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## SUPPLEMENT

## CURRENT ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL CONDITIONS

Prepared for the Federal Open Market Committee

> APPENDIX A: QUARTERLY SURVEY Of CHANGES IN BANK LENDING PRACTICES* November 1973

The large majority of the 125 banks reporting in the November 15, 1973, Quarterly Survey of Changes in Bank Lending Practices were following essentially unchanged policies from three months earlier, when most banks reported that their policies had firmed. (See Table 1.) However, a significant minority of banks reported that their policies had firmed moderately in the most recent period, but a few banks did report some easing. In the preceding survey, virtually no easing was reported. Loan demand at the vast majority of banks had remained unchanged or weakened, and these trends generally were expected to continue. Detailed examination of the responses to the survey, though, revealed that the moves toward tightening seemed to represent lagged responses of banks to stronger loan demands in previous periods as well as increased demands for credit in the current period.

There were modest moves toward greater firmness in nonprice terms of lending such as compensating balances and standards of credit worthiness. Banks also had a somewhat more stringent attitude toward new and nonlocal customers and scrutinized more closely the value of loan applicants as depositors or as a source of collateral business.

There were no significant divergences between the policies of smaller and larger banks with respect to price and nonprice terms of lending (Table 2). Regionally, the pattern was fairly consistent as bankers generally were guided by policies adopted earlier this year (Table 3).

[^1]QUARTERLY SURVEY OF CHANGES IN BANK LENDING PRACTICES
POLICY ON NOVEMAER 15 , 1973 COMPARE TO THRFE MONTHS EARLIER)
(STATUS OF POLICY ON NOVEMAER 15 , 1973 COMPAREN TO THRFE MONTHS
INUMBER OF BANKS \& PERCENT OF TOTAL RANKS REPORTING)

|  | total |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { MUCH } \\ \text { STRONGER } \end{gathered}$ |  | MODERATELY STRONGER |  | ESSENTIALLY UNCHANGED |  | moderately WEAKER |  | MUCH WEAKER |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Banks | PCT | ranks | Prt | BANKS | PCT | RANKS | PCT | Banks | PCT | Banks | PCT |  |
| STRENGTH OF DEMAND FOR COMMFRCIAL ANII <br> INOUSTRIAL LOANS (AFTER ALLOWANCE FOR <br> Bankis ugual seasonal vartationis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COMPARED TO THREE MONTHG AGO | 125 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 22 | 17.6 | 53 | 42.4 | 50 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| Anticipated demand in next 3 monthe | 124 | 100.0 | 1 | 0.8 | 16 | 12.9 | 69 | 55.7 | 37 | 29.8 | 1 | 0.8 |  |
|  | ANSWE QUFS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ERING } \\ & \text { STION } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | MODERA FIRM POL |  | FSSEN UNCH POL | IIALLY ANGED ICY | $\begin{gathered} \text { MODERA } \\ \text { EASI } \\ \text { POLI } \end{gathered}$ | ately IER CY |  |  |  |
| LENDING TO NONFINANCIAL BUSTNESSFS | HANKS | PCT | RANKS | PCT | BANKS | PCT | RANKS | PCT | ganks | PCT | ganks | PCT | > |
| TERMS AND CONDITIONS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |
| INTEREST RATES CHARGED | 125 | 100.0 | 9 | 7.2 | 27 | 21.6 | 60 | 48.0 | 29 | 23.2 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| COMPENSATING OR SUPPORTING GALANCES | 124 | 100.0 | 4 | 3.7 | 18 | 14.9 | 98 | 79.1 | 4 | 3.2 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| STANDARDS OF CREDIT WORTHINESS | 124 | 100.0 | 4 | 3.2 | 20 | 16.1 | 98 | 79.1 | 2 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| maturity of term loans | 124 | 100.0 | 1 | 0.8 | 16 | 12.9 | 99 | 79.8 | 8 | 6.5 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| REVIEWING CREOIT LINES OR LOAN APPLICATIUNS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ESTABLISHEO CUSTOMERS | 125 | 100.0 | 1 | 0.8 | 15 | 12.0 | 96 | 76.8 | 13 | 20.4 | 0 | 9.0 |  |
| NEW CUSTOMERS | 125 | 10000 | 9 | 7.2 | 30 | 24.0 | 65 | 52.0 | 21 | 16.8 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| Local gervice area customers | 125 | 100.0 | 1 | 0.8 | 16 | 12. ${ }^{\text {A }}$ | 94 | 75.2 | 14 | 11.2 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| NONLUCAL SERVICE AREA CUSTOMERE | 125 | 100.0 | 10 | 8.0 | 25 | 20.0 | 78 | 62.4 | 12 | 9.6 | 0 | 0.0 |  |

