Minutes for October 27, 1958

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 proposed to place in the record of policy actions required to be kept under the provisions of Section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act an entry covering the item in this set of minutes commencing on the page and dealing with the subject referred to below:

Page 17 Approval of a discount rate of 2-1/2 per cent for the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta; and agreement to approve the same rate for any other Federal Reserve Bank advising of the establishment of such rate.

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.

Chm. Martin  
Gov. Szymczak x
Gov. Vardaman x
 Gov. Mills x
Gov. Robertson x
Gov. Balderston x
Gov. Shepardson x

1/ In accordance with Governor Shepardson's memorandum of March 8, 1957, these minutes are not being sent to Governor Vardaman for initial.
Minutes of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System
on Monday, October 27, 1958. The Board met in the Board Room at 10:00 a.m.

PRESENT: Mr. Balderston, Vice Chairman
Mr. Szymczak
Mr. Mills
Mr. Robertson
Mr. Shepardson
Mr. Sherman, Secretary
Mr. Fauver, Assistant Secretary
Mr. Riefler, Assistant to the Chairman
Mr. Thomas, Economic Adviser to the Board
Mr. Young, Director, Division of Research and Statistics
Mr. Hackley, General Counsel
Mr. Masters, Director, Division of Examinations
Mr. Noyes, Adviser, Division of Research and Statistics
Mr. Koch, Associate Adviser, Division of Research and Statistics
Mr. Solomon, Assistant General Counsel
Mr. Smith, Assistant Director, Division of Examinations
Mr. Brill, Chief, Capital Markets Section, Division of Research and Statistics

Continental Bank case (Item No. 1). On May 20, 1957, the Board ruled adversely on a demand by Continental Bank Counsel to inspect the confidential sections of reports of examination of Continental of March and October 1956. At the meeting of available members of the Board on October 22, 1958, Special Counsel Powell presented reasons why he believed it would be desirable for the Board to permit Continental Counsel to inspect the reports. Mr. Powell's arguments were based primarily on court decisions since January 1958, reviewed in a memorandum distributed under date of October 21, 1958, which appeared to hold that the doctrine stated by the Supreme Court in Jencks v. United States, 353 U.S. 657, was applicable not only to criminal proceedings
but to civil proceedings and administrative hearings. Briefly, that case held that, where the Government refused to permit the accused to inspect confidential reports in the Government's possession touching the subject matter of testimony of witnesses against the accused, the criminal action must be dismissed. Mr. Powell had stated that the Continental proceeding could not have been carried on without the benefit of these reports of examination and might have to be dropped if the reports and testimony based thereon should be stricken from the record.

A memorandum from Mr. Hackley dated October 23, 1958, also distributed, expressed agreement by the Legal Division with Mr. Powell's analysis of the effect of the cases he cited, stating that it seemed reasonably probable that a reviewing court would hold that the Board's refusal to permit inspection of the documents in question would require remand of the case to the Board. In that event, the Board would have the alternative of reopening the case and permitting inspection of the documents in question or of dismissing the proceeding against the Bank. The memorandum set forth arguments for refusing inspection as follows:

1. It is not certain that a reviewing court would remand the case because of refusal to permit inspection of the documents in question. Even if that should happen, the Board could then decide to permit inspection of the documents and could still win the case, both as to legal authority and evidence of inadequate capital. The resulting delay might not be a controlling consideration.

2. Even though cases of this kind might be rare, permission to inspect the confidential sections of the examination reports in this case might tend to cause examiners to be less frank and complete in the opinions stated by them in confidential sections. As a result the value of such confidential sections to the supervisory agencies could be seriously impaired. In other words, it might be
more desirable, on balance, to maintain the confidentiality of information contained in confidential sections of reports of examination than to establish the Board's authority, on the basis of the present proceeding, to require member banks to increase their capital.

3. Even if a reviewing court should remand the case to the Board for the reasons above indicated, it seems doubtful that the court would do so without first passing upon the Board's authority under the law to require a member bank to maintain adequate capital and to increase its capital if deemed necessary by the Board. This is, of course, one of the basic points involved in this proceeding; and establishment of the Board's legal authority in this respect might be considered sufficient to offset "losing" the case because of the Board's failure to permit inspection of the confidential sections.

