Monetary policy decisions are made in response to the current state of the American economy. Because our economy is complex, monetary policy making and its execution must, therefore, be complex. The necessity for making qualitative judgments only increases this complexity. For example, few persons would disagree with the general goals implied by the statement at the beginning of this article. Opinions do differ, however, with respect to the effectiveness of monetary policy in achieving these goals and with respect to which goals should be given priority in case of conflict. Furthermore, interpretations of current economic developments are by no means unanimous; nor is there complete agreement as to which techniques could be best used in executing the chosen policy.

The complexities involved in determining and executing monetary policy are exceptionally well illustrated in the period from early 1960 to the present. This was a period of both recession and recovery and, in addition, one in which special problems were created by the United States’ balance of payments position.

The Economic Setting

It is easy to see now that in early 1960 a change was taking place in economic activity from expansion to recession, but at the time it was not so evident. During the first few months of the year, our interpretations of the behavior of economic indicators were colored by memories of the optimistic forecasts for the “scintillating Sixties.” The falterings of certain key indicators were interpreted by some as merely reactions to the excessive expansion that had immediately followed the settlement of the steel strike in late 1959. To certain others, they were seen as the expected pause before a renewed period of economic expansion.

Before mid-1960 was reached, the “pause” turned out to be a prelude to recession. Manufacturing, generally one of the first sectors to exhibit weakness during a period of business decline, again led the way. Manufacturers’ sales dropped steadily downward from the February 1960 peak and did not begin to rise again until after January 1961. Industrial production, after a period of hesitation, started moving downward in May 1960. Manufacturing employment declined in response. Total nonfarm employment began to drop off after April 1960. The rate of unemployment rose steadily, reaching 7 percent by May 1961.
In the past two years, the condition of the nation’s economy has changed from one of recession to one of recovery. During this period, the Federal Reserve System has been operating to bolster the banking system’s ability to meet expanding borrowing needs.

The policy of increasing available member bank reserves first enabled banks to get out of debt to the Federal Reserve System and since mid-1960 has created a net free reserve condition.

Increased reserves made it possible for member banks to expand their loans and investments substantially. An increase in deposits and currency accompanied the growth in bank credit.

An absence of inflationary pressures was indicated by the downward drift in wholesale prices, the moderate rise in consumer prices, unused capacity to produce major materials, and continued high unemployment.

Just as it is hard to be sure that economic activity has reached a peak until after recession is well underway, it is also difficult to be sure that a recession has ended until recovery has gone on for some time. As the year 1961 progressed, however, it became more and more evident that a general improvement in economic conditions was in progress. Industrial production rose sharply in the months after February 1961, and a new record was set after June of that year. Later, the rate of expansion slowed slightly, but by March 1962 industrial production had reached a point more than 13 percent above the low of February 1961, and 4 percent above the pre-recession peak set in January 1960.

Although the recession had its serious aspects for many sectors of the economy, its overall effects were relatively mild. Personal income, for example, continued to rise through a great part of 1960 and declined hardly at all—less than one percent—from October 1960 to February 1961. Total consumption expenditures exhibited only a minor hesitation during the recessionary period, and most of this was caused by declines in spending for consumer durable goods; expenditures for services actually rose. If February 1961 is accepted as the low point, the recession lasted only nine months, a relatively short period of economic decline as measured by the history of preceding recessions.

Despite the recovery in economic activity in 1961, unemployment and unused capacity still remained substantial. Not until late 1961 did the rate of unemployment begin to decline, and in March 1962 it was still 5.5 percent of the labor force.

The competitive economic environment that had characterized the economy for several years, in contrast to the tight market conditions of the early postwar years, has continued during economic recovery. At the end of 1961, wholesale prices, despite recovery, were actually lower than they had been a year earlier. Consumer prices increased less than one percent in 1961, considerably more slowly than in the preceding five years.

Although price trends indicated the need for less concern about immediate inflationary problems, a balance of payments problem plagued the American people all during the 1960 recession and the recovery. In 1960, the surplus of American exports of goods and services over imports increased from the abnormally low level of 1959, partly because imports declined during the recession and partly because exports increased. The export surplus increased further in 1961, totaling $5.2 billion. Nevertheless, deficits in financial transactions with the rest of the world were much larger in 1960 and 1961 than in earlier years, chiefly because of the greatly increased outflow of short-term capital; net deficits in the balance of payments thus continued. In 1960, $1.7 billion of the net deficit was settled by United States gold and the remainder, $2.2 billion, was settled by foreigners’ increasing their short-term claims on this country. Although the deficit was smaller in 1961, the United States continued to lose gold in the amount of $820 million, and short-term liabilities to foreigners rose $1.7 billion.
Setting the Goals

In 1960, when it became clear that a recession was under­way, a proper policy goal was to bring an end to this recession so far as was possible through monetary means. Recession turned to recovery in 1961, but the nation’s potential productive capacity was not yet being fully utilized, so the ultimate goal became one of laying the groundwork for further economic expansion.