1/ SURVEY OF LENDING PRACTICES AT L2G LARGE HANKS RFPORTING IN THE FEDERAL RESERVE QUARTERLY INTEHEST RATE SURVEY AS OF NOVEMBER 15, 1973.

|  | ANS AERING OUFSTION |  | MUCH FIRMER POLICY |  | MODERATELY FIRMFR POLIrY |  | FSSENTIALLY UNCHANGED POLICY |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { MODERATELY } \\ \text { EASIER } \\ \text { POLICY } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MUCH } \\ & \text { EASIER } \\ & \text { POLICY } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HANKS | PCT | RANKS | PCT | BANKS | PCT | RANKS | PCT | BANKS | PCT | BANKS | PCT |
| FACTORS RELATING TO APPLICANT 2 , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VALUE AS DEPOSITOR OR SOUHCE OF COLLATERAL RUSINESS | 125 | 100.0 | 10 | 8.0 | 22 | 17.6 | 90 | 72.0 | 3 | 2.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Intentied use of the lidan | 125 | 100.0 | 4 | 3.2 | 17 | 13.6 | 96 | 76.8 | 8 | 6.4 | 0 | 0.0 |

LENDING TO "NONCAPTIVF" FTNANCE ROMPANIES
TEAMS AND CONDITIONS:

| INTEREST RATES CHAHGED | 125 | 100.0 | 4 | 3.2 | 17 | 13.6 | 88 | 70.4 | 16 | 12.8 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COMPENSATING OR SUPPORTING GALANCER | 125 | 100.0 | 2 | 1.6 | 8 | 6.4 | 113 | 90.4 | 2 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| ENFOHCEMENT OF BALANCF PESAIIREAENTE | 125 | 100.0 | 5 | 4.0 | 17 | 13.6 | 101 | 80.8 | 2 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| Establishing new or Largep crenit \| ines | 125 | 100.0 | 10 | 8.0 | 15 | 12.0 | 88 | 70.4 | 12 | 9.6 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
|  | ANSW QUE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ERING } \\ & \text { TTION } \end{aligned}$ |  | Rably S INf | MODER LE WII | atELy S ING | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FSSEN } \\ & \text { UNCH } \end{aligned}$ | IALLy ANGED | MODER <br> MO <br> WIL |  | CONSID MOR WIL | ABLY <br> No | \% |
|  | RANKS | PCT | RANKS | PC.T | BANKS | PCT | RANKS | PCT | BANKS | PCT | BANKS | PCT |  |
| IILLINGNESS TO MAKE OTHFR TYPES OF LIAANS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TERM LOANS TO RUSINFSSES | 125 | 100.0 | 2 | 1.6 | 12 | 9.6 | 92 | 73.6 | 19 | 15.2 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| CONSUMER INSTALMENT LOANS | 124 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 1.6 | 105 | 84.7 | 16 | 12.9 | 1 | 0.8 |  |
| Single family mortgage loans | 122 | 100.0 | 9 | 7.4 | 16 | 13.1 | 83 | 68.0 | 14 | 11.5 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| MULTI-FAMILY MORTGAGE LOANS | 121 | 100.0 | 14 | 11.6 | 16 | 13.2 | B4 | 69.4 | 7 | 5.8 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| ALL OTHER MORTGAGF LOANS | 123 | 100.0 | 7 | 5.7 | 17 | 13.A | 91 | 74.0 | 8 | 6.5 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| Participation loans with CORRESPONDENT RANKS | 125 | 100.0 | 1 | 0.8 | 11 | 8.8 | 99 | 79.2 | 14 | 11.2 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| LOANS TO GROKERS | 125 | 100.0 | 5 | 4.0 | 13 | 10.4 | 102 | 81.6 | 5 | 4.0 | 0 | 0.0 |  |

