AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

substantial amounts relative to the total amount of shares outstanding.

[26 FR 868, Jan. 28, 1961. Redesignated at 61 FR 57289, Nov. 6, 1996]

§ 250.404 Serving as director of member bank and corporation selling own stock.

(a) The Board recently considered the question whether section 32 of the Banking Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 78) would be applicable to the service of a director of a corporation which planned to acquire or organize, as proceeds from the sale of stock became available, subsidiaries to operate in a wide variety of fields, including manufacturing, foreign trade, leasing of heavy equipment, and real estate development. The corporation had a paid-in capital of about $60,000 and planned to sell additional shares at a price totaling $10 million, with the proviso that if less than $3 million worth were sold by March 1962, the funds subscribed would be refunded. It thus appeared to be contemplated that the sale of stock would take at least a year, and there appeared to be no reason for believing that, if the venture proved successful, additional shares would not be offered so that the corporation could continue to expand.

(b) The Board concluded that section 32 would be applicable, stating that although § 218.102, as clarified by § 218.104, related to closed-end investment companies, the rationale of that interpretation is applicable to corporations generally.

[26 FR 2456, Mar. 23, 1961. Redesignated at 61 FR 57289, Nov. 6, 1996]

§ 250.405 No exception granted a special or limited partner.

(a) The Board has been asked on several occasions whether section 32 of the Banking Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 78) is applicable to a director, officer, or employee of a member bank who is a special or limited partner in a firm primarily engaged in the business described in that section.

(b) Since the Board cannot issue an individual permit, it can exempt a limited or special partner only by amending part 218 (Regulation R). After the statute was amended in 1935 so as to make it applicable to a *partner,* the Board carefully considered the desirability of making such an exception. On several subsequent occasions it has reconsidered the question. In each instance the Board has decided that in view of a limited partner's interest in the underwriting and distributing business, it should not make the exception.

[27 FR 7954, Aug. 10, 1962. Redesignated at 61 FR 57289, Nov. 6, 1996]

§ 250.406 Serving member bank and investment advisor with mutual fund affiliation.

(a) The opinion of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has been requested with respect to service as vice president of a corporation engaged in supplying investment advice and management services to mutual funds and others (''Manager'') and as director of a member bank.

(b) Section 32 of the Banking Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 78), forbids any officer, director, or employee of any corporation ''primarily engaged in the issue, flotation, underwriting, public sale, or distribution, at wholesale or retail, or through syndicate participation, of stocks, bonds, or other similar securities * * *'' to serve at the same time as an officer, director, or employee of a member bank.

(c) Manager has for several years served a number of different open-end or mutual funds, as well as individuals, institutions, and other clients, as an investment advisor and manager. However, it appears that Manager has a close relationship with two of the mutual funds which it serves. A wholly owned subsidiary of Manager (''Distributors''), serves as distributor for the two mutual funds and has no other function. In addition, the chairman and treasurer of Manager, as well as the president, assistant treasurer, and a director of Manager, are officers and directors of Distributors and trustees of both funds. It appears also that a director of Manager is president and director of Distributors, while the clerk of Manager is also clerk of Distributors. Manager, Distributors and both funds are listed at the same address in the local telephone directory.

(d) While the greater part of the total annual income of Manager during the

past five years has derived from ''individuals, institutions, and other clients'', it appears that a substantial portion has been attributable to the involvement with the two funds in question. During each of the last four years, that portion has exceeded a third of the total income of Manager, and in 1962 it reached nearly 40 percent.

(e) The Board has consistently held that an open-end or mutual fund is engaged in the activities described in section 32, so long as it is issuing its securities for sale, since it is apparent that the more or less continued process of redemption of the stock issued by such a company would restrict and contract its activities if it did not continue to issue the stock. Clearly, a corporation that is engaged in underwriting or selling open-end shares, is so engaged.

(f) In connection with incorporated manager-advisors to open-end or mutual funds, the Board has expressed the view in a number of cases that where the corporation served a number of different clients, and the corporate structure was not interlocked with that of mutual fund and underwriter in such a way that it could be regarded as being controlled by or substantially one with them, it should not be held to be ''primarily engaged'' in section 32 activities. On the other hand, where a manager-advisor was created for the sole purpose of serving a particular fund, and its activities were limited to that function, the Board has regarded the group as a single entity for purposes of section 32.

(g) In the present case, the selling organization is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the advisor-manager, hence subject to the parent's control. Stock of the subsidiary will be voted according to decisions by the parent's board of directors, and presumably will be voted for a board of directors of the subsidiary which is responsive to policy lines laid down by the parent. Financial interests of the parent are obviously best served by an aggressive selling policy, and, in fact, both the share and the absolute amount of the parent's income provided by the two funds have shown a steady increase over recent years. The fact that dividends from Distributors have represented a relatively small proportion of the income of Manager, and that there were, indeed, no dividends in 1961 or 1962, does not support a contrary argument, in view of the steady increase in total income of Manager from the funds and Distributors taken as a whole.

(h) In view of all these facts, the Board has concluded that the separate corporate entities of Manager and Distributors should be disregarded and Distributors viewed as essentially a selling arm of Manager. As a result of this conclusion, section 32 would forbid interlocking service as an officer of Manager and a director of a member bank.

[28 FR 13437, Dec. 12, 1963. Redesignated at 61 FR 57289, Nov. 6, 1996]

§ 250.407 Interlocking relationship involving securities affiliate of brokerage firm.

(a) The Board of Governors was asked recently whether section 32 of the Banking Act of 1933 (''section 32''), 12 U.S.C. 78, prohibits the interlocking service of X as a director of a member bank of the Federal Reserve System and as a partner in a New York City brokerage firm (''Partnership'') having a corporation affiliate (''Corporation'') engaged in business of the kinds described in section 32 (''section 32 business'').

(b) Section 32, subject to an exception not applicable here, provides that

> No officer, director, or employee of any corporation or unincorporated association, no partner or employee of any partnership, and no individual, primarily engaged in the issue, flotation, underwriting, public sale, or distribution, at wholesale or retail, or through syndicate participation, of stocks, bonds, or other similar securities, shall serve the same time as an officer, director, or employee of any member bank * * *.

(c) From the information submitted it appears that Partnership, a member firm of the New York Stock Exchange, is the successor of two prior partnerships, in one of which X had been a partner. This prior partnership had been found not to be ''primarily engaged'' in section 32 business. The other prior partnership, however, had been so engaged. By arrangement between the two prior firms, Corporation was formed chiefly for the purpose of