



1 9 9 5
Annual Report

United States
Securities and Exchange Commission



1 9 9 5
Annual Report

United States
Securities and Exchange Commission



THE CHAIRMAN

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549

The Honorable Albert Gore, Jr.
President of the United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable Newt Gingrich
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Gentlemen:

I am pleased to transmit the annual report of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) for fiscal year 1995. The activities and accomplishments set forth in the annual report continue the Commission's long tradition of hard work and high achievement. I would like to take this opportunity to offer my views of the Commission's progress in addressing several of the major issues facing the Commission.

Municipal Debt Markets

In recent years, the Commission and the municipal securities industry have taken several major steps to prepare the debt markets for the twenty-first century. The Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board has effectively severed the link between political campaign contributions and municipal bond underwriting business with its Rule G-37. This rule recently withstood a challenge in the U.S. Court of Appeals, reaffirming industry and regulatory efforts to curtail the insidious practice known as "pay-to-play." In addition, the Commission has undertaken a number of enforcement actions to help ensure the integrity of this market.

The Commission has also been concerned about inadequate disclosure in the secondary market for municipal securities. In response, industry and issuer groups offered recommendations that were incorporated into Commission rule amendments and will make up-to-date information more readily available.

In addition, the Commission has met with state and local officials throughout our nation in an open dialogue about the prudent management of public funds. We have stressed the importance of safety and liquidity over risk and return as well as the special responsibilities involved in seeking capital through our public markets.

Promoting Capital Formation

Throughout its existence, the Commission has balanced the need for full disclosure and investor protection against the burden that its rules, regulations, and requirements may impose on capital formation. This year, we undertook two fundamental reappraisals of the way the agency regulates. First, an SEC Advisory Committee on Capital Formation and Regulatory Processes was appointed to examine our regulatory approach and consider how it might be improved. The Committee is considering such questions as whether the Commission should register companies instead of securities. The Commission also created an internal Task Force on Disclosure Simplification, which analyzed the cost to companies (in both time and legal fees) of complying with the agency's form and filing requirements. The Task Force reviewed hundreds of forms and regulations and recommended amendment or elimination of many of them. If implemented in its entirety, the report's recommendations would eliminate or modify one-half of the rules and one-fourth of the forms that affect corporate America.

In recent years, the Commission has created a new, simpler registration and disclosure regime for small businesses seeking capital in the securities markets. During 1995, the Commission proposed to allow small businesses to "test the waters" with registered initial public offerings and we shortened the restricted holding periods for privately placed securities under Rule 144. The agency also worked with Congress to craft a "safe harbor" provision in securities litigation reform legislation that might encourage corporations to disclose forward-looking information by protecting them from some of the liability concerns raised by frivolous lawsuits.

Disclosure Developments

The Commission has launched several efforts to simplify and streamline disclosure. In 1995, the Commission worked with the investment company industry and state securities regulators to develop the "profile prospectus," a clear, one-page summary that accompanies the regular prospectus and is designed to give investors a better understanding of the mutual fund they are considering buying. Pilot "profiles" developed by eight fund groups have been available to investors since August 1, 1995.

Toward the same end, the Commission proposed improved disclosure requirements for money market funds. The new standards are designed to simplify money market fund prospectuses considerably, making them less costly to prepare and allowing investors to focus on a short document that contains the most essential information about the fund.

Enhancing Investor Protections

Under the Commission's regulatory scheme, securities firms and self-regulatory organizations serve as the front-line defense against violations of the securities laws. The Commission's enforcement, examination, and investor education activities back up that defense.

In the past year, the Commission continued its traditionally vigorous enforcement program. Recent notable cases have involved domestic and international insider trading, Ponzi schemes, government securities fraud, misleading disclosures, kickbacks or conflicts of interest related to municipal securities offerings, broker-dealer sales practice abuses, "prime bank notes," and the relatively new problem of unregistered securities offerings over the Internet.

In May 1995, the Commission consolidated its examination and inspection activities into the Office of Compliance Inspections and Examinations (OCIE). The Commission created OCIE to conduct and coordinate examinations of brokers, dealers, self-regulatory organizations, investment companies and advisers, and transfer agents. One reason the office was created was to enable the SEC to better coordinate its examinations with fellow regulators, and I am pleased to report that we have already reached an important agreement with our colleagues that will reduce duplication of effort for us as well as for the firms we examine.

Working with the industry self-regulatory organizations and state regulators, the Commission also conducted a sales practice sweep of small and medium-sized brokerage firms. The objective of the sweep was to identify problem brokers and to ensure that appropriate supervisory mechanisms are in place and, where necessary, to take appropriate enforcement action.

The Commission's Office of Investor Education and Assistance continued its concerted efforts to reach out to investors. With the help and cooperation of the securities industry and state regulators, the office continued its highly popular investor town meetings to offer tips on how to invest wisely. Other outreach efforts during the year include the creation of an SEC site on the World Wide Web, which offers corporate financial information from our Electronic Data Gathering, Analysis, and Retrieval System (EDGAR) as well as SEC News Digests, litigation releases, speeches, testimony before Congress, rule proposals, press releases and investor alerts. For those who lack Internet access, the Commission also created a toll-free investor information line.


International Listings

During the year, the agency worked to reduce costs for foreign companies entering the U.S. markets by simplifying the registration and reporting process while maintaining high U.S. disclosure standards. At a time when cross-border listings in other major markets have either hit a plateau or declined, foreign issuer participation in the U.S. markets has grown dramatically in the 1990s—the Commission had a record 738 foreign listings at the beginning of 1996.

* * *

I believe that this is one of the most important periods in the Commission's existence. The American corporate community, the securities industry, and our capital markets are changing rapidly. Stocks and bonds are rapidly becoming the investment vehicles of choice for an increasing number of Americans. The Commission—working closely with the Congress, the private sector, and the investors we are bound to serve—is working to meet the challenges posed by these changes. I have every confidence that the Commission will continue to perform its responsibilities with the professionalism and dedication that all of us have come to expect.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Levitt', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Arthur Levitt
Chairman

Table of Contents

Commission Members and Principal Staff Officers	xi
Biographies of Commission Members	xiii
Arthur Levitt ♦ Steven M.H. Wallman	
Regional and District Offices	xv
Enforcement	
Key 1995 Results	1
Enforcement Authority ♦ Enforcement Activities ♦ Investor Education and Assistance Activities ♦ Sources for Further Inquiry	
International Affairs	
Key 1995 Results	21
Arrangements for Mutual Assistance and Exchanges of Information ♦ Enforcement Cooperation ♦ Technical Assistance ♦ International Organizations and Multilateral Initiatives ♦ Trade Negotiations	
Regulation of the Securities Markets	
Key 1995 Results	27
Securities Markets, Trading, and Significant Regulatory Issues ♦ Oversight of Self-Regulatory Organizations	
Investment Management Regulation	
Key 1995 Results	38
Significant Investment Company Act Matters ♦ Significant Investment Advisers Act Developments ♦ Significant Holding Company Act Developments	
Compliance Inspections and Examinations	
Key 1995 Results	47
Investment Company and Investment Adviser Inspections ♦ Broker-Dealer Examinations ♦ Self-Regulatory Organization Inspections and Oversight	
Full Disclosure	
Key 1995 Results	52
Review of Filings ♦ Rulemaking, Interpretive, and Legislative Matters ♦ Conferences ♦ Committees and Task Forces	

Accounting and Auditing Matters

Key 1995 Results 61

Accounting Related Rules and Interpretations ♦ Oversight of Private-Sector Standard-Setting ♦ Oversight of the Accounting Profession’s Initiatives ♦ International Accounting and Auditing Standards

Other Litigation and Legal Activities

Key 1995 Results 67

Significant Litigation Developments ♦ Significant Adjudication Developments ♦ Significant Legislative Developments ♦ Corporate Reorganizations ♦ Ethical Conduct Program

Municipal Securities Initiatives

Key 1995 Results 80

Municipal Securities Disclosure ♦ Technical Assistance

Economic Research and Analysis

Key 1995 Results 82

Economic Analysis and Technical Assistance

Policy Management and Administrative Support

Key 1995 Results 84

Policy Management ♦ Administrative Support

Endnotes 90

Appendix 99

Enforcement Cases Initiated by the Commission During Fiscal Year 1995 in Various Program Areas ♦ Fiscal 1995 Enforcement Cases Listed by Program Area ♦ Investigations of Possible Violations of the Acts Administered by the Commission ♦ Administrative Proceedings Instituted During Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1995 ♦ Injunctive Actions ♦ Right to Financial Privacy ♦ Types of Proceedings ♦ Foreign Restricted List ♦ Self-Regulatory Organizations: Expenses, Pre-tax Income and Balance Sheet Structure ♦ Consolidated Financial Information of Self-Regulatory Organizations ♦ Self-Regulatory Organizations—Clearing Corporations, 1994 Revenues and Expenses ♦ Self-Regulatory Organizations—Depositories, 1994 Revenues and Expenses ♦ Certificate Immobilization ♦ Investment Companies and Investment Advisers ♦ Section 13(f)(1) Reports ♦ Exemp-

tions ♦ Corporate Reorganizations ♦ The Securities Industry: Revenues, Expenses, and Selected Balance Sheet Items ♦ Unconsolidated Financial Information for Broker-Dealers ♦ Unconsolidated Annual Revenues and Expenses for Broker-Dealers Doing a Public Business, 1990–1994 ♦ Unconsolidated Balance Sheet for Broker-Dealers Doing a Public Business Year-end, 1990–1994 ♦ Carrying and Clearing Firms ♦ Securities Industry Dollar in 1994 for Carrying/Clearing Firms ♦ Unconsolidated Revenues and Expenses for Carrying/Clearing Broker-Dealers ♦ Unconsolidated Balance Sheet for Carrying/Clearing Broker-Dealers ♦ Securities Traded on Exchanges: Market Value and Volume ♦ NASDAQ (Share Volume and Dollar Volume) ♦ Share and Dollar Volume by Exchanges ♦ Market Value of Equity/Options Sales on U.S. Exchanges ♦ Volume of Equity/Options Sales on U.S. Securities Exchanges ♦ Share Volume by Exchanges ♦ Dollar Volume by Exchanges ♦ Securities Listed on Exchanges ♦ Value of Stocks Listed on Exchanges ♦ Appropriated Funds vs. Fees Collected ♦ Budget Estimates and Appropriations ♦ U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission Organizational Chart

Commission Members and Principal Staff Officers

(As of November 8, 1995)

Commissioners*

Term Expires

Arthur Levitt, *Chairman*

1998

Steven M.H. Wallman, *Commissioner*

1997

Principal Staff Officers

Michael E. Schlein, *Chief of Staff*

Linda C. Quinn, *Director, Division of Corporation Finance*

Meredith B. Cross, *Deputy Director*

William E. Morley, *Senior Associate Director*

Abigail Arms, *Associate Director*

Robert A. Bayless, *Associate Director*

Howard F. Morin, *Associate Director*

Mauri L. Osheroff, *Associate Director*

Albert S. Dandridge, III, *Associate Director*

David A. Sirignano, *Senior Legal Advisor*

William R. McLucas, *Director, Division of Enforcement*

Colleen P. Mahoney, *Deputy Director*

Paul V. Gerlach, *Associate Director*

Thomas C. Newkirk, *Associate Director*

Gary N. Sundick, *Associate Director*

Joan E. McKown, *Chief Counsel*

Barry R. Goldsmith, *Chief Litigation Counsel*

Stephen J. Crimmins, *Deputy Chief Litigation Counsel*

George H. Diacont, *Chief Accountant*

James A. Clarkson, III, *Director of Regional Office Operations*

Barry Barbash, *Director, Division of Investment Management*

Heidi Stam, *Associate Director*

Vacant, *Associate Director*

Jack Murphy, *Chief Counsel*

Brandon Becker, *Director, Division of Market Regulation*

Robert L.D. Colby, *Deputy Director*

Larry E. Bergmann, *Associate Director*

Jonathan Kallman, *Associate Director*

Howard Kramer, *Associate Director*

*Commissioner J. Carter Beese resigned from the Commission on November 14, 1994, and Commissioner Richard Y. Roberts resigned from the Commission on July 17, 1995.

Michael A. Macchiaroli, *Associate Director*
Catherine McGuire, *Associate Director/Chief Counsel*
Holly Smith, *Associate Director*

Simon Lorne, *General Counsel, Office of General Counsel*
Paul Gonson, *Solicitor and Deputy General Counsel*
Phillip D. Parker, *Deputy General Counsel (Legal Policy)*
Anne E. Chafer, *Associate General Counsel*
Richard M. Humes, *Associate General Counsel*
Diane Sanger, *Associate General Counsel*
Jacob H. Stillman, *Associate General Counsel*

Lori A. Richards, *Director, Office of Compliance Inspections and Examinations*
Mark Fitterman, *Associate Director*
Mary Ann Gadziala, *Associate Director*
Gene Gohlke, *Associate Director*
C. Gladwyn Goins, *Associate Director*

Paul S. Maco, *Director, Office of Municipal Securities*

Michael H. Sutton, *Chief Accountant, Office of the Chief Accountant*

Brenda Murray, *Chief Administrative Law Judge, Office of the Administrative Law Judges*

Richard R. Lindsey, *Chief Economist, Office of Economic Analysis*

Nancy M. Smith, *Director, Office of Investor Education and Assistance*

Victor H. Tynes, Jr., *Director, Office of Equal Employment Opportunity*

James M. McConnell, *Executive Director, Office of the Executive Director*
Fernando L. Alegria, Jr., *Associate Executive Director*
Michael Bartell, *Associate Executive Director*
Wilson A. Butler, Jr., *Associate Executive Director*
Vacant, *Associate Executive Director*

Michael D. Mann, *Director, Office of International Affairs*

Kathryn Fulton, *Director, Office of Legislative Affairs*

Jennifer Kimball, *Director, Office of Public Affairs, Policy Evaluation and Research*

Jonathan G. Katz, *Secretary of the Commission*

Biographies of Commission Members

Chairman

Following his nomination by President Clinton and his confirmation by the Senate, Arthur Levitt, Jr. was sworn in as the 25th Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission on July 27, 1993.

Before being nominated to the Commission, Mr. Levitt served as the Chairman of the New York City Economic Development Corporation and, from 1978 to 1989, the Chairman of the American Stock Exchange.

Throughout his career, Mr. Levitt has been called upon to serve on many governmental task forces and boards of directors. At the federal level, he has served on four executive branch commissions, including chairing the White House Small Business Task Force from 1978 to 1980. Most recently, he was a member of the President's Base Closure and Realignment Commission and the Defense Department Task Force on the National Industrial Base. In addition to heading the New York City Economic Development Corporation, he chaired the Special Advisory Task Force on the Future Development of the West Side of Manhattan and the Committee on Incentives and Tax Policy of the New York City Mayor's Management Advisory Task Force.

Mr. Levitt has served on 10 corporate and philanthropic boards, including those of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, East New York Savings Bank, First Empire State Corporation, the Revson Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation and Williams College.

Mr. Levitt founded Levitt Media Company in 1986, and served as the company's Chairman. Its primary holding was *Roll Call, the Newspaper of Congress*.

Prior to accepting the Amex chairmanship, Mr. Levitt worked for 16 years on Wall Street. From 1969 to 1978, he was President and Director of Shearson Hayden Stone, Inc. (today Smith Barney) whose predecessor firm he joined as a partner in 1962. It was during this period that Mr. Levitt first involved himself with Amex, becoming one of its governors in 1975 and in 1977 accepting the additional position of Vice Chairman.

From 1959 to 1962, Mr. Levitt worked at the Kansas-based agricultural management firm Oppenheimer Industries, where he rose to the position of Executive Vice President and Director. From 1954 to 1959, Mr. Levitt was assistant promotion director at Time, Inc.



Mr. Levitt, 65, graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Williams College in 1952 before serving two years in the Air Force. Married since 1955 to the former Marylin Blauner, Mr. Levitt has two grown children, Arthur III and Lauri.



Commissioner

Steven M.H. Wallman was nominated to the Securities and Exchange Commission by President Bill Clinton and confirmed by the Senate on June 29, 1994. He was sworn in as a Commissioner on July 5, 1994. His term expires in June 1997.


Before being nominated to the Commission, Mr. Wallman was in private practice with the Washington law office of Covington and Burling. He joined the firm in 1978 as an Associate, becoming a Partner in 1986. While at Covington & Burling, Mr. Wallman specialized in general corporate, securities, contract and business law. Mr. Wallman also worked for the Boston Consulting Group in 1978. He is a member of the American Law Institute and the American Bar Association.


Mr. Wallman received his J.D. from the Columbia University School of Law in 1978. In 1976, he earned an S.M. from the Sloan School of Management at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and an S.B. from M.I.T. in 1975. He and his wife live in Great Falls, Virginia.

Mr. Wallman was born on November 14, 1953.


SEC REGIONAL AND DISTRICT OFFICES




Pacific Region
San Francisco District


Central Region
Fort Worth District
Salt Lake District


Midwest Region


Northeast Region
Boston District
Philadelphia District


Southeast Region
Atlanta District

Central Regional Office

Robert H. Davenport, Regional Director
1801 California St., Suite 4800
Denver, CO 80202-2648
(303) 391-6800

Fort Worth District Office

T. Christopher Browne,
District Administrator
801 Cherry Street, 19th Floor
Fort Worth, TX 76102
(817) 334-3821

Salt Lake District Office

Kenneth D. Israel, District Administrator
50 S. Main Street, Suite 500
Salt Lake City, UT 84144-0402
(801) 524-5796

Midwest Regional Office

Mary Keefe, Regional Director
Citicorp Center
500 W. Madison St., Suite 1400
Chicago, IL 60661-2511
(312) 353-7390

Northeast Regional Office

Richard H. Walker, Regional Director
7 World Trade Center, Suite 1300
New York, NY 10048
(212) 748-8000

Boston District Office

Juan M. Marcelino, District Administrator
73 Tremont Street
Sixth Floor, Suite 600
Boston, MA 02108-3912
(617) 424-5900

Philadelphia District Office

Donald M. Hoerl, District Administrator
The Curtis Center, Suite 1005 E.
601 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106-3322
(215) 597-3100

Pacific Regional Office

Elaine M. Cacheris, Regional Director
5670 Wilshire Blvd., 11th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90036-3648
(213) 965-3998

San Francisco District Office

David B. Bayless, District Administrator
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 1100
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 705-2500

Southeast Regional Office

Charles V. Senatore, Regional Director
1401 Brickell Avenue, Suite 200
Miami, FL 33131
(305) 536-4700

Atlanta District Office

Richard P. Wessel,
District Administrator
3475 Lenox Road, N.E.
Suite 1000
Atlanta, GA 30326-1232
(404) 842-7600

Enforcement

The Commission's enforcement program is designed to protect investors and foster confidence by preserving the integrity and efficiency of the securities markets. The enforcement program's principal legislative mandates contain explicit authority for the agency to conduct investigations and prosecute violations of the securities laws by bringing enforcement actions in federal court or instituting administrative proceedings before the Commission. Last year, as in prior years, the Commission maintained a strong presence in all areas within its jurisdiction.

Key 1995 Results

In 1995, the Commission instituted a significant number of enforcement actions in response to a wide range of securities law violations. In its administrative and judicial proceedings, the Commission sought and obtained relief from a broad and flexible array of remedies designed to protect investors and the public interest. Investor complaints and inquiries continued to provide the Commission with information on potential securities fraud and abuse. During 1995, nearly one-fifth of the investigations initiated by the Commission stemmed, in part, from investor complaints.

The Commission obtained court orders requiring defendants to disgorge illicit profits of over \$994 million. Civil penalties authorized by the Securities Enforcement Remedies and Penny Stock Reform Act of 1990 (Remedies Act), the Insider Trading Sanctions Act of 1984 (ITSA), and the Insider Trading and Securities Fraud Enforcement Act of 1988 (ITSFEA) totaled over \$34 million. In some instances, the payment of disgorgement pursuant to a court order was waived based upon the defendant's demonstrated inability to pay. Courts also have noted in some cases that civil penalties were appropriate but were not imposed because of a demonstrated inability to pay.

Total Enforcement Actions Initiated

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Total	320	394	416	497	486
Civil Injunctive Actions	172	156	172	196	171
Administrative Proceedings	138	226	229	268	291
Civil and Criminal Contempt Proceedings	9	11	15	33	23
Reports of Investigation	1	1	0	0	1

In Commission-related cases, criminal authorities obtained 92 criminal indictments or informations, and 98 convictions during 1995. The Commission granted access to its files to domestic and foreign prosecutorial authorities in 285 instances.

Over 42,500 complaints and inquiries were analyzed and responded to during 1995, an increase of 10 percent over 1994. Approximately 50 percent of the complaints involved broker-dealers, while the remainder involved issuers, mutual funds, banks, transfer and clearing agents, investment advisers, and various financial and non-financial matters. More than 2,900 complaints were referred to the Commission's operating divisions, self-regulatory organizations (SROs), and other regulatory entities for review or action.

Enforcement Authority

The Commission has broad authority to investigate possible violations of the federal securities laws. Informal investigations are conducted on a voluntary basis, with the Commission requesting persons with relevant information to cooperate by providing documents and testifying before SEC staff. The federal securities laws also empower the Commission to conduct formal investigations in which the Commission has the authority to issue subpoenas that compel the production of books and records and the appearance of witnesses to testify. Generally, both types of investigations are conducted on a confidential, non-public basis.

Traditionally, one of the Commission's principal enforcement mechanisms for addressing violative conduct has been the federal court injunction, which prohibits future violations. In civil actions for injunctive relief, the Commission is authorized to seek temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions as well as permanent injunctions against any person who is violating or about to violate any provision of the federal securities laws. Once an injunction has been imposed, conduct that violates the injunction is punishable by either civil or criminal contempt, and violators are subject to fines or imprisonment. In addition to seeking such orders, the Commission often seeks other equitable relief such as an accounting and disgorgement of illegal profits. When seeking temporary restraining orders, the Commission often requests a freeze order to prevent concealment of assets or dissipation of the proceeds of illegal conduct. The Remedies Act authorized the Commission to seek, and the courts to impose, civil penalties for any violation of the federal securities laws (with the exception of insider trading violations for which penalties are available under ITSA and ITSFEA). The Remedies Act also affirmed the existing equitable authority of the federal courts to bar or suspend individuals from serving as corporate officers or directors.

The Commission has the authority to institute several types of administrative proceedings, in addition to civil injunctive actions. The Commission may institute administrative proceedings against regulated entities in which the sanctions that may be imposed include a censure, limitation on activities, and suspension or revocation of registration. The Commission may impose similar sanctions on persons associated with such

entities and persons affiliated with investment companies. In addition, individuals participating in an offering of penny stock may be barred by the Commission from such participation. In administrative proceedings against regulated entities and their associated persons, the Remedies Act also authorized the Commission to impose penalties and order disgorgement.

The Remedies Act further authorized the Commission to institute administrative proceedings in which it can issue cease and desist orders. A permanent cease and desist order can be entered against any person violating the federal securities laws, and may require disgorgement of illegal profits. The Commission also is authorized to issue temporary cease and desist orders (if necessary, on an *ex parte* basis) against regulated entities and their associated persons if the Commission determines that the violation or threatened violation is likely to result in significant dissipation or conversion of assets, significant harm to investors, or substantial harm to the public interest prior to the completion of proceedings.

Section 8(d) of the Securities Act of 1933 (Securities Act) enables the Commission to institute proceedings to suspend the effectiveness of a registration statement that contains false and misleading statements. Administrative proceedings pursuant to Section 15(c)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Exchange Act) can be instituted against any person who fails to comply, and any person who is a cause of failure to comply, with reporting, beneficial ownership, proxy, and tender offer requirements. Respondents can be ordered to comply, or to take steps to effect compliance, with the relevant provisions. Pursuant to Rule 102(e) of the Commission's Rules of Practice (former Rule 2(e)), administrative proceedings can be instituted against professionals who appear or practice before the Commission, including accountants and attorneys. The sanctions that can be imposed in these proceedings include suspensions and bars from appearing or practicing before the Commission.

The Commission is authorized to refer matters to other federal, state, or local authorities or SROs such as the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) or the National Association of Securities Dealers (NASD). The staff often provides substantial assistance to the Department of Justice for the criminal prosecution of securities violations.

Enforcement Activities

Set forth below are summaries of significant enforcement actions initiated in various areas during 1995. Defendants or respondents who consented to settlements of actions did so without admitting or denying the factual allegations contained in the complaint or order instituting proceedings. See Table 2 for a listing of all enforcement actions instituted in 1995.

Offering Cases

Securities offering cases involve the offer and sale of securities in violation of the registration provisions of the Securities Act. In some cases, the issuers attempt to rely on exemptions from the registration requirements that are not available under the circumstances. Offering cases frequently

involve material misrepresentations concerning, among other things, use of proceeds, risks associated with investments, disciplinary history of promoters or control persons, business prospects, promised returns, success of prior offerings, and the financial condition of issuers.

1. Offerings over the Internet

The Internet and the various commercial on-line computer services have become a popular source of information about many areas of public interest, including securities. In some cases, however, communications over the Internet also have been used to solicit the purchase of unregistered securities or to further securities frauds. In *SEC v. Block*,¹ for example, the Commission alleged that the defendant used the Internet to advance a "prime bank" scheme. (Other prime bank schemes are described below.) Potential investors were promised that their funds would be doubled in as little as four months and that their investments were guaranteed against loss by a "Prime Bank Guarantee" that would be used as security. In fact, no such prime bank instrument existed, and the defendant failed to disclose the risks associated with the investments, or how the promised returns would be generated. On September 14, 1995, the Commission obtained a preliminary injunction and an asset freeze in these pending proceedings.

The Commission alleged that the defendant in *SEC v. Odulo*,² posted a false and misleading solicitation on the Internet seeking investors for a \$500,000 offering of \$1,000 denomination bonds. According to the complaint, the defendant represented that the bonds would yield a "whopping 20% rate of return" and were "a very low risk" investment. The defendant failed to disclose that the proceeds were sought to fund a proposed new venture involving the acquisition and raising of eels, and failed to disclose his lack of expertise in the culturing of eels. To lend credibility to the offering, the defendant created false endorsements of the bonds by fictitious investment advisers and falsely stated that all investments were insured against possible loss. The defendant consented to the entry of an injunction.

In *SEC v. Pleasure Time Inc.*,³ the defendants allegedly recruited investors for a "multi-level marketing" system by telephone, fax, and postings on the Internet. Investors were told that they could reap enormous profits from a world-wide telephone lottery with projected receipts of \$300 million. The defendants failed to disclose the legal, regulatory, and technical obstacles to starting such a lottery. The Commission obtained a preliminary injunction in this case, and one of the defendants has consented to the entry of an injunction.

2. Prime Bank Schemes

Schemes to sell so-called "prime bank" securities continue to appear. The typical case involves the offer and sale of notes, debentures, letters of credit, or guarantees purportedly issued by one or more major international banks. Investors in these schemes are typically promised unrealistic rates of return, *e.g.*, a 150 percent annualized rate of "profits." In *SEC v. Gallard*,⁴ the Commission alleged that John Gallard, Adrian Gallard, and their

company, The Aberdeen Group, Inc., defrauded investors through their operation of a scheme to sell fraudulent “prime bank” securities. The Commission alleged that, since 1992, defendants defrauded investors of over \$2.3 million in the offer and sale of fictitious securities. Defendants falsely represented that they could obtain debt instruments issued by “top world banks” at a deep discount from face value and could arrange for the resale of the securities at a tremendous profit to investors. In fact, the securities did not exist, and defendants, instead of delivering the securities as promised, simply kept the large deposits they had induced investors to pay, and fabricated defaults by the investors to justify the “forfeiture” of the “refundable” deposits. This action was pending at the end of the year.