Protecting the dollar from the erosion of inflation at home was not an immediate problem. There was, how­ever, a growing need to protect the position of the dollar abroad. Monetary policy goals, therefore, included action to ease the nation’s balance of payments difficulties.

The power of the Federal Reserve System to help achieve these goals lay in its ability to expand member bank reserves and thus to increase the lending and investing ability of the member banks. Through this means, the System indirectly influenced the level of interest rates and the spending and savings activities of the entire economy.

Consequently, over the entire period between June 1960 and March 1962, the System supplied member banks with about $1.4 billion in additional effective reserves, measured on a seasonally adjusted basis. The increased reserves have supported a near-record expansion in bank credit. In 1961 alone, commercial banks increased their loans and investments by $15.9 billion, an amount greater than the record credit expansion of 1958.

Techniques Used to Foster Credit Expansion

Expansion in the reserve base and easier credit condi­tions were achieved in a variety of ways. In the spring of 1960, open market policy was eased when the Federal Reserve System bought greater amounts of Treasury bills than was usual at that time of the year. The discount rate, the charge made to member banks for borrowing from the Federal Reserve, was lowered from 4 to 3½ percent. In the summer, margin requirements against stock market credit were cut from 90 to 70 percent. The reserve base was increased as banks were allowed to count additional vault cash as a part of legal reserves, and as reserve requirements for the banks in the central reserve cities of New York and Chicago were cut one-half of a percentage point. In late summer, the discount rate was again lowered—this time to 3 percent.

In the fall and early winter of 1960, member banks were allowed to count all vault cash as legal reserves.

Sources for data used in the charts:

Industrial Production, Member Bank Reserves, Reserves and Borrowings, Bank Loans and Investments, Deposits and Currency, U. S. Gold Stock, Interest Rates, Interest Rate Differentials, Commercial Bank Liquidity, Sources of New Credit: Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.


Balance of Payments: U. S. Dept. of Commerce.

Short-Term Interest Rates: Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System and Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Long-Term Interest Rates: Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System and Moody’s Investor’s Service.

The execution of monetary policy during the past two years has been influenced by the continuing balance of payments deficit and the accompanying decline in the nation’s gold stock.

The U.S. Balance of Payments and U.S. Gold Stock shows changes over time. The interest rates and interest rate differentials for various countries indicate how rates have changed. The short-term interest rates and long-term interest rates charts show the rates for different periods. The commercial bank liquidity and sources of new credit charts illustrate changes in liquidity and credit sources.
and reserve requirements at the central reserve city banks were lowered again by one percentage point. After February 20, 1961, the Federal Reserve System began to supply some additional reserves by purchasing longer-term securities rather than confining its purchases entirely to short-term issues. In December 1961, the Board of Governors authorized an increase in the maximum rates banks could pay on savings and other time deposits. Throughout 1961, open market operations contributed towards maintaining ease in bank reserve positions, and this condition continued during the early months of 1962.

The member banks' first response in the spring of 1960 was to use the additional available reserves to reduce their borrowings from the Federal Reserve. By the end of that year, member banks were practically out of debt. By the middle of 1961, their excess reserves—the difference between actual and required reserves—exceeded reserves secured by borrowing by a substantial amount. Expressed in technical terms, the banks had turned from a net borrowed reserve position—reserves secured from borrowings exceeding excess reserves—to a free reserve position—excess reserves exceeding borrowings. During 1961 and the early months of 1962, free reserves have ranged from $381 million to $696 million. Relative stability in prices has made it possible for the Federal Reserve System to continue conditions of relative monetary ease, even after economic recovery was well underway.

The banks initially used the additional reserves to increase their holdings of U. S. Government and other securities, since loan demand was moderate. As recovery developed, however, loan expansion became more important.

The greater lending and investing activity by the banks was accompanied by an increase in deposits and currency. During the second half of 1960, demand deposits and currency rose at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 1.6 percent. The rate increased to 3.5 percent in 1961. Although in the early months of 1962 the level of demand deposits after seasonal adjustment has changed little, there has been a sharp increase in the growth of time deposits.