$2 /$ FOR THESE FACTORS, FIRMED MEANS THE FACTORS WERE CUNSIDERED MORE IMPORTANT IN MAKING DECISIONS FOR APPROVING CrEDIT REOUESTS. ANO EASIER MFANS THEY WERE LESS IMPORTANT.

COMPARISON OF SUAHTFRIY CrANGES IN BANK LENDING PRAGTICEG AT RANKS GROUPFO BY SIZE OF TOTAL DEPOSITS L/ (STATIS OF יOLICY ON NOVEMPER 15. 1973. COMPARFD TO THREE MONTHS EARLIER) (NIIMAER DF BAIKS IN EACH COLUMN AS PFR CENT DF TOTAL BANKG AASWERING OLIESTIONI


[^2]\$1 BILLION) REPORTING IN THE FFDEHAL RESERVE OUARTERI.Y INTEREST RATE GURVEY $\triangle E$ OF NOVFMRER 15 : 1973.


2/ FOR THESE FACTORS, FIRMER MEANS THE FACTORS WERE CONSIDERED MORE IMPORTANT IN MAKING DFCISIONS FOR APPROVING CREDIT REQUESTS, AND EASTER MFANS THEY WERE LESS IMPORTANT.
ouarterly supvey af changes in bank lenoing practices at gelecten large banks in the u. S. IN STATUS DF PNLICY ON NOVEMGER 15, 1973 COMPARED TO THRFE MONTHS EARLIER (NUMBER OF RANKS)


STRENGTH OF DEMANO FOR COMMERCIAI ANII
INOUSTRIaL LOANS (After allowance for
BANK'S USUAL SEASONAL VARIATION)
COMPARED TO 3 MONTHS AGO 12 "

| MUJCH STRONGER | n | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MODEHATELY STHONGER | 27 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| ESSENTIALLY UNCHANGED | 57 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| MODERATELY WEAKFR | 50 | 1 | B | 5 | 3 | ? | 6 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 9 |
| MUCH WEAKER | " | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

ANTICIPATED DEMANO NEXT THRET MONTHS

MUCH STRONGER
MOUERATELY STRONGER
ESSENTIALLY UNCHANGED MOOERATELY WEAKER MUCH WEAKER

| 1 | 1 | 0 | $n$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 64 | 3 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 9 |
| 37 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | n | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

LENDING TO NONFINANCIAL BUSINESSES

TERMS ANO CONDITIONS
INTEHFST RATES CHAHGED 1PE

| MIJCH FIRMER POLICY | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | $n$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MODERATELY FIRMFR PDLICY | 27 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| ESSFNTTALLY UNCHANGEI) POLICY | 611 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| MOUERATELY EASIEH POLICY | 20 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 8 |
| MUICH EASIER POLICY | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ompensating galances | 124 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MUCH FIRMER POLICY | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MODERATELY FIHMER POLICY | 14 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 5 | $n$ | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| ESSENTJALLY IJNCHANGED POLICY | 9 m | 3 | 13 | 8 | 5 | G | 10 | 10 | 8 | 14 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 9 |
| MODERATELY EASIFR POLICY | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | ก | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| MUCH EACIER POLICY | $n$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

1/ SURVFY OF LENDING PRACTICES AT $12 \zeta$ LARGE BANKS REPORTING IN THE FEDERAL RESERVE QUARTERLY INTEREST RATE SURVEY AS OF NOVEMBEN 15. 1973.
 ONF INANCIAL BUSINESSES