In *SEC v. Norton*,⁵ the Commission charged four individuals with engaging in a fraudulent “prime bank” scheme that resulted in one investor losing \$765,000 and another investor losing \$125,000. According to the complaint, the defendants raised funds from investors by falsely promising them extraordinary profits and a risk-free investment if they deposited funds in an escrow account at a law firm. The investors were told that their funds would be used to facilitate the purchase and sale of prime bank notes supposedly issued by the top banks in the world. In fact, as alleged in the complaint, the investors’ funds were misappropriated. These proceedings are pending.

3. Telecommunications Cases

The Commission also has filed actions arising from the solicitation of interests in ventures purportedly developing advanced telecommunication technologies. These cases typically arise from the fraudulent, unregistered sale of securities in ventures ostensibly involved in wireless cable, specialized mobile radio, interactive video and data services, and similar telecommunication technologies. While many telecommunications technology companies raise capital through legitimate means, the Commission has uncovered numerous fraudulent ventures, which often take the form of limited liability companies or partnerships that promoters falsely represent as outside the registration provisions of the federal securities laws, and which often are promoted through “infomercials” and high-pressure telephone sales pitches.

The Commission’s complaint in *SEC v. United Communications, Ltd.*⁶ alleged a scheme that induced approximately 3,000 investors nationwide to invest over \$40 million in “membership units” in limited liability companies that purportedly were developing wireless cable television systems. The defendants used high pressure “boiler room” telemarketing tactics, misrepresented the returns that investors could expect, and omitted to disclose risks. They represented that investors would receive a return of up to 400 percent within a few years, at minimal risk, while using millions of dollars of investor funds for their own purposes. Three individuals and four companies, including United Communications, Ltd., consented to the entry of injunctions. In addition, United Communications and two of the

settling individuals agreed to disgorge a total of \$12,334,040. A relief defendant, TechniVision, Inc., also agreed to disgorge \$7 million. This action was pending as to other defendants at the end of the year.

In *SEC v. Future Vision Direct Marketing, Inc.*,⁷ the Commission alleged a scheme involving the fraudulent offer and sale of “membership interests” in limited liability companies, and partnership interests in a limited partnership, formed to fund wireless cable television operations in Venezuela. The defendants raised approximately \$3 million from the sale of membership interests in the limited liability companies, and approximately \$310,000 from sales of limited partnership interests. Offering materials failed to disclose material information concerning, among other things, the principals’ primary roles in the offerings, loans from the principals to the limited liability companies, and prior criminal and/or civil fraud actions against certain of the defendants. Investor funds also were misappropriated by certain defendants. The Commission obtained a preliminary injunction and an asset freeze in this action, which was pending at the end of the year.

In *SEC v. Telecom Marketing, Inc.*,⁸ the Commission alleged that the defendants violated the antifraud and registration provisions of the federal securities laws through the offer and sale of as much as \$28.5 million in investment contracts by Telecom Marketing, Inc. and two other firms. The investment contracts involved are units in two general partnerships formed to invest in wireless cable television systems in Mobile, Alabama and Madison, Wisconsin. The partnership units in question were sold to over 2,600 investors residing throughout the United States at prices ranging from \$3,750 to \$5,450 per unit. Both offerings were sold by a network of boiler rooms. Among other things, the offering materials failed to disclose the relatively low prices paid by the promoters for the assets to be transferred to the partnerships, or the correspondingly large profits to be made by the promoters on the transactions. Finally, the offering materials for both offerings disclosed sales commissions of 15 percent, when in fact the boiler rooms received sales commissions of 50 percent of the funds they raised. The Commission obtained a preliminary injunction, an asset freeze, and the appointment of a receiver in these pending proceedings.

In *SEC v. Qualified Pensions, Inc.*,⁹ the Commission alleged that Qualified Pensions, Inc. (QPI) and Jerry G. Allison misappropriated at least \$4.5 million in retirement savings entrusted to QPI to be maintained in individual retirement accounts (IRA) and other retirement savings plans. More than 14,500 individuals were induced to transfer at least \$270 million of their retirement savings to accounts at QPI, which permitted investors to purchase illiquid, unregistered securities that generally cannot be purchased in IRA accounts at banks or broker-dealers. In addition, promoters of speculative telecommunication technology securities, many of which involve frauds, sent QPI account opening documents to prospective investors along with their own promotional materials, and encouraged investors to invest their retirement savings in the offered securities through QPI. The complaint alleges that at least \$72 million of QPI’s customers’ funds were invested

in telecommunication technology securities. The Commission obtained a preliminary injunction, an asset freeze, and the appointment of a receiver in these pending proceedings.

4. Other Offering Cases

The Commission filed an action against Irwin H. "Sonny" Bloch, a "consumer advocate" and radio talk show host, alleging that Bloch and entities under his control defrauded investors of \$3.8 million in connection with the sale of unregistered membership interests in three limited liability companies formed to acquire certain AM radio stations in Florida. In *SEC v. Bloch*,¹⁰ the Commission alleged, among other things, that the defendants distributed offering materials that contained material misrepresentations and omissions concerning the projected value of an investment, and the projected revenues, expenses, and growth rate of the radio stations. In addition, Bloch diverted over \$1 million in investor funds to himself and his spouse and to companies under their control. This action was pending at the end of the year.

In *SEC v. Bennett*,¹¹ the Commission alleged that The Foundation for New Era Philanthropy and John G. Bennett, Jr. engaged in a massive scheme by which hundreds of non-profit organizations, including churches, charities, and universities, were defrauded out of at least \$100 million. The defendants purported to operate an investment program in which non-profit organizations were induced to invest for a period of six months, with promises that they would receive back twice the amount of their investments through a "matching fund" supplied by anonymous benefactors. In fact, there were no benefactors, and New Era was operating a "Ponzi" scheme, in which funds obtained from newer investors were used to meet obligations to prior investors. The Commission obtained a preliminary injunction and an asset freeze in these proceedings, which were pending at the end of the year.

The Commission's action in *SEC v. International Breeders, Inc.*¹² involved the fraudulent sale of unregistered partnership interests in ostrich breeding ventures. The defendants offered the interests through high-pressure, boiler room sales tactics, and raised at least \$6.5 million from over 700 investors. Among other things, the defendants misrepresented to investors that they could receive returns of 500 percent or more. In addition, defendants failed to disclose that ostrich breeding is a high-risk, highly speculative investment, or that many of the defendants had been ordered by several states to cease and desist the offer and sale of ostrich investments. The Commission obtained a preliminary injunction and an asset freeze in these proceedings, which were pending at the end of the year.

In *SEC v. Naiman*,¹³ the Commission alleged that Gary F. Naiman, the president of Pioneer Mortgage Company, offered and sold \$238 million of trust deed investments to approximately 2,500 elderly investors without disclosing Pioneer's poor financial condition, the increasing number of borrowers who were defaulting on the loans underlying the trust deeds,

or Naiman's diversion of investor funds for unauthorized purposes. Naiman consented to the entry of an injunction and an order requiring him to disgorge \$164,031,701, plus interest.

Financial Disclosure

Actions involving false and misleading disclosures concerning matters that affect the financial condition of an issuer, or involving the issuance of false financial statements, often are complex and, in general, demand more resources than other types of cases. Effective prosecution in this area is essential to preserving the integrity of the full disclosure system. The Commission brought 71 cases containing significant allegations of financial disclosure violations against issuers, regulated entities, or their employees. Many of these cases included alleged violations of the books and records and internal accounting control provisions of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. The Commission also brought 11 cases alleging misconduct by accounting firms or their partners or employees.

In *SEC v. First Capital Holdings Corp., Inc.*,¹⁴ the Commission alleged that First Capital made material misrepresentations and omissions concerning the financial condition and results of operations of its subsidiary, First Capital Life Insurance Company (FCL). FCL sought to increase its statutory capital and surplus under reinsurance agreements that did not support the recognition of "reserve credits" under California law; as a result, by year-end 1990, First Capital overstated its subsidiaries' consolidated capital and surplus by over \$65 million. First Capital failed to disclose the negative effect that any reversal of FCL's accounting treatment of reserve credits would have on First Capital's ability to continue as a going concern. First Capital consented to the entry of an injunction. In related proceedings, First Capital's chief financial officer and chief operating officer each consented to the entry of cease and desist orders.

In *SEC v. Softpoint, Inc.*,¹⁵ the Commission alleged that Softpoint's earnings and income from 1992 through 1994 were artificially inflated by the reporting of fictitious software sales in periodic filings and press releases. Softpoint falsely disclosed the generation of \$4.4 million in revenue from certain sales to foreign distributors (certain of which were under the control of Softpoint's former president). In addition, Softpoint issued 420,000 shares of its stock to these foreign distributors, the stock then being sold in the United States purportedly pursuant to Regulation S. Softpoint falsely disclosed that funds received from these stock sales were payments on the receivables from the foreign distributors. Softpoint's president and former president also sold Softpoint stock while in possession of material non-public information about the fraudulent scheme. These proceedings were pending at the end of the year.

The Commission's complaint in *SEC v. Digitran Systems, Incorporated*¹⁶ alleged that Digitran improperly recognized revenue on several transactions. Digitran's false claims of having sold simulators to customers resulted in income statements in which total revenue was inflated by 46 percent to 93 percent. Improperly recognized revenue was reflected in periodic filings, a registration statement, and press releases. In addition, two of the individual

defendants sold Digitran stock while in possession of material non-public information regarding the company's financial condition and operations. This case was pending at the end of the year.

The Commission filed an action against four former members of senior management at Kurzweil Applied Intelligence, Inc., who engaged in a scheme to inflate Kurzweil's revenues and income at the time of the company's initial public offering in 1993. In *SEC v. Bradstreet*,¹⁷ the Commission alleged Kurzweil recognized revenue from non-existent sales and from sales that did not meet the requirements of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). As a result, Kurzweil reported operating results for 1993 that overstated revenue by \$2,760,000, or 25 percent, and reported a profit of \$154,000 instead of a loss of \$2,293,000; for the nine months ended October 31, 1993, Kurzweil overstated revenue by \$5,736,000, or 76 percent, and reported net income of \$649,000 instead of a loss of \$5,518,000. These misstated results were included in Kurzweil's Form S-1 registration statement and in quarterly reports filed with the Commission. Two of the individual defendants also sold Kurzweil stock while in possession of material non-public information concerning the company's true financial condition. This case was pending at the end of the year.

The Commission issued a Report of Investigation, pursuant to Section 21(a) of the Exchange Act, *In the Matter of The Cooper Companies, Inc.*,¹⁸ concerning the failure of Cooper's board of directors to respond adequately to information concerning potential misconduct by Gary Singer, Cooper's former co-chairman, and his brother, Steven Singer, who was then a Cooper director and its chief administrative officer. Among other things, Gary Singer failed to disclose a series of transactions by which he caused \$6 million in high-yield bonds to be transferred between Cooper accounts and accounts in the names of his wife and aunt; these unauthorized transactions deprived Cooper and its shareholders of profits in excess of \$560,000. After the board learned that he had concealed these fraudulent, self-dealing transactions and thereby caused the company's outstanding reports to be inaccurate, the board failed to take immediate and effective action to protect the interests of the company's investors. The board's inaction also allowed Steven Singer, who was allegedly involved in a frontrunning scheme that was under investigation by the Commission, to direct the issuance of a press release on behalf of the company that falsely denied any knowledge of wrongdoing. The Commission's report was issued to emphasize the responsibility of directors to safeguard both the integrity of corporate statements and the interests of investors, when they become aware of evidence of fraudulent conduct by management.

The Commission found in *In the Matter of Marvin E. Basson, CPA*,¹⁹ that the outside auditor of Towers Financial Corporation committed fraud and engaged in improper professional conduct in connection with his audit and audit reports on the company's financial statements for the years 1988 through 1991. The financial statements filed by Towers during this period overstated income and accounts receivable, which were not recorded in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. Basson also was enjoined by consent in related proceedings. The respondent consented to

the entry of the Commission's order pursuant to Rule 2(e) (now re-codified as Rule 102(e)) of the Rules of Practice, by which he was denied the privilege of appearing or practicing before the Commission.

In *In the Matter of C. Steven Bolen*,²⁰ the Commission denied the respondent the privilege of appearing or practicing before the Commission. Bolen, the former executive vice president and chief financial officer of Financial News Network, Inc. (FNN), had been enjoined by consent in 1994, based upon his participation in a fraudulent scheme to inflate FNN's revenues and earnings for 1989 and the first three quarters of 1990, by, among other things, causing an overstatement of revenues received from two related companies and an understatement of the write-off of the assets of a discontinued FNN business segment. FNN also had been caused to enter into numerous equipment sale/leaseback transactions in which the quantity, type, and value of the equipment being sold; the identities of the sellers; and the disposition of the proceeds from the transactions were falsified. Bolen consented to the entry of the Commission's order entered pursuant to Rule 2(e).

Derivative Securities

The Commission conducted several major investigations involving transactions in the market for derivative securities. The Commission instituted cease and desist proceedings against BT Securities Corporation, a broker-dealer subsidiary of Bankers Trust New York Corporation. In *In the Matter of BT Securities Corporation*,²¹ the Commission found that BT Securities defrauded a customer, Gibson Greetings, Inc., by misrepresenting the value of Gibson's derivatives portfolio. The actions of BT Securities caused Gibson to continue to purchase derivatives. In addition, the false information supplied by BT Securities led Gibson to understate the extent of its unrealized losses in financial statements filed with the Commission and distributed to the public. BT Securities consented to the entry of orders issued by the Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission that together required the payment of a penalty of \$10 million.

In proceedings related to the action against BT Securities Corporation, the Commission, in *In the Matter of Gibson Greetings, Inc.*,²² alleged that Gibson violated the reporting and books and records provisions of the federal securities laws in connection with its accounting for and disclosure of certain derivatives that it had purchased on the advice of BT Securities. Among other things, Gibson failed to establish internal controls sufficient to identify such derivative positions and require that they be marked to market, and to ensure that derivative transactions were properly executed. The respondents in this matter consented to the entry of the Commission's cease and desist order.

In *SEC v. Schulte*,²³ the Commission claimed that a securities salesman fraudulently sold millions of dollars in derivative securities to at least 14 Ohio municipalities and school districts. Schulte allegedly failed to describe the nature of the risks of the securities, failed to inform investors of the type of securities being sold, and falsely represented to investors that the derivatives were guaranteed by the U.S. Government. Total losses sustained

by the investors have not been determined, but the Commission alleged that losses by four of the investors alone exceeded \$3.4 million. This case was pending at the end of the year.

In *In the Matter of Van Kampen American Capital Asset Management, Inc.*,²⁴ the Commission alleged the intentional mispricing by the respondent's portfolio manager of certain derivative securities held in its portfolio. The mispricing was intended to conceal a decline in the value of the securities, and resulted in an overvaluing of the portfolio by \$6.88 million and calculation of net asset value inflated by as much as 76 cents per share. The respondent consented to the entry of the order by which it was censured and ordered to pay a civil penalty of \$50,000. In related proceedings, the Commission also took action against the portfolio manager. In *In the Matter of Thomas M. Rogge*,²⁵ the Commission alleged, among other things, the respondent caused Van Kampen's records to reflect that prices for the securities at issue had been obtained from brokerage firms, when in fact he was pricing the securities himself. Rogge consented to the entry of a cease and desist order by which he was ordered to pay a civil penalty of \$11,000; he also consented to a bar from association with any regulated entity.

In *In the Matter of Askin Capital Management, L.P.*,²⁶ the Commission alleged antifraud violations in connection with the valuation of portfolios invested in mortgage derivative securities and other collateralized mortgage obligations. Among other things, the respondents, Askin Capital Management and its chief executive officer, David Askin, disseminated misleading performance information to advisory clients and prospective clients in written reports and oral presentations. The respondents consented to the entry of cease and desist orders. Askin Capital Management's registration was revoked, and Askin was barred from association with regulated entities and ordered to pay \$50,000 to settle pending or future claims by or on behalf of one or more of the advisory clients of Askin Capital Management.

Municipal Securities

The Commission has become increasingly concerned with activities in the municipal securities markets. In recent years, the individual investor increasingly has become an important player in the market for municipal securities, both through direct purchases of municipal bonds and through investments in mutual funds that hold these instruments. Accordingly, the Commission's enforcement program has been focusing more attention in this area, resulting in several important enforcement actions being brought by the Commission in 1995.

The Commission filed an injunctive action, involving alleged political corruption, against Terry D. Busbee, an elected board member of the Escambia County Utilities Authority (ECUA), located in Florida, and Preston C. Bynum, an employee of a broker-dealer firm. In *SEC v. Busbee*,²⁷ the Commission's complaint claims that Busbee and Bynum entered into an arrangement by which Busbee received financial benefits from Bynum at a time when Bynum's firm was selected as the senior underwriter or senior managing underwriter for several issues of ECUA municipal securities. In connection with the

arrangement, Busbee allegedly received bank loans of \$36,000, repayment of approximately \$27,000 in principal and interest on these loans, and a direct payment of \$3,500. Busbee and Bynum consented to the entry of injunctions. In addition, Bynum agreed to pay a civil money penalty in the amount of \$25,000 and, in related administrative proceedings, *In the Matter of Preston C. Bynum*,²⁸ consented to the entry of an order by which he was barred from association with regulated entities.

In *In the Matter of Derryl W. Peden*,²⁹ the Commission settled a portion of the administrative proceeding instituted last year against Thorn, Alvis, Welch. According to the order instituting the proceeding, a municipal bond underwriter allegedly engaged in a scheme in which sham transactions were used to conceal the payment of issuance costs out of bond proceeds, in excess of amounts permitted under the Internal Revenue Code. The bonds at issue were sold to finance certain urban renewal projects. Thorn Alvis's president and its bond counsel allegedly caused Thorn Alvis falsely to represent that the developer of the projects was providing cash contributions, when, in fact, part of the bond proceeds were simply being routed through the developer—by inflating his fee—to create the appearance of cash contributions. Peden, the bond counsel, consented to the entry of a cease and desist order, and agreed to disgorge \$35,000. The remainder of the action was pending at the end of the year.

In *SEC v. Stifel, Nicolaus and Company, Inc.*,³⁰ the Commission alleged that, between 1989 and 1993, a broker-dealer accepted millions of dollars in undisclosed payments from certain third parties who sold investments to municipal bond issuers advised by the broker-dealer. In advising the issuers about the purchase of these investments, Stifel defrauded its clients by failing to disclose its conflict of interest. Stifel consented to the entry of an injunction and agreed to disgorge \$922,741, pay prejudgment interest on that amount of \$263,637, and pay a civil money penalty of \$250,000. In pending proceedings, *SEC v. Cochran*,³¹ the Commission alleged that three former employees of Stifel failed to comply with their duty to disclose the same conflicts of interest to the firm's clients.

The Commission alleged in *SEC v. Sutcliffe*,³² that the defendant defrauded investors by participating in the preparation of false and misleading municipal bond offering circulars. Sutcliffe was the undisclosed promoter and control person of two not-for-profit corporations that participated in 26 public offerings of municipal and corporate bonds that raised over \$107 million to acquire, renovate, and operate nursing homes. Among other things alleged by the Commission, the offering circular for one of the offerings contained material misrepresentations and omissions concerning the defendant's role as a promoter of the offering, his control over the issuer, his regulatory history, and the commingling of revenues from existing nursing homes. Sutcliffe consented to the entry of an injunction. In a related action, *SEC v. Goodman*,³³ the underwriter's representative and the underwriter's counsel consented to the entry of injunctions.

In *SEC v. Rudi*,³⁴ the Commission alleged the payment of more than \$300,000 in kickbacks to a financial adviser in connection with the offering of debt securities by New Jersey's Camden County Municipal Utilities

Authority. When the financial adviser, Consolidated Financial Management, Inc., was informed that it would receive a flat fee of \$15,000 instead of its fee in prior offerings of \$1 per \$1,000 face value of the bonds offered, Nicholas Rudi, the adviser's president, solicited and ultimately received a kickback of \$200,000 from First Fidelity Bank, N.A., the underwriter of the offer. Joseph Salema, at the time the executive vice-president of Consolidated Financial Management, also solicited and received a \$90,000 kickback from Robert Jablonski, a commissioner of the New Jersey Highway Authority, in exchange for assistance in securing the selection of First Fidelity as lead underwriter. Salema and two individuals associated with First Fidelity consented to the entry of injunctions and agreed to pay a total of \$347,000, representing disgorgement and prejudgment interest. This action was pending as to Rudi, and a financial advisory firm he owns, at the end of the year.

Insider Trading

Insider trading occurs when a person in possession of material non-public information engages in securities transactions or communicates such information to others who trade. Insider trading encompasses more than trading and tipping by traditional insiders, such as officers or directors who are subject to a duty to either disclose any material non-public information or abstain from trading in the securities of their own company. Violations also may arise from the transmission or use of material non-public information by persons in a variety of other positions of trust and confidence or by those who misappropriate such information.

In addition to permanent injunctions, the Commission often seeks ancillary relief, including disgorgement of any profits gained or losses avoided. The ITSA penalty provisions authorize the Commission to seek a civil penalty, payable to the United States Treasury, of up to three times the profit gained or loss avoided against persons who unlawfully trade in securities while in possession of material non-public information or who unlawfully communicate material non-public information to others who trade. Civil penalties also can be imposed upon persons who control insider traders. During 1995, the Commission brought 45 cases alleging insider trading violations.

The Commission filed an action against 17 individuals alleging insider trading in connection with 4 AT&T acquisition targets: Paradyne Corporation, NCR Corporation, Digital Microwave Corporation, and Teradata Corporation (*SEC v. Brumfield*³⁵). Charles Brumfield, at the time a vice president in AT&T's Human Resources Department, used his position at AT&T to learn of the company's acquisition plans. With the assistance of Thomas Alger, his close friend and subordinate at AT&T, Brumfield orchestrated widespread trading in the securities of the four takeover targets through a circle of family and friends in New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Florida, and North Carolina. The combined trading profits of the defendants was approximately \$2.6 million. In related proceedings, seven of the defendants in the Commission's action also pled guilty to criminal charges, and an eighth defendant was convicted after a jury trial.

The Commission filed an action against seven defendants alleging that they committed insider trading by purchasing the securities of Grumman Corporation, or by tipping others so that they could purchase Grumman securities, shortly before the announcement of a tender offer by Martin Marietta Corporation for Grumman's outstanding shares (*SEC v. Croce*³⁶). Nicholas Croce, a Grumman employee directly involved in due diligence meetings in preparation for the merger, tipped his brother, Frank Croce, also a Grumman employee, who then tipped their cousin, Frank Sanitate, who purchased Grumman securities himself and tipped the other defendants. Frank Sanitate, his five tippees, and six other people to whom these tippees recommended Grumman securities, realized gains totaling more than \$640,000. The defendants consented to the entry of injunctions. In addition, they agreed to pay a total of \$295,214 representing disgorgement, prejudgment interest, and civil penalties. In related proceedings, Lawrence M. Mathe also consented to an injunction based on his trading in and recommendation of Grumman securities, and agreed to pay \$265,313, representing disgorgement, prejudgment interest, and a civil penalty.

The Commission alleged that Stephen H. Wagner, an attorney in the Legal Department of Lockheed Corporation, engaged in insider trading when he purchased call options for Lockheed stock while in possession of material non-public information concerning a merger agreement between Lockheed and Martin Marietta Corporation (*SEC v. Wagner*³⁷). Wagner, who learned of the merger by virtue of his employment in the Legal Department, bought options that had an expiration date of only 18 days after the date of purchase and that were "out of the money" (*i.e.*, had an exercise price that was substantially in excess of the current trading price of Lockheed common stock). Wagner consented to the entry of an injunction and an order requiring him to disgorge \$42,188, plus prejudgment interest of \$2,213.87, and to pay an ITSA penalty of \$42,188.

The Commission charged two former executives of the Los Angeles based footwear company, L.A. Gear, Inc., with insider trading (*SEC v. Schwartzberg*³⁸). The defendants, Gilbert N. Schwartzberg, the former chief administrative officer and a director of the company, and Arden Franklin, the former controller of the company, also were charged with falsifying LA Gear's books and records. In addition, Schwartzberg was charged with causing LA Gear to file a false and misleading financial report with the Commission. Schwartzberg and Franklin consented to the entry of injunctions, and agreed to pay \$1 million and \$20,185.65, respectively, representing disgorgement, prejudgment interest, and civil penalties. In addition, Schwartzberg agreed not to serve as an officer or director of any public company.

In *SEC v. Seibald*,³⁹ the Commission alleged that on four separate occasions between July 1990 and January 1991, Jack D. Seibald, while employed as an equity research analyst at Salomon Brothers Inc., obtained material non-public information relating to several public companies he followed and unlawfully conveyed such information to defendants Bernard Seibald (his brother and a former stockbroker at Prudential Bache Securities), Stewart R. Spector (his father-in-law and a former managing director of

Furman, Selz Inc.), Eric S. Fessler (his friend), and other persons. The complaint further alleges that after receiving such information from Seibald, Bernhard, Spector, and Fessler unlawfully traded in the securities of the subject companies for their own accounts and, in the case of Bernhard and Spector, for the accounts of the two incorporated entities named in the action as relief defendants, whose beneficial owners are related to Seibald and Bernhard. Fessler consented to the entry of an injunction and agreed to disgorge \$53,000 plus \$21,594 in prejudgment interest. The proceedings were pending against the other defendants at the end of the year.

*SEC v. Woodward*⁴⁰ involved charges that Richard W. Woodward, an attorney formerly associated with Cravath, Swaine & Moore, improperly caused his brother, John T. Woodward, and a friend to purchase the securities of 12 issuers that were Cravath clients or possible merger partners of Cravath clients in advance of possible merger and acquisition announcements. Those mergers and acquisitions included the acquisition of Caesars World by ITT, the acquisition of Neutrogena by Johnson & Johnson, and the proposed acquisition of CBS, Inc. by QVC, Inc. John Woodward purchased the securities of the subjects of such mergers and acquisitions, and caused others to purchase, resulting in total profits of approximately \$578,000. Richard Woodward's friend, and people he caused to trade, made profits of approximately \$355,000. Richard Woodward and John Woodward consented to the entry of injunctions. In addition, Richard and John Woodward consented to disgorge \$25,000 and \$85,000, respectively.

Section 15(f) of the Exchange Act and Section 204A of the Advisers Act, which were enacted as part of ITSFEA, require broker-dealers and investment advisers to establish, maintain, and enforce written policies and procedures reasonably designed to prevent the misuse of material non-public information by such regulated entities or by persons associated with them. In *In the Matter of Gabelli & Company, Inc.*,⁴¹ the Commission alleged that Gabelli & Company, a registered broker-dealer and an indirect majority-owned subsidiary of Gabelli Funds, Inc. (GFI), and GAMCO, an investment adviser and a majority-owned subsidiary of GFI, failed to adopt policies, procedures, and practices reasonably designed to prevent the misuse of material non-public information in connection with the purchase and sale of Lynch Corporation securities, by accounts maintained at the respondents, prior to a board meeting at which Lynch's board of directors approved Lynch's fourth quarter and year-end 1991 financial results, and the release of those financial results. Specifically, respondents' policies, procedures, and practices did not adequately take into account the special circumstances presented by Mario J. Gabelli's role as chairman of the board of directors and chief executive officer of Lynch and his roles as de facto chief investment officer of Gabelli & Company and chief investment officer of GAMCO. The respondents consented to the entry of a cease and desist order, and, among other things, agreed to each pay civil penalties of \$50,000.

1. Broker-Dealers

Each year, the Commission files a significant number of enforcement actions against broker-dealer firms and persons associated with them. The Commission's actions against broker-dealers often focus on violations of the net capital and customer protection rules, violations of books and records provisions, or fraudulent sales practices. The Commission also takes action against broker-dealer firms and their senior management for failure to supervise employees with a view to preventing violations of the federal securities laws.