Arguments for permitting inspection set forth in Mr. Hackley's memorandum were as follows:

1. Failure to permit inspection of the documents in question would probably lead to remand of the case to the Board by a reviewing court for the reasons above indicated and thereby, after a delay of many months, force the Board at that time either to dismiss the case or permit inspection of those documents.

2. Disclosure in this case would not necessarily impair the future effectiveness of bank examinations and bank supervision. Cases like the present one are rare. It could be understood, as would probably be the case in any event, that if it should appear that any administrative proceeding of this kind might be instituted against a member bank, there would be one or more special examinations of that bank and that it would be recognized that confidential sections of reports of such examinations might become subject to inspection in subsequent administrative proceedings. In such cases, with this possibility in mind, the examiners might be instructed to make reports orally to their superiors with respect to some matters ordinarily included in confidential sections of examination reports; but even that modification might prove to be unnecessary in actual practice.

3. As previously suggested, it is possible that if the court should remand the case because of the Board's refusal to permit inspection of the documents in question, the court might still uphold the Board's legal authority to require member banks to
increase their capital. However, even if the Board's legal authority were thus upheld, the fact that the Board would have "lost" the case in the eyes of the public, or in any event would have been long delayed in obtaining corrective action by the Bank, might seriously impair future efforts by the Board to require correction of capital inadequacy on the part of member banks. Moreover, it is possible that the Board's refusal to permit such inspection might so influence the reviewing court as to cause it to remand the case without expressly confirming the Board's legal authority to require additional capital.

Mr. Hackley's memorandum went on to state that if the Board decided to adhere to its 1957 position and deny Continental the right to inspect the documents, it need only advise Mr. Powell of that decision. If, on the other hand, the Board were now to reverse its position, it was recommended that the Hearing Examiner be advised in writing that, upon reconsideration and in the light of court decisions handed down since that time, the Board had receded from the position taken in its telegram of May 20, 1957 and was now willing to permit inspection by Counsel for Continental of the supplemental (confidential) sections.

Responding to Governor Balderston's request for comments, Mr. Hackley said that the legal situation had been fully set forth in Mr. Powell's memorandum. While there might be some question that the courts would apply the doctrine of the Jencks case to the examination reports, the Legal Division agreed with Mr. Powell's position. Thus, the matter was essentially a question of policy.

Mr. Masters then stated that the Examinations Division found it extremely difficult to make a choice between preserving the confidential character of examiners' opinions and the desire to pursue to a definite
conclusion the proceeding brought against Continental. The Division was reluctant to introduce any obstacles to the ultimate success of the proceeding, and the information in the confidential sections of the two reports in question was quite innocuous. He was concerned, however, about the possible effect of a decision to permit inspection of these records on the whole supervisory process. At stake, he said, was more than a long-standing tradition among all bank supervisory agencies. He could not impress on the Board too strongly that the confidential section was the heart of an examiner's review. It was to that section that bank supervisors looked for a frank expression of views about the quality of management. It was the vital source for keeping supervisors informed at both the local and the Federal level. The decision in this matter was directly tied to the freedom with which examiners might obtain information and express their views. Once it became common knowledge that disclosure had been made, examiners would be more cautious and tend to "clam up" in preparing this section of the report. Mr. Masters added that this was the examiner's point of view, and he realized there was another side just as important in determining whether to make the reports available.

Governor Balderston asked Mr. Masters to comment on Mr. Powell's suggestion of an alternative whereby the examiner would make an oral report to his supervisor on the basis of which the supervisor would prepare a memorandum which, in Mr. Powell's opinion, would have a privileged status since it would not be prepared by the examiner whose
testimony would be used in an administrative proceeding such as this.

Mr. Masters replied that he did not believe the suggestion offered a satisfactory substitute for the confidential section. Among other reasons, it would be difficult to relay the oral comments of the examiner in a manner that would adequately inform supervisors at the Federal level.