TERMS AND CONDITIONS
STANDARDG OF CREDIT WORTHINESS
MICH FIRMFR POLICY
MOOERATELY FIRMFR POLICY
FSSENTIALLY UNCHANGED POLICY MODERATEI Y EASIER POLICY MUCH EASIER POLICY

| 1 | 1 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 3 | 5 |
| 4 | 14 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |

0
0
9
0
0
1
5
5
0
0
$n$
1
5
0
0
0
2
9
0
0

| 1 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 2 |
| 12 | 7 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |

MATURITY OF TERM LOANS
MUCH FIHMER POLICY
MODERATELY FIRMFR POLICY
ESSFNTIALLY UNCHANGED POLICY MODERATELY EASIER

| 1 | 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 16 | 4 | 3 |
| 90 | 4 | 17 |
| $m$ | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |

## REVIEWING PREDIT LINES OR LOANG

ESTABLISHED CUSTUMEFS
124
MIICH FIRMER POLICT MODERATELY FIHMFR POLICY ESSENTIALLY UNCHANGFO POLICY MODERATEL．Y EASIFR POLICY MUCH FASIER POLICY

1
15
94
12
19
NEW CUSTOMERS
MUCH FIRMER POLICY 4
MODERATELY FIRMFR POLICY
ESSENTIALLY UNCHANGED POLICY MOUERATELY EASIFH POLICY 36
65 MUCH EASIER POLICY

LOCAL SERVJCE AREA CUSTOMFRS
$\qquad$
MUCH FIRMER POLTCY 1
MODERATELY FIGMER POLTCY
ESSENTIALLY UNCHANGED POLICY MODERATELY EASIFR POLJCY MUCH EASIER POLICY

14
94
14
1

| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 | 4 | $n$ | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| 5 | 13 | $H$ | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | $n$ | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $n$ | 0 |

onomo
－ッローロ
がNO

OーONO
OーONO

Owo
 BUSINESSES

## RFVIEWING CREDIT LINFS OR LOANA

NONLOCAL SEHVICF AREA CUST 12,
MUCH FIRMER PULICY $1 \cdot$ MODERATELIY FIRMER POLICY MOUFHATELY EASIEA POLICY MUCH EASIER POLICY

| 10 | 1 | 3 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $2 n$ | 2 | 5 |
| $7 m$ | 5 | 10 |
| 12 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 0 | 0 |


| $n$ | 3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 4 |
| 7 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 |
| 0 |  |


| 0 | 0 | 2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 4 | 8 | 7 |
| $n$ | 1 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |


| 0 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5 | 4 |
| 5 | 6 |
| 0 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 |


| 2 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 1 |
| 7 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |


| 1 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 6 | 7 | 9 |
| 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |

FACTORS HELATING TO APPI ICANT ? ,
VALUE AS DEPOSITOR OR SOUWRE OF COLLATFHAL HUSTNESC

MUCH FIHMER POLICY JI MOUEHATFIY + IRMFR POLTCY FSSENTIALLY HNCHANGED PGLICY MOUERATEIY FASIFH POITCY MUCH EASIER ROLTCY

| 1 | 2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 1 | 3 |
| 6 | 15 |
| 0 | $n$ |
| 0 | 0 |


| $n$ | $?$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | $?$ |
| 8 | 7 |
| $n$ | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |


| 2 | $n$ | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $n$ | $n$ | 1 |
| 7 | $n$ | 9 |
| $n$ | $n$ | 1 |
| $n$ | $n$ | 0 |


| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 8 | 6 | 10 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |

OONN
$00 N D O$

| 1 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 2 |
| 7 | 7 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |

MUCH FTRMER POLICY MOUE RATELY FIWMFH POLICY ESSENTIALLY UNCHANGEII POIJCY 17
44
4 MODERATEIY EASIER POLICY MUCH EASItR POLTCY

| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 6 | 15 | 7 | 4 |
| 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 3 | $?$ | $?$ |
| 9 | $H$ | 7 | 11 |
| 1 | 1 | $n$ | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

=ONー
$00 \omega 00$

| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 7 | $A$ | 10 |
| 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |

LENDING TO "NONCAPTJVE:
FINANCE COAPANIFS
TFPMS ANT CONIITIONS
IITEHFST HATES CHARGFD I M

| MUCh Fihmer poltey | " | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | $n$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOUHASTEI Y + IRMFP POLICY | 17 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| FSSENTIALI Y ifnchangeli Pri.icy | 4. | 7 | 14 | $\stackrel{\sim}{1}$ | 6 | 5 | 8 | A | 7 | 11 | $b$ | 2 | 6 | 6 | 9 |
| MOUENATEIY fasife policy | 1 n | 0 | 2 | n | 2 | $n$ | 1 | 1 | $n$ | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| MUCH EASIER POLICY | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

2) FOR THESF FACTORG, FTRMED MFA:S THE FACTORS WERF CONSIDEREN MOHF IMPORTANT IN MAKING DFCISIONS FOR APPGOVING CREDIT RFDIESTS. AND EASIEH MFANS THEY WFRF LESS IMPORTANT.

|  | ALI | HOS- |  | NFW | Yukk | PHTL- | CLEVE- | RICH- | ATLAN- | CHIC- | Sr. | MINNE = | KANS. | DAL* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | nsts | TON | TOTAL | CITY | y outsine | AOEL. | LaNO | MnND | TA | AGO | LOUIS | APOLIS | CITY | LAS | FRAN |
| LENDINT, tO "MOMCAOTTVF" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | FINAMICE COMDANIFG

TEKME ANO CONDITIUNE:
STIE OF CGMPRNGATIAG RALARIGFG 10 D

```
MOU- FTRMF.R POLTYY
```

MOLIFHATHIY FIHMFH BOLTCY
FSSHNTIALLY HiNCHANGFIS POLICY 11 :
MOUF NATEIY EASIFG HOLICY
MUCH EAGIFR POLICY
$i$
$11 i$
$?$
$i$

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 2 | 0 | $a$ | 1 |

MUCH EASIFR POLICY
ENFORCEMENT OF
BAIANCF PFMIIRENATAT I, PL
MUCH FIKMFR PULTCY .
ODFRATELY FIFMFH POLICY
ESt MITTALIY IINCHANT,FD POL ICY $1: 1$ MOOF WATEIY $L$ ASIFH POLICY MUCM FASIFL POLICY

## ESTAHLTSMINTA NFW OK IAKTGEM CREDIT LINFG

 MOHFIFMFH HOLICYMOHAK FIRMFH ESS - JTIALI F IJNCHANGFO ONLICY MODENATELY EASIFA POLICY MUCH EASIFH POLICY

WILLINGNFSS TO MAFE UTHFH TYPFG OF LNANS

TFYM LOANS TO RUSINFSSES 12 "
ronsidfrathy LEsS WILLI"A MOUERATELY LESS WILI ING ESSENTIALYY UNCHANGED SSENTIALLY MOHE WILI MOUERAELY MORE WILLING

## CONSUMER INSTALMENT LOANS

ONSIDFRABLY LESS WILI
MOUEMATELY LEGS WILLING MOUERATELY LEGS WILLING ESSENTIALLY UNCHANGED MODERATELY MORE WILLING CONSIDERABLY MORE WILLING

| ; | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $n$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | r | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 47 | 6 | 14 | 7 | 7 | h | 9 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 8 |
| 10 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | n | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| $\cdot 1$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 124 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $n$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | n | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 105 | 8 | 15 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 7 | 14 | 7 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 7 |
| 1 A | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | n | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |



## B-1 <br> SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX B* MONTHLY SURVEY OF BANK LOAN COMMITMENTS

As reported by 134 banks in the Monthly Survey of Bank Loan Commitments, unused comitments during October grew at a fairly rapid pace compared to other recent months. The growth may in part be reflective of the very slow rate of takedowns in October when the spreads between the commercial paper rates and the prime rate made the commercial paper market attracitive to borrowers. Bank customers apparently let their commitments go unused, as outstanding loans under commitments declined slightly over the month. In addition, new commitments advanced briskly compared to the previous month, but the volatility of the series makes interpretation of one-month movements risky.