In *SEC v. Stratton Oakmont, Inc.*,⁴² the Commission alleged that a broker-dealer firm had failed to comply with a Commission order entered on March 17, 1994, in a prior enforcement action. The administrative order, to which Stratton Oakmont had consented, found that the firm had engaged in fraudulent sales practices, made baseless price predictions, permitted unauthorized trading in customer accounts, and manipulated the price of a security. Stratton Oakmont was directed, among other things, to implement sales practice procedures recommended by an independent outside consultant appointed by the Commission. The consultant recommended that Stratton overhaul its operations and sales practices and, among other things, recommended that Stratton tape record all telephone calls made to and from its customers, hire additional supervisors with acceptable disciplinary and compliance records, hire additional compliance persons, revamp the system by which Stratton compensates its brokers, take steps to ensure that all sales scripts used by Stratton brokers are completely accurate and up-to-date, and make significant changes to the manner by which Stratton responds to complaints from customers. Stratton refused to make any of these changes. Following a non-jury trial, the court entered a permanent injunction requiring Stratton to comply with the Commission's order.

The Commission alleged a manipulation in the price of securities issued by Of Counsel Enterprises, Inc., by three broker-dealer firms, F.N. Wolf & Co., Inc., Hibbard Brown & Co., Inc., and L.C. Wegard & Co., Inc., and three individuals who were their principals (*In the Matter of F.N. Wolf & Co., Inc.*)⁴³. Respondents purchased the securities at ever-increasing prices, and Wolf & Co. entered ever-increasing bids into the NASDAQ system. The firms dominated and controlled the market for the securities and substantially reduced the float. As a result, the price was manipulated from \$3.25 to \$8; the securities were then sold to the public at the inflated price and the respondents realized profits totaling \$5,658,000. These proceedings were pending at the end of the year.

Stephen Strabala, a former registered representative associated with a broker-dealer, entered into an agreement with Columbiana County, Ohio, to invest county funds in U.S. Treasury securities and insured investments such as certificates of deposit. Strabala subsequently opened a cash and margin account in the name of "S&S Investments" at a broker-dealer firm in Omaha, to which a total of \$7.735 million in county funds were wired.

Strabala used the county's funds to invest in index options, while providing the county with false confirmations of transactions in Treasury notes and certificates of deposit. A net trading loss of \$3.5 million was incurred on the trades. Among other things, Strabala also diverted \$334,000 from this account to pay for a condominium and for other personal purposes. In two other accounts opened in Detroit and Palo Alto with county funds, losses of \$400,000 and \$1.82 million, respectively, were generated. Strabala consented to the entry of an order by which he was barred from association with any regulated entity (*In the Matter of Stephen T. Strabala*⁴⁴). Strabala also was enjoined in related civil proceedings, and ordered to disgorge \$334,000, plus prejudgment interest (*SEC v. Strabala*⁴⁵).

*In the Matter of H.D. Vest Investment Securities, Inc.*⁴⁶ arose from activities by a registered representative associated with H.D. Vest, who created an investment club, primarily for trading index options, and converted funds invested in the club to his own use. The registered representative also used forged authorizations to transfer funds from other customer accounts to a bank account under his control, which funds he also converted. The Commission alleged that H.D. Vest failed reasonably to supervise the registered representative; among other things, the firm failed to place the employee under heightened scrutiny when it became aware of his questionable employment background (including an arbitration filed by a customer related to his association with another broker-dealer) and his request to have discretionary authority for the investment club even though he knew or should have known that the arrangement violated the firm's policy on discretionary trading. H.D. Vest consented to the entry of an order by which it was censured, ordered to pay a civil penalty of \$50,000, and required to comply with undertakings concerning supervision and other matters.

2. Investment Advisers and Investment Companies

The Commission instituted several significant cases involving investment advisers and investment companies. The Commission alleged that Sanjay Saxena, a registered investment adviser and the publisher of a weekly investment newsletter, raised at least \$3.2 million through the sale to at least 165 investors of interests in an unregistered investment pool (*SEC v. Saxena*⁴⁷). Saxena promised annual returns in excess of 50 percent, and further promised that he would repay one-quarter of any trading losses. While the pool was incurring substantial losses, Saxena represented to his investors that their investments were profitable. After the Commission commenced its investigation, Saxena represented that he would repay investors in full; however, he failed to repay at least \$656,000 to at least 45 investors, who were sent false monthly statements indicating that their investments were profitable while their funds were in fact being used to repay other investors. Saxena consented to the entry of an injunction and an order requiring him to pay a total of \$774,793.04, representing disgorgement and prejudgment and postjudgment interest. In related administrative proceedings, Saxena consented to the entry of an order barring him from association with any regulated entity.

Account Management Corporation (AMC), a registered investment adviser, and two individuals, AMC's president and vice-president, were charged with inadequately disclosing the firm's allocation policy with respect to certain profitable transactions in "hot issues" (*In the Matter of Account Management Corporation*⁴⁸). During an 18-month period in 1992 and 1993, AMC bought and sold securities in 34 initial public offerings that generated short-term trading profits of approximately \$337,000. Instead of distributing the shares equitably to all of its eligible accounts, the respondents principally favored certain accounts maintained for non-fee paying customers who were close friends of the respondents. In addition, trades by such accounts frequently involved free-riding; that is, purchases were made when there were inadequate funds in the accounts, so that the purchases were financed by the proceeds of the subsequent profitable re-sales. In one instance, an account was not opened until three days after a profit was realized on a re-sale. The respondents consented to the entry of a cease and desist order by which they were censured and AMC was ordered to pay a civil penalty of \$100,000.

Between 1990 and 1992, Roger W. Honour allegedly traded personally in securities that he also was buying or selling for his investment advisory clients, including individuals and investment companies. Honour's trading, which involved a conflict of interest because of the proximity of his trading to that of his clients and the low trading volume of the securities in comparison to the size of the trades made for his clients, resulted in total illegal profits of \$115,615. Honour consented to a cease and desist order by which he was censured and ordered to disgorge \$115,615, plus prejudgment interest, and to pay a civil penalty of \$275,000 (*In the Matter of Roger W. Honour*⁴⁹).

The complaint against John J. Kaweske, a former portfolio manager with Invesco, a registered investment adviser and complex of mutual funds, alleged a fraudulent scheme by which Kaweske concealed from Invesco management certain secret arrangements by which his son directly and indirectly received commissions from issuers of securities, based upon purchases of those securities by funds advised by Invesco and managed by Kaweske; Kaweske allegedly caused two funds to invest in private placements of two development stage companies, for which his son received finder's fees (*SEC v. Kaweske*⁵⁰). Kaweske also concealed from Invesco and funds he managed that he was a founder, director, and shareholder in a corporation whose shares or subsidiary's shares were purchased by the funds. In addition, Kaweske failed to report at least 47 personal securities transactions to Invesco management; many of these transactions involved securities that were bought or sold by Invesco funds that Kaweske managed. This case was pending at the end of the year.

In *In the Matter of John Logan Wallace*,⁵¹ the Commission alleged that the respondent, a portfolio manager associated with Oppenheimer Management Corporation, bought shares in a private placement offering through a personal account at a registered broker-dealer without properly reporting this transaction to his employer, as required by Section 17(j) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 and Rule 17j-1(c), within 10 days of

the end of the calendar quarter in which the transaction occurred. Wallace consented to the entry of a cease and desist order by which he was censured and required to pay a civil penalty of \$20,000.

The Commission alleged that Louis Acevedo, a registered investment adviser, and an entity under his control, Galleon Capital Management, engaged in a scheme to misappropriate “soft dollar” funds intended for the benefit of their investment advisory clients (*SEC v. Galleon Capital Management*⁵²). “Soft dollar” agreements between an investment adviser and a broker-dealer typically stipulate that a percentage of commissions generated in client accounts may be paid to providers of research services for research that benefits the clients. The defendants created phony invoices for services provided pursuant to a soft dollar arrangement, and submitted these invoices to brokers. Payments received were transferred to Acevedo and did not benefit investment advisory clients. Also, brokers were double billed for certain soft dollar services, or were billed for services that were not appropriate for soft dollar reimbursement. In addition, the defendants churned one or more accounts to generate soft dollar credits. The defendants consented to the entry of an injunction and an order requiring the disgorgement of \$285,916, representing illegal profits obtained as a result of the scheme.

The Commission instituted cease and desist proceedings against Anthony J. Benincasa, who aided and abetted a Ponzi scheme by which Peter T. Jones, an unregistered investment adviser, raised at least \$9.2 million from over 400 investors (*In the Matter of Anthony J. Benincasa*⁵³). Benincasa opened accounts which falsely identified a company under his control, Independence Asset Management (IAM), as a partnership involving Jones and a third party. Among other things, Benincasa continued to use funds placed by investors in IAM even though he knew that Jones was making material misrepresentations and omissions to investors. He also told investors that the fund was doing well when it was actually losing money. During the relevant period, IAM generated net commissions of \$333,000 for Benincasa. These proceedings were pending at the end of the year. In separate proceedings, Jones and IAM were enjoined and Jones was barred from association with any regulated entity.

See also *In the Matter of Van Kampen American Capital Asset Management, Inc.*, and *In the Matter of Askin Capital Management, L.P.*, described above.

Investor Education and Assistance Activities

Investor complaints and inquiries alert the Commission to securities fraud and abuse and are often the first indicators of wrongdoing. Since an educated investor provides the best defense against securities fraud, in 1995 the SEC continued its initiative to improve public awareness and to educate investors on how to identify securities fraud, and how to report suspicious activity to securities regulators.

In October 1994, the SEC created a toll-free investor information line. The investor information line allows callers to order investor education materials and learn how the Commission can assist them with their

complaints. It also provides access to important recorded investor protection messages. Since its inception in October 1994, over 75,000 calls have been received on the investor information line (1-800-SEC-0330).

During 1995, the Commission released its second brochure, *Invest Wisely, An Introduction to Mutual Funds* which provides basic information to help investors select mutual funds, identify decisions to be made before making an initial investment choice, and resolve particular problems that may arise. Over 277,000 copies of the *Invest Wisely* brochures have been distributed since March 1994 when the first brochure was released. In July 1995, the Commission released *What Every Investor Should Know about Settling Trades in Three Days, Introducing T+3*, which provides basic information on when investors must settle their securities transactions. Over 8,000 of the *Introducing T+3* brochures were distributed during 1995.

Emphasis on increased participation of individual investors in Commission rulemaking activities continued in 1995. Several Commission rule proposals published in plain English, including how risk ought to be disclosed in mutual funds, how to improve prices when buying or selling stocks, and executive and director compensation disclosure, resulted in over 5,000 comments being received from individual investors.

Investor town meetings also continued in 1995 with over 3,000 investors attending meetings held in Albuquerque, Dallas, Houston, and Nashville.

Sources for Further Inquiry

The agency publishes the *SEC Docket*, which includes announcements regarding enforcement actions. SEC litigation releases describe civil injunctive actions and also report certain criminal proceedings involving securities-related violations. These releases typically report the identity of the defendants, the nature of the alleged violative conduct, and the disposition or status of the case, as well as other information. The *SEC Docket* also contains Commission orders instituting administrative proceedings, making findings, and imposing sanctions in those proceedings, and initial decisions and significant procedural rulings issued by Administrative Law Judges. In addition, recent litigation releases, orders in administrative proceedings, and other information of interest to investors are posted on the Internet at the SEC's World Wide Web site (<http://www.sec.gov>).

International Affairs

The Office of International Affairs (OIA) has primary responsibility for the negotiation and implementation of information-sharing arrangements and the development of other initiatives to facilitate international cooperation. OIA coordinates and assists in making requests for assistance to, and responding to requests for assistance from, foreign authorities. OIA also addresses other international issues that arise in litigated matters, such as effecting service of process abroad and gathering foreign-based evidence under various international conventions, freezing assets located abroad, and enforcing judgments obtained by the SEC against foreign parties. In addition, OIA operates in a consultative role regarding the significant ongoing international programs and initiatives of the SEC's other divisions and offices. OIA is responsible for the SEC's technical assistance programs for countries with emerging securities markets. OIA also consults with and provides technical assistance to other Federal agencies regarding trade-related issues relevant to the regulation of securities markets in the United States.

Key 1995 Results

OIA made 230 requests for enforcement assistance on behalf of the Commission to foreign governments and responded to 337 requests for enforcement assistance from foreign governments.

The SEC signed understandings to assist in law enforcement and regulatory matters with South African authorities, including the Financial Services Board (FSB), the Securities Regulation Panel (SRP) and the Office for Banks (OFB). In addition, the SEC signed declarations of intent with the two South African securities regulators, the FSB and the SRP, to enter into comprehensive information-sharing Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) once the South African bodies obtain the necessary authority to do so. Also, the SEC signed a declaration on cooperation with the United Kingdom Investment Management Regulatory Organization (IMRO) to facilitate information-sharing and joint inspections of registered investment advisers.

The SEC's leadership role and active involvement in the Council of Securities Regulators of the Americas (COSRA) and the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) have advanced Commission goals for international regulatory and market oversight issues on a multilateral basis. During the past year, the membership of COSRA adopted principles of effective market oversight which describe the mechanisms needed for establishing and implementing a self-regulatory system for effective market oversight, with an emphasis on the critical role of government oversight to ensure a balance between industry self-interest and the public interest. For example, substantial progress

has been made on developing internationally acceptable accounting standards for cross-border offerings, as evidenced by the agreement of the IOSCO Technical Committee and the International Accounting Standards Committee (IASC) to a work plan that, when successfully completed, will result in a comprehensive core set of international accounting standards (IAS). In addition, the IOSCO Technical Committee jointly issued a paper with the Basle Committee on Banking Supervision setting forth a framework for regulators to assess information on the derivatives activities of securities firms and banks.

Arrangements for Mutual Assistance and Exchanges of Information

The SEC has an increasing need to obtain foreign-based information to protect the United States markets and investors from cross-border fraud and other violations of the United States securities laws. In this regard, the SEC has developed ways to enhance international mechanisms for effective market surveillance and information-sharing, and for cooperation in the investigation and prosecution of cross-border fraud and market manipulation.

The SEC has worked actively to forge strong bilateral and multilateral relationships with its foreign counterparts. In particular, the SEC has entered into approximately 25 MOUs and other less comprehensive agreements, to establish the means for sharing information and providing comprehensive enforcement assistance in virtually all facets of the securities markets. Such mechanisms have improved the SEC's ability to detect and prosecute violations of the United States securities laws where information is needed from abroad. The SEC is using the relationships established through MOUs to expand cooperation beyond specific enforcement matters, including, for example, oversight of investment management activity with U.K. authorities. In addition, the SEC's commitment to international securities organizations has augmented its bilateral and multilateral efforts in the enforcement area.

On March 2, 1995, the SEC signed understandings with key South African authorities: the FSB, which regulates financial markets and brokerage institutions; the SRP, which oversees corporate takeovers and mergers and administers insider trading laws; and the OFB, which supervises the nation's banks. Three sets of agreements were utilized to reflect the current regulatory structure in South Africa and to make the broadest provisions of assistance possible in securities matters. The understandings signed with the FSB and the SRP include both communiqués, which embody each party's commitment to assist in securities law enforcement and regulatory matters, and declarations of intent, which signify the commitment to enter comprehensive information-sharing Memoranda of Understanding once the South African regulators have obtained the necessary authority under South African law to implement such agreements. A declaration signed with the OFB should similarly enhance the ability of that body to share bank-related information critical to market oversight. Thus, the understandings are the first step of an evolving relationship with the South African authorities.

In addition, in May 1995, the SEC signed a declaration on cooperation with the U.K. IMRO. The declaration is the first bilateral cooperative arrangement focused on the cross-border investment advisory business. It also builds on the provisions in the SEC's MOU with the U.K. for sharing information and

providing assistance relating to cross-border investment management activity, including, in particular, assistance in conducting on-site inspections of registered investment advisers.

The SEC also has been developing and implementing a framework for the functional regulation of the securities activities of financial conglomerates. In this regard, the SEC has undertaken initiatives in a number of countries. In July 1995, the SEC announced a joint initiative with the U.K. Securities and Investments Board (SIB) to conduct in-depth studies of the financial, operational, and management controls used by selected securities firms that conduct significant cross-border derivatives and securities activities. This is the first initiative that brings together the major securities regulators in a practical exercise that will lead to a better understanding of each regulator's approaches and contribute to better information exchange. It is expected that the initiative will be extended to include authorities and firms in other jurisdictions.

Enforcement Cooperation

The table below summarizes the international requests for assistance made and received by the SEC.

Type of Request	Fiscal Year				
	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
SEC Requests to					
Foreign Governments					
Enforcement Assistance	145	191	213	223	230
Enforcement Referrals	6	7	1	2	6
Technical Assistance	0	2	6	1	2
Total	151	200	220	226	238
Foreign Requests to					
the SEC					
Enforcement Assistance	160	184	232	296	337
Enforcement Referrals	7	11	16	10	10
Technical Assistance	44	58	59	78	119
Total	211	253	307	384	466

In two insider trading cases, the assistance provided under MOUs was critical to the SEC's successful prosecution of foreign nationals. The case of *SEC v. Morris*, Civil Action No. 94-8518 (CBM) (S.D.N.Y.) provides an excellent example of how the SEC relies on international assistance in its investigations. This case involved insider trading in the securities of Hilton Hotels Corporation by non-United States persons. The suspect trading all originated in the U.K. and was conducted by persons with no apparent connection to Hilton. Using the SEC's MOU with U.K. authorities, the SEC obtained telephone records that made it possible to trace the flow of the non-public information on which the trading was based. Based on the telephone records,

the SEC determined within a short time period the source of the inside information and the trail that it followed. The SEC obtained a default judgment against one of the defendants and settled with two additional defendants. Litigation against a fourth defendant is continuing. The SEC has obtained an aggregate of approximately \$400,000 in disgorgement and \$275,000 in penalties.

In another insider trading case, *SEC v. Malavasi*, Civil Action No. 95-1691 (D.D.C.), the SEC relied principally on information compelled by the Italian CONSOB, pursuant to its MOU with the SEC, to successfully bring this case. The documents produced pursuant to the MOU included bank account documents identifying the beneficial owners of accounts through which suspicious trading took place. On September 6, 1995, the SEC filed and settled a civil action against Giovanni Malavasi, secretary to the Board of Directors of Luxottica Group SpA. The complaint alleged Malavasi learned of non-public information concerning Luxottica's plans for a takeover of U.S. Shoe Corporation, and traded while in possession of this information. Malavasi agreed to disgorge \$100,000 and pay a civil penalty of \$42,749. The investigation is continuing.

Technical Assistance

The SEC provides technical assistance to emerging securities markets to assist them in developing the regulatory infrastructure necessary to promote investor confidence. The SEC's program is comprised primarily of courses offered at the SEC's headquarters, where a broad range of topics are addressed to a wide audience in a cost-effective manner. OIA is responsible for coordinating the SEC's overall international technical assistance program.

Each spring the SEC hosts the International Institute for Securities Market Development (the Market Development Institute), an intensive two-week, management-level training program covering a full range of topics relevant to the development and oversight of securities markets. The Market Development Institute is intended to promote market development, capital formation, and the building of sound regulatory structures in emerging market countries. The fifth annual Market Development Institute was held in the spring of 1995, with 96 delegates from 53 countries in attendance.

The SEC has expanded upon the successful Market Development Institute concept with a one-week International Institute for Securities Enforcement and Market Oversight (Enforcement Institute) for foreign securities regulators. This program promotes market integrity and the development of closer enforcement cooperation, and includes practical training sessions on SEC enforcement investigations, investment company and adviser inspections, broker-dealer examinations, and market surveillance. Ninety-eight individuals representing fifty-one countries attended the second annual Enforcement Institute held during the last week of October 1995.

International Organizations and Multilateral Initiatives

The SEC benefits from the opportunity to better understand foreign regulations, markets, and practices through participation in multilateral organizations. Moreover, through its involvement in international organizations,

the SEC has the opportunity to promote its views on important issues that affect the United States securities markets and the SEC's regulatory program, and help develop international consensus on these issues. During 1995, the SEC contributed to the work of the following international organizations and multilateral initiatives:

The International Organization of Securities Commissions

IOSCO is an international forum created to promote cooperation and consultation among regulators overseeing the world's securities markets. With over 100 members, most of the world's securities regulators are represented. The SEC plays a leadership role in IOSCO. Over the years, the SEC has been actively involved in many aspects of the organization's work, particularly in work relating to: identifying accounting and auditing standards that would be used in multinational offerings; regulating the secondary market and market participants; fostering the international enforcement of securities laws; and promoting international cooperation in connection with cross-border investment funds.

At IOSCO's 1995 Annual Conference, the Technical Committee and the Board of the International Accounting Standards Committee (IASC) issued a joint press release announcing that they had agreed upon a work plan that, when successfully completed, would result in a comprehensive core set of international accounting standards. Provided the Technical Committee is satisfied with this core set, it will then be in a position to recommend endorsement of the standards for cross-border capital raising and listing purposes. During 1995, several other reports were prepared by working parties and released by IOSCO's Technical Committee. In addition, continued cooperation with the Basle Committee resulted in a joint report with the Technical Committee on a *Framework for Supervisory Information about the Derivative Activities of Banks and Securities Firms*. The report represents an important step in the ongoing cooperation between securities and banking regulators to ensure prudent oversight of the securities activities carried on by securities firms and by banks.

Council of Securities Regulators of the Americas

COSRA provides a forum for mutual cooperation and communication to enhance the efforts of each country in the Americas and the Caribbean to develop and foster the growth of sound securities markets that are fair to all investors. Formed in 1992 by the securities regulatory authorities of North, South, and Central America, and the Caribbean, COSRA has proven to have a significant impact on the international cooperative efforts of securities regulators throughout the region. The SEC actively promoted the concept of a regional organization and at the Summit of the Americas, held in Miami in December 1994, the participating governments endorsed the work of COSRA. COSRA's membership represents both advanced and emerging markets, and the organization strives to enhance the efforts of each country to develop and foster the growth of fair and open securities markets. Through the development of principles on Transaction Transparency, Audit Trails, Clearance and Settlement, Cross-border

Surveillance of Investment Advisers, Fundamental Elements of a Sound Disclosure System, and Enforcement Cooperation, COSRA has contributed to the development of high regulatory standards in the Americas.

At its annual meeting in 1995, COSRA adopted principles of effective market oversight which describe the mechanisms needed for establishing and implementing a self-regulatory system for effective market oversight, with an emphasis on the critical role of government oversight to ensure a balance between industry self-interest and the public interest. COSRA also agreed on a future work agenda to cover implementation of the Summit of the Americas' anti-corruption initiatives, an examination of market structure issues, and enhancement of the capital formation process. Finally, the Inter-American Development Bank announced its decision to support and fund COSRA members' efforts to implement COSRA principles and to host the 1996 annual meeting in Washington, D.C.

Trade Negotiations

As a result of the globalization of securities markets, the SEC is now regularly engaged in discussions with fellow regulators on ways to facilitate cross-border activities, including offerings, securities trading, and the provision of advisory services. In addition, the SEC increasingly has provided technical assistance to the Administration in its negotiations involving trade and market access issues.

In January 1995, the U.S.-Japan Framework Agreement on Financial Services was finalized. Among the most significant developments under the Agreement is the opening of the Japanese public pension fund market to U.S. fund managers. The Agreement also liberalized access by investment companies to the Japanese markets and, in addition, eased restrictions on introduction of new securities products in Japan.

United States and Asian Markets

The SEC has been working on a bilateral basis with many countries in the Asia-Pacific region and has in place Memoranda of Understanding or other formal arrangements with the regulatory authorities of several such countries, including China, Japan, and Indonesia. In April 1995, Chairman Arthur Levitt and New York Stock Exchange President Richard Grasso met with government officials and business executives in Southeast Asia with the goal of developing a strong relationship between Southeast Asian and U.S. securities markets. The visit included Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore. The SEC has provided technical assistance to China, Thailand, and other countries in the Asia-Pacific region. The goals of such assistance are to promote and maintain the stability, efficiency, and integrity of these emerging securities markets and to encourage the adoption of U.S.-style market structures that are more likely to be open to U.S. market participants and service providers. The SEC is working to activate direct cooperation and discussion between the SEC and the Securities and Exchange Board of India as part of the U.S. Department of the Treasury's (Treasury) initiative to renew the activities of the Indo-U.S. Economic/Commercial Subcommittee. The SEC also is working with the Treasury to foster multilateral cooperation among the financial and regulatory authorities in the Asia-Pacific region.

Regulation of the Securities Markets

The Division of Market Regulation (Division) oversees the operations of the nation's securities markets and market professionals. In calendar year 1995, the Commission supervised over 8,500 broker-dealers with 58,119 branch offices and over 505,600 registered representatives, 8 active registered securities exchanges, the NASD and the over-the-counter markets, 15 registered clearing agencies, the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board, and the Securities Investor Protection Corporation. Broker-dealers filing FOCUS reports with the Commission had approximately \$1.5 trillion in assets and \$89 billion in capital in 1995. The Division also monitors market activity, which has experienced significant growth. At the end of calendar 1995, equity market capitalization stood at \$8 trillion in the United States and \$16.5 trillion worldwide. Average daily trading volume reached 346.6 million shares on the New York Stock Exchange and 404.6 million shares on the Nasdaq Stock Market. The fastest growing area has been derivatives activities, where the approximate notional amount of contracts outstanding at the 6 most active derivatives dealers and their affiliates is \$5.6 trillion, with an aggregate current net exposure of approximately \$39.9 billion.

Key 1995 Results

The Division proceeded with its efforts to enhance the overall efficiency of the marketplace through its ongoing review of trading systems and practices. In 1995, the SEC launched an initiative to form the Derivatives Policy Group (DPG) to address a broad range of issues pertaining to the derivatives markets. The clearance and settlement system underwent a major change as the time for settlement of transactions was shortened from five to three business days. Issuers were provided greater flexibility in offering dividend reinvestment and stock purchase plans that allow investors to obtain shares directly from the issuer. The municipal securities program made great strides in the area of disclosure and trading systems (market transparency). The Commission approved and the industry implemented a program to enhance training of registered representatives by their broker-dealers and to establish requirements for ongoing industry-wide computer-based training.

Securities Markets, Trading, and Significant Regulatory Issues

Derivatives

The Division continued to be actively involved in numerous derivatives related projects. During the year, the SEC initiated the creation of the DPG, consisting of the unregistered affiliates of the six securities firms most active in the over-the-counter (OTC) derivatives markets. In March 1995, the DPG

submitted a report to the SEC establishing a framework for voluntary oversight of their OTC derivatives activities. The DPG's framework included recommendations regarding management controls, enhanced reporting, evaluating risk in relation to capital, and counterparty relationships. In addition, through the SEC's risk assessment program, the Division reviewed data concerning the derivatives activities of the material affiliates of approximately 250 securities firms.

In 1995, the Commission approved proposals by five exchanges and the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (NASD) to list and trade warrants based on broad-based indexes,⁵⁴ thereby facilitating the trading of new financial products. Moreover, the Commission amended Rule 3a12-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Exchange Act) to designate the sovereign debt of Spain as exempted securities for the purpose of futures trading,⁵⁵ and proposed a further amendment to Rule 3a12-8 to permit futures on Mexican sovereign debt.⁵⁶ Both of these initiatives reflect the Commission's flexibility in adapting to the increased internationalization of the derivatives markets. Finally, the Division prepared a memorandum in response to the October 6, 1994 letter of Representative James Leach concerning the impact of derivatives activities on the global financial system. The memorandum discussed a variety of actions the Commission has taken to address the risks of derivatives products.

The Division was actively involved in the Commission's enforcement action against BT Securities Corporation (BT), arising from the sale of certain OTC derivative securities to Gibson Greetings, Inc.⁵⁷ Concurrent with the settlement of the Commission's action against BT, the Commission issued an order providing a temporary exemption for persons acting as brokers or dealers with respect to certain categories of OTC derivative instruments, to the extent such instruments are securities, from the broker-dealer registration requirement under Section 15(a) of the Exchange Act.⁵⁸ By order, the Commission extended the temporary exemption until September 30, 1996.⁵⁹ The extension of the exemption is intended to avoid any dislocation of existing OTC derivatives markets and to allow those broker-dealers who have not already done so time to move existing business covered by the exemption into entities that do not rely on the exemption.