Governor Mills expressed agreement with Mr. Masters' comments. He felt it would be inadvisable and contrary to appropriate precedent to release information of this character. His review of Continental's Proposed Findings and Conclusions led him to conclude that Continental was not making a big issue in regard to the confidential sections of the reports. Furthermore, he found it difficult to see how the doctrine of the Jencks case, which involved criminal violations, was applicable here inasmuch as this was an administrative proceeding. In his opinion, a decision to permit inspection of the confidential sections would be injurious to the whole process of bank examination and would have unsettling effects on the relationship between bank supervisory agencies and the commercial banking fraternity.

Mr. Hackley commented that the specific cases referred to by Mr. Powell also had been referred to in the brief of Respondent, which indicated that Counsel for Respondent did have their applicability to this matter in mind. The cases, he said, demonstrate rather clearly that the doctrine of the Jencks case would be equally applicable to administrative proceedings on the grounds of "due process" and "fair
play." He thought the chances very good that a reviewing court would take the same position with regard to examination reports. He noted that one of the cases represented a decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia which would be the forum for a review of the Continental case.

Mr. Solomon observed that while these recent decisions were all of a similar pattern, they could not in any sense be described as new doctrine. Rather, he said, they were part of a gradual spelling out of the position of the courts with regard to due process in administrative proceedings. There was always a possibility of trying to distinguish these recent cases from the Continental matter, but he thought it would be extremely difficult to make the distinctions stand up.

Governor Robertson expressed the view that there was a great deal to be said for the position so carefully outlined and defended by Mr. Masters, but in this instance he felt it was the wrong position for the Board to take. There was no doubt, he said, that the confidential section was designed to give supervisory agencies the benefit of examiners' frank views. However, their confidentiality was designed to protect a given institution, not to protect Government officials. In the present case, Counsel for Respondent had requested an opportunity to inspect the comments of the examiners. This would not breach the confidentiality of the comments so far as the rest of the banking world and the public were concerned. There would be no reason for persons outside the bank to learn the contents of these confidential sections unless the bank itself should
make the information known. Most examiners, he said, were careful to state only views that could be backed up, although a few were inclined to go overboard. If the possibility of such comments being brought to light at a later date would make the examiners more judicious in stating unfavorable factors with respect to bank management, that would be all to the good. He would not accede to revealing the confidential sections to others than those immediately concerned in an administrative proceeding, but he did not believe that serious consequences would result from acceding to Counsel's request in this case.

Governor Shepardson agreed wholeheartedly with the position just outlined by Governor Robertson, adding that any other position was indefensible in his opinion. The whole purpose of bank supervision and examination was to forestall undesirable or illegal activities in banks. Since there was a possibility that a supervisory agency might get involved in litigation with an individual bank, it was important that the preparation of all relevant documents be with that possibility in mind. Once litigation developed, the bank had the right to know the basis of charges brought. This did not involve public or loose divulgence of confidential information. He also agreed with Governor Robertson's view that if the possibility of inspection was going to restrain examiners from putting injudicious statements in the confidential sections, that would be wholesome. Anyone reporting on the character of another person or on his operations or the operations of the institution with which he was associated should be under the discipline of having to substantiate what he reported. The fact that an examiner put comments into a
confidential section meant that the supervisory authority would take into account those comments, and that was sufficient reason for making the examiner know he was under the discipline of having to consider carefully the basis of his statements. On the specific matter before the Board, Governor Shepardson said that the confidential sections of the reports in question should be made available to the respondent bank on the grounds that the bank was entitled to all the information that the Board had about it. As to the precedent involved, he reiterated that if an examiner might be so indiscreet as to make statements that he feared would not stand up, he should be under the discipline of showing that these were matters of opinion, not fact. Governor Shepardson could see no reason why opinions should not be stated, so long as they were carefully arrived at and presented as such, and in case an action were brought against the bank, he could see no reason why the opinions so stated should not be divulged to the respondent so that the latter would have an opportunity to controvert them.

Governor Szymczak stated that, at the risk of appearing to be inconsistent, he agreed with both points of view. One was the means to an end, the other an end in itself. He wanted to give adequate recognition to Mr. Masters' point on the importance of maintaining confidentiality of the examiners' views. On the other hand, in this case the Board was dealing with a bank that had accused the System of vindictive and punitive actions when the end sought was to get adequate capital in the bank. It was important from the supervisory point of view to determine
whether the Board had the legal right to require more capital. Therefore, he felt compelled to go along with the view that Continental should be able to look at the confidential sections of the reports.