All of the actions of the monetary authorities helped improve the liquidity of commercial banks and their ability to lend. In addition to acquiring more reserves, these banks improved their lending power by shifting to shorter-term securities.

**Interest Rates and the Balance of Payments**

An essential part of the execution of monetary policy during this period was to supply reserves in a way that would not excessively depress short-term interest rates and thus add to the United States' balance of payments difficulties. Short-term funds tend to move to those areas of the world where their earnings will be the greatest. Thus, if short-term interest rates in this country had been depressed unduly by the monetary authorities in their efforts to promote recovery and economic growth, transfers of short-term funds out of the country might have been stimulated and this nation's balance of payments deficit worsened.

As it turned out, in 1960-61 short-term rates, as measured by the yield on Treasury bills, did not decline to the level reached in the recession of 1958, although, as measured by excess reserves, monetary ease was as great. The bill rate never averaged less than 2.2 percent for any month in the recent period, whereas in 1958 it fell to 0.8 percent.

Some of the firmness in the rates on Treasury bills resulted from the Treasury Department's concentrating its borrowings of new money in the form of short-term securities. The Federal Reserve reduced to some extent the direct impact its open market operations might have had in depressing short-term bill yields by switching some of its purchases from short-term to intermediate- and long-term issues, beginning in early 1961.

In the initial part of the present recovery, short-term rates remained relatively firm. Long-term rates rose less than in the comparable phase of the 1958-59 recovery, despite heavy demands for long-term funds. In recent months long-term rates have declined. A rapid growth of bank credit and a substantial flow of savings into financial institutions supplied some of the long-term funds. In addition, the Treasury supplied long-term funds to the private sectors of the economy by purchasing long-term securities for investment accounts. To a lesser extent, Federal Reserve purchases of longer-term securities may have kept rates from rising. The concentration of Treasury and Federal Reserve purchases of longer-term securities during the months of March, April, and May 1961, when corporations and state and local governments were borrowing heavily, may have helped to push rates down.

Whatever the reasons, so far in the recovery period a large volume of long-term financing has been accomplished without a substantial increase in long-term rates.

**Flexible Monetary Policy**

For about two years now, the Federal Reserve has been operating to bolster the banking system's ability to meet expanding borrowing needs. The steadily increasing total of effective member bank reserves that has resulted from these operations, however, conceals a flexibility in adapting to changes in the economic environment and in using a variety of techniques in executing policy.

Changes in the economic environment itself suggested to some extent the appropriate policy steps to be taken. The accumulating evidence of the recession of 1960 pointed out that a policy of restraint was no longer needed and that a stimulative policy would be desirable. A continuing high rate of unemployment and an under-utilization of resources suggested the desirability of a policy to encourage further expansion; the absence of inflationary price pressures lessened the dangers that such a policy might otherwise incur.

At the same time, another aspect of the economic environment—the balance of payments problem—pointed to the desirability of conducting open market operations in such a way as to minimize downward pressures on short-term interest rates. The behavior of interest rates and of the credit and capital markets during the period, moreover, have from time to time suggested modifications in

(Continued on Page 6)
When we discussed Alabama's economy in this Review last summer, it seemed that the state would soon be experiencing record levels of employment as well as of income. But it turned out that nonfarm employment, adjusted for seasonal variation, rose sharply only through July 1961, a mere three months after recovery got underway. This measure increased slightly between July and November, then declined steadily through March. At this point it stood barely above the recession low, whereas it increased 5.7 percent in the comparable months following the 1957-58 recession.

Personal income also began to increase after April 1961. It continued to expand until November as the average number of hours worked each week and hourly earnings in manufacturing advanced beyond the rise in employment, then dropped substantially in December and January. Both personal income and manufacturing employment rebounded in February, and the latter declined only slightly in March.

What accounts for this marked hesitancy in Alabama's recovery? A look at the charts reveals part of the answer. Recovery nationally has been moderate, and major indicators show that Alabama's economy has become quite sensitive to national developments. Nonagricultural employment and personal income in Alabama began to turn up two months after the February 1961 trough of the national recession. Nevertheless, they increased in roughly the same proportions from February through November as in the nation. Toward the close of the year, economic activity in Alabama weakened in contrast to further expansion nationally, but since January 1962 has recovered part of the lost ground.