The SEC took a leading role in several international efforts to improve regulatory oversight of the securities industry. In August 1995, the SEC announced a joint initiative with the United Kingdom Securities and Investments Board (SIB) to conduct in-depth studies of the financial, operational, and management controls used by selected securities firms that conduct significant cross-border derivatives and securities activities. This joint initiative builds on the joint statement previously issued by the SEC, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and the SIB that identified several areas in which regulators can cooperate in their oversight of the OTC derivatives market. The Division participated in several of these in-depth joint reviews on domestic as well as foreign securities firms.

Through the SEC's membership in the Technical Committee of the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO), the Division took part in preparing an IOSCO report entitled, *The Implications for Securities Regulators of the Increased Use of Value at Risk Models by Securities Firms*. That report raised several important issues regarding the use of models for

regulatory purposes and concluded that further information and analysis is required before IOSCO can consider the use of internal models for the purpose of setting capital standards for market risk. The Division also participated in the preparation of a paper, issued jointly by IOSCO and the Basle Committee on Banking Supervision, establishing a framework for supervisors to assess information on the derivatives activities of securities firms and banks. This effort built on previous joint efforts by IOSCO and the Basle Committee in the area of management control mechanisms for derivatives activities.

Clearance and Settlement

The SEC continued to work to enhance all components of the national clearance and settlement system. In particular, the SEC worked closely with the SROs, broker-dealers, and industry groups on implementation of a three business day settlement period (T+3) for broker-dealer trades pursuant to Rule 15c6-1 under the Exchange Act. Prior to the implementation of the three-day settlement period, the SEC responded to concerns raised by the industry and exempted from the rule sales of certain insurance products and certain foreign securities. The SEC also amended the rule to permit new issues of securities to settle on an extended time frame under certain conditions.

The SEC worked closely with registered clearing agencies, broker-dealers, and federal bank regulators such as the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (FRB), the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to achieve a safe and efficient conversion to same-day funds settlement, scheduled for implementation in 1996. In February 1996, the payment systems for securities transactions (*i.e.*, corporate and municipal securities) and principal and interest payments converted from next-day funds settlement to same-day funds settlement. The conversion affects payments for settlements among clearing corporations, depositories, and financial intermediaries and between financial intermediaries and their institutional clients. The conversion does not affect payments to and from retail investors. The same-day funds settlement system conversion should help reduce systemic risk by eliminating overnight credit risk.

Proposals to Improve Order Handling and Execution of Customer Orders

On September 29, 1995, the Commission proposed for comment two rules and two amendments to an existing rule intended to improve the handling and execution of customer orders in exchange-traded securities and securities traded over the counter. The proposed rules are intended to strengthen transparency, enhance order handling, and promote interaction of customer orders. The proposal recognizes the importance of fair competition among markets and market participants and permits the securities industry to select the means to achieve the ends.⁶⁰

Automation Initiatives

Pursuant to Rule 17a-23 under the Exchange Act,⁶¹ the Division received 96 filings for automated trading systems. The rule requires brokers and dealers that operate automated trading systems to maintain participant, volume, and transaction records, and to report system activity periodically to the Commission.

The staff continued to perform Automation Review Policy (ARP) reviews of the exchanges, Nasdaq, and clearing agencies.⁶² The primary purpose of the ARP program is to monitor and assess the electronic data processing facilities supporting the transaction and information dissemination activities of the SROs in their relationship to the national market system. The staff completed 10 on-site reviews and issued 7 reports, which included 46 recommendations for improvements. Typical recommendations included the need for back-up facilities for data centers, enhancements to data security efforts, and better use of capacity planning tools.

The staff received 10 technology briefings from the SROs to ascertain recent and planned changes and improvements in their automated systems. The staff also assessed the ability of SROs to respond to systems malfunctions and examined SRO measures to prevent system outages.

Trading Practices Developments

Specialists. The Commission granted an exemption from Rules 10b-6 and 10b-13 under the Exchange Act to allow New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) specialists to continue to act in their specialist capacity during a distribution of, or a tender offer for, specialty securities when they otherwise would be subject to those rules because of their affiliates' participation in such transaction.⁶³ The exemption requires specialists and their affiliates to establish procedures to segregate the flow of confidential, market-sensitive information between a specialist and its affiliates, and notes the implementation of certain surveillance and notification procedures by the NYSE.

Dividend Reinvestment and Stock Purchase Plans. The Commission granted a class exemption from Rule 10b-6 under the Exchange Act for certain dividend reinvestment and stock purchase plans (DRSPPs).⁶⁴ The exemption facilitates access to plans by permitting investors to obtain their first shares of an issuer's securities directly from the issuer, and expands the availability of these programs to persons other than the issuer's employees and shareholders. The staff also clarified that an issuer operating a DRSP may be acting as a broker-dealer if it induces or attempts to induce the purchase or sale of its securities; receives compensation based on securities transactions; or holds and maintains the funds, securities, and accounts of DRSP participants. Thus, an issuer operating a DRSP in this manner either must limit its activities through the use of an agent that is a broker-dealer or bank, or register as a broker-dealer.

The Commission, acting by delegated authority, granted exemptions pursuant to Rule 10b-10(e) under the Exchange Act to permit broker-dealers to confirm automatic dividend reinvestment transactions through the use of monthly account statements, rather than with immediate confirmations.⁶⁵

Universal Banks. The Commission issued a letter granting exemptions from Rules 10b-6, 10b-7, and 10b-8 under the Exchange Act and addressing the effect of these rules on a universal bank (*i.e.*, a non-U.S. entity that engages in both commercial and investment banking activities).⁶⁶ These exemptions rely on the establishment, maintenance, enforcement, and audit of information barriers to insulate the activities of affiliated entities to permit activities that otherwise would be prohibited during the course of a distribution.

Internationalization. The Commission took a variety of actions pertaining to multinational offerings. For example, consistent with its Statement of Policy regarding class exemptions for certain foreign issuers that conduct distributions in the United States,⁶⁷ the Commission granted class exemptions from Rules 10b-6, 10b-7, and 10b-8 under the Exchange Act for distributions of securities by certain highly capitalized United Kingdom issuers⁶⁸ and for distributions of certain highly capitalized Dutch issuers.⁶⁹ The exemptions permit distribution participants to effect transactions in the United Kingdom or in The Netherlands in the security being distributed and related securities, subject to certain disclosure, recordkeeping, record production, and notice requirements.

Municipal Securities

Price Transparency Initiatives. In January 1995, the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (MSRB) began Phase I of its price transparency program, during which the MSRB produces a daily report of inter-dealer transactions in the more actively traded municipal securities. In future phases of the program, the MSRB will collect and publicly disseminate transaction data for all municipal securities trades. The Public Securities Association (PSA) is developing ways to reach the public with price data from the MSRB's daily report and other sources. The PSA, with two information vendors, initiated production of a generic yield scale of representative municipal prices for publication in various print media, and established a telephone service that reports contemporary and historical municipal securities transaction data to callers for a fee.

Disclosure. Following the publication of the Commission's March 1994 interpretive release discussing the disclosure obligations of participants in the municipal securities market under the antifraud provisions of the federal securities laws,⁷⁰ in November 1994 the Commission adopted amendments to Rule 15c2-12 under the Exchange Act to further deter fraud in the municipal securities market.⁷¹ The amendments prohibit broker-dealers from underwriting primary offerings of municipal securities unless they have determined that continuing disclosure about the municipal securities, in the form of annual financial information and notices of certain material events, will be provided to various information repositories, including Nationally Recognized Municipal Securities Information Repositories (NRMSIRs) and state information depositories (SIDs). Material event notices also may be provided to the MSRB. The amendments also prohibit broker-dealers from recommending the purchase or

sale of a municipal security in the secondary market unless they have procedures in place that assure that they will receive promptly certain material event information disclosed about that security.

The amendments, which were phased in between July 3, 1995 and January 1, 1996, allow municipal issuers and underwriters time to implement necessary procedures to facilitate compliance with the amendments.

On June 23, 1995 and September 19, 1995, the Division issued letters to the National Association of Bond Lawyers.⁷² These letters provide extensive guidance about the amendments to Rule 15c2-12.

Information Repositories. In 1995, the Division announced the designation of six applicants as NRMSIRs for purposes of Rule 15c2-12.⁷³ The designated NRMSIRs are: (1) Bloomberg L.P. of Princeton, NJ; (2) Thomson Municipal Services, Inc. of New York, NY; (3) Disclosure, Inc. of Bethesda, MD; (4) Kenny Information Systems of New York, NY; (5) Moody's Investors Service of New York, NY; and (6) R.R. Donnelley of Hudson, MA.

The Commission also announced the recognition of SIDs located in Texas, Michigan, and Idaho. In adopting the amendments to Rule 15c2-12,⁷⁴ the Commission stated that an appropriate SID would be a depository operated or designated by the state that receives information from all issuers within the state, and makes this information available promptly to the public on a contemporaneous basis.⁷⁵ A state may designate a SID through legislative or executive action.

Broker-Dealer Regulation

Extension of Credit. An important area currently under debate in the industry and at the Commission is the role that margin should play in today's securities markets, and what steps can be taken to improve the present scheme for federal margin requirements. In 1995, the Commission worked with Congress, the industry, and other regulators to develop margin proposals that would address concerns raised about the current margin scheme while maintaining the safeguards arising from margin standards.

The staff also issued several no-action letters clarifying its position with respect to the application of the extension of credit prohibitions of Section 11(d)(1) of the Exchange Act. For example, the staff granted no-action relief from Section 11(d)(1) with respect to installment payments for an initial offering of Canadian securities sold to a limited number of Qualified Institutional Buyers in the United States pursuant to Rule 144A under the Securities Act of 1933.⁷⁶ The staff also issued no-action relief under Section 11(d)(1) in connection with the offer and sale by a company of certain securities issued as units generally consisting of a Treasury note and a purchase contract under which the holder would purchase stock of the company at a future date.⁷⁷

Networking Arrangements. Having issued numerous no-action letters addressing networking arrangements among registered broker-dealers, insurance companies, and insurance agencies in connection with the offer and sale of insurance securities products, the Division issued a comprehensive, definitive letter describing in detail the conditions under which these arrangements may be conducted without the insurance agencies

or their unregistered employees registering as broker-dealers under Section 15 of the Exchange Act.⁷⁸ In that letter, the Division expressly stated that it will no longer respond to no-action requests in this area unless the request presents novel or unusual issues.

Confirmation Disclosure. On November 10, 1994, the Commission adopted amendments to its confirmation rule, Rule 10b-10 under the Exchange Act, to require brokers and dealers to disclose: (1) if they are not members of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation (SIPC) (except, in limited circumstances, for transactions in mutual fund shares); (2) when a debt security is not rated by a nationally recognized statistical rating organization; (3) the availability of yield information with respect to transactions in collateralized debt securities; and (4) mark-ups and mark-downs in certain Nasdaq and regional exchange-listed securities that are subject to last sale reporting, but are not technically “reported securities” under Rule 11Aa3-1 under the Exchange Act.⁷⁹ The amendments also added a preliminary note clarifying that the confirmation disclosures required by Rule 10b-10 may not represent all the disclosure required under the antifraud provisions of the federal securities laws. The Commission deferred acting on a proposal to require disclosure of mark-ups in riskless principal transactions in debt securities, to allow the industry time to develop enhanced price information in the markets for those securities.

The Commission, acting by delegated authority, exempted certain limited purpose broker-dealers from the requirement to disclose that they are not members of SIPC.⁸⁰ The Commission, acting by delegated authority, also clarified the confirmation delivery requirements of broker-dealers regarding accounts managed by third-party fiduciaries and the requirements with respect to disclosure of the unrated status of a debt security.⁸¹

Supervision of Conglomerates. The Division participated in an international effort by securities, banking, and insurance regulators to address regulation of financial conglomerates. This effort led to the issuance of a paper in April 1995 entitled, *The Supervision of Financial Conglomerates*, recognizing several effective methods of group supervision of conglomerates. The Division will pursue work on practical issues in this area through a reconstituted tripartite group.

Application for Broker-Dealer Registration. The Commission proposed for public comment amendments to Form BD, the uniform broker-dealer registration form under the Exchange Act.⁸² The amendments to Form BD respond to design updates to the Central Registration Depository system operated by the NASD, which ultimately will allow for electronic filing of Form BD, as well as Forms U-4 and U-5 (the uniform form used to terminate broker-dealers and their associated persons with the Commission, the states, and the SROs). Amendments to the disclosure section of Form BD, where most of the changes are proposed to be made, would provide regulators with better information about an applicant’s disciplinary history. The amendments also propose, among other things, new items to Form BD to obtain more accurate information with respect to U.S. broker-dealers that

have foreign owners, broker-dealers that are affiliated with U.S. or foreign banks, and broker-dealers that conduct securities activities on the premises of financial institutions.

Money Laundering. The Division continued to work with the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network of the Treasury to develop practical approaches to combat money laundering. The Division participated in the Bank Secrecy Act Advisory Group and in the United States delegation to the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering, and the independent group of major financial center countries and regions, which is provided technical advice with respect to potential enforcement matters.

Arbitration. The Commission worked closely with the principal SRO arbitration forums to address key challenges facing the arbitration systems identified by the Commission and others interested in the arbitration process. Accordingly, the Commission encouraged the work of the NYSE Symposium on Arbitration and the NASD Arbitration Policy Task Force, which were established to meet these SRO responsibilities.

The Commission approved proposed rule changes by the NASD and national securities exchanges designed to enhance the procedures for resolving disputes among broker-dealers and between broker-dealers and investors. In particular, the Commission approved amendments to arbitration rules that (1) establish a mediation program,⁸³ (2) implement a pilot program for seeking injunctive relief in intra-industry disputes,⁸⁴ (3) implement a voluntary pilot program administering large and complex cases,⁸⁵ and (4) enable the NASD to discipline members that fail to honor settlement agreements reached in the arbitration or mediation process.⁸⁶

Unlisted Trading Privileges

Pursuant to rulemaking requirements of the Unlisted Trading Privileges (UTP) Act of 1994, the Commission adopted new rules and amendments to existing rules under Section 12(f) of the Exchange Act on April 21, 1995.⁸⁷ The rules reduced the period that exchanges must wait before extending UTP to any listed initial public offering (IPO) from the third trading day in the IPO, as the UTP Act of 1994 had required temporarily, to the second trading day in the IPO. The rules also require exchanges to have rules and oversight mechanisms in place to ensure fair and orderly markets and the protection of investors with respect to UTP in any security.

The Joint Industry Plan for UTP in OTC Securities (OTC/UTP Plan), operating under temporary Commission approval, permits exchanges to trade Nasdaq/national market securities subject to the terms of the OTC/UTP Plan. On August 14, 1995, the Commission extended the temporary approval of the Plan, and increased the number of Nasdaq/national market securities that a participant exchange may trade from 100 to 500.⁸⁸

Transfer Agent Regulation

The Commission solicited comment on the concept of establishing electronic links between issuer shareholder registration systems and broker-dealer recordkeeping systems. As discussed in the concept release, one benefit of such

links would be the opportunity for issuers to offer “account statements” in lieu of certificates to their shareholders and for shareholders to move their shares efficiently to their brokerage firms within the three-day settlement cycle mandated by Rule 15c6-1.⁸⁹

The Commission adopted Rule 17Ad-16, which requires transfer agents to notify securities depositories when assuming or terminating services on behalf of an issuer or when changing their names or addresses.⁹⁰ The Commission also released for comment amendments to its transfer agent rules which are designed to address investor concerns resulting from direct registration systems and shorter trade settlement time frames (*i.e.*, T+3 settlement).⁹¹

Lost and Stolen Securities

Rule 17f-1 under the Exchange Act sets forth participation, reporting, and inquiry requirements for the SEC’s Lost and Stolen Securities Program.⁹² Statistics for calendar year 1994 (the most recent data available) reflect the program’s continuing effectiveness. As of December 31, 1994, 24,518 institutions were registered in the program, a 2 percent increase over 1993. The number of securities certificates reported as lost, stolen, missing, or counterfeit increased from 1,634,161 in 1993 to 2,954,692 in 1994, an 81 percent increase. The dollar value of these reported certificates decreased from \$4.0 billion in 1993 to \$3.8 billion in 1994, a 5 percent decrease. The aggregate dollar value of the securities contained in the program’s database increased from \$92.6 billion in 1993 to \$96.4 billion in 1994, a 4 percent increase. The total number of certificates inquired about by participating institutions through the program decreased from 6,553,308 in 1993 to 6,245,375 in 1994, a 5 percent decrease. In 1994, the dollar value of certificate inquiries that matched previous reports of lost, missing, stolen, or counterfeit securities decreased from \$252 million in 1993 to \$159 million in 1994, a 37 percent decrease. The total number of these matches increased from 69,769 in 1993 to 269,001 in 1994, a 286 percent increase.

Oversight of Self-Regulatory Organizations

National Securities Exchanges

As of September 30, 1995, there were eight active securities exchanges registered with the SEC as national securities exchanges: American Stock Exchange (AMEX), Boston Stock Exchange (BSE), Chicago Board Options Exchange (CBOE), Cincinnati Stock Exchange (CSE), Chicago Stock Exchange (CHX), NYSE, Philadelphia Stock Exchange (PHLX), and Pacific Stock Exchange (PSE). The agency granted exchange applications to delist 91 debt and equity issues, and granted applications by issuers requesting withdrawal from listing and registration for 69 issues.

The exchanges submitted 364 proposed rule changes during 1995. A total of 317 pending and new filings were approved by the Commission, and 46 were withdrawn. Notable rule filings approved by the Commission included proposals:

- to adopt uniform enabling rules submitted by the AMEX, CBOE, CHX, MSRB, NASD, NYSE, PSE, and PHLX for the implementation of a continuing education program for the securities industry;⁹³

- to extend through March 29, 1996 the existing pilot program of the CSE relating to the preferencing of public agency market and marketable limit orders by approved dealers and proprietary members;⁹⁴
- to amend and extend through March 29, 1996 the existing pilot program of the BSE that permits competing specialists on the floor of the BSE;⁹⁵ and
- to adopt a minimum voting rights policy for shareholders of publicly traded securities submitted by the NYSE, AMEX, and NASD.⁹⁶

National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

The NASD is the only national securities association registered with the SEC and includes more than 5,400 member firms. Through a wholly-owned subsidiary, the NASD owns and operates the Nasdaq Stock Market, which trades more than 5,700 securities and is the second largest stock market in the United States and the world (after the NYSE).

The NASD submitted 70 proposed rule changes to the Commission during the year. The Commission approved 66 proposed rule changes which included proposed rule changes submitted during the year and several proposed rule changes submitted in prior years. Among the significant changes approved by the Commission were:

- a prohibition against a Nasdaq market maker trading ahead of any customer limit order in a Nasdaq security sent to it for execution from another broker-dealer;⁹⁷
- a restriction against certain persons receiving securities prior to the public offering when these securities trade at a premium in the secondary market (the rule does not restrict bona fide distributions of hot issues to the public);⁹⁸
- requirements for filing and review of advertising and sales literature;⁹⁹
- a requirement that all NASD members report customer complaints to the NASD, including quarterly summary statistics concerning customer complaints;¹⁰⁰
- establishment of internal procedures relating to the review of requests for exemptions from Rule G-37 of the MSRB relating to restrictions on political contributions;¹⁰¹
- procedures governing the administration of mediation proceedings;¹⁰² and
- an amendment to allow nonmembers to receive real-time access to view all orders "broadcast" through the NASD's SelectNet Service.¹⁰³

Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board

The MSRB is charged with the primary rulemaking authority for municipal securities dealers. The SEC received 18 new proposed rule changes from the MSRB. A total of 23 new and pending proposed rule changes were approved by the Commission. In particular, the Commission approved amendments to MSRB Rule G-15(a) to clarify the current customer confirmation requirements in municipal securities transactions.¹⁰⁴

Clearing Agencies

Fifteen clearing agencies were registered with the SEC at year-end. In addition, the SEC extended the temporary registration as a clearing agency of the Participants Trust Company,¹⁰⁵ MBS Clearing Corporation,¹⁰⁶ Delta Government Options Corporation,¹⁰⁷ and the Government Securities Clearing Corporation (GSCC).¹⁰⁸

Registered clearing agencies submitted 157 proposed rule changes to the SEC and withdrew 9. The SEC approved 148 proposed rule changes, including the following:

- implementation of the first stage of GSCC's proposed clearance and settlement system for repurchase agreements;¹⁰⁹
- implementation of the National Securities Clearing Corporation's (NSCC) Collateral Management Service, which allows clearing agency participants to view information regarding their clearing fund and margin deposits at NSCC and other registered clearing agencies and allows registered clearing agencies to view the same type of information about their participants at other registered clearing agencies;¹¹⁰ and
- implementation of the Options Clearing Corporation's Stock Loan/Hedge Program for specialist and market maker accounts, which allows stock loan and borrow transactions in these accounts to constitute hedges against stock option positions for purposes of margin calculation.¹¹¹

Applications for Re-entry

Rule 19h-1 under the Exchange Act prescribes the form and content of, and is the mechanism by which the Commission reviews, proposals submitted by SROs to allow persons subject to statutory disqualification, as defined in Section 3(a)(39) of the Exchange Act, to become or remain associated with member firms. In 1995, the Commission received 41 filings submitted by SROs pursuant to Rule 19h-1. Of the 41 filings, the NASD made 32, the NYSE made 8, and the CHX made 1. No applications were denied; three were withdrawn.

Investment Management Regulation

The Division of Investment Management oversees the regulation of investment companies and investment advisers under two companion statutes, the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, and administers the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

Key 1995 Results

In 1995, a large part of the work of the Division of Investment Management focused on three areas: (1) improving and simplifying communications to investment company shareholders; (2) reducing operational burdens on investment companies; and (3) modernizing the regulation of public utility holding companies. Key steps taken to improve disclosures to investment company shareholders included an initiative to simplify investment company prospectuses and to improve risk disclosure. The Commission permitted a test group of eight mutual fund groups to provide their investors with a short prospectus summary, or "profile," that would accompany the prospectus currently provided to investors. The Commission also issued a concept release seeking public comments and suggestions on how to improve the descriptions of risk provided by investment companies, including whether to require some form of quantitative risk measure in investment company prospectuses.

The Commission adopted rules under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (Investment Company Act) to allow a single mutual fund to offer multiple classes of shares with different sales charge arrangements and to permit mutual funds to impose certain types of deferred sales loads. These rules give funds greater flexibility to tailor their sales load arrangements without having to seek exemptive relief from the Commission. The Commission also proposed amendments to the Investment Company Act rule governing the custody of fund assets outside of the United States. The proposed amendments would reduce the burdens currently placed on fund directors in reviewing foreign custody arrangements and provide funds with significantly more flexibility to select foreign custodians without sacrificing investor protection.

The Division issued a report, *The Regulation of Public Utility Holding Companies*, which describes the results of the staff's study of the regulatory framework of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (Holding Company Act) in light of recent developments in the gas and electric utility industry. The primary recommendation of the report is that Congress should repeal the Holding Company Act and simultaneously provide necessary authority to state regulators and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to ensure the continued protection of consumers. The report also recommends a number of proposals for administrative reform.

Significant Investment Company Act Matters

Rulemaking

The Commission adopted and proposed for amendment several rules under the Investment Company Act. A description of some of these rules is provided below.

Multiple Class Structures. In February 1995, the Commission adopted Rule 18f-3, which permits open-end management investment companies to issue multiple classes of shares with varying arrangements for the distribution of their shares and the provision of services to their shareholders.¹¹² Rule 18f-3 eliminates many of the requirements imposed under prior Commission exemptive orders governing multiple class structures and enables investment companies to issue multiple classes without obtaining exemptive relief from the Commission. The Commission also amended the registration form for open-end management investment companies under the Investment Company Act and the Securities Act of 1933 (Securities Act). The amendment prescribes prospectus disclosure requirements for multiple class investment companies and master-feeder arrangements, which consist of one or more “feeder” investment companies that invest in the same portfolio, or “master” investment company. A conforming amendment was made to Rule 12b-1 under the Investment Company Act, which governs the payment of asset-based sales charges.

Deferred Sales Loads. In February 1995, the Commission adopted Rule 6c-10, which permits open-end management investment companies to impose contingent deferred sales loads (*i.e.*, a sales load paid at redemption that declines over several years until it reaches zero) without obtaining exemptive relief from the Commission.¹¹³ At the same time, the Commission proposed for comment amendments to Rule 6c-10 that would give open-end management investment companies greater flexibility to impose a wider variety of deferred sales loads, such as loads that are paid in a series of installments.¹¹⁴ The Commission also proposed for comment amendments to the registration form for open-end management investment companies under the Investment Company Act and the Securities Act to modify the prospectus disclosure requirements for deferred sales loads.

Foreign Custody. In July 1995, the Commission proposed for comment amendments to Rule 17f-5, which governs the custody of investment company assets outside the United States.¹¹⁵ The proposed amendments would (a) revise the findings that currently must be made in establishing foreign custody arrangements to focus exclusively on the safekeeping of investment company assets, (b) permit an investment company’s board of directors to delegate its responsibilities under the rule to evaluate these arrangements, and (c) expand the class of foreign banks and securities depositories that could serve as investment company custodians. The amendments are designed to reduce the burdens currently placed on investment company directors in reviewing foreign custody arrangements and to provide investment companies with significantly more flexibility to select foreign custodians without sacrificing investor protection.

Personal Investment Activities. In September 1995, the Commission proposed for comment amendments to Rule 17j-1 under the Investment Company Act, Rule 204-2 under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940

(Investment Advisers Act), and investment company registration forms under the Investment Company Act and the Securities Act.¹¹⁶ The proposed amendments would effect the recommendations made by the staff in connection with its 1994 study of the personal investment activities of investment company personnel by enhancing investment company oversight of personal investment activities, requiring public disclosure of personal investment policies, and making the scope of Rule 17j-1 more consistent with its purpose.

Rule 24f-2. In February 1995, the Commission proposed for comment amendments to Rule 24f-2 and new Form 24F-2.¹¹⁷ Rule 24f-2 permits open-end investment companies to register an indefinite number of shares under the Securities Act, to net redemptions against sales in determining Securities Act registration fees, and to pay registration fees on an annual basis. The amendments are designed to clarify the application of certain provisions of Rule 24f-2, to make the rule's filing deadlines more flexible under certain circumstances, to improve the accuracy of information required to be filed under Rule 24f-2, and to improve the agency's ability to process the filings. The amendments were approved by the Commission in September 1995.

Quarterly Report Proposal. In July 1995, the Commission proposed for comment new Rule 30b3-1, which would require money market funds to file electronically with the Commission quarterly reports detailing their portfolio holdings.¹¹⁸ The information in the proposed reports would substantially improve the ability of the examination staff to monitor money market funds for compliance with the Investment Company Act.

Safe Harbor. In July 1995, the Commission proposed for comment new Rule 3a-4, which would provide a safe harbor from the definition of investment company for certain programs under which professional portfolio management services are provided to numerous individual clients.¹¹⁹ If adopted, the rule would establish a non-exclusive method by which such programs can operate without being subject to the requirements of the Investment Company Act.

Exemptive Orders, No-Action Letters, and Interpretations

In 1995, the Commission issued exemptive orders permitting, among other things, investment advisers of multi-manager funds to hire sub-advisers without shareholder approval, the operation of "funds of funds," and the sale of interests in unit investment trusts subject to a non-contingent deferred sales load. The staff issued no-action letters and interpretations under the Investment Company Act concerning, among other things, aggregated trades, segregation requirements for short selling, joint borrowing arrangements, foreign custody, issuers of asset-backed securities, and affiliated transactions.