Governor Balderston said that after listening to Mr. Powell's presentation on October 22, he came to the belief that the stream of legal doctrine flowing from the Jencks case required the Board to reconsider its examination procedures and especially the preparation of the reports thereof. The only valid basis for the existing precedent of withholding information was to protect the institution examined. Thus, if the respondent institution requested access to the information upon which the Board reached its judgment, he felt the institution had a right to see the charges. Unless the confidential section was made available to Respondent and his Counsel, the Board would be in the dubious position of having put members of its examining staff on the stand and yet being unwilling to provide Respondent with information to which the Board had access. Therefore, it was Governor Balderston's view that Respondent should have access to the confidential sections.

Governor Mills said that since the indicated decision would represent a change from precedent, he would favor its publication in the Federal Reserve Bulletin and the Federal Register in the form of a ruling so that the banking fraternity might have complete knowledge of the change in attitude toward these reports.

Mr. Masters stated that he would hope that kind of publicity could be avoided. He questioned whether this particular decision, because of
its limited effect, would have a major impact on the examiners' reporting in the confidential section. While no effort should be made to keep the decision a secret, he thought the matter should be treated as applying only to this particular case.

Mr. Hackley said that the Legal Division had not considered the matter of public announcement since the original telegram to the hearing officer in May 1957 had not been made public. He had some concern that a public announcement might lead to misunderstanding. He then read a draft of letter which could be sent to the Hearing Examiner with copies to the Board's Special Counsel and Counsel for the Respondent.

Referring to Governor Mills' point concerning publicity, Governor Shepardson said this decision probably would become a matter of common knowledge. He wondered whether the Board would be in a better position if it spelled out the conditions under which the exception to precedent was being made and the limitations on the right to inspect the reports. His thought was that the Legal Division might prepare a statement of the principles involved and the extent to which the Board was prepared to modify its policy to meet requests from banks involved in supervisory actions.

Governor Robertson felt that public release of this decision, which was but a logical deviation from a policy based solely on tradition, would be premature. He did not think that the decision represented a departure in principle, and he thought most bankers would understand it. He favored limiting advice at present to the interested parties. In the
event a question were to be raised, the Board should carefully set forth a statement that would give the conditions under which these reports had been made available. Therefore, he agreed with Governor Shepardson's suggestion that the Legal Division prepare a draft statement while the decision was fresh which could be used if necessary.

Mr. Hackley noted that participation by him and Mr. Solomon during the consideration of this matter had been on the premise that the Board was acting within its judicial or adjudicatory powers. He recognized that it could conceivably be argued that this was a matter involving the prosecution of the case, but it was the judgment of the Legal Division that the basic question involved was one of policy and that therefore its participation was appropriate.

Thereupon, it was agreed, with Governor Mills voting "no" for reasons indicated, to make available to Counsel for the Continental Bank and Trust Company for inspection by him the confidential sections of reports of examination of that bank dated March 12, 1956, and October 16, 1956. The Board approved the sending of the letter attached to these minutes as Item No. 1 to Mr. Emery J. Woodall, Hearing Examiner, with the understanding that copies would be furnished to the Board's Special Counsel as well as to Counsel for the Respondent. It was also understood that the Legal Division would prepare a statement on the basic issues involved in the divulgence of information from the confidential section of examination reports, this statement to be considered as the basis for a public explanation of the Board's views, should such statement be needed.
At this point Messrs. Fauver and Thomas left the meeting.

Conference with representatives of Pan American Bank. At Governor Robertson's request, there followed a discussion of the procedure to be followed during the meeting scheduled for 2:00 p.m. on October 28 with representatives of the Pan American Bank, Miami, Florida.

Governor Robertson said that, while he felt a supervisory matter such as this was better handled by one individual than by a meeting with the Board, it had been decided in this case that the available members of the Board would meet with representatives of Pan American Bank. It seemed obvious to him that one individual should be designated to make certain that the Board obtained what information it could concerning the present situation in the bank and what it planned to do to correct criticized matters, but that no opinion should be expressed by that individual or by any other individual until the Board had had an opportunity to explore the matter following the meeting.