Before looking at the factors that caused relative weakness in income and employment in Alabama after November, let us review developments that took place up through that month. Improvement in the manufacturing sector, particularly in iron and steel, and in related coke and coal production led the recovery that took place through mid-summer. Consumers, judging from the behavior of the seasonally adjusted index of retail sales developed by the University of Alabama's Bureau of Business Research, tended to strengthen recovery forces by sharply increasing their spending as incomes rose.

If the initial recovery rate was to be sustained, further stimulation from outside the state was apparently needed. A strong enough stimulus, however, was not forthcoming. A slower rate of increase in national industrial production and a temporary standstill in manufacturing employment were mirrored in Alabama's manufacturing activity. Most segments of the state's manufacturing employment changed little from July through November. Employment in primary metals began to turn down after August, but because of new short-term contracts, there were offsetting employment gains in transportation equipment in the Birmingham area.

Employment in activities other than manufacturing also changed little during this period, after seasonal adjustment. Notably, state and local government employment,
which continued to expand without interruption during the recession, leveled off after schools reopened in September.

The relative weakness that prevailed in Alabama’s economy after November was centered in iron and steel production. Expanding at about the same rate as nationally until the fourth quarter of 1961, output in this sector dropped off substantially after October, while increasing further in the U. S. as a whole. This divergence probably reflects differences in the product mix of Alabama mills and those in the North. The latter tend to produce greater proportions of rolled steel products, and with auto production strong during the fourth quarter of 1961, the demand for sheet steel was relatively high. Alabama’s steel manufacturers, on the other hand, specialize in pipes, wires, bars, and rails. Because imports of some of these commodities competed vigorously with domestic production, Alabama’s steel output may have been particularly affected. The sharp drop-off in seasonally adjusted nonfarm employment in January was largely attributable to a labor dispute in iron and steel foundries. Then, too, bad weather reduced employment in some other areas of production.

By February, however, striking iron and steel workers returned to their jobs, and manufacturing employment increased more than seasonally. Although a decline in nonmanufacturing employment was more than offsetting, personal income and retail sales rose sharply.

Recent signs of improvement in economic activity and past responsiveness to changes at the national level suggest that Alabama will make further gains this year, provided the U. S. economy continues to advance. The early settlement of a labor contract in steel should have a stabilizing influence on the state’s economy. At least we can be confident that economic activity will not be affected by a speculative buildup of steel inventories followed by a major national strike, such as occurred in 1959. Just how much steel production will increase, however, is hard to predict, especially since the impact of greater foreign competition is hard to assess. At least one large contract order—an oil pipeline scheduled to be laid between Texas and New York—should improve Alabama’s steel output this year.

In construction activity some promising factors are also evident. Highway construction apparently is continuing to boom, which should help Alabama’s cement industry. A statewide program of improving and expanding airport facilities is underway. Various water projects in northern Alabama are slated to bring in Federal expenditures in the fiscal year beginning July. All these activities should be reflected in nonresidential construction contract awards. During the eight months ended February 1962, such awards measured 25 percent less than in the comparable months of a year earlier because of a decline in the public works and utilities component.

Differences in economic structure among various areas of Alabama make it improbable that developments in 1962 will be uniform throughout the state. This has been illustrated in the past. For example, from 1960 to 1961, the Tennessee Valley, which includes the tri-city area of Florence, Sheffield, and Tuscumbia and Huntsville, showed rapid growth compared with the state as a whole. Mobile, where growing pulp and paper and chemicals industries are located, fared better in 1961 than the industrial cities of central Alabama.

ALBERT A. HIRSCH

This is one of a series in which economic developments in each of the Sixth District states are discussed. Developments in Georgia’s economy were analyzed in the April REVIEW, and a discussion of Mississippi’s economy is scheduled for a forthcoming issue.

RECESSION TO RECOVERY
(Continued from Page 4)

the techniques to be used in executing policy.

The record since early 1960, if it does nothing more, demonstrates once again that monetary policy making remains a complicated and difficult task. Policies adopted, and techniques used to execute these policies, may be appropriate at one time and inappropriate at another. The economic environment itself provides a setting, and since that environment is affected not only by the decisions of millions of Americans but of people throughout the world, the constant changes that take place are not always easily predictable. Only through flexibility can monetary policy be adapted to the continually changing economic scene.

CHARLES T. TAYLOR

Bank Announcements

The First National Bank of Belleair Bluffs, Largo, Florida, a newly organized member bank, opened for business on April 13 and began to remit at par for checks drawn on it when received from the Federal Reserve Bank. Officers are Harold H. Underwood, President; William S. Dewes, Vice President; Paul P. Morse, Cashier; and James A. Peterson, Assistant Cashier. Capital totals $350,000, and surplus and undivided profits, $420,000.