Sub-advisers. The Commission issued orders permitting certain investment advisers to multi-manager investment companies to hire sub-advisers for the funds and to make material changes to sub-advisory contracts without approval by the funds' shareholders, provided that shareholders are provided with an information statement containing substantially all information that would otherwise be included in a proxy statement concerning new sub-advisers and material changes to the sub-advisory contracts. In addition,

the orders allow the funds to disclose sub-advisory fees for each fund in their prospectuses and other reports in the aggregate, without separately disclosing each sub-adviser's fee.¹²⁰

"Funds of Funds." The Commission issued orders permitting certain mutual funds to operate as "funds of funds"—funds that invest their assets in affiliated investment companies.¹²¹ The orders supersede prior orders¹²² and permit the funds to acquire up to 100 percent of the voting shares of any mutual fund in the same family of funds. Congress is considering legislation that similarly would facilitate the operation of mutual funds that invest substantially all of their assets in other funds in the same fund family.¹²³

Unit Investment Trusts. The Commission issued orders permitting certain unit investment trusts (UITs) to be sold subject to a non-contingent deferred sales load, provided the load is disclosed in the fee table in the UITs' prospectuses.¹²⁴

Aggregated Trades. The staff stated that it would not recommend enforcement action under Section 17(d) of the Investment Company Act, Rule 17d-1 thereunder, or Section 206 of the Investment Advisers Act if an investment adviser aggregates trades on behalf of its mutual fund clients and other clients, including clients in which the adviser has a proprietary interest, provided that trades are aggregated and allocated fairly and equitably.¹²⁵

Segregation Requirements. The staff, modifying an earlier position, stated that it would not recommend enforcement action under Section 18(f) of the Investment Company Act if a fund that engaged in short selling maintained in a segregated account assets having a value that, when combined with the value of collateral deposited with a broker in connection with the short sale, equals the current market value of the security sold short.¹²⁶ The staff's prior position required the segregated account to maintain assets at least equal in value to the current market value of the securities sold short but in no event less than the market value of the securities when they were sold short.

Committed Line of Credit Arrangement. The staff stated that it would not recommend enforcement action under Section 17(d) of the Investment Company Act or Rule 17d-1 thereunder if affiliated funds jointly entered into a committed line of credit arrangement with a bank to provide the funds with a source of cash to meet unanticipated redemption requests. The arrangement was subject to conditions designed to ensure that each fund's participation in the arrangement would be equitable and in the fund's best interests.¹²⁷

Custodial Arrangements. The staff stated that it would not recommend enforcement action under Section 17(f) of the Investment Company Act or Rule 17f-5 thereunder if a closed-end fund held Russian equity securities under certain custodial arrangements that were not contemplated when Rule 17f-5 was adopted.¹²⁸ Under Russia's unique share registry system, equity securities of Russian issuers are maintained in book-entry form by registrars located throughout Russia. The fund's proposed arrangements included monitoring the registrars, enhancing oversight by the fund's board of directors, and providing prominent prospectus disclosure of the risks posed by the Russian registry system.

Asset-backed Securities. The staff issued a no-action letter that provided guidance regarding the scope of Rule 3a-7 under the Investment Company Act, which excludes certain issuers of asset-backed securities from the

definition of investment company.¹²⁹ The staff emphasized that issuers relying on the rule must be engaged solely in the business of acquiring and holding eligible assets, as defined in the rule, and in activities “related or incidental” thereto, *e.g.*, only those that support or further the entity’s business of acquiring and holding eligible assets.

Investment Series. The staff stated that separate series of a series investment company should be treated as separate investment companies for purposes of Section 17 of the Investment Company Act, which generally prohibits transactions between funds and their affiliated persons and affiliated persons of such affiliated persons. The staff’s position permitted a broker-dealer to engage in transactions with a particular series of a series investment company when an affiliate of the broker-dealer serves as sub-adviser to another series of the same company.¹³⁰

Separate Investment Accounts. The staff stated that it would not recommend enforcement action if a fund’s total return, as quoted in its prospectus, statement of additional information, advertisements, and sales literature, included the performance of certain predecessor unregistered separate investment accounts (SIAs) for the periods prior to the effective date of the fund’s registration statement.¹³¹ Relief was based on the representations that the registered fund would be managed in a manner that is in all material respects equivalent to the management of the corresponding SIA, and that the SIAs were created for purposes entirely unrelated to the establishment of a performance record.

Insurance Company Matters

The staff stated that it would not recommend enforcement action under Section 17(a) of the Securities Act and Rule 156 thereunder if certain variable annuity contracts used supplemental sales materials reflecting hypothetical rates of return illustrating both the accumulation and distribution periods.¹³² The issuer has developed an interactive computer software program that permits investors to input personalized financial data and then to compare the hypothetical performance of the annuity with the hypothetical performance of mutual funds.

The Division clarified the application of Rule 24f-2 under the Investment Company Act to the two-tier arrangements used in offering variable insurance contracts to investors.¹³³ Under these arrangements, underlying funds may calculate and pay their Securities Act registration fees pursuant to Rule 24f-2 based on all of their sales and redemptions during the previous fiscal year, exclusive of sales to and redemptions from insurance company separate accounts that already paid such fees.

Disclosure Matters

The Commission took several key initiatives to improve disclosures to investment company shareholders, including issuing a concept release and testing “profile” prospectuses. The most significant initiatives are described below.

Risk Disclosure. In March 1995, the Commission issued a concept release requesting comment on how investment companies could improve disclosure about their risks. To encourage individual investors to comment, the Commission also issued with the release a summary targeted to individual investors. Over 3,700 comments were received and were being evaluated at year-end. The staff also worked closely with several fund groups to develop simplified prospectuses by eliminating technical jargon and legal prose.

Profile Prospectus. In August 1995, the Commission permitted a test group of eight mutual fund groups to provide their investors with a “profile” prospectus, which would accompany the prospectus currently provided to investors. Each profile briefly outlines 11 disclosure items, including information regarding the fund’s investment objectives; investment strategies; risks and appropriateness of investment; fees and expenses; past performance; investment adviser; and purchase, redemption, and distribution procedures. The use of profiles is being undertaken initially for a one-year test period to determine, among other things, whether investors find them helpful regarding investment decisions.

Reporting of Expenses. In July 1995, the Commission adopted amendments relating to the reporting of expenses by investment companies.¹³⁴ The amendments require investment companies to reflect as expenses certain of their liabilities paid by broker-dealers in connection with allocating brokerage transactions to such broker-dealers and liabilities reduced by certain expense offset arrangements. The amendments also require investment companies to disclose the average commission rate paid. The amendments are designed to enhance the information provided to investors so that they may be better able to assess and compare investment company expenses and yield information.

Money Market Fund Short Form Prospectus. In July 1995, the Commission proposed for comment amendments to Form N-1A, the form used by open-end investment companies to register securities.¹³⁵ The proposed amendments are designed to promote the use of money market fund prospectuses that are shorter, more informative, and readily understandable to investors.

Filings Reviewed

In 1995, the staff reviewed 68 percent of the 2,321 new portfolios filed (however, more than 90 percent of new open-end and closed-end portfolios were reviewed), 84 percent of the 711 proxy statements filed, and 12 percent of the 15,258 post-effective amendments filed with the Commission. The post-effective amendments included 378 registration statements filed in connection with fund mergers, which are among the most complex filings made by investment companies. Increased merger activity by investment companies resulted in a 36 percent increase in the number of merger registration statements filed, all of which were reviewed. These figures include filings by insurance product separate accounts.

Significant Investment Advisers Act Developments

Rulemaking

In February 1995, the Commission proposed for public comment new Rule 204-4 and Form ADV-B under the Investment Advisers Act that would require certain investment advisers to provide clients with an annual report regarding the brokerage commissions they pay and the advisers' receipt of research and other "soft dollar" benefits from those commissions.¹³⁶

No-Action Letters and Interpretations

In 1995, the Division issued no-action letters and interpretations under the Investment Advisers Act concerning, among other things, registration and electronic recordkeeping.

Registration. The staff stated that it would not recommend enforcement action under Sections 203 and 208(d) of the Investment Advisers Act if certain affiliates of a registered investment adviser did not themselves register as investment advisers under Section 203, where (a) the affiliates would not be providing any investment advice, (b) the affiliates and each of their employees would be deemed "associated persons" of the registered adviser when provided access to recommendations of the registered adviser, and (c) the staff would be provided with access to the books and records of the affiliates to the extent necessary to examine the business of the registered adviser.¹³⁷

Electronic Recordkeeping. The staff stated that it would not recommend enforcement action under the recordkeeping rules under the Investment Advisers Act and Investment Company Act if advisers that use a service offering on-line access to research reports do not maintain hard copies of all reports consulted.¹³⁸

Interagency Agreement

The staff also participated in the drafting and negotiation of an agreement between the Commission and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency to conduct joint examinations of national banks, and their subsidiaries that advise mutual funds, and the funds they advise. This agreement should minimize the burdens on such banks and bank-advised funds, reduce regulatory costs, and enable the staff to obtain access to certain bank records even though the bank itself is not registered as an investment adviser.

Significant Holding Company Act Developments

Recent Study

In June 1995, the Division issued a report, *The Regulation of Public Utility Holding Companies*, which describes the results of the staff's study of the regulatory framework of the Holding Company Act in light of recent developments in the gas and electric utility industry.¹³⁹ The primary

recommendation of the report is that Congress repeal the Holding Company Act conditioned upon the enactment of provisions (1) to ensure state regulators and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission access to books and records of companies in multi-state, public utility systems and (2) to provide for federal audit authority and oversight of affiliate transactions. The report also includes legislative and administrative proposals intended to update and streamline the regulatory structure governing public utility holding companies.

Rulemaking

The Commission adopted rule amendments that exempt from Commission review certain additional types of securities that both public utility and non-utility subsidiaries of registered holding companies may issue.¹⁴⁰ The Commission also proposed amendments to broaden the exemption to include all securities issued by a subsidiary company of a registered holding company.¹⁴¹ The Commission further proposed a new rule that would exempt from Commission review the holding company system's investments in energy-related activities of amounts up to the greater of 15 percent of the holding company's total capitalization or \$50 million. The rule also would exempt without limit investments by registered gas companies in gas-related activities.¹⁴²

Registered Holding Companies

As of September 30, 1995, there were 15 public utility holding companies registered under the Holding Company Act. The registered systems were comprised of 97 public utility subsidiaries, 14 exempt wholesale generators, 35 foreign utility companies, 229 non-utility subsidiaries, and 47 inactive subsidiaries, for a total of 437 companies and systems with utility operations in 26 states. These holding company systems had aggregate assets of approximately \$136 billion and operating revenues of approximately \$46 billion as of September 30, 1995.

Financing Authorizations

During 1995, the Commission authorized registered holding company systems to issue approximately \$22.9 billion of financing authorizations, an increase of 31 percent over 1994. The total financing authorizations included \$4.9 billion of investments in exempt wholesale generators and foreign utility companies, an increase of 1,072 percent over 1994, and investments of \$172 million in enterprises engaged in energy management.

Examinations

The staff examined 9 service companies and 1 special purpose corporation. The staff reviewed the accounting policies, cost determination procedures, intercompany transactions, and quarterly reports of these service companies and special purpose corporations. Through the examination program and by uncovering misallocated expenses and inefficiencies, the Commission's activities during 1995 resulted in savings to consumers of approximately \$18.5 million.

Applications and Interpretations

In 1995, the Commission issued various orders under the Holding Company Act. Four of the most significant orders are described below.

CINergy Corporation. CINergy Corporation became a new registered holding company following the Commission's approval of its acquisition, through merger, of the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company and PSI Resources, Inc.¹⁴³

Southern Company. The Commission authorized the Southern Company to invest approximately \$179 million in a new subsidiary that will provide wireless communications services to both associate and nonassociate companies.¹⁴⁴ Also, the Commission approved a percentage limitation upon the new subsidiary's transactions with nonassociates based on the investment needed to provide services to associate and nonassociate companies, respectively. The Commission suggested its willingness to consider a more flexible standard in the area of diversification, consistent with the language of Section 11(b)(1) of the Holding Company Act. In another decision, the Commission removed a revenue-based percentage limitation on the activities of an energy management subsidiary of a registered holding company. Cited, among other things, were the financial health of the subsidiary; the benefits that consumers had derived from its operations; and Congress' goal of encouraging energy security, efficiency, competition, and environmental quality, all of which are promoted by the energy management services industry.¹⁴⁵

Central and South West Corporation. The Commission authorized Central and South West Corporation, a registered holding company, and its service company subsidiary, Central and South West Services, Inc. (CSW Services), to consolidate and centralize in CSW Services certain service and management activities that were previously conducted individually by the operating companies of the registered system. The Commission determined that (a) the procedures to be used to authorize, monitor, and control the rendering of services by CSW Services to the operating companies should be adequate to enable management to control the cost, quality, and level of services received from CSW Services, and (b) its approval of the restructuring did not preclude the state regulatory authorities from scrutinizing and disallowing the pass-through of costs in rates for services rendered by CSW Services.¹⁴⁶

Columbia Gas System, Inc. The Commission approved the bankruptcy reorganization plan of the Columbia Gas System, Inc.¹⁴⁷ and, in light of the extensive disclosure available to investors, integrated its report on the plan therewith.

Compliance Inspections and Examinations

The Office of Compliance Inspections and Examinations, together with the regional office examination staff, conducts the nationwide compliance inspections and examinations program for regulated entities, as authorized by the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Investment Company Act of 1940, and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. These entities include brokers, dealers, municipal securities dealers, self-regulatory organizations, transfer agents, investment companies, and investment advisers.

Key 1995 Results

In May 1995, the Commission consolidated its examination and inspection activities into the Office of Compliance Inspections and Examinations (OCIE). The responsibilities for these activities was previously divided between the Divisions of Market Regulation and Investment Management. The Commission created OCIE to streamline the examination process by consolidating the management of the activities; reducing duplication; and improving coordination with the regional office examination staff, the Division of Enforcement (Enforcement), and other regulatory agencies. The office will offer higher quality training for examiners, better use of resources, and improved planning of examination strategies.

The inspection staff undertook a number of initiatives to enhance the joint and cooperative efforts among foreign, federal, and state regulators and self-regulatory organizations (SRO) in conducting inspections and other oversight activities of regulated entities. The staff also identified ways to foster increased cooperative efforts among Commission examiners responsible for inspecting different types of regulated entities. All of these joint and cooperative efforts have the objective of increasing the staff's effectiveness and productivity and enhancing investor protection.

Furthermore, the staff focused on methods to utilize limited examination resources as effectively as possible. For example, the emphasis of the examination program shifted toward a model that selects the registrants to examine based on risk factors, rather than a cyclical approach.

Investment Company and Investment Adviser Inspections

During the year, the staff completed inspections of 348 investment company complexes and 1,075 investment advisers. In 82 percent of these inspections, the staff found deficiencies that needed correction. An additional seven percent of the inspections completed were referred to Enforcement for consideration of an investigation and possible enforcement action.

Investment Companies

During the year, examiners completed inspections of 348 investment company complexes with \$1.1 trillion under management, indicating an average frequency of inspection for the 969 investment company complexes of once every 2.8 years. The complexes inspected managed 3,144 portfolios, which represented approximately 51 percent of the mutual fund and closed-end fund portfolios in existence at the beginning of 1995. This indicated an average inspection frequency for mutual and closed-end funds of once every 2 years. The complexes inspected represented a mix of both large and smaller complexes. Forty-eight of the inspections were done on a "for cause" basis, which means the staff had some reason to conduct the inspection other than the simple passage of time.

Of the 348 inspections completed, 23 were referred to Enforcement. Of those referrals, 48 percent had problems related to net asset value calculations, 48 percent had problems related to internal controls, and 39 percent had problems related to prohibited transactions.

Mutual Fund Administrators. Approximately 43 percent of all mutual fund complexes use third party administrators to perform their accounting and administrative functions. Prior to 1995, administrators were inspected individually and during inspections of fund complexes. During 1995, the staff began a special program of comprehensive individual, or stand-alone, inspections of these administrators to review their activities across their entire mutual fund client base. Examiners completed 25 inspections of administrators during the year. Of these, one was referred to Enforcement. The administrator inspections also resulted in the staff subsequently conducting three "for cause" examinations of investment company fund complexes.

Variable Insurance Products. In response to the rapid growth in variable insurance product assets and the emergence of new channels of distribution, five specialized insurance product examination teams were formed in OCIE and the regional offices during the year. These teams were charged with identifying and examining variable life and annuity contract separate accounts. The teams worked in conjunction with the Division of Investment Management (Investment Management) in the planning and execution of the examination program. During the year, 18 insurance company complexes were examined and deficiency letters were issued in each examination. The examinations revealed significant internal control weaknesses, as well as issues that were referred to Investment Management for comment.

Bank Advised Mutual Funds. The Commission and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency signed an agreement on June 12, 1995 that provides for joint examinations of mutual funds advised by national banks and national banks that provide investment services to funds. As a result of this agreement, one joint examination was completed and a second was initiated. These two examinations focused on a review of key internal control areas as well as an analysis of portfolio transaction data relating to both mutual fund and trust department client trading. This represents the first time Commission examiners have been able to compare mutual

fund trading to trading by other trust department clients to determine if there is evidence of overreaching or other abusive investment or trading practices.

Investment Advisers

During the year, the staff's general approach to targeting investment advisers for inspection was changed significantly to reflect the large growth in the number of advisers over the last several years and the lack of growth in the size of the inspection staff. These changes also recognize that the level of risk of loss to clients posed by different types of advisers varies greatly.

New Inspection Approach. Examinations focused on the advisers that appeared to pose a higher risk to clients, such as those that had actual custody of client funds and securities and those that had discretionary management authority over clients' cash and securities. Examiners in the regional offices were given the primary responsibility for conducting inspections of all discretionary managers and those non-discretionary managers with \$100 million or more under management as well as advisers with custody of client assets. Regional staff also were responsible for conducting all "for cause" inspections.

Sweep Inspections. Inspections of the remaining investment advisers became the responsibility of the Commission's headquarters staff. The staff conducted geographical sweep inspections of 90 investment advisers in Maryland, Washington, and Minnesota. State examiners in all three states were invited to participate. A majority of the advisers examined were financial planners. Typically, financial planners prepare financial plans that are implemented through sales of mutual funds by the planners in their capacity as a registered representative of a broker-dealer. Most planners also sell insurance products.

Under this new approach, the inspection staff completed 1,075 investment adviser inspections, including examinations of 893 advisers with discretionary management authority. The non-investment company assets managed by the advisers inspected totalled \$462 billion. The 893 inspections of discretionary advisers covered 11 percent of all such advisers, indicating an average inspection cycle for discretionary advisers of once every 8 to 10 years. The overall inspection cycle for advisers dropped from once every 22 years to once every 20 years.

Deficiency letters were sent in 75 percent of the examinations, 10 percent were concluded with a conference call, and 1 percent was referred to Enforcement. Deficiencies found during inspections were concentrated in books and records and brochure disclosures. No deficiencies were found in 14 percent of the inspections.

Of the 177 "for cause" examinations, 70 were referred to Enforcement. Of the referrals, 60 percent had problems related to custody of client funds or securities, 58 percent had problems involving conflicts of interest, and 51 percent had problems related to marketing or performance advertising.

Broker-Dealer Examinations

During the year, the OCIE focused on and expanded the activities of the broker-dealer examination program, initiating and coordinating projects focused on particular areas of regulatory concern, such as the recent Joint Regulatory Sales Practice Examination Sweeps, a follow-up to the *Large Firm Report* by the Divisions of Market Regulation and Enforcement.

The staff conducted a sales practice sweep of small and medium-sized brokerage firms designed to review the hiring, retention, and supervisory practices of both New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) and National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (NASD) member firms, as well as the sales practices of identified registered representatives employed by these firms. The sweep was a collaborative effort by the Commission, the NYSE, the NASD, and the North American Securities Administrators Association. The objective of the sweep was to identify problem brokers, and to ensure that appropriate supervisory mechanisms are in place or, where necessary, to take appropriate enforcement action against these individuals. The staff completed 179 examinations at 101 different firms and was analyzing the findings of the examinations at fiscal year-end.

The staff also completed a total of 662 examinations of brokers, dealers, and municipal securities dealers consisting of 393 oversight examinations and 269 “for cause” examinations. Findings from 158 examinations were referred to the Division of Enforcement for further consideration. Referrals to SROs were made in 42 examinations. Many of these examinations focused on areas of recent concern to the Commission, such as broker-dealers’ internal controls. As a result, the staff developed and tested a module to be used to review the internal controls of broker-dealers. The module covers internal audit, senior management, trading, funding and liquidity, credit controls, new products, physical premises, SRO examination and workpapers, and financial information analysis. The module was used in a number of comprehensive examinations of broker-dealers’ internal controls.

SRO Inspections and Oversight

The staff adopted “Guiding Principles” for conducting SRO inspections. These principles include coordinating various SRO inspection teams to ensure consistent reviews and recommendations, to expedite the inspection process, to develop tracking systems to monitor and track SRO programs, and to provide follow up to recommendations made in inspection reports. In addition, inspection teams will meet regularly with all SROs not only to follow up on recommendations of inspection reports, but also to ensure that important issues of mutual interest are discussed with the SROs.

The staff completed routine oversight inspections of the enforcement and sales practice examination programs of the NYSE and the Chicago Board Options Exchange (CBOE), as well as the sales practice investigations program of the CBOE. The market surveillance, investigatory, and disciplinary programs of the Boston Stock Exchange (BSE), the CBOE, the Chicago Stock Exchange (CHX), the NYSE, the Pacific Stock Exchange (PSE), and the Philadelphia Stock Exchange (Phlx) were inspected. The staff also inspected

the arbitration programs of the NASD and the NYSE and started inspections of the arbitration programs of the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (MSRB) and the PSE.

Examiners completed several special purpose inspections, which included the American Stock Exchange's (Amex) listing program and the NASD's Public Disclosure Program; the audit trail systems of the Amex, the CBOE, the NASD, and the NYSE; the BSE's pilot competing specialist initiative; and the Cincinnati Stock Exchange's (CSE) pilot preferencing program. The staff started an inspection of the NASD's enforcement, waiver, surveillance, and examination program for broker-dealer compliance with MSRB Rule G-37.

Routine oversight inspections of the regulatory programs administered by the NASD's 14 district offices were conducted. These inspections included reviews of eight district offices' broker-dealer examination, financial surveillance, and formal disciplinary action programs, as well as investigations of customer complaints, terminations of registered representatives "for cause," and members' notices of disciplinary action against their own employees.

Five clearing agencies were inspected: the Government Securities Clearing Corporation, Philadelphia Depository Trust Company, Stock Clearing Corporation of Philadelphia, Midwest Securities Trust Company, and Midwest Clearing Corporation.

SRO Final Disciplinary Actions

Section 19d-1 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 19d-1 thereunder require all SROs to file reports with the Commission of all final disciplinary actions. In 1995, the SROs filed 1,105 reports. The Amex filed 14 reports, the BSE filed 1 report, the CBOE filed 46 reports, the CHX and the CSE filed none, the NASD filed 827 reports, the National Securities Clearing Corporation filed 5 reports, the NYSE filed 183 reports, the Options Clearing Corporation filed 3 reports, the Phlx filed 24 reports, and the PSE filed 2 reports.

Full Disclosure System


The full disclosure system is administered by the Division of Corporation Finance. The system is designed to provide investors with material information, foster investor confidence, contribute to the maintenance of fair and orderly markets, facilitate capital formation, and inhibit fraud in the public offering, trading, voting, and tendering of securities.

Key 1995 Results

Reflecting a significant increase in transactions in the latter half of the year, the \$824 billion in securities filed for registration during the year represented a slight increase over the \$815 billion in 1994. Common stock offerings of nearly \$400 billion filed for registration in 1995 (compared to \$333 billion in 1994) reflected a substantial increase in merger activity, as well as a modest increase in stock offerings. Offerings filed by first time registrants (IPOs) totalled approximately \$82 billion, nearly level with 1994.

Foreign companies' participation in the United States public market continued to show strong growth in 1995. One hundred and eighteen foreign companies from 28 countries, including Royal Bank of Canada, Jilin Chemical Company (China), PowerGen plc and National Power plc (United Kingdom), CRVD (Brazil), Asia Pulp and Paper (Singapore), Portugal Telecom and Jefferson Smurfit plc (Ireland), entered the United States public markets for the first time. At year-end, there were 709 foreign companies from 43 countries filing reports with the Commission. Foreign companies registered public offerings of \$41 billion in 1995.

REGISTRATION STATEMENTS FILED DOLLAR VALUE (\$BILLIONS)



In the rulemaking area, a package of initiatives was published for comment by the Commission to streamline and enhance the utility of disclosure. The proposals would allow the use of abbreviated or summary financial information in disclosure documents delivered to investors, streamline director and executive compensation disclosure in annual proxy and information statements, raise the total assets threshold for Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 (Exchange Act) registration, reduce the holding period requirements in Rule 144 under the Securities Act of 1933 (Securities Act), and exempt from federal registration small offerings that are exempt under a California law.

The Commission also revised its prospectus delivery and other rules to facilitate compliance with prospectus delivery requirements with the change to a three business day settlement period for securities transactions (T+3). Use of electronic media to deliver mandated disclosure documents was addressed and facilitated by the issuance of an interpretive release providing guidance and a degree of certainty to issuers that use electronic media to deliver or transmit information to investors.

In addition, broad-based initiatives are being considered that may result in substantial revisions to the registration and disclosure processes. In 1995, the Commission established an Advisory Committee on the Capital Formation and Regulatory Processes, reflecting the Commission's continuing efforts to minimize regulatory burdens while maximizing investor protection. The Committee is considering fundamental issues relating to the regulatory framework governing the capital formation process, such as whether Commission rules should provide for registration of companies rather than securities.

An internal Task Force on Disclosure Simplification undertook a "top to bottom" review of all forms and disclosure requirements relating to securities offerings and disclosure obligations of public companies. The purpose of the review is to streamline and simplify regulations, including the elimination of any requirements that have outlived their usefulness.

In 1995, the staff reviewed 30.8% of the reporting issuers, as well as 1,150 Securities Act and Exchange Act registration statements of first time filers.

Review of Filings

The following table summarizes the principal filings reviewed during the last five years. The levels of reviews of new issuer filings, tender offers, contested solicitations, and going private transactions, all of which are subject to review, reflect the increases and decreases in the number of filings received.

FULL DISCLOSURE REVIEWS

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Reporting Issuer Reviews <u>a/</u>	2,660	3,058	3,531	3,400	3,930
New Issuer Reviews <u>b/</u>	799	1,147	1,200	1,599	1,150
Major Filing Reviews					
Securities Act Registrations					
Headquarters					
New Issuers	465	831	877	1,167	805
Repeat Issuers	758	970	924	863	815
P/E Amdts. <u>c/</u>	308	210	117	114	100
Regions					
Registrations	183	158	189	217	145
P/E Amdts. <u>c/</u>	275	137	103	90	115
Exchange Act Initial Registrations	151	158	148	215	200
Annual Report Reviews					
Full	1,122	1,041	1,466	1,085	1,345
Full Financial	712	1,126	1,155	1,405	1,585
Special <u>d/</u>	435	409	360	455	585
Tender Offers (14D-1)	37	27	56	82	140
Going Private Schedules	68	61	61	75	77
Contested Proxy Solicitations	65	58	35	42	59
Proxy Statements					
Merger/Going Private	188	141	149	163	225
Others w/Financials	214	150	149	180	205
Other <u>e/</u>	160	245	1,143	847	195

a/ Includes companies subject to Exchange Act reporting whose financial statements were reviewed during the year.

b/ Includes non-Exchange Act reporting companies whose Securities Act or Exchange Act registration statements were reviewed during the year.

c/ Includes only post-effective amendments with new financial statements.

d/ Forms 10-K, 10-KSB, and 20-F reviewed in connection with the review of other filings. Special reviews in years prior to 1995 may have been underrecorded and therefore are not fully comparable to the 1995 number.

e/ 1993 and 1994 include reviews in connection with the executive compensation disclosure project.