Governor Mills said that, for the very reasons stated by Governor Robertson, he did not plan to attend the meeting with the Pan American representatives. It would be very difficult, he said, to sit through a session of that sort without either countermanding some opinion expressed or individually expressing an opinion that might muddy the waters.

Governor Shepardson felt that it would be desirable for the Board to hear the Pan American representatives, but he also thought that there should be probing and exploring of the situation during the
conference. Otherwise, the Board would be missing an opportunity to secure information. He agreed that the Board should avoid the confusion that might arise from having several persons asking questions during the conference. He favored having all of the Board members who cared to do so hear the entire discussion with one Board member having the responsibility for leading the discussion and probing to bring out information desired. He noted that representatives of the Atlanta Reserve Bank would also be present and suggested that they should be informed in advance of whatever procedure was agreed upon by the Board for the conduct of the conference.

Governor Szymczak agreed with the suggested procedure, adding that because of another engagement he would find it necessary to leave the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

Governor Balderston noted that this was a bank supervisory conference, and he suggested that Governor Robertson be designated to conduct the conference for the Board along the lines that Governor Robertson had suggested. No disagreement with this suggestion was indicated.

Governor Robertson suggested that Mr. Masters as a staff member thoroughly familiar with the case also be authorized to present additional questions that might occur to him if they were not otherwise raised during the meeting, and there was no indication of objection to this suggestion.

The discussion concluded with the understanding that the available members of the Board who desired to do so would meet tomorrow
with representatives of Pan American Bank, that Messrs. Bryan and
Denmark of the Atlanta Reserve Bank also would be present, and that
Governor Robertson would conduct the conference along the lines
discussed at this meeting. It was also understood that representatives
of the Division of Examinations, the Legal Division, and the Secretary's
Office would be present at the conference.

Visit of Messrs. Schermerhorn and Auer. Governor Robertson
reported that Mr. Schermerhorn, President of The National Shawmut Bank of
Boston, and Mr. Hildreth Auer, President of Malden Trust Company, Malden,
Massachusetts, had asked through the Boston Reserve Bank for an opportunity
to meet him, that they were calling this afternoon, and that Messrs. Hackley
and Masters would be present at the discussion. He did not know the purpose
of their visit, but Mr. Schermerhorn was aware from the Board's August 6,
1958, letter to the Boston Reserve Bank that the Clayton Act precluded
Mr. Volpe from serving at the same time as a director of Malden Trust
Company and The National Shawmut Bank.

Examination of Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis. Governor
Balderston then asked Mr. Smith to comment on the examination of the
Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis made as of August 1, 1958, and
concerning which the report of examination had circulated to the members
of the Board. In the course of his comments, Mr. Smith stated that no
matters were disclosed by the examination which called for action by the
Board at this time. He then withdrew from the meeting.

Margin regulations. Before this meeting there had been dis-
tributed under a covering memorandum from Mr. Young dated October 24,
1958, memoranda from Messrs. Solomon and Brill dated October 23, 1958, regarding the withdrawal and substitution rules in margin regulations. There was a brief discussion of the memoranda, at the conclusion of which it was understood that the matter would be brought up for further consideration at a later meeting.

Messrs. Noyes and Brill then withdrew from the meeting.

Firstamerica Corporation matter (Item No. 2). This morning a telegram had been received from San Francisco signed by Mr. Gesell, Counsel, Firstamerica Corporation, referring to the hearing under the Bank Holding Company Act that was to commence in San Francisco today on the application of Firstamerica Corporation for permission to acquire voting shares of California Bank, Los Angeles, preparatory to merger of that bank with First Western Bank and Trust Company, San Francisco. The wire requested permission to withdraw prior to receipt of the application in evidence certain exhibits that contained confidential information and which had been submitted prior to the time it was known there would be a public hearing. These schedules would be re-filed as confidential exhibits and new schedules would be substituted for the public record revealing all data except portions indicated as confidential. Mr. Gesell stated that this procedure had been discussed with Board Counsel O'Connell, and he requested that advice be sent by wire before noon today to the Hearing Examiner.