The October data in greater detail, in Table 1, columns 1 and 2, show that unused commitments of comercial and industrial firms grew rather rapidly, which was largely accounted for by a jump in confirmed lines of credit. The unused commitments of nonbank financial institutions also showed rapid growth, even though these institutions drew substantially on their commitments (columns 4 and 5). Unused commitments for real estate mortgages, following the trend of recent months, declined even though new commitments for real estate mortgages increased well above September's level--possibly in anticipation of the large expenditures on plant widely predicted for next year. The reported increase in outstanding mortgages under commitments was modest, but the actual increase was somewhat larger due to loan sales.

Table 2 permits a comparis on of the most recent figures on unused commitments with such data since the inception of the survey. 1 Data on unused commitments for July through October 1973, from the 131 banks that reported in all of those months, are presented. Survey information on new commitments and loans under commitments, however, are not shown due to re. porting problems in the early months of the survey with those series.

Over the entire July-October period, unused C\&I commitments increased very little (column 1) while unused commitments for real estate mortgages declined (column 8). In contrast, nonbank financial institutions, perhaps due to thrift institutions reacting to disinternediation earlier this year, built up their commitments from commercial banks appreciably (column 7).
$1 /$ Although the first month of the survey was June, those data were
excluded because many banks were unable to provide complete information.
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Interpretation of the commitments data may be aided by analysis of the utilization ratio, defined as the ratio of outstanding loans made under commitments to unused commitments plus outstanding loans under commitments. The ratio is often used by bankers to interpret their position regarding commitments. With growth in unused commitments strong over the month of October, the utilization ratio for all commitments reclined, led by the drop in the C \& I ratio, as shown in Table 3. Only the utilization ratio for real estate mortgages rose in October in response to the decline of unused mortgage commitments.

[^3]Table 1
Monthly Changes in Loan Commitments and Loans Under Commitments at Large U.S. Banks September 30, 1973, to October 31, 1973
(Dollar amounts in billions)

|  | Unused commitments--One-month changes |  | $\frac{\text { New commitments }}{\substack{\text { (3) } \\ \text { Amount }}}$ | Loans under commitments--One-month changes 2/ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) <br> Amount | (2) <br> Per cent |  | (4) <br> Amount | (5) <br> Per cent |
| Total commercial and industrial | 2.89 | 3.6 | 4.44 | -1.17 | -1.7 |
| Term loans | . 12 | 2.3 | . 75 | -. 14 | -0.7 |
| Revolving credits | . 18 | 1.0 | 1.03 | . 21 | 1.1 |
| Total: term and revolving | . 30 | 1.9 | 1.78 | . 07 | 0.2 |
| Confirmed lines | 2.37 | 4.6 | 1.72 | -1.28 | -4.9 |
| Other | . 22 | 5.1 | . 89 | . 05 | 0.8 |
| Nonbank financial institutions | 1.16 | 4.5 | . 92 | . 41 | 2.8 ¢ |
| Real estate mortgages | -. 41 | -4.5 | 1.07 | . 20e | 1.1 |
| Total | 3.64 | 3.2 | 6.42 | -1.06 | -1.0 |

Number of banks $=134$

1/ New commitments is a different concept from that used in the Quarterly Survey of Bank Loan Commitments. It no longer includes renewals and cannot account for the total change in unused commitments.
2/ Loans under commitments are those loans made under commitments currently or previously in force, less repayments principal. The change in loans under commitments is thus the net increase in outstanding loans made under commitments over the period September 30, 1973, to October 31, 1973. It is a proxy for takedowns minus repayments. The stock of loans under commitments and its increment over the period are distorted by takedown of loan conmitments by overseas branches of U.S. banks and loan sales.
e-- Partially estimated.
NOTE: Minor inconsistencies may occur in the figures due to rounding.