On April 15, the Social Circle Bank, Social Circle, Georgia, a nonmember bank, began to remit at par. Officers include Cleon E. Moore, President; E. L. Sanders, Executive Vice President; Sidney Berger, Vice President; and Mary S. Chandler, Cashier. Capital totals $50,000, and surplus and undivided profits, $99,109.

The table on Debits to Individual Demand Deposit Accounts, which has been omitted this month, is scheduled to reappear in the June REVIEW. Copies of the current table are available upon request to the Research Department of this Bank.

REVISION IN SIXTH DISTRICT STATISTICS

Beginning with this issue, the statistical table on page 7 is presented in a revised form, making it possible for us to show additional statistical series and, in some cases, more up-to-date information. Appearing for the first time are the following statistical series: installment credit at commercial banks; construction employment; farm employment; insured unemployment; average weekly hours worked in manufacturing; and member bank loans and deposits in leading cities. The furniture store sales indexes and the turnover of demand deposits will no longer be shown.

All indexes have been changed from the 1947-49 base to the new standard base of 1957-59, recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and generally being adopted by organizations preparing indexes. These indexes are presented as percentages of the average during the base period, i.e., 1957-59 = 100. Data for the preceding months not shown in the table may be obtained upon request from the Research Department of this Bank.
Sixth District Statistics
Seasonally Adjusted
(All data are indexes, 1957-59 = 100, unless indicated otherwise.)

SIXTH DISTRICT

INCOME AND SPENDING
Personal Income, (Mil. S. Annual Rate) Jan. 37,811 36,505 36,850 35,939
Farm Cash Receipts ....... Feb. 111 114 107 115
Crop........ Feb. 111 115 107 111
Livestock ....... Mar. 110 113 110 104
Department Store Sales* Mar. 118 115 116 110
Department Store Stocks ** Mar. 118 115 116 110
Installment Credit at Banks, * (Mil. $) Mar. 136 142 124 120
Repayments .......... Mar. 124 130 127 123

PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT
Nonfarm Employment ...... Mar. 105 105 105 103
Manufacturing .... Mar. 104 104 103 100
Apparel ........ Mar. 114 114 113 107
Chemicals .......... Mar. 100 100 100 101
Fabricated Metals .... Mar. 105 104 104 101
Food ............... Mar. 105 105 105 104
Lbr., Wood Prod., Furn., & Fix. .... Mar. 97 96 94 94
Paper ............ Mar. 102 102 101 103
Primary Metals .... Mar. 94 94 91 89
Textiles ....... Mar. 96 96 96 95
Transportation Equipment Mar. 99 101 98 85
Nonfarm Employment ...... Mar. 105 106 105 104
Construction ...... Mar. 94 94 93 90
Farm Employment .. Mar. 91 85 93 96
Insured Unemployment, (Percent of Cov. Emp.) .... Mar. 4.1 4.1 5.0 6.1
Avg. Weekly Hrs. in Mfg., (Hrs.) .... Mar. 39.9 39.9 37.4 39.9
Manufacturing Payrolls ........ Mar. 141 142 132 125
Nonmanufacturing ........ Mar. 101 101 102 101
Construction .......... Mar. 99 99 97 98
Residential ........ Mar. 110 100 103 92
Other Services .... Mar. 99 99 99 99
Electric Power Production** .... Mar. 120 130 122 119

FINANCE AND BANKING
Member Bank Loans* Mar. 132 130 129 123
Bank Deposits** Mar. 127 121 119 113
Member Bank Deposits* Mar. 112 112 111 111
Leading Cities ....... Mar. 120 119 118 113

ALABAMA

INCOME AND SPENDING
Personal Income, (Mil. S. Annual Rate) Feb. 5,127 4,936 5,126 4,813
Farm Cash Receipts ....... Feb. 107 111 110 104
Department Store Sales** Mar. 111 106 100 105

PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT
Nonfarm Employment ...... Mar. 101 101 102 101
Manufacturing .... Mar. 104 104 103 100
Nonmanufacturing ...... Mar. 103 104 105 104
Construction .......... Mar. 92 92 90 94
Farm Employment .. Mar. 84 82 80 92
Insured Unemployment, (Percent of Cov. Emp.) .... Mar. 4.5 5.1 5.7 6.9
Avg. Weekly Hrs. in Mfg., (Hrs.) .... Mar. 36.9 35.9 36.9 35.9
Avg. Hourly Pay in Mfg., (Dollars) .... Mar. 41.0 40.8 39.0 38.9
Manufacturing Payroll s Mar. 116 115 102 101