Mr. Hackley stated that he could see no objection to granting the Applicant's request, and he presented a draft of wire to Hearing Examiner
Jensch which he recommended be approved by the Board with the understanding that prior to dispatch he would confirm through Mr. O'Connell, who was now in San Francisco, that the latter had no objection to granting the request.

Mr. Hackley's recommendation was approved unanimously, and a copy of the telegram is attached to these minutes as Item No. 2, Mr. Hackley having ascertained subsequent to the meeting that Mr. O'Connell concurred in the proposal to grant Applicant's request.

Thereupon the meeting adjourned.

Secretary's Notes:

A telegram was received from the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta during the afternoon advising that the directors of that Bank, subject to approval by the Board of Governors, had established a rate of 2-1/2 per cent (an increase from 2 per cent) on discounts and advances under sections 13 and 13a of the Federal Reserve Act, effective the day following approval by the Board, along with a rate of 3 per cent on advances under section 10(b), a rate of 4-1/2 per cent on advances under the last paragraph of section 13, and a range of rates of 3-1/2 to 5-1/2 per cent on advances direct to industrial and commercial businesses under section 13b. Other rates in the Bank's existing schedule were established without change. This telegram was brought to the attention of Governors Balderston, Szymczak, Mills, Robertson, and Shepardson, all of whom approved the sending of an advice to the Atlanta Bank of Board approval of the 2-1/2 per cent discount rate and the other rates established by that Bank, effective October 28, 1958, such rates being in line with the pattern of rates approved October 23, 1958. It was also understood that the usual telegram of notification would be sent to Federal Reserve Banks and branches, that the customary statement for the press would be released at 4:00 p.m. EST, and that the action would be reported for publication in the Federal Register.
In taking this action the members of the Board authorized the Secretary to send wires of approval to other Reserve Banks, presently having a 2 per cent discount rate, if they acted to raise their rates within the pattern established by the action approved today and by the actions of other Reserve Banks approved on October 23, 1958, to increase their discount rates to 2-1/2 per cent, along with appropriate subsidiary rates.

Governor Shepardson today approved on behalf of the Board a telegram to the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco approving the appointment of Hugh J. Maguire as assistant examiner. A copy of the telegram is attached as Item No. 3.
Mr. Emery J. Woodall,
Hearing Examiner,
Board of Governors of the
Federal Reserve System,
Washington 25, D. C.

October 27, 1958.

Dear Mr. Woodall:

This is with further reference to your telegram of May 15, 1957 in which you referred to the Board a demand made on the record by Counsel for The Continental Bank and Trust Company, Salt Lake City, Utah, for production by the Board for use by him of supplemental reports of examination of that Bank dated March 12, 1956 and October 16, 1956 in connection with the hearing being conducted by you in proceedings relating to that Bank. In the Board's telegram of reply, dated May 20, 1957, the Board declined to authorize disclosure of such supplemental reports of examination and refused the demand of the Bank's Counsel for their production.

The Board has reconsidered this matter in the light of a reappraisal of the various questions of policy involved and in the light of certain court decisions since May 1957. On the basis of this reconsideration, the Board is now prepared to make available to Counsel for The Continental Bank and Trust Company, for inspection by him, the supplemental reports of examination of that Bank dated March 12, 1956 and October 16, 1956.

Copies of this letter are being sent to Counsel, and it is suggested that this letter be made a part of the record in this proceeding.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Merritt Sherman

Merritt Sherman,
Secretary.
October 27, 1958

Jensch - Hearing Examiner,  
c/o Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco

In response to telegram of October 26 from Gesell, Counsel  
for Firstamerica Corporation, Board grants request of Applicant  
for permission to withdraw Schedules F-2 and F-3 and Appendix 5 to Exhibit E attached to application with understanding that said schedules and appendix will be filed as confidential exhibits for record and that new schedules and appendix would be substituted where appropriate in public record revealing all data except portions indicated as confidential.

(Signed) Merritt Sherman

Sherman
October 27, 1958.

SWAN - SAN FRANCISCO

Reurlet October 22, 1958, Board approves appointment of Hugh J. Maguire as an assistant examiner for the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, effective November 1, 1958.

(Signed) SHERMAN