Table 2
Unused Commitments at Large U.S. Banks July 1973 to October 197. (Dollar amounts in billions)

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & C \& I \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C \& I } \\ & \text { term } \\ & \text { loans } \end{aligned}$ | $C \& I$ revolving credit | ```C & I term and revolving credit``` | $\begin{gathered} C \& I \\ \text { confirmed } \\ \text { lines } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $C \& I$ other | Nonbank financial institutions | Real estate mortgage | Total unused commitments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { amt. } \% \\ \text { chg. } \end{gathered}$ | $\text { amt. } \begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { chg. } \end{gathered}$ | $\text { amt. } \begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { chg. } \end{gathered}$ | amt. \% chg. | $\begin{gathered} \text { amt. } \begin{array}{c} \% \\ \text { chg. } \end{array} . \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { amt. } \\ \text { \% } \mathrm{ch} \text {. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { amt. } \\ \% \\ \text { chg. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { amt. } \% \\ \text { chg. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { amt. } \\ \text { chg. } \end{gathered}$ |
| July 31 | 77.8 -- | 5.3 -- | 18.1 -- | 24.1 -- | 50.5 -- | 3.2 -- | 23.5 -- | 9.3 -- | 110.6 |
| August 31 | 78.00 .2 | 5.7-0.6 | 18.62 .9 | 23.8-1.2 | 51.21 .4 | $3.0-8.0$ | 24.75 .1 | 9.40 .9 | 112.11 .4 |
| September 30 | $77.1-1.2$ | 5.0-3.8 | 17.9-3.5 | 23.0-3.6 | 51.20 .1 | 2.8-3.7 | $24.9 \quad 0.8$ | 8.9 -4.8 | 110.9-1.1 |
| October 31 | 79.93 .7 | 5.22 .8 | 18.11 .0 | 23.31 .4 | 53.54 .5 | 3.06 .6 | 26.14 .5 | $8.5-4.5$ | 114.53 .2 |
| July 1973 - Oct. 1973 change | 2.12 .7 | -0.1-1.9 | -- -- | -0.8-3.3 | 3.05 .9 | $-0.2-6.3$ | 2.611 .1 | -0.8 -8.6 | 3.93 .5 |
| Number of banks $=134$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTE: Minor inconsistencies may occur in the figures due to rounding.

Table 3
Loan Commitments at Large U.S. Banks (Dollar amounts in billions)


1/ Loans under commitments are those loans made under commitments currently or previously in force, less repayments of principal.
2/ The utilization ratio is the ratio expressed as a percentage of loans under commitments to the sum of unused comuitments and loans under commitments.
e -partially estimated.
NOTE: Minor inconsistencies may occur in the figures due to rounding

APPENDIX C: DEMAND DEPOSIT OWNERSHIP SURVEY*
October, 1973

Demand deposit ownership data for weekly reporting banks indicate a slightly larger increase in gross IPC deposits (not seasonally adjusted) at these institutions in October than in the same month of previous survey years. (See Table 1.) The October strength in IPC demand deposits followed relatively weak growth in September, which is consistent with the pattern of $M_{1}$ expansion over the SeptemberOctober period.

The largest proportion of the increase in total IPC balances at large banks in October occurred in deposits of nonfinancial businesses; but when compared to previous years, this growth appeard to be mostiy seasonal. However, the $\$ 500$ million increase in deposits held by financial businesses was considerably larger than the average October rise in the 3 previous survey years. The unusual pickup in financial institution deposits in October may have reflected in part an increa in balances of thrift institutions which during this period still faced considerable uncertainty about the future direction of thrift deposit flows.