FINANCE AND BANKING
Member Bank Loans* Mar. 133 129 132 127
Member Bank Deposits* Mar. 119 117 116 113
Bank Deposits** Mar. 124 122 116 111

FLORIDA

INCOME AND SPENDING
Personal Income, (Mil. S. Annual Rate) Feb. 10,920 10,573 10,748 10,193
Farm Cash Receipts ....... Feb. 115 109 113 134
Department Store Sales** Mar. 141 127 125 122

PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT
Nonfarm Employment ...... Mar.112 112 111 108
Manufacturing .... Mar. 119 118 117 113
Nonmanufacturing ...... Mar. 111 111 130 107
Construction .......... Mar. 92 92 90 87
Farm Employment .. Mar. 94 96 97 101
Insured Unemployment, (Percent of Cov. Emp.) .... Mar. 3.6 3.8 4.1 5.1
Avg. Weekly Hrs. in Mfg., (Hrs.) .... Mar. 41.8 41.9 40.8 41.2
Manufacturing Payroll s Mar.145 146 142 132

FINANCE AND BANKING
Member Bank Loans* Mar. 128 125 124 121
Member Bank Deposits* Mar. 122 121 121 115
Bank Deposits** Mar. 125 121 124 115

*For Sixth District area only. Other totals for entire six states.

**Daily average basis.

Sources: Personal income estimated by this Bank; nonfarm, mfg. and nonmfg. emp., mfg. payroll s and hours, and unemp., U.S. Dept. of Labor and cooperating state agencies; cotton consumption, U.S. Bureau of Census; construction contracts, F. W. Dodge Corp.; petro l. prod., U.S. Bureau of Mines; elec. power prod., Fed. Power Comm.; farm cash receipts and farm emp., U.S. D.A. Other indexes based on data collected by this Bank. All indexes calculated by this Bank.

NOTE: The series on manufacturing payrolls has been revised by adjustment to the Dept. of Commerce annual estimates of manufacturing income.
Most measures of District business activity posted better than seasonal gains in March. Consumer spending increased following the record level of personal income reached in February. Member bank loans rebounded from the previous two months' lull, and consumer credit outstanding at commercial banks showed the largest monthly gain in almost two years. Farm employment continued to expand as favorable weather helped increase the normal pace of spring work. On the other hand, nonfarm employment, which had registered substantial gains in the previous two months, remained unchanged, as a moderate rise in manufacturing was offset by declines in other sectors.

Consumer spending strengthened somewhat during March, partially reflecting the sizable increase in personal income in February. Bank debits, a measure of total spending, advanced for the second consecutive month to a record high. Sales at furniture stores pushed to the highest volume in two years. Sales at household appliance stores, however, remained virtually unchanged, and department store sales declined during March. Preliminary April figures show a slight further decline in department store sales. More comprehensive figures for February indicate that consumer spending rose substantially in that month. Sales of firms operating one to ten outlets increased, and sales tax collections rose markedly.

Gains in manufacturing employment were widespread, occurring in all District states except Alabama. In most states, however, the gains were more than offset by decreases in nonmanufacturing employment. Manufacturing production workers put in a full work week during March, averaging the same number of hours as in February. Manufacturing payrolls also held at an advanced level.

Construction employment showed additional slight improvement in March. The latest three-month average of construction contracts rose to a new high, largely because of a big utility project in Tennessee. Cotton consumption, an index of activity in the District's important textile industry, rose substantially to the highest volume in nearly three years.

The pace quickened in the farm economy as farmers pushed ahead with their spring work. Improved weather in most areas enabled them to accomplish field work and planting that had been delayed by rain. Spurred by these activities, farm employment rose in March. Marketings of livestock and poultry products also increased as farmers sold more milk, eggs, and pork. The index of prices received by farmers slackened in April as citrus, milk, hog, egg, and broiler prices declined. Recent trends in production and prices, however, indicate that cash receipts from farm marketings declined only slightly, if at all.

Substantial gains were registered in loans, investments, and deposits at member banks during March. Loans at banks in leading cities, seasonally adjusted, rose further during April. The increase in investments in March was concentrated at banks outside leading cities. Total member bank deposits, seasonally adjusted, also increased slightly, with time deposits again accounting for the gain. Deposits have trended upward in recent months in all states except Louisiana, where they have changed little since October.