Rulemaking, Interpretive, and Legislative Matters

Prospectus delivery in connection with T+3 settlement

The Commission proposed and adopted amendments to its rules and forms, as well as a new rule under the Securities Act, in order to implement two solutions to prospectus delivery timing issues arising in connection with the change to T+3 securities transaction settlement.¹⁴⁸ The amendments and rule are based on recommendations submitted by representatives of financial intermediaries. Among other things, the initiatives for the first time allow prospectus disclosure to be completed through the use of supplements to prospectuses subject to completion (*i.e.*, term sheets) and the confirmation of sale. In addition, the Commission amended an exemption from T+3 clearance and settlement for purchases and sales of securities pursuant to a firm commitment offering. This exemption is now limited to offerings in which an alternative settlement cycle is agreed to by the issuer and the underwriter.

Electronic delivery of documents to security holders

The Commission issued an interpretive release¹⁴⁹ and related rule proposals¹⁵⁰ addressing the use of electronic media to deliver or transmit to investors information under the federal securities laws. The interpretive release provides guidance and a degree of certainty to issuers who use electronic media in complying with the applicable delivery requirements of the federal securities laws. The interpretive release also contains numerous examples applying these concepts to specific fact situations and solicits comment on various matters to assist the Commission in evaluating the need for additional interpretations. The rule proposals include a number of technical amendments to the Commission's rules and forms that are intended to codify some of the interpretations set out in the interpretive release.

June 1995 Initiatives

On June 27, 1995, the Commission issued eight releases, seven proposing rule changes and one stating interpretive positions, to streamline disclosure, facilitate capital raising, and deter abusive practices.

1. Abbreviated Financial Statements

The Commission issued a release proposing new rules and amendments that would allow the use of abbreviated financial statements in annual reports to shareholders and other disclosure documents that are delivered to investors, such as prospectuses, proxy and information statements, and documents furnished to investors in connection with tender offers or going private transactions.¹⁵¹ The release also seeks comment on other approaches to streamlining the annual report to shareholders, such as permitting the use of a summary annual report, or allowing registrants total flexibility by rescinding the Commission's requirements for delivery of an annual report to shareholders.

2. Streamlining Delivery of Executive and Director Compensation Disclosure

The Commission proposed amendments to Item 402 of Regulation S-K and Regulation S-B to streamline executive compensation disclosure in annual proxy and information statements and to reformat director compensation disclosure.¹⁵² The amendments would permit registrants to furnish the detailed executive compensation disclosure currently required to be provided in the proxy or information statement, in the annual report on Form 10-K. The proposed amendments also would replace the current narrative disclosure of several common elements of director compensation with a new tabular presentation in the proxy statement.

3a. Small Offering Exemption for Certain California Limited Issues

The Commission issued a release proposing a new Securities Act Section 3(b) exemption from the registration requirements of the federal securities laws.¹⁵³ Under the proposed exemption, offers and sales of securities in amounts of up to \$5 million, that satisfy the conditions of a recently-enacted exemption from California state qualification requirements, also would be exempt from federal registration. The federal antifraud prohibitions would continue to apply to all such exempt transactions. The proposed exemption would provide that purchasers in the exempt transaction receive “restricted securities.” No filing with the Commission would be required.

3b. Solicitation of Comment Concerning Prohibitions Against General Solicitations in Exempt Offerings

In light of the California Exemption, which allows general solicitations so long as sales are effected only to qualified purchasers, the Commission also solicited comment on whether general solicitations should be permitted in Regulation D and private placements.¹⁵⁴ The release includes questions about whether Regulation D should allow general solicitations, who should be able to use them, and the extent to which the content of such communications should be restricted.

4. Solicitations of Interest Prior to an Initial Public Offering

The Commission issued proposals that would allow many issuers that are not subject to Exchange Act reporting requirements to “test the waters” for interest in their company prior to the preparation and filing of an IPO registration statement under the Securities Act.¹⁵⁵ The proposed rule is intended to allow an issuer with no established market for its securities to assess potential investor interest in the company before incurring the costs associated with the preparation of a Securities Act registration statement. The proposal would require that written solicitation documents or broadcast scripts be submitted to the Commission on or before first use. If, after “testing the waters,” an issuer decided to proceed with a registered IPO, it would have to file a registration statement and provide investors with a prospectus. “Test the waters” solicitations would have to be discontinued once a registration statement was filed. Sales of securities would not be allowed until 20 calendar days after the last publication or delivery of the document or broadcast. Regulation A would be amended where appropriate so that its “test the waters” provisions would operate in a parallel fashion.

5. Relief From Section 12(g) Registration for Small Issuers

The Commission proposed amendments to its rules under the Exchange Act governing the total assets threshold for entry into and exit from the full disclosure system.¹⁵⁶ Under the proposals, issuers would be required to register pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Exchange Act if they have 500 shareholders of record and \$10 million in total assets, an increase from the current asset threshold of \$5 million. Rules relating to exiting from the Exchange Act reporting system also would be revised to allow issuers to cease reporting if they drop below a total assets threshold of \$10 million, wherever the present standard is \$5 million.

6. Reduction of Rule 144 Holding Period

The Commission proposed amendments to the holding period requirements contained in Rule 144 under the Securities Act to permit resales of “restricted” securities after a one-year, rather than a two-year holding period.¹⁵⁷ Also under the proposal, securities held by non-affiliated security holders could be resold without restriction after a holding period of two, rather than three years. These proposals are designed to decrease the costs associated with private capital raising by reducing the discount arising from the length of the holding period. The Commission also requested comment on whether Rule 144 should be revised to address new trading strategies, such as equity swaps and reminded Section 16 insiders of their obligations to report equity swap transactions.

7a. Streamlining Disclosure Requirements Relating to Significant Business Acquisitions

The Commission issued a release proposing amendments to the financial statement requirements for significant acquisitions to eliminate the requirements to provide audited financial statements for pending and recently completed business acquisitions in Securities Act registration statements, other than registrations by “blank check companies.”¹⁵⁸ The proposed rules are intended generally to allow issuers to provide information about significant acquisitions in Securities Act registration statements on the same time schedule as for Exchange Act reporting, thereby alleviating the need for such issuers to forego public offerings and to undertake private or offshore offerings. In addition, the proposed rules would provide an automatic waiver of the earliest year of required financial statements for completed acquisitions that do not exceed a specified significance level, if such audited financial statements are not readily available.

7b. Quarterly Reporting of Unregistered Equity Sales

In connection with a review of offshore capital raising practices, the Commission proposed amendments to its annual and quarterly reporting forms for domestic issuers that would require disclosure of unregistered sales of equity securities during the previous fiscal quarter.¹⁵⁹ The proposed amendments are

limited to unregistered sales of common equity securities (and common equity equivalents) because of the significant market impact the issuance of such securities often has and the current lack of public information about such sales.

8. *Problematic Practices Under Regulation S*

The Commission issued an interpretation of Regulation S stating its views with respect to certain practices in connection with offers, sales and resales of securities purportedly made in offshore transactions in reliance on Regulation S.¹⁶⁰ The release discusses transactions in which circumstances indicate that securities are in essence being placed offshore temporarily to evade registration requirements with the result that the incidence of ownership of the securities never leaves the U.S. market or that a substantial portion of the economic risk relating thereto is left in or is returned to the U.S. market during the restricted period, or the transaction is such that there was no reasonable expectation that the securities could be viewed as actually coming to rest abroad. The release states that such transactions would not be covered by Regulation S or the safe harbors and would be found not to be an offer and sale outside the U.S. for purposes of the general statement, which provides that the regulatory requirements under Section 5 of the Securities Act shall be deemed not to apply to offers and sales of securities that occur outside the U.S.

The release also solicits comments on the need to amend Regulation S to deter abuses and requests general comments as to which types of companies are using Regulation S, how they are using it, and what mechanisms can be used to prevent abuse. The Commission specifically requested comment as to whether it should propose amendments to the safe harbor for primary offerings of domestic companies reporting under the Exchange Act that would (1) extend the 40-day restricted period, (2) exclude certain discounted offers, (3) restrict hedging and other risk shifting transactions during the restricted period, or (4) prohibit payment with certain types of non-recourse or other types of promissory notes where the expectation of repayment derives solely from the resale of securities.

Section 16

The Commission issued a release proposing amendments to the Section 16 rules,¹⁶¹ as part of its continuing effort to improve the regulatory scheme governing the reporting of certain insider holdings and transactions, as well as the recovery of short-swing profit. In 1994, the Commission solicited public comment on proposed amendments to this regulatory scheme,¹⁶² and solicited further comment in September 1994 as to the treatment of instruments that may be settled only in cash.¹⁶³ The most recent release proposes an alternative amendment to Rule 16b-3 that would exempt virtually all transactions between an issuer and its officers and directors, in addition to an amendment to the rule exempting transactions in dividend or interest reinvestment plans that would reduce regulatory burdens. Comment also was solicited as to whether the Commission should recommend that Congress rescind Section 16(b) of the

Exchange Act. The comment period on the earlier releases was extended to comport with the close of the comment period relating to this release, and both the 1994 and 1995 proposals will be considered by the Commission.

Electronic Data Gathering, Analysis, and Retrieval System (EDGAR)

In view of the statutory requirement that the Commission certify that electronic filings from a significant test group of filers were received and reviewed for a period of six months before mandating electronic filing for all registrants, the staff undertook a comprehensive study of the test period results. Following its review of the study, which concluded that provision of information through the EDGAR system is at least as efficient and effective as through paper filings, the Commission adopted as final the rules that had been applicable to electronic filing during the statutorily mandated significant test period and made them applicable to all domestic registrants and third parties filing with respect to those registrants.¹⁶⁴ Phase-in of registrants into the electronic filing system recommenced on January 30, 1995, and proceeded as outlined in a revised phase-in schedule, with completion of phase-in set for May 1996. Minor amendments to the electronic filing rules also were adopted to reflect the staff's experience with the rules since mandated electronic filing began in 1993. On September 28, 1995, the Commission instituted its Internet World Wide Web site, which includes EDGAR filings as well as certain Commission releases and announcements.

Public Hearings on Safe Harbor for Forward-looking Statements

The Commission issued a concept release in 1994 regarding disclosure of forward-looking information and the effectiveness of the safe-harbor provisions for that type of disclosure.¹⁶⁵ The release solicited comment from the public on various alternatives to the safe harbor provision that have been proposed by several persons and announced public hearings to address these issues further in a public forum. The hearings were held in Washington, D.C. on February 13, 1995, and in San Francisco, California on February 16, 1995.

Legal Proceedings Involving Directors, Executive Officers, Significant Shareholders and Others

The Commission proposed amendments that would expand disclosure requirements relating to legal proceedings involving management, promoters, control persons, and others by enlarging the classes of legal proceedings that are subject to disclosure and by extending the period during which such disclosure is required from the current five to ten years.¹⁶⁶ The proposals also would make uniform all such requirements found in various forms, schedules, and reports.

Conferences

SEC Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation

The fourteenth annual SEC Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation was held in Providence, Rhode Island on September 13-14, 1995. Approximately 150 small business representatives, accountants, attorneys, and government officials attended the forum. Numerous recommendations were formulated with a view to eliminating unnecessary governmental impediments

to small businesses' ability to raise capital. A final report will be provided to interested persons, including Congress and regulatory agencies, setting forth a list of recommendations for legislative and regulatory changes approved by the forum participants.

SEC/NASAA Conference Under Section 19(c) of the Securities Act

The twelfth annual federal/state uniformity conference was held in Washington, D.C. on March 27, 1995. Approximately 60 SEC officials met with approximately 60 representatives of the North American Securities Administrators Association to discuss methods of effecting greater uniformity in federal and state securities matters. After the conference, a final report summarizing the discussions was prepared and distributed to interested persons and participants.

Committees and Task Forces

Advisory Committee on Capital Formation

In 1995, the Commission established an Advisory Committee on the Capital Formation and Regulatory Processes, reflecting the Commission's continuing efforts to minimize regulatory burdens while maximizing investor protection. The Committee is considering fundamental issues relating to the regulatory framework governing the capital formation process, such as whether Commission rules should provide for registration of companies rather than securities.

Task Force on Disclosure Simplification

An internal Task Force on Disclosure Simplification initiated a "top to bottom" review of all forms and disclosure requirements relating to securities offerings and disclosure obligations of public companies. The purpose of the review is to streamline and simplify regulations, including the elimination of any requirements that have outlived their usefulness.

Accounting and Auditing Matters

The Chief Accountant is the principal adviser to the Commission on accounting and auditing matters arising from the administration of the various securities laws. The primary Commission activities designed to achieve compliance with the accounting and financial disclosure requirements of the federal securities laws include:

- *rulemaking and interpretation that supplements private-sector accounting standards, implements financial disclosure requirements, and establishes independence criteria for accountants;*
- *review and comment process for agency filings directed to improving disclosures in filings, identifying emerging accounting issues (which may result in rulemaking or private sector standard-setting), and identifying problems that may warrant enforcement actions;*
- *enforcement actions that impose sanctions and serve to deter improper financial reporting by enhancing the care with which registrants and their accountants analyze accounting issues; and*
- *oversight of private sector efforts, principally by the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) and the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), which establish accounting and auditing standards designed to improve financial accounting and reporting and the quality of audit practice.*

Key 1995 Results

The Commission continued its involvement in initiatives directed toward reducing the disparities that currently exist between different countries' accounting and auditing standards. During 1995, the International Accounting Standards Committee (IASC) developed a work plan that, upon successful completion, would result in a comprehensive core set of international accounting standards. Target date for completion of the work plan is June 1999; however, efforts are underway to accelerate that timetable, possibly by as much as a year.

Accounting-Related Rules and Interpretations

The agency's accounting-related rules and interpretations supplement private-sector accounting standards, implement financial disclosure requirements, and establish independence criteria for accountants. The agency's principal accounting requirements are embodied in Regulation S-X, which governs the form and content of financial statements filed with the SEC.

Debt Extinguishment. The staff issued interpretive guidance regarding the period in which a gain or loss should be recognized on the early extinguishment of debt.¹⁶⁷ The guidance was issued in response to divergent

reporting practices by public companies by which certain companies were recognizing such a gain or loss in a period earlier than the period in which the debt is considered extinguished.

Oversight of Private-Sector Standard-Setting

The SEC monitors the structure, activity, and decisions of the private-sector standard-setting organizations, which include the FASB. The Commission and its staff worked closely with the FASB in an ongoing effort to improve the standard-setting process, including the need to respond to various regulatory, legislative, and business changes in a timely and appropriate manner. A description of FASB activities in which the staff was involved is provided below.

During 1995, the FASB completed work on an exposure draft of a proposed standard that would specify when entities should be included in consolidated financial statements.¹⁶⁸ The proposed standard would require a controlling entity to consolidate all entities deemed to be under its control unless such control is temporary. For purposes of this requirement, control of an entity is defined as representing the power to use or direct the use of the individual assets of another entity in essentially the same ways as the controlling entity can use its own assets. If adopted as proposed, the new standard would represent a significant change from existing practice in which consolidation policy generally is based on the existence of majority voting interests.

In another consolidations-related project, the FASB continued its joint undertaking with the Accounting Standards Board of the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA) to consider the current reporting requirements under *Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 14, "Financial Reporting for Segments of a Business Enterprise."* An exposure draft that would establish common standards on disaggregated disclosures was issued after year-end.

In 1995, the FASB adopted a new standard on accounting for impairment of long-lived assets.¹⁶⁹ Under the new standard, long-lived assets and certain identifiable intangibles to be held and used by an entity are reviewed for impairment whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying amount of an asset may not be recoverable. The approach set forth in the new standard is referred to as a "two-step" method because the test for recognition of impairment is different than the measurement of the impairment loss. Recognition of impairment occurs if the sum of the future cash flows expected to result from the use of the asset and its eventual disposition (an undiscounted measure) is less than the asset's carrying amount. However, the impairment loss would be measured by the amount by which the asset's carrying amount exceeds its fair value. The standard represents the culmination of a long range project that is expected to narrow the range of divergent financial reporting practices in this area.

The FASB also issued a final standard on accounting for stock compensation.¹⁷⁰ *Statement 123, Accounting for Stock-Based Compensation*, encourages companies to adopt a new accounting method that recognizes the cost of stock option awards based on estimated fair value at grant date. Alternatively, companies may elect to continue to follow the existing accounting requirements set forth in Accounting

Principles Board Opinion No. 25, which generally do not result in an expense charge for most options. Companies electing to continue to apply Opinion 25 would be required to provide footnote disclosure of the effect on net income had the company recognized expense based on estimated fair value at grant date. The statement becomes effective for calendar year 1996.

The FASB made progress during 1995 on its major long-term project to address financial instruments and off-balance sheet financing issues. The FASB is pursuing an approach to accounting for derivative instruments and hedging that it believes would improve the current accounting for those instruments. Under the FASB's approach, entities would select among two options, both of which would rely on fair value measurements. The determination of fair value would be based on the valuation guidance provided in FASB Statement 107, *Disclosures about Fair Value of Financial Instruments*, adopted in an earlier phase of this project. In a related action, the FASB issued an exposure draft to provide for more consistent reporting of securitizations and other financial transactions in which financial assets are transferred in exchange for cash or other assets.¹⁷¹ The proposed standard addresses determining when financial assets should be considered sold and derecognized from the balance sheet and when related revenues and expenses should be recognized.

During 1995, Congress considered litigation reform issues that impact the accounting profession. These issues include, among others, class action reforms, the shifting from one party to another of litigation costs and expenses, proportionate liability, substantive standards for accountants' liability, and safe harbors for disclosures of forward-looking information. The Senate bill and the House of Representatives bill took different approaches to these issues.¹⁷² Both bills, however, included provisions that would (1) codify the Commission's authority to set auditing standards related to illegal acts, related party transactions, and the evaluation of an entity as a going concern and (2) require auditors to report certain uncorrected illegal acts of registrants to the Commission. The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 which included these provisions was enacted after year-end.

In addition, the Commission has responded to Congressional interest in streamlining disclosure requirements¹⁷³ by, among other things, initiating a project to reexamine Regulation S-X for possible outdated accounting provisions or provisions that may not be necessary because they duplicate generally accepted accounting principles.

Finally, Congressional interest in the accounting for derivative instruments continued in 1995. Commission testimony stressed the need for sound financial statements of issuers of derivative instruments.¹⁷⁴

The FASB's Emerging Issues Task Force (EITF), in which the Commission's Chief Accountant participates, continued to identify and resolve accounting issues. During 1995, the EITF reached consensus on a number of issues, including questions relating to accounting for financial instruments, revenue recognition, and business combinations, thereby narrowing divergent reporting practices of public companies. Also during 1995, the EITF formed an Agenda Committee in response to recommendations made by an FASB Committee to Review the EITF.

Oversight of the Accounting Profession's Initiatives

The Commission and its staff continued to be active in overseeing the auditing standard-setting process and other activities of the accounting profession. A discussion of the activities in which the SEC staff was involved follows.

AICPA. The SEC oversaw various activities of the accounting profession conducted primarily through the AICPA. These included (1) the Auditing Standards Board (ASB), which establishes generally accepted auditing standards; (2) the Accounting Standards Executive Committee (AcSEC), which provides guidance through its issuance of statements of position and practice bulletins and prepares issue papers on accounting topics for consideration by the FASB; and (3) the SEC Practice Section (SECPS), which seeks to improve the quality of audit practice by member accounting firms that audit the financial statements of public companies through various requirements, including peer review.

ASB. The staff continued to work closely with the ASB to enhance the effectiveness of the audit process. The ASB issued a series of annual Audit Risk Alerts to provide auditors with an overview of recent economic, professional, and regulatory developments that may affect 1995 year-end audits.

SECPS. Two programs administered by the SECPS are designed to ensure that the financial statements of SEC registrants are audited by accounting firms with adequate quality control systems. A peer review of member firms by other accountants is required every three years and the Quality Control Inquiry Committee (QCIC) reviews on a timely basis the quality control implications of litigation against member firms that involves public clients. The staff coordinates closely with the Public Oversight Board (POB) in performing its oversight of the two programs. The POB, which is independent of the AICPA (except for funding), also engages in other activities directed towards improvements in the financial reporting process.¹⁷⁵

The Commission exercises oversight of the SECPS through frequent contacts with the POB and members of the executive, peer review, and QCICs of the SECPS. The staff each year selects a random sample of peer reviews and evaluates selected working papers of the peer reviewers and the related POB files. This oversight has shown that the peer review process contributes significantly to improving the quality control systems of member firms and, therefore, enhances the consistency and quality of practice before the Commission.

Closed case summaries prepared by the QCIC and related POB oversight files are also reviewed by SEC staff. This review and discussions with the POB and QCIC staff provide SEC staff with enough information to conclude that the QCIC process provides added assurances, as a supplement to the peer review process, that major quality control deficiencies, if any, are identified and addressed on a timely basis. Therefore, the Commission believes that the QCIC process benefits the public interest.

AcSEC. The AcSEC issued a statement of position calling for enhanced footnote disclosures about risks and uncertainties.¹⁷⁶ Also during 1995, the AcSEC issued an exposure draft of a proposed accounting guide on environmental liabilities.¹⁷⁷

Special Committee. In addition, the AICPA's Special Committee on Financial Reporting issued a comprehensive report which focuses on the financial information needs of users.¹⁷⁸ The report of the Special Committee, also referred to as the "Jenkins" Committee in recognition of its chairman, Edmund Jenkins, makes certain recommendations to enhance the utility of business reporting. However, since the Special Committee is not a standard-setting body, its recommendations will be considered by accounting standard setters, predominately the FASB and by regulators, such as the SEC. The FASB plans to issue an Invitation to Comment on the recommendations of the Special Committee, as well as those made by the Association for Investment Management and Research (AIMR) in its White Paper entitled "Financial Reporting in the 1990s and Beyond."

International Accounting and Auditing Standards

Significant differences in accounting and auditing standards currently exist between countries. These differences are an impediment to multinational offerings of securities. The SEC, in cooperation with other members of the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO), actively participated in initiatives by international bodies of professional accountants to establish appropriate international standards that might be considered for use in multinational offerings. In 1995, the IASC issued a standard on disclosure and presentation of financial instruments.¹⁷⁹ Work also continued on major projects addressing recognition and measurement issues related to financial instruments,¹⁸⁰ earnings per share,¹⁸¹ intangible assets,¹⁸² reporting financial information by business segments,¹⁸³ income taxes,¹⁸⁴ presentation of financial statements,¹⁸⁵ and accounting for retirement and other employee benefit costs.¹⁸⁶

In August 1993, the Working Party informed the IASC of the necessary core accounting standards that would comprise a comprehensive body of principles for enterprises (not in a specialized industry) undertaking cross-border offerings and listings. In June 1994, the Working Party provided the IASC with its evaluation of the acceptability of existing and recently improved IASC standards and identified the projects that would be necessary to complete the development of a core set of standards. In July 1995, the IASC and IOSCO's Technical Committee announced that the Board of the IASC has developed a work plan that the Technical Committee agrees will result, upon successful completion, in International Accounting Standards (IAS) comprising a comprehensive core of standards. Completion of comprehensive core standards that are acceptable to the Technical Committee will allow the Technical Committee to recommend endorsement of IAS for cross-border capital raising and listing purposes in all global markets. Completion of the work plan is estimated to be June 1999. Efforts are underway to accelerate that work plan, possibly by as much as a year.

In addition to the existing projects in process, the work plan includes planned projects on accounting in interim periods, discontinued operations, provisioning and contingencies, leases, research and development, impairment, investments, and goodwill.

In December 1994, the Commission eliminated the need to reconcile the differences that would result from the application of SFAS No. 52, *Foreign Currency Translation*, if the issuer accounts for its operations in hyperinflationary economies using the historical cost/constant currency method in accordance with IAS 21, *The Effects of Changes in Foreign Exchange Rates*.¹⁸⁷ This followed a 1994 action in which the Commission revised financial statement requirements so that foreign private issuers may now submit, without reconciliation, a cash flow statement prepared in accordance with IAS 7, *Cash Flow Statements*. Also, the Commission proposed to eliminate the requirements to reconcile certain differences attributable to the method of accounting for a business combination (pooling of interests or purchase) and the amortization period of goodwill and negative goodwill, provided that the financial statements comply with IAS 22, *Business Combinations*.¹⁸⁸

In the auditing arena, the staff closely monitored the efforts of the International Auditing Practices Committee (IAPC) of the International Federation of Accountants to codify the International Standards on Auditing (ISAs). As a result of its oversight, the staff became concerned with the introduction of black lettering, which resulted in portions of the standards that were deemed by the IAPC to represent "basic principles and essential procedures" being presented in bold type. As a result, uncertainty was introduced into the standards regarding the amount of work to be performed by an auditor in order to represent that his or her audit complied with the ISAs. The staff's concerns were communicated to IOSCO and, through IOSCO, to the IAPC. The IAPC did not address IOSCO's concerns in its final standards. As a result, IOSCO was unable to reach a consensus to endorse the codified ISAs. The staff has advised the IAPC that additional changes to the final codified standards are necessary before the staff would recommend that the Commission support an IOSCO endorsement of the ISAs.

Other Litigation and Legal Activities

The General Counsel represents the Commission in all litigation in the United States Supreme Court and the courts of appeals. The General Counsel defends the SEC and its employees when sued in district courts, prosecutes administrative disciplinary proceedings against attorneys, appears amicus curiae in significant private litigation involving the federal securities laws, and oversees the regional offices' participation in corporate reorganization cases. The General Counsel analyzes legislation that would amend the federal securities laws or other laws affecting the work of the agency, drafts congressional testimony, prepares legislative comments, and advises the Commission on issues arising from the agency's regulatory and enforcement activities including all public releases and rule proposals. In addition, the General Counsel advises the Commission in administrative proceedings under various statutes, and advises the Commission and prepares both opinions with respect to appeals from administrative law judges' decisions and self-regulatory organizations'(SRO) disciplinary actions, and orders resolving related motions.

Key 1995 Results

Issues of major importance were litigated in 1995 in cases in which the Commission participated, either as a party or as *amicus curiae*. In *Mastrobuono v. Shearson Lehman Hutton, Inc.*,¹⁸⁹ the United States Supreme Court held that inclusion of a New York choice of law provision in a broker-dealer's arbitration agreement with its customers does not bar arbitrators from awarding punitive damages that would otherwise have been available in a court. In *Gustafson v. Alloyd Co.*,¹⁹⁰ the United States Supreme Court held that Section 12(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 (Securities Act) applies only to public offerings of securities by the issuer or controlling persons of the issuer. In *Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc.*,¹⁹¹ the Supreme Court held that the part of Section 27A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Exchange Act) that allowed the reinstatement of certain private actions after dismissal on statute of limitations grounds was an unconstitutional violation of the separation of powers doctrine. The Commission participated as *amicus curiae* in the foregoing cases. In *Blount v. SEC*,¹⁹² the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upheld, against constitutional challenge, the Commission's approval of Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board Rule G-37, which imposes limitations on the activities of certain municipal securities dealers who contribute to issuer officials or who solicit or coordinate contributions on behalf of those officials.

The SEC continued to handle a large number and a wide variety of legislative matters in 1995. The SEC testified, and the staff provided technical and other assistance, with respect to bills addressing such subjects as revision

of the private securities litigation system, Glass-Steagall repeal, regulatory reform, repeal of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (Holding Company Act), the regulation of municipal securities, and a proposed merger of the SEC and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC).

A record 74 new appeals were filed with the Commission in 1995. The adjudicatory staff kept pace with its 1994 output by submitting to the Commission a total of 82 draft opinions and orders resolving substantive motions.

Significant Litigation Developments

Arbitration

In *Mastrobuono v. Shearson Lehman Hutton, Inc.*,¹⁹³ the United States Supreme Court, as urged by the SEC as *amicus curiae*, held that inclusion of a New York choice of law provision in a broker-dealer's arbitration agreement with its customers does not bar arbitrators from awarding punitive damages that would otherwise have been available in a court, even though New York decisional law does not permit punitive damages to be awarded by an arbitrator.