Consumer and foreign held IPC deposits at weekly reporting banks--which in previous October surveys have not grown at all-increased by very small amounts in the most recent survey month.
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Table 1
CHANGES IN THE LEVELS OF GROSS IPC DEMAND DEPOS ITS BY OWNERSHIP CATEGORY, WEEKLY REPORTING BANKS (Billions of dollars, not seasonally adjusted)

| Month/ | FINANCIAL BUS INESS |  |  |  | NONF INANCIAL BUS INESS |  |  |  | CONSUMER |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 |
| Jan. |  | . 4 | 0 | . 3 |  | -1.7 | -1.8 | -1.3 |  | . 4 | . 7 | . 6 |
| Feb. |  | 0 | . 7 | -. 7 |  | -2.2 | -1.4 | -2.8 |  | -. 6 | -1.0 | -1.5 |
| March |  | . 3 | . 3 | . 1 |  | . 2 | . 5 | -1.2 |  | . 8 | . 6 | . 2 |
| April |  | 0 | . 3 | 0 |  | . 9 | 1.0 | . 3 |  | 1.4 | 2.0 | 2.1 |
| May |  | -. 4 | -. 6 | -. 5 |  | -. 5 | -. 8 | -. 2 |  | -1.2 | -1.6 | -1.7 |
| June |  | . 3 | . 4 | . 4 |  | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.6 |  | . 4 | . 4 | . 2 |
| July | . 1 | . 1 | . 3 | . 6 | -. 1 | . 5 | 1.3 | . 3 | . 3 | . 4 | . 4 | . 2 |
| August | -. 9 | -. 8 | -. 7 | -. 5 | 0 | -1.3 | -1.1 | -1.6 | 0 | -. 5 | -. 2 | 0 |
| Sept. | . 7 | . 5 | . 1 | . 2 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.5 | . 9 | . 6 | . 3 | . 3 | . 1 |
| October | -. 2 | . 1 | . 4 | . 5 | -. 1 | . 9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | -. 3 | 0 | 0 | .1 |
| Nov. | . 4 | -. 1 | . 4 |  | . 2 | . 3 | . 5 |  | . 2 | . 1 | . 4 |  |
| Dec. | -. 1 | . 7 | . 2 |  | 2.2 | 2.8 | 3.9 |  | 2.2 | 0 | . 5 |  |


|  | FOREIGN |  |  |  | ALL OTHER |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 |
| Jan. |  | 0 | -. 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | . 2 |  | -1.0 | -1.2 | -. 2 |
| Feb. |  | 0 | 0 | . 2 |  | 0 | 0 | -. 2 |  | -2.8 | -3.1 | -5.1 |
| March |  | 0 | . 1 | 0 |  | . 2 | . 1 | -. 2 |  | 1.6 | 1.6 | -1.1 |
| April |  | 0 | 0 | . 2 |  | 0 | -. 1 | 0 |  | 2.4 | 3.2 | 2.6 |
| May |  | 0 | . 1 | . 1 |  | -. 2 | -. 2 | 0 |  | -2.4 | -3.2 | -2.4 |
| June |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | . 5 | . 3 | -. 1 |  | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.1 |
| July | 0 | 0 | 0 | . 1 | 0 | -. 6 | 0 | . 3 | . 3 | . 4 | 2.0 | 1.5 |
| August | -. 2 | -. 1 | 0 | 0 | -. 5 | -. 4 | -. 2 | -. 4 | -1.5 | -3.0 | -2.2 | -2.6 |
| Sept. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . 6 | . 5 | . 4 | . 4 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 1.7 |
| October | 0 | 0 | 0 | . 1 | . 3 | -. 1 | 0 | . 1 | -. 3 | . 8 | 1.4 | 1.7 |
| Nov. | -. 1 | 0 | 0 |  | -. 4 | . 1 | . 1 |  | . 3 | . 3 | 1.4 |  |
| Dec. | 0 | . 1 | 0 |  | . 1 | . 5 | . 4 |  | 4.5 | 4.1 | 5.1 |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In some cases, original copies needed to be photocopied before being scanned into electronic format. All scanned images were deskewed (to remove the effects of printer- and scanner-introduced tilting) and lightly cleaned (to remove dark spots caused by staple holes, hole punches, and other blemishes caused after initial printing).
    ${ }^{2}$ A two-step process was used. An advanced optical character recognition computer program (OCR) first created electronic text from the document image. Where the OCR results were inconclusive, staff checked and corrected the text as necessary. Please note that the numbers and text in charts and tables were not reliably recognized by the OCR process and were not checked or corrected by staff.
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