American Telephone and Telegraph Company pursuant to its Employees’ Stock Plan.

(b) According to the current offering under the Plan, an employee of the AT&T system may purchase shares through regular deductions from his pay over a period of 24 months. At the end of that period, a certificate for the appropriate number of shares will be issued to the participating employee by AT&T. Each employee is entitled to purchase, as a maximum, shares that will cost him approximately three-fourths of his annual base pay. Since the program extends over two years, it follows that the payroll deductions for this purpose may be in the neighborhood of 38 percent of base pay and a larger percentage of “take-home pay.” Deductions of this magnitude are in excess of the saving rate of many employees.

(c) Certain AT&T employees, who wish to take advantage of the current offering under the Plan, are the owners of shares of AT&T stock that they purchased under previous offerings. A bank proposed to receive such stock as collateral for a “living expenses” loan that will be advanced to the employee in monthly installments over the 24-month period, each installment being in the amount of the employee’s monthly payroll deduction under the Plan. The aggregate amount of the advances over the 24-month period would be substantially greater than the maximum loan value of the collateral as prescribed in §221.7 (the Supplement).

(d) In the opinion of the Board of Governors, a loan of the kind described would violate this part if it exceeded the maximum loan value of the collateral. The regulation applies to any margin stock-secured loan for the purpose of purchasing or carrying margin stock (§221.3(a)). Although the proposed loan would purport to be for living expenses, it seems quite clear, in view of the relationship of the loan to the Employees’ Stock Plan, that its actual purpose would be to enable the borrower to purchase AT&T stock, which is margin stock. At the end of the 24-month period the borrower would acquire a certain number of shares of that stock and would be indebted to the lending bank in an amount approximately equal to the amount he would pay for such shares. In these circumstances, the loan by the bank must be regarded as a loan “for the purpose of purchasing” the stock, and therefore it is subject to the limitations prescribed by this part. This conclusion follows from the provisions of this part, and it may also be observed that a contrary conclusion could largely defeat the basic purpose of the margin regulations.

(e) Accordingly, the Board concluded that a loan of the kind described may not be made in an amount exceeding the maximum loan value of the collateral, as prescribed by the current §221.7 (the Supplement).

§221.115 Accepting a purpose statement through the mail without benefit of face-to-face interview.

(a) The Board has been asked whether the acceptance of a purpose statement submitted through the mail by a lender subject to the provisions of this part will meet the good faith requirement of §221.3(c). Section 221.3(c) states that in connection with any credit secured by collateral which includes any margin stock, a nonbank lender must obtain a purpose statement executed by the borrower and accepted by the lender in good faith. Such acceptance requires that the lender be alert to the circumstances surrounding the credit and if further information suggests inquiry, he must investigate and be satisfied that the statement is truthful.

(b) The lender is a subsidiary of a holding company which also has another subsidiary which serves as underwriter and investment advisor to various mutual funds. The sole business of the lender will be to make “non-purpose” consumer loans to shareholders of the mutual funds, such loans to be collateralized by the fund shares. Most mutual funds shares are margin stock for purposes of this part. Solicitation and acceptance of these consumer loans will be done principally through the mail and the lender wishes to obtain the required purpose statement by mail rather than by a face-to-face interview. Personal interviews are not practicable for the lender because shareholders of the funds are scattered throughout the country. In order to
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provide the same safeguards inherent in face-to-face interviews, the lender has developed certain procedures designed to satisfy the good faith acceptance requirement of this part.

(c) The purpose statement will be supplemented with several additional questions relevant to the prospective borrower's investment activities such as purchases of any security within the last 6 months, dollar amount, and obligations to purchase or pay for previous purchases; present plans to purchase securities in the near future, participations in securities purchase plans, list of unpaid debts, and present income level. Some questions have been modified to facilitate understanding but no questions have been deleted. If additional inquiry is indicated by the answers on the form, a loan officer of the lender will interview the borrower by telephone to make sure the loan is "non-purpose". Whenever the loan exceeds the "maximum loan value" of the collateral for a regulated loan, a telephone interview will be done as a matter of course.

(d) One of the stated purposes of Regulation X (12 CFR part 224) was to prevent the infusion of unregulated credit into the securities markets by borrowers falsely certifying the purpose of a loan. The Board is of the view that the existence of Regulation X (12 CFR part 224), which makes the borrower liable for willful violations of the margin regulations, will allow a lender subject to this part to meet the good faith acceptance requirement of §221.3(c) without a face-to-face interview if the lender adopts a program, such as the one described in paragraph (c) of this section, which requires additional detailed information from the borrower and proper procedures are instituted to verify the truth of the information received. Lenders intending to embark on a similar program should discuss proposed plans with their district Federal Reserve Bank. Lenders may have existing or future loans with the prospective customers which could complicate the efforts to determine the true purpose of the loan.

§ 221.116 Bank loans to replenish working capital used to purchase mutual fund shares.

(a) In a situation considered by the Board of Governors, a business concern (X) proposed to purchase mutual fund shares, from time to time, with proceeds from its accounts receivable, then pledge the shares with a bank in order to secure working capital. The bank was prepared to lend amounts equal to 70 percent of the current value of the shares as they were purchased by X. If the loans were subject to this part, only 50 percent of the current market value of the shares could be lent.

(b) The immediate purpose of the loans would be to replenish X's working capital. However, as time went on, X would be acquiring mutual fund shares at a cost that would exceed the net earnings it would normally have accumulated, and would become indebted to the lending bank in an amount approximately 70 percent of the prices of said shares.

(c) The Board held that the loans were for the purpose of purchasing the shares, and therefore subject to the limitations prescribed by this part. As pointed out in §221.114 with respect to a similar program for putting a high proportion of cash income into stock, the borrowing against the margin stock to meet needs for which the cash would otherwise have been required, a contrary conclusion could largely defeat the basic purpose of the margin regulations.

(d) Also considered was an alternative proposal under which X would deposit proceeds from accounts receivable in a time account for 1 year, before using those funds to purchase mutual fund shares. The Board held that this procedure would not change the situation in any significant way. Once the arrangement was established, the proceeds would be flowing into the time account at the same time that similar amounts were released to purchase the shares, and over any extended period of time the result would be the same. Accordingly, the Board concluded that bank loans made under the alternative proposal would similarly be subject to this part.