Scope of Section 12(2) of the Securities Act

In *Gustafson v. Alloyd Co.*,¹⁹⁴ the United States Supreme Court held that Section 12(2) of the Securities Act applies only to public offerings of securities by the issuer or controlling persons of the issuer. The SEC, as *amicus curiae*, had contended that Section 12(2) applies to all types of sales. Section 12(2) gives buyers a right of rescission against sellers who make false or misleading representations.

Statutes of Limitation

In *Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc.*,¹⁹⁵ the Supreme Court held, contrary to the position urged by the SEC as *amicus curiae*, that part of Section 27A of the Exchange Act was unconstitutional on the ground that it violated the separation of powers doctrine. Section 27A, which had two parts, had been enacted to prevent retroactive application of the one-year/three-year statute of limitations the Court had adopted in *Lampf, Pleva, Lipkind, Prupis and Petigrow v. Gilbertson*.¹⁹⁶ The part of Section 27A that the Court invalidated allowed private actions under Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act to be reinstated even though they had been finally dismissed prior to enactment of Section 27A.

Regulation of Municipal Securities

In *Blount v. SEC*,¹⁹⁷ the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upheld the validity of Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board Rule G-37, which imposes limitations on the activities of certain municipal securities dealers who contribute to issuer officials or who solicit or coordinate contributions on behalf of those officials. The court found that the Rule did not violate the First Amendment, was not impermissibly vague, and did not violate the Tenth Amendment.

In *United States v. Rudi*,¹⁹⁸ the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, as urged by the SEC as *amicus curiae*, refused to dismiss an indictment charging the independent financial adviser to a New Jersey county with securities fraud. The court held that Rudi's failure to disclose kickbacks he allegedly received from the underwriter of the county's bonds was "in connection with" the sale of the bonds for purposes of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act. The court also rejected Rudi's assertion that Section 10(b) does not apply to a transaction between an issuer and its underwriter.

Proxy Rules—Shareholder Proposals

In *NYCERS v. SEC*,¹⁹⁹ the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reversed a district court order regarding a SEC no-action letter interpreting the "ordinary business" exception contained in the Commission's shareholder proxy proposal rule, holding, as urged by the Commission, that a no-action letter does not have the binding force of law and therefore is not a legislative rule requiring notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act. The court also dismissed plaintiffs' claim against the Commission that the position taken in the no-action letter was arbitrary and capricious, holding that shareholders who disagree with that interpretation have the adequate judicial remedy of suing a company that refuses to include a shareholder proposal.

Violation of Anti-Fraud Provisions

In *SEC v. Maio*,²⁰⁰ the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit affirmed a district court decision finding that the defendants had engaged in fraudulent insider trading. In so doing, the Court joined the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second and Tenth circuits in holding that the SEC had validly exercised its rulemaking authority in adopting Exchange Act Rule 14e-3,²⁰¹ which prohibits insider trading in connection with a tender offer.

In *SEC v. Lauer*,²⁰² the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit held that a program falsely represented as involving the use of commingled investor funds for trading "prime bank" instruments constituted a security and was properly enjoined as involving fraud in the sale of those securities.

Requests for Access to Commission Records

The Commission received approximately 100 subpoenas for documents and testimony in 1995. In some of these cases, the Commission declined to produce the requested documents or testimony because the information sought was privileged. The Commission's assertions of privilege were upheld in every instance when the party issuing the subpoena challenged the assertion in court.

The Commission received 2,389 requests under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) for access to agency records. There were 64 appeals to the SEC's General Counsel from initial denials by the FOIA Officer. Three actions were brought in federal court challenging Commission decisions under the FOIA. One case was withdrawn by the plaintiff; the second is pending. In the third case, the requester sought review of the FOIA Officer's initial denial of a request

without first appealing to the Commission. The court granted the Commission's motion for summary judgment and the requester has appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.²⁰³

Motions to Vacate Permanent Injunctions

In *SEC v. Worthen*, John Worthen moved to vacate a permanent injunction entered against him in 1974. Worthen, a twice-convicted securities law violator, argued that his injunction should be vacated primarily because it was entered upon his default. The Commission opposed Worthen's motion, arguing that Worthen's injunction was valid and noted that Worthen pled guilty to criminal contempt of the injunction in 1989. Worthen's motion was denied without opinion. Worthen's appeal is pending.²⁰⁴

In *SEC v. Calvo*, William Calvo moved to vacate a permanent injunction entered against him in 1988.²⁰⁵ The injunction arose out of Calvo's participation, as underwriter's counsel, in a public offering. The court vacated the permanent injunction on the grounds that, in light of the effects of the injunction, its continuance constituted fundamental unfairness.

Motions for Attorneys' Fees Under the Equal Access to Justice Act

Applications for attorneys' fees aggregating approximately \$2 million were filed by defendants in four Commission enforcement actions in which the Commission did not obtain all or certain of the relief it sought against a particular defendant. Three of those applications were denied, as the court found that the Commission was substantially justified in bringing the action or that the defendant did not otherwise qualify for an award of fees.²⁰⁶ In one of those cases, *SEC v. Littler*, the court denied Equal Access to Justice Act fees because even though the court declined to issue an injunction against him, Littler was found to have violated the federal securities laws and thus was not a prevailing party entitled to fees. The fourth is pending.

Actions Against the Commission and the Staff

Numerous court actions, seeking millions of dollars in the aggregate, were brought against the Commission and its staff alleging constitutional, statutory, and common law tort violations in connection with the conduct of various enforcement investigations. All of these actions were dismissed except one, in which a summary judgment motion on behalf of the staff member is pending.²⁰⁷

Actions Under the Right to Financial Privacy Act

In FY 1995, 30 actions were filed against the Commission in federal district court pursuant to the Right to Financial Privacy Act (RFPA). The movants in these cases sought to quash Commission subpoenas to financial institutions for the movants' bank account records. In each of the cases decided, the court denied the motion to quash and ordered the subpoena enforced, finding a demonstrable reason to believe that the subpoenaed records were relevant to a legitimate law enforcement inquiry and that the staff had complied with the procedural requirements of the RFPA. The remainder of the cases are pending or were withdrawn.

Asset Freezes

In *Colello v. SEC*, the court held that the Swiss-United States Treaty on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters—which enables U.S. law enforcement agencies to freeze an individual’s Swiss assets—violates the Fourth and Fifth Amendments to the United States Constitution.²⁰⁸ In so doing, the court rejected the government’s argument that the Swiss appeals process established pursuant to the Treaty provides an individual whose Swiss assets have been frozen with an adequate opportunity to challenge the basis for a freeze for purposes of the Due Process Clause. The court also rejected the government’s argument that the “reasonable suspicion” standard—pursuant to which Swiss asset freezes may be executed under the Treaty—is reasonable for purposes of the Fourth Amendment.

Challenges to Commission Rules

In *U.S. Securities Corporation v. SEC*, the court dismissed a petition for a writ of mandamus requiring the Commission to exempt petitioners from membership in the National Association of Securities Dealers (NASD) and from certain broker-dealer reporting and net capital requirements because petitioner was a small business. The court also dismissed the request for a declaratory judgment that Section 15(b)(8) of the Exchange Act, which requires all broker-dealers to be members of a national securities association, is unconstitutional.

In *Britton v. Chalsty*, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation that a declaratory judgment action against the Commission be dismissed. The Magistrate Judge found, as urged by the Commission, that the district court lacked jurisdiction to consider whether Commission Rule 17a-3, which directs broker-dealers to seek arrest information from persons applying to become associated persons, violates Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Magistrate Judge concluded that Section 25(b)(1) of the Exchange Act provides that United States courts of appeals have exclusive jurisdiction over challenges to Commission rules or orders.

Significant Adjudication Developments

The staff submitted to the Commission 82 draft opinions and orders resolving substantive motions, consistent with 1994’s record 81 draft opinions and orders. The staff resolved by delegated authority another 72 motions. The Commission issued 57 opinions and 34 related orders.

Seventy-four new appeals were filed with the Commission in 1995, exceeding the record 71 received in 1993. A higher percentage of the Commission’s adjudication docket than in prior years now is represented by appeals from decisions of administrative law judges, including decisions in Commission Rule 2(e) proceedings against accountants.

Joint Arrangement under the Investment Company Act of 1940

For the first time in recent years, the Commission addressed in an adjudicatory decision the reach of Section 17(d) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (Investment Company Act) and Rule 17d-1 thereunder. These provisions require prior Commission approval of any joint arrangement involving an investment

company and an affiliated person. In *Sequoia Partners, L.P.*, the Commission declined to approve a joint arrangement between Counselors Tandem Securities Fund, Inc. (the Fund), and Sequoia Partners, L.P. (Sequoia), a partnership that had acquired over 25 percent of the Fund's common stock.²⁰⁹ The Fund and Sequoia had executed a settlement agreement that required the Fund both to make a tender offer for its common shares at 95 percent of net asset value (NAV), and to reimburse Sequoia for \$240,000 of expenses that Sequoia incurred in a proxy contest with the Fund. The Commission rejected the application to approve the reimbursement as untimely, as the Fund already had placed the \$240,000 at issue in escrow. The Commission further concluded that Sequoia's effort to obtain reimbursement constituted overreaching by an affiliate, which is inconsistent with the Act's objective to prevent such self-dealing. Lastly, the Commission found that the proposed arrangement violated the "best price" requirement (Exchange Act Rule 13e-4(f)(8)(ii)) of the Commission's tender offer rules, because Sequoia thereby was to be paid almost 100 percent of NAV on tender of its shares while other shareholders were to be paid 95 percent of NAV on their tenders.

Acquisition Approved under the Holding Company Act

In its only Holding Company Act decision this year, the Commission granted two applications under that Act filed by Gaz Metropolitan, Inc. (GMLI) and Gaz Metropolitan and Company, Limited Partnership (GMLP), Canadian public companies.²¹⁰ Applicants sought, among other things, permission for GMLP to complete its acquisition of the stock of Northern New England Gas Corporation (NNEG), a Vermont exempt holding company that owns all the stock of Vermont Gas Systems, Inc. (VGS), a Vermont corporation that provides gas service in that state. In approving the acquisition under Section 10(c)(2) of the Holding Company Act, the Commission concluded that nothing in the Holding Company Act prevents a foreign company that does not own or control public utility or holding company securities from acquiring the securities of a domestic public utility company.

Sales Practice Abuses/Deficient Supervision

Again this year the Commission reviewed a number of cases finding sales practices abuses and deficient supervision. In *Dan A. Druz*,²¹¹ for example, the Commission found a branch manager of Shearson Lehman Brothers, Inc. to have failed reasonably to supervise and control the activities of a salesman who executed over 100 unauthorized trades in the accounts of three different customers.

In *Patricia A. Johnson*,²¹² the Commission found that a former branch manager of Paine Webber, Inc. failed to provide effective and reasonable supervision of a registered representative with a view towards preventing that person's violations of the antifraud provisions. Johnson disregarded firm procedures and ignored numerous "red flags," including several customers' complaints about the handling of their accounts, which included charges of misuse of customer funds. The Commission found that the limited action Johnson took against the representative—placing him on probation—was insufficient. Johnson

also had contended on appeal that this administrative proceeding was brought in violation of the federal statute of limitations contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2462. The Commission concluded that Section 2462 does not apply to proceedings brought under Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act that seek only remedial sanctions.

In another appeal of a law judge's decision, *Martin Herer Engelman, Peter Paul Kim, and Lawrence David Isen*,²¹³ the Commission found that a Stuart-James, Inc. branch manager and his two assistants engaged in pervasive fraud in their dealings with customers. Their misconduct included inducing customers to buy speculative securities with promises that these investments were safe and would result in tremendous gains within short periods of time, and withholding from customers information that investors in the recommended securities stood to lose their entire investment. The Commission barred all three respondents from association with any broker or dealer and entered cease and desist orders in this matter.

Unfair Commissions/Excessive and Fraudulent Markups

In *Atlanta-One, Inc., et al.*,²¹⁴ the Commission agreed with the NASD that commissions representing between 14 and 89 percent of customers' investments in foreign currency options traded by the firm were unfair. The Commission found that general proscriptions against gouging customers placed the respondents on notice that charging commissions at these rates was conduct inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade. The Commission accordingly sustained the censures, 30-day suspensions, fines, and requalification requirements the NASD had imposed for this misconduct.

Finally, in one of a number of disciplinary actions concerning retail markups on securities reviewed this year, *Hibbard, Brown & Co. et al.*,²¹⁵ the Commission found that an NASD member firm and its president and head trader charged customers excessive and fraudulent markups in thousands of sales of a common stock, generating over \$8.7 million in excessive profits in only eight trading days. The Commission concluded that these respondents violated a dealer's fundamental duty to treat its customers fairly when they arranged to acquire the stock at less than half the price that they were selling it to their retail customers. Concluding too that the inter-dealer market for the stock was the result of a "stage-managed performance" which produced wholly illusory prices, the Commission rejected the respondents' contention that the best evidence of the fairness of their retail prices was the numerous inter-dealer transactions in the stock. The Commission instead found that, because the firm was not a market-maker in the stock, the firm's contemporaneous cost of acquiring the stock provided the best evidence of prevailing market price. The Commission sustained the NASD's censures and fines of the three respondents and its determination to expel the firm from NASD membership and bar both the president and head trader from association with any member.

Significant Legislative Developments

Congress actively considered, but did not enact, a number of bills that would affect the work of the SEC. Most notably, (1) the House and Senate passed separate litigation reform measures; (2) a House bill was introduced to revise the federal securities laws and “deregulate” the United States capital markets; (3) a House bill was introduced to amend or supplement provisions of the Investment Company Act; (4) following extensive hearings, both the House Banking and the House Commerce Committees approved legislation to repeal the Glass-Steagall Act; (5) the House held hearings on proposals to repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act; (6) a Senate bill was introduced to delegate to the states the regulation of smaller investment advisers; (7) a bill was introduced and hearings held in the House regarding the merger of the SEC and the CFTC; (8) bills were introduced in the House and Senate regarding the exemption from the securities laws of charitable organizations that issue charitable gift annuities; and (9) three bills were introduced in the House and one in the Senate addressing the regulation of participants in the derivatives markets, and oversight hearings were held to explore the issue of Orange County, California’s derivatives-related losses. Legislative activity in most or all of these areas is expected to continue in 1996.

Securities Litigation Reform

House and Senate bills providing for the reform of the private securities litigation system were introduced in the opening days of the 104th Congress. Both H.R. 1058 (passed by the House in March 1995) and S. 240 (passed by the Senate in June 1995) contain provisions that would, among other things: eliminate certain abuses associated with class action lawsuits; eliminate civil racketeer influenced and corrupt organizations liability for securities law violations; replace joint and several liability with proportionate liability for defendants who act recklessly; and provide for an express right of contribution among co-defendants. Differences between the two bills exist with respect to such highly controversial issues as: the creation of statutory safe harbors for forward-looking statements; the codification of a definition of “recklessness;” pleading standards for fraud actions; and the availability of the fraud-on-the-market theory of liability. As of September 30, 1995, conferees had yet to be named to resolve the differences between the House and Senate bills.

In testimony earlier in the year before House and Senate committees on the respective bills, the SEC expressed support for efforts to make private securities litigation more effective and to deter meritless lawsuits. At the same time, the SEC opposed provisions that would (among other things) eliminate recklessness as a basis for liability, establish a broadly applied scheme of proportionate liability, and create an overly broad safe harbor for forward-looking statements.

Glass-Steagall Repeal

Two major Glass-Steagall reform proposals were introduced early in the 104th Congress. The House Banking and Commerce Committees both held hearings on and reported legislation (H.R. 1062) that would have, among other

things, (1) permitted banks to affiliate with securities firms through a holding company structure, and (2) taken some steps to bring certain bank securities activities within the federal securities regulatory scheme, but (3) nonetheless allowed banks to conduct a range of broker-dealer activities directly or through “separately identifiable departments or divisions” of the bank. The SEC testified before both Committees, reaffirming its long tradition of support for financial services modernization in the context of functional regulation.

As of September 30, 1995, H.R. 1062 had apparently been linked with another bill (H.R. 1858) that contained a variety of regulatory relief provisions and highly controversial provisions relating to bank insurance powers. It was unclear whether disagreements over the issue of bank insurance powers would prevent Glass-Steagall legislation from moving forward in fiscal 1996. For its part, the Senate did not actively take up the issue of Glass-Steagall reform in 1995, though early in the year Senator D’Amato introduced a bill to significantly broaden the scope of commercial as well as securities activities permitted for companies that own banks.

Securities Deregulation

H.R. 2131, the “Capital Markets Deregulation and Liberalization Act of 1995,” was introduced in the House in July 1995. The bill, which seeks to reduce regulatory overlap and lower the costs of raising capital, would, among other things: preempt most state securities regulation; redefine the suitability obligations of broker-dealers with respect to “institutional investors;” repeal much of the Williams Act (the statute regulating tender offers); relax prospectus delivery requirements under the Securities Act; grant the SEC general and specific exemptive authority under the Securities Act; repeal the Trust Indenture Act of 1939; and reduce the number of SEC Commissioners from five to three. No action had been taken on H.R. 2131 as of September 30, 1995; however, hearings on the measure were scheduled for November 1995.

Investment Adviser Regulation

The opening days of the 104th Congress saw the introduction of S. 148, the “Investment Advisers Integrity Act,” in the Senate. S. 148 would target specific amounts from the SEC’s budget that would have to be devoted to enforcement of the Advisers Act. The bill also would reallocate responsibility for regulation of investment advisers between the federal and state securities regulators; it would essentially exempt from registration with the SEC (and make the states responsible for regulating) investment advisers that manage less than \$5 million in assets. Under the bill, the SEC would retain authority to investigate allegations of fraud involving any investment adviser, whether registered with the SEC or with a state regulator. The SEC also would have discretionary rulemaking authority to require SEC registration of investment advisers that manage between \$1 million and \$5 million in assets. The Senate, however, took no action on S. 148 in 1995, and no comparable legislation was introduced in the House.

Investment Company Act Amendments

H.R. 1495, the “Investment Company Act Amendments of 1995,” was introduced in April 1995. Incorporating a number of recommendations from a 1992 SEC staff report, the bill seeks to modernize aspects of investment company operation and regulation. H.R. 1495 would, among other things: except from regulation under the Investment Company Act investment pools that include only highly sophisticated purchasers, and streamline the existing exception for “private” investment companies; require a majority of fund directors to be independent; reduce the number of shares necessary for approving certain important matters, such as advisory contracts and changes in a fund’s investment objective; give funds greater advertising flexibility; authorize the creation of a mutual fund with a single unified fee covering all fund services and most expenses; and lift restrictions on mutual funds making investments in other mutual funds in the same fund complex. No counterpart to H.R. 1495 was introduced in the Senate in 1995, and the House took no action on the bill prior to September 30, 1995; however, hearings were held in the House early in fiscal 1996.

Regulation of Public Utility Holding Companies

In June 1995, the SEC issued a staff report discussing the results of a one-year study of the Holding Company Act. The report contained three alternative legislative recommendations: (1) repeal of the Holding Company Act, accompanied by additional authority at the state and federal level for the continued protection of consumers; (2) outright repeal of the Act; or (3) full exemptive authority under the Act for the SEC. In testimony before subcommittees of the House Commerce Committee, the SEC expressed its preference for the first alternative—conditional repeal. Legislation embodying this recommendation was subsequently introduced in October 1995.

Separately, the Senate in 1995 considered and passed a telecommunications bill (S. 652), one small part of which would broaden the ability of registered public utility holding companies to diversify into telecommunications and information services, notwithstanding the prohibitions on diversification imposed by the Holding Company Act. House-passed telecommunications legislation (H.R. 1555), however, would not affect the ability of registered holding companies to engage in telecommunications or information services under the Holding Company Act.

SEC-CFTC Merger

H.R. 718, the “Markets and Trading Reorganization and Reform Act,” was introduced in January 1995 and was referred primarily to the House Banking Committee. The bill proposes to replace the SEC and the CFTC with a new, merged Markets and Trading Commission. The SEC testified before a subcommittee of the House Banking Committee regarding H.R. 718 in March 1995. The SEC testified that, while a merger of the two agencies might make sense in a number of ways, the benefits of such a merger do not at this point justify the time and political capital that would be needed to accomplish it. In addition, the SEC expressed concern about specific

provisions of the bill, which could make the transition to unified regulation very cumbersome. As of September 30, 1995, H.R. 718 had not been reported out of the Banking Committee.

Regulatory Reform

The 104th Congress considered numerous regulatory reform bills in 1995. In general, the bills considered would alter the way that all federal agencies, including the SEC, write and review rules. In a number of instances, the SEC testified and/or provided written statements describing the likely impact of specific bills on the agency's independence and its enforcement program.

In March 1995, the House passed H.R. 9 that would, among other things: compensate private property owners for certain regulatory restrictions that limit the use of their property; give the Office of Management and Budget an enhanced role in analyzing agency rulemakings under the Regulatory Flexibility Act; and require agencies to analyze benefits and costs in connection with their risk-assessment activities. (Paperwork reduction provisions, originally part of H.R. 9, were passed as a separate measure by both the House and Senate and signed into law as Pub. L. No. 104-13 in May 1995).

SEC 1996 Funding

The solution to the offsetting fee problem of the SEC's 1995 appropriation was understood to be a one-time, stopgap measure. Work on the SEC's 1996 appropriation, therefore, required agreement on a long-term approach to funding the agency. In June 1995, House Commerce Committee Chairman Bliley announced an agreement in principle with the chairmen of the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees on a long-term funding mechanism for the SEC. Under the agreement, securities registration fees would be gradually reduced, while funding from the United States Treasury general appropriation account for the agency would increase.

The House in July 1995 passed an appropriations bill (H.R. 2076) that generally reflected this agreement: it would provide the SEC with funding for 1996 at the \$297 million level that was in place for 1995 (and a securities registration fee rate of 1/29th of one percent in Section 6(b) of the Securities Act). The Senate Appropriations Committee, by contrast, in September 1995 approved a bill that would have cut the SEC's funding for 1996 by 20 percent from the 1995 level. The Senate subsequently passed legislation that would cut the SEC's appropriation by 10 percent. At the end of fiscal 1995, the SEC's funding still was uncertain, as was the funding for virtually all other federal agencies.

Other Legislation and Hearings

Bills also were introduced in the House and Senate in 1995 addressing, among other things, the regulation of participants in the derivatives markets and the disclosure obligations of issuers of municipal securities.

Corporate Reorganizations

The Commission, as a statutory adviser in reorganization cases under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, seeks to assure that the interests of public investors are adequately protected. During 1995, there were 120 active Chapter 11 cases involving public companies. The Commission entered a formal appearance in 13 cases with significant public investor interest. The Commission also was actively involved during 1995 as a statutory party in the *Orange County*²¹⁶ bankruptcy, the largest municipal bankruptcy ever filed under Chapter 9 of the Bankruptcy Code, in order to protect the holders of the County's public debt securities and the municipal bond market generally. The Commission sought in addition to prevent any disruption of trading in the wake of the bankruptcy filing.

Committees

Official committees negotiate with debtors on the formulation of reorganization plans and participate generally in all aspects of the case. The Bankruptcy Code provides for the appointment of an official committee for stockholders where necessary to assure adequate representation of their interests.

During 1995, the Commission sought to assure that committees were not hindered in their efforts to represent public investors, successfully objecting to attempts to dissolve the committee in *In re America West Airlines*,²¹⁷ and to limit the scope of the committee's activities in *In re UDC Homes*.²¹⁸ The Commission also reiterated its position that insider trading prohibitions apply to members of official committees, who frequently receive confidential information on a company's operations and prospects. In *In re County of Orange*,²¹⁹ *In re House of Fabrics, Inc.*,²²⁰ and *In re Baldwin Builders*,²²¹ the Commission supported the adoption of court orders permitting trading in the debtor's securities only by committee members that engage in securities trading in the regular course of their business and that implement procedures designed to prevent the misuse of inside information.

Disclosure Statements/Reorganization Plans

A disclosure statement is a combination proxy and offering statement used to solicit acceptances for a reorganization plan. Such plans often provide for the issuance of large quantities of new unregistered securities pursuant to an exemption from Securities Act registration contained in the Bankruptcy Code. During 1995, the staff reviewed 92 plans and disclosure statements and commented on 75. Recurring problems with disclosure statements included inadequate financial information, lack of disclosure on the issuance of unregistered securities and insider transactions, and plan provisions that contravene the Bankruptcy Code. Most of the staff's comments were adopted by the debtors without the need for formal Commission intervention.

In *In re Trans World Airlines*,²²² *In re Diversified, Inc.*,²²³ and *In re Phar-Mor, Inc.*²²⁴ the Commission objected to plan provisions that would have discharged third parties, such as officers and directors, from liabilities. This issue is of significance to investors because in many cases debtors seek to

use the Chapter 11 process to protect officers and directors from personal liability for various kinds of claims, including liability under the federal securities laws.

Enforcement Matters

Bankruptcy issues frequently arise in Commission enforcement actions. In *In re Bilzerian*,²²⁵ a case with significant implications for the enforcement program, the district court overruled a bankruptcy court order that had barred the Commission from bringing an action to have its \$33 million securities fraud disgorgement judgment excepted from discharge in Bilzerian's bankruptcy proceeding. In *In re Steven Weil*,²²⁶ the Commission blocked an attempt by a debtor to use the automatic stay of the Bankruptcy Code to prevent enforcement of a disgorgement order entered in a Commission law enforcement action.

Ethical Conduct Program

In 1995, the Ethics Office staff continued to respond to a demand for counseling services at the rate of approximately 20 new matters per week. These inquiries reflected unique or novel issues, while routine or repetitive inquiries were handled by ethics liaison officers and deputies located within each division and office.

Municipal Securities Initiatives

The Office of Municipal Securities (OMS) was established in 1995 as part of the Commission's overall effort to provide a core of expertise and coordination on urgent and ongoing municipal securities issues. OMS provides expertise to the Commission and staff members, assists on municipal securities enforcement cases, coordinates disclosure rules and other ongoing municipal regulatory initiatives, and addresses new issues that arise in the municipal securities area. In addition, OMS provides assistance in legislative matters and works directly with issuers, investors, brokers, dealers, municipal securities dealers, and other professionals on issues relating to municipal securities.

Key 1995 Results

The staff, together with the Office of the General Counsel, coordinated the SEC's participation in the Orange County, California municipal bankruptcy and related issues. The staff also worked with the Division of Enforcement, both in Washington and in the regional and district offices, providing technical assistance in the many municipal securities investigations and enforcement proceedings undertaken since the beginning of 1995. In addition, along with the Divisions of Market Regulation and Corporation Finance, the staff provided guidance to the municipal markets including issuer, broker, dealer, and municipal securities dealer organizations, in conjunction with the implementation of amendments to Rule 15c2-12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (Rule 15c2-12) concerning secondary market disclosure.

The staff appeared on behalf of the SEC before the House Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities and Government Sponsored Enterprises of the House Banking Committee and testified on the municipal securities markets in the aftermath of the Orange County, California bankruptcy.

Municipal Securities Disclosyre

The staff planned and organized the Commission's participation in a teleconference on municipal securities disclosure sponsored by the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA), the National Association of Counties, and the Public Securities Association (PSA). Chairman Arthur Levitt and SEC staff participated in the teleconference and provided general information and direction on municipal securities disclosure and the prudent management of public funds. Specific information also was provided on Rule 15c2-12. The teleconference provided information and responses to queries from municipal securities professionals, including issuers. Approximately 1,200 individuals participated in the live broadcast of the teleconference.

The staff worked to educate municipal market participants in the implementation of, and compliance with, amendments to Rule 15c2-12, which require secondary market disclosure. The staff also provided guidance to market participants regarding recent SEC enforcement decisions that apply the antifraud provisions of the federal securities laws to the municipal securities markets and professionals. In furtherance of this effort, the staff met with numerous organizations involved in the municipal finance industry.

