Senior Mail Clerk David W. Southard, Chauffeur Claiborne Johnson, Operator, Offset Press		4,345 3,125 4,659	4,480 3,210 4,909	
<u>Of</u>	fice of the Controller			
Joseph H. Hoyle, Payroll Clerk		4,755	4,890	

Acceptance of resignations

Colin D. Campbell, Economist, Division of Research and Statistics, effective September 7, 1956.

Evelyn M. Lewis, Elevator Operator, Division of Administrative Services, effective August 28, 1956.

Letter to Mr. Phelan, Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, reading as follows:

In accordance with the request contained in your letter of August 17, 1956, the Board approves the reappointment of Harold L. Saf as an examiner for the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The authorization heretofore given your Bank to designate Mr. Saf as a special examiner is hereby cancelled.

Please advise as to the salary rate and the date upon which the appointment is made effective.

Secretary