Technical Assistance

In 1995, the staff provided support to Chairman Levitt's and Secretary of the Treasury Rubin's joint efforts to increase the awareness of local government financial officers of the need for the prudent management of public funds in today's markets. The staff, working through the Office of Legislative Affairs, also provided technical assistance to Congress on issues involving municipal securities, such as providing information on the investment of public funds, suitability requirements, and the municipal bankruptcy in Orange County, California.

The staff worked with the Division of Market Regulation on matters relating to the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (MSRB), including the implementation of MSRB rule G-37, which prohibits brokers, dealers, and municipal securities dealers from engaging in municipal securities business with issuers if certain political contributions have been made to officials of such issuers. In addition, the staff worked with the Divisions of Market Regulation and Corporation Finance on various issues surrounding the implementation of amendments to Rule 15c2-12.

The staff worked with the Office of the General Counsel on the municipal bankruptcy in Orange County, California, and other municipal securities matters; assisted the Office of Compliance Inspections and Examinations in oversight concerning municipal securities regulations; provided technical assistance to the Division of Investment Management on proposed rulemaking; and assisted the Office of Investor Education and Assistance on issues pertaining to individual investors and municipal securities price transparency.

OMS staff provided technical assistance to the Division of Enforcement on several municipal securities enforcement actions, including: *SEC v. Stifel, Nicolaus and Company, Inc.*, Litigation Release No. 14587 (August 3, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 2964; *SEC v. Goodman and Harold Tzinberg*, Litigation Release No. 14471 (April 18, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 0457; *SEC v. Terry D. Busbee and Preston C. Bynum*, Litigation Release No. 14387 (January 23, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 1949; and *SEC v. Nicholas A. Rudi, Joseph C. Salema, Public Capital Advisors, Inc. formerly known as Consolidated Financial Management, Inc., George L. Tuttle, Jr. and Alexander S. Williams*, Litigation Release No. 14421 (February 23, 1995), 58 Docket 2495.

Economic Research and Analysis

The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) provides the Commission and the operating divisions with the technical and analytical support necessary to understand and evaluate the economic effects of Commission regulatory policy. OEA plays a major role in the Commission's enforcement effort by applying economic and statistical tools to issues such as materiality and disgorgement.

Key 1995 Results

In 1995, the staff focused its efforts on a number of areas, including enforcement cases, mutual fund disclosure, and market structure issues. The staff provided technical assistance to the Division of Enforcement, designed a survey to evaluate investors' understanding of financial products, and analyzed various risk measures in connection with the Commission's release on mutual fund risk disclosure.

Economic Analysis and Technical Assistance

The staff assisted the Division of Enforcement in approximately 40 cases of insider trading, market manipulation, fraudulent financial reporting, and other violations of securities laws. This work generally involved the application of financial economics and statistical techniques to determine whether the elements of fraud are present and to estimate, where appropriate, the amount of disgorgement to be sought. In particular, the staff assisted in the development of data presented at trial in the action against First Jersey Securities, assisted in the taking of testimony in cases involving complex financial instruments, and assisted in evaluating reports of consultants and the testimony of experts hired by opposing parties. The staff also assisted the Division of Enforcement in several large-scale investigations.

The staff developed a survey, in cooperation with the Division of Investment Management (IM), aimed at learning what individual investors understand about financial products. Responses to a nationwide telephone survey of mutual fund owners were used to examine why investors choose particular mutual funds. The statistical analysis focused on relations between the type of fund and venue, purchase information, investment knowledge possessed by investors, and various demographic variables. This survey led to a Profile Prospectus focus-group program, which is currently being conducted by IM and several mutual fund families. The staff also provided an extensive statistical analysis of risk measures in support of IM's concept release on mutual fund risk disclosure.

The staff provided extensive statistical analysis for the Commission's Advisory Committee on Capital Formation and Regulatory Processes, which is considering company registration versus the registration of individual securities

offerings. This analysis addressed the costs of new issues and the volume of offerings, the effects of various possible thresholds for issuer participation in company registration, and the impact of SEC review of prospectuses.

The staff provided advice and a variety of statistical analyses, related to market structure issues, to the Commission and operating divisions. These included analyses of the impact of small order execution system trading activity on the NASDAQ market, New York Stock Exchange specialists' profitability and market participation, the effects of preferenced order flow and related pilot programs, execution quality, market fragmentation, and payment for order flow.

The staff continued to monitor the securities industry and developments in the domestic and international securities markets. In addition, the staff analyzed 90 rule proposals to assess their potential effects on small entities as required in the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980.

During the year, OEA initiated a variety of projects designed to expand the Commission's understanding of the capital markets. These projects are long-term in nature and focus on the use and economics of soft dollar commissions, price stabilization in the initial public offering aftermarket, the demand for proprietary trading systems, and the trading of American Depository Receipts and foreign securities in the over-the-counter market.

Policy Management and Administrative Support

Policy management and administrative support provide the Commission and operating divisions with the necessary services to accomplish the agency's mission. Policy management is provided by the executive staff, including the Office of Legislative Affairs; the Office of the Secretary; the Office of Public Affairs, Policy Evaluation and Research; the Office of the Executive Director; and the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity. The responsibilities and activities of policy management include developing and executing management policies, formulating and communicating program policy, overseeing the allocation and expenditure of agency funds, maintaining liaison with the Congress, disseminating information to the press, and facilitating Commission meetings.

Administrative support includes services such as accounting, financial management, fee collection, information technology management, data processing, space and facilities management, and human resources management. Under the direction of the Office of the Executive Director, these support services are provided by the Offices of the Comptroller, Information Technology, Administrative and Personnel Management, and Filings and Information Services.

Key 1995 Results

In 1995, the Commission held 55 meetings and considered 240 matters. Major activities of the Commission included amendments to streamline financial disclosure requirements for foreign and domestic issuers, public hearings on the safe harbors from liability for disclosure of "forward looking" information, rules to streamline prospectus delivery requirements to accommodate timing concerns raised by implementation of the trade date plus three days settlement standard (known as T+3), the establishment of a program of joint and coordinated examinations of broker-dealers and investment company activities, and rules to implement the EDGAR system.

The agency collected fees for the United States Treasury in excess of its appropriation for the thirteenth consecutive year. The SEC's total fee collections in 1995 were \$559 million and the net gain to the Treasury was \$292 million.

Policy Management

Commission Activities. During 55 Commission meetings held in 1995, the Commission considered 240 matters, including the proposal and adoption of Commission rules, enforcement actions, and other items that affect the

stability of the nation's capital markets and the economy. The Commission also acted on 1,027 staff recommendations by seriatim vote. Significant regulatory actions taken by the Commission included:

- proposing amendments to the National Market System rules on execution of customer orders by brokerage firms;
- adopting comprehensive revisions to its rules of practice for administrative proceedings;
- conducting hearings in Washington, D.C. and San Francisco, California on possibly amending current rules on safe harbors for corporate disclosure;
- proposing amendments to rules on codes of ethics for investment company personnel; and
- issuing a concept release on improving disclosure of risks by mutual funds and other investment companies.

Congressional interest in the agency's activities and initiatives remained high. The Commission and staff members testified at 16 congressional hearings during the year. In addition, the Congress actively considered a number of important issues under the Commission's jurisdiction. These were most notably:

- securities litigation reform;
- concerns relative to the municipal bond and government securities markets;
- proposals for regulatory reform;
- Glass-Steagall reform and financial services modernization;
- proposals to merge the SEC and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission;
- the regulation of public utility holding companies; and
- the SEC's appropriation.

Public Affairs. The Office of Public Affairs, Policy Evaluation and Research (OPAPER) communicated information on Commission activities to those interested in or affected by Commission actions, including the press, regulated entities, the general public, and SEC employees through ongoing programs and special projects. The office published the *SEC News Digest* daily, which provided information on rule changes, enforcement actions against individuals or corporate entities, administrative actions, litigation releases, acquisition reports, decisions on requests for exemptions, upcoming Commission meetings, and other events of interest. OPAPER published a regular newsletter, *The SEC Employee News*, and prepared a daily summary of news clips for agency employees. Special projects, such as support for activities related to the Chairman's investor education initiatives, the creation of the SEC's Internet Web site, and the agency's International Institute for Securities Markets Development were undertaken.

Many of the agency's actions are of national and international interest. When appropriate, these actions are brought to the attention of regional, national, and international press. The office issued 262 press releases on upcoming events, SEC programs, enforcement actions, and special projects.

In addition, the office responded to approximately 50,000 requests for specific information on the SEC or its activities. The office also coordinated visits of domestic and foreign officials to the SEC. In total, programs for 776 foreign visitors and 103 United States visitors were coordinated during the year.

Management Activities. The Office of the Executive Director continued to promote management controls and financial integrity and to manage audit follow-up requirements. The office continued to analyze the efficiency and effectiveness of operating divisions and support offices and to coordinate and implement the agency's compliance with and response to actions under the National Performance Review (NPR) and the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, including development of the agency's strategic plan. Working closely with other senior officials, the staff formulated the agency's budget submissions to the Office of Management and Budget and the Congress.

Equal Employment Opportunity. The Office of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) provided the agency with support for compliance with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967; the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and the Equal Pay Act of 1963. This support was provided through the office's compliance and affirmative employment activities.

The primary services provided by the compliance branch included counseling and dispute resolution, administrative fact-finding investigations, and final agency decisions on formal complaints of employment discrimination. In connection with the affirmative employment activity, the office participated in orientation programs for new employees and administered the Federal Women's Program, the Hispanic Employment Program, and the Black Employment Program and sponsored, along with the Office of Administrative and Personnel Management (OAPM), the SEC's Disability Issues Advisory Committee.

Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act. The Office of Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and Privacy Act Operations responded to requests for access to information pursuant to FOIA, the Privacy Act, and the Government in the Sunshine Act, and processed requests under the agency's confidential treatment rules. Confidential treatment requests were generally made in connection with proprietary corporate information and evaluated in conjunction with access requests to prevent the unwarranted disclosure of information exempt under the FOIA.

The agency received 2,430 FOIA requests and appeals, 12 Privacy Act requests and appeals, 42 Government in the Sunshine Act requests, 11 government referrals, and 8,300 requests and appeals for confidential treatment. All responses to FOIA, Privacy Act, and Government in the Sunshine Act requests were made within the statutory time-frame.

Administrative Support

Financial Management and Operations. In 1995, the SEC collected fees in excess of its appropriation. The SEC's total fee collections in 1995 were \$559 million, 188 percent of the agency's appropriated spending authority of \$297 million (which consisted of \$75 million in appropriated funds, an appropriation of \$192 million subject to reduction as offsetting fees were received, and \$30 million from a carry-over of prior year offsetting fee collections). The \$559 million in total fee collections, minus the SEC's current year spending authority of \$267 million (\$297 million less the \$30 million from prior year offsetting fee collections), resulted in a net gain of \$292 million to the United States Treasury.

The SEC's total fee revenue in 1995 was collected from four basic sources: registrations of securities under Section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 (comprising 71 percent of total fee collections), transactions of covered exchange listed securities (19 percent), tender offer and merger filings (7 percent), and miscellaneous filings (3 percent). Offsetting fee collections were generated from an increase in the fee rate under Section 6 (b) of the Securities Act from one-fiftieth of one percent to one-twenty-ninth of one percent.

During the year, the staff updated the agency's Five-Year Financial Management Plan. This plan responds to current financial system issues, recognizes new legislative and NPR requirements, and is consistent with the agency's information technology plan.

In other financial areas, the staff implemented a new Electronic Time and Attendance System, completed the testing of an off-the-shelf travel management software package, and replaced an imprest fund based travel advance program with an automated teller machine based system that uses the government credit card for travel advances.

Information Resources Management. The Office of Information Technology (OIT) continued to develop and enhance SEC information resources. Notably, full implementation of the Electronic Data Gathering, Analysis, and Retrieval (EDGAR) project continued to proceed smoothly. As of September 30, 1995, nearly 75 percent of all SEC registrants were filing all of their required material electronically. The last two groups of filers will enter the system in November 1995 and May 1996.

A conference was held on August 14, 1995 to solicit public input on how to improve and update the EDGAR system. In a further effort to solicit input from the public and the securities industry, the SEC published a Request for Information (RFI) in the *Commerce Business Daily* during the week of October 9, 1995. Questions included in this RFI were drawn from comments received at the August 14 conference.

The OIT continued implementing the agency's strategic automation modernization initiative. Several infrastructure improvements were implemented, including the upgrade of staff workstations and the enhancement of the local area network/wide area network. Upgraded personnel, payroll, and financial management systems were among the new systems implemented to enhance administrative functions.

Modifications to the agency's disaster recovery plans were initiated to provide the agency with fully integrated backup capabilities for its local area network and its mainframe computing resources, in the event of a disaster at either of its computer facilities—the main Operations Center in Alexandria, Virginia or the Headquarters building in Washington, D.C. Work also continued on the development of a backup capability for the EDGAR system.

On September 28, 1995, the Commission's new World Wide Web (WWW) site was inaugurated. The WWW server was configured to provide basic access to the EDGAR database of electronic filings on a 24-hour delayed basis and to provide a forum for litigation releases, news digests, press releases, Commission rulemaking activities, and a wide range of other information of interest to the investing public. Key financial information that previously was not easily accessible is now available worldwide to students, public interest groups, individual investors, and any other interested party with access to a computer and Internet interface.

Administrative and Personnel Management. The OAPM provided a wide range of personnel and office support functions to the agency's divisions and offices. Personnel programs included recruitment and staffing, position management and classification, employee compensation and benefits, training, performance management, employee recognition, employee relations, counseling, disciplinary actions, personnel security and suitability, personnel action processing, and maintenance of official employee records. Support programs included procurement and contracting, space acquisition, lease administration, facilities management, property management, desktop publishing, printing, publications, mail services, and telecommunications management.

Efforts to streamline and reinvent personnel programs continued as a result of the NPR. Based on focus group recommendations, new policies on alternate work schedules and flexiplace were implemented in January 1995 to assist employees in balancing work and family demands. The streamlining of internal operations continued with the implementation of the first phase of the new automated Personnel Resource System and the establishment of a centralized photocopy center.

The SEC joined a consortium of federal agencies in sponsoring and participating in an in-depth study by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA). The purpose of the NAPA study is to discover and evaluate organizations with innovative personnel programs and to generate models for implementing change in human resources management that can be shared with government agencies.

The SEC obtained authority from the Office of Personnel Management to offer early retirements and implemented a Voluntary Early Retirement program for members of the Senior Executive Service and employees in grade 15 positions. As part of this effort, several special retirement planning seminars were provided to eligible staff.

During 1995, overall training activities increased with mandatory HIV/AIDS training for all employees, customer service training for all support office employees, and conflict resolution techniques for managers and supervisors. A total of 2,597 employees attended 5,390 training events.

The agency awarded contracts, purchase orders, and credit card purchases totalling approximately \$31,293,747 during 1995. As part of its effort to encourage the use of the government-wide credit card for purchases of commercially available goods and services under \$2,500, OAPM issued 25 credit cards to purchasing agents and contracting officers throughout the agency. The SEC administered 15 leases for an approximate total of 794,797 square feet of office and related space.

Public Reference. The SEC maintains public reference rooms in its Washington, D.C., New York, and Chicago offices. In a continuing interest to better serve the public, the procedures in the headquarters public reference room were enhanced to expedite identification, location, and retrieval of documents and microfiche. The public reference rooms made all company filings and Commission rules, orders, studies, reports, and speeches available to the public.

During 1995, the staff provided assistance to 28,070 visitors to the headquarters public reference room, responded to 7,070 requests for documents, processed 590 requests for certifications of filings and records, and responded to 81,350 telephone inquiries. The public reference staff received and filed 390,450 paper documents and 488,180 microfiche records to the existing library of publicly available information.

Endnotes

¹*SEC v. Block*, Exchange Act Release No. 14598 (Aug. 10, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 3112.

²*SEC v. Odulo*, Exchange Act Release No. 14591 (Aug. 7, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 3105.

³*SEC v. Pleasure Time Inc.*, Litigation Release No. 14440 (Mar. 15, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2909.

⁴*SEC v. Gallard*, Litigation Release No. 14485 (May 2, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 691.

⁵*SEC v. Norton*, Litigation Release No. 14529 (June 14, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1747.

⁶*SEC v. United Communications, Ltd.*, Litigation Release No. 14424 (Feb. 27, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2595.

⁷*SEC v. Future Vision Direct Marketing, Inc.*, Litigation Release No. 14287 (Oct. 4, 1994), 57 SEC Docket 2278.

⁸*SEC v. Telecom Marketing, Inc.*, Litigation Release No. 14494 (Mar. 29, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 3106.

⁹*SEC v. Qualified Pensions, Inc.*, Litigation Release No. 14636 (Sept. 13, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 708.

¹⁰*SEC v. Bloch*, Litigation Release No. 14511 (May 25, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1271.

¹¹*SEC v. Bennett*, Litigation Release No. 14503 (May 18, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1147.

¹²*SEC v. International Breeders, Inc.*, Litigation Release No. 14607 (Aug. 17, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 3228.

¹³*SEC v. Naiman*, Litigation Release No. 14463 (Apr. 10, 1995), 59 SEC 260.

¹⁴*SEC v. First Capital Holdings Corp., Inc.*, Litigation Release No. 14444 (Mar. 17, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 3002.

¹⁵*SEC v. Softpoint, Inc.*, Litigation Release No. 14480 (Apr. 27, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 547.

¹⁶*SEC v. Digitran Systems, Incorporated*, Litigation Release No. 14375 (Jan. 4, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 1591.

¹⁷*SEC v. Bradstreet*, Litigation Release No. 14571 (July 26, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 2819.

¹⁸*In the Matter of The Cooper Companies, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 35082 (Dec. 12, 1994), 58 SEC Docket 681.

¹⁹*In the Matter of Marvin E. Basson, CPA*, Exchange Act Release No. 35840 (June 13, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1650.

²⁰*In the Matter of C. Steven Bolen*, Exchange Act Release No. 34974 (Nov. 15, 1994), 58 SEC Docket 8.

²¹*In the Matter of BT Securities Corporation*, Exchange Act Release No. 35136 (Dec. 22, 1994), 58 SEC Docket 1182.

²²*In the Matter of Gibson Greetings, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 36357 (Oct. 11, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1401.

²³*SEC v. Schulte*, Litigation Release No. 14372 (Dec. 29, 1994), 58 SEC Docket 1476.

²⁴*In the Matter of Van Kampen American Capital Asset Management, Inc.*, Investment Advisers Act Release No. 1525 (Sept. 29, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1284.

²⁵*In the Matter of Thomas M. Rogge*, Investment Advisers Act Release No. 1472 (Feb. 22, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2474.

- ²⁶*In the Matter of Askin Capital Management, L.P.*, Investment Advisers Act Release No. 1492 (May 23, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1233.
- ²⁷*SEC v. Busbee*, Litigation Release No. 14387 (Jan. 23, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 1949.
- ²⁸*In the Matter of Preston C. Bynum*, Exchange Act Release No. 35870 (June 20, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1801.
- ²⁹*In the Matter of Derryl W. Peden*, Exchange Act Release No. 35045 (Dec. 2, 1994), 58 SEC Docket 505.
- ³⁰*SEC v. Stifel, Nicolaus and Company, Inc.*, Litigation Release No. 14587 (Aug. 3, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 2964.
- ³¹*SEC v. Cochran*, Litigation Release No. 14644 (Sept. 20, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 833.
- ³²*SEC v. Sutcliffe*, Litigation Release No. 14658 (Sept. 28, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1006.
- ³³*SEC v. Goodman*, Litigation Release No. 14471 (Apr. 18, 1995).
- ³⁴*SEC v. Rudi*, Litigation Release No. 14421 (Feb. 23, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2495.
- ³⁵*SEC v. Brumfield*, Litigation Release No. 14408 (Feb. 9, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2225, *refiled after resolution of criminal proceedings*, Litigation Release No. 14706 (Oct. 31, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1888.
- ³⁶*SEC v. Croce*, Litigation Release No. 14655 (Sept. 28, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1004.
- ³⁷*SEC v. Wagner*, Litigation Release No. 14479 (Apr. 26, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 546.
- ³⁸*SEC v. Schwartzberg*, Litigation Release No. 14454 (Mar. 31, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 152.
- ³⁹*SEC v. Seibald*, Litigation Release No. 14449 (Mar. 28, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 3103.
- ⁴⁰*SEC v. Woodward*, Litigation Release No. 14548 (June 28, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 2122.
- ⁴¹*In the Matter of Gabelli & Company, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 35057 (Dec. 8, 1994), 58 SEC Docket 520.
- ⁴²*SEC v. Stratton Oakmont, Inc.*, Litigation Release No. 14355 (Dec. 15, 1994), 58 SEC Docket 806.
- ⁴³*In the Matter of F.N. Wolf & Co., Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 34892 (Oct. 25, 1994), 57 SEC Docket 2576.
- ⁴⁴*In the Matter of Stephen T. Strabala*, Exchange Act Release No. 36305 (Sept. 29, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1087.
- ⁴⁵*SEC v. Strabala*, Litigation Release No. 14667 (Sept. 29, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1329.
- ⁴⁶*In the Matter of H.D. Vest Investment Securities, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 35946 (July 10, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 2330.
- ⁴⁷*SEC v. Saxena*, Litigation Release No. 14348 (Dec. 8, 1994), 58 SEC Docket 607.
- ⁴⁸*In the Matter of Account Management Corporation*, Exchange Act Release No. 36314 (Sept. 29, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1157.
- ⁴⁹*In the Matter of Roger W. Honour*, Investment Advisers Act Release No. 1527 (Sept. 29, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1300.
- ⁵⁰*SEC v. Kaweske*, Litigation Release No. 14399 (Feb. 6, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2215.
- ⁵¹*In the Matter of John Logan Wallace*, Investment Advisers Release No. 1470 (Feb. 21, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2470.
- ⁵²*SEC v. Galleon Capital Management*, Litigation Release No. 14315 (Nov. 1, 1994), 57 SEC Docket 2939.
- ⁵³*In the Matter of Anthony J. Benincasa*, Exchange Act Release No. 36273 (Sept. 25, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 0852.

⁵⁴Exchange Act Release Nos. 36165 (Aug. 29, 1995), 60 FR 46653 (Sept. 7, 1995); 36166 (Aug. 29, 1995), 60 FR 46660 (Sept. 7, 1995); 36167 (Aug. 29, 1995), 60 FR 46667 (Sept. 7, 1995); 36168 (Aug. 29, 1995), 60 FR 46637 (Sept. 7, 1995); 36169 (Aug. 29, 1995), 60 FR 46644 (Sept. 7, 1995) (five options exchanges); and 36296 (Sept. 28, 1995), 60 FR 52234 (Oct. 5, 1995) (NASD).

⁵⁵Exchange Act Release No. 34908 (Oct. 27, 1994), 59 FR 54812 (Nov. 2, 1994).

⁵⁶Exchange Act Release No. 36213 (Sept. 11, 1995), 60 FR 48078 (Sept. 18, 1995).

⁵⁷Order Instituting Proceedings Pursuant to Section 8A of the Securities Act of 1933 and Sections 15(b) and 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Findings and Order Imposing Remedial Sanctions in the Matter of BT Securities Corporation. Exchange Act Release No. 35136 (Dec. 22, 1994), 58 SEC Docket 1182.

⁵⁸Exchange Act Release No. 35135 (Dec. 22, 1994), 59 FR 67358 (Dec. 29, 1994), 58 SEC Docket 1264.

⁵⁹Exchange Act Release No. 36270 (Sept. 22, 1995), 60 FR 50223 (Sept. 28, 1995).

⁶⁰Exchange Act Release No. 36310 (Sept. 29, 1995), 60 FR 52792 (Oct. 10, 1995).

⁶¹Exchange Act Release No. 35124 (Dec. 20, 1994), 59 FR 66702 (Dec. 28, 1994).

⁶²Exchange Act Release Nos. 27445 and 29185 (Nov. 16, 1989 and May 9, 1991), 54 FR 48703 (Nov. 24, 1989) and 56 FR 22490 (May 15, 1991).

⁶³Letter regarding Application of Rules 10b-6 and 10b-13 to New York Stock Exchange Specialists, Exchange Act Release No. 36044 (July 31, 1995), 60 FR 40212 (Aug. 7, 1995).

⁶⁴Letter regarding Dividend Reinvestment and Stock Purchase Plans, Exchange Act Release No. 35041 (Dec. 1, 1994), 59 FR 63393 (Dec. 8, 1994), as modified by Letter regarding Dividend Reinvestment and Stock Purchase Plans (May 12, 1995); and Letter regarding Bank-Sponsored Investor Services Programs (Sept. 14, 1995) and Letter regarding First Chicago Trust Company of New York (Dec. 1, 1994).

⁶⁵Letter regarding Legg Mason Wood Walker (Aug. 24, 1995); Letter regarding Bear Stearns Securities Corporation (June 14, 1995); Letter regarding U.S. Clearing Corporation (Apr. 11, 1995).

⁶⁶Letter regarding CS Holding (Mar. 31, 1995), [1995] Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) ¶177018.

⁶⁷Exchange Act Release No. 33137 (Nov. 3, 1993), 58 FR 60324 (Nov. 15, 1993).

⁶⁸Letter regarding Distributions of Certain United Kingdom Securities and of Certain Securities Traded on SEAQ International, Exchange Act Release No. 35234 (Jan. 10, 1995), 60 FR 4644 (Jan. 24, 1995).

⁶⁹Letter regarding Distributions of Certain Dutch Securities, Exchange Act Release No. 36412 (Oct. 19, 1995), 60 FR 55391 (Oct. 25, 1995).

⁷⁰Exchange Act Release No. 33741 (Mar. 9, 1994), 59 FR 12748 (Mar. 17, 1994).

⁷¹Exchange Act Release No. 34961 (Nov. 10, 1994), 59 FR 59590 (Nov. 17, 1994).

⁷²Letter from Robert L. D. Colby, Deputy Director, Division of Market Regulation, SEC, to John S. Overdorff, Chair, and Gerald J. Laporte, Vice-Chair, Securities Law and Disclosure Committee, National Association of Bond Lawyers (June 23, 1995); Letter from Catherine McGuire, Chief Counsel, Division of Market Regulation, SEC, to John S. Overdorff, Chair, Securities Law and Disclosure Committee, National Association of Bond Lawyers (Sept. 19, 1995).

⁷³Letters dated June 22, 1995 from Brandon Becker, Director, Division of Market Regulation, SEC, to: Michael R. Bloomberg, Pres., Bloomberg, L.P.; Daniel Heimowitz, Exec. V.P., Moody's Investor Services; Robert C. Bulik, Exec. V.P., Disclosure, Inc.;

Joel Mandelbaum, Pres., Thomson Municipal Services Group; and Aaron V. Klapow, V.P., Kenny S&P Information Services. Also, Letter from Robert Colby, Deputy Director, Division of Market Regulation, SEC, to Joel Brenner, Storch & Brenner (Oct. 27, 1995).

⁷⁴Exchange Act Release No. 34961 (Nov. 10, 1994), 59 FR 59590 at 59603-59604 (Adopting Release) (Nov. 17, 1994).

⁷⁵1994 Adopting Release, *id.*, 59 FR at 59604. There is no requirement that a SID be an instrumentality of the state. A SID may be a private organization that has been designated by the state to function as its SID.

⁷⁶Letter regarding Ontala Forest Products, Inc. (Dec. 14, 1994).

⁷⁷Letter regarding Browning-Ferris Industries, Inc. (June 20, 1995).

⁷⁸Letter regarding First of America Brokerage Service, Inc. (Sept. 28, 1995).

⁷⁹Exchange Act Release No. 34962 (Nov. 10, 1994), 59 FR 59612 (Nov. 17, 1994), 57 SEC Docket 3014.

⁸⁰Letter regarding Investment Company Institute (Aug. 1, 1995).

⁸¹Letter regarding Public Securities Association (Sept. 29, 1995).

⁸²Exchange Act Release No. 35224 (Jan. 12, 1995), 60 FR 4040 (Jan. 19, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 1662.

⁸³Exchange Act Release No. 35990 (July 19, 1995), 60 FR 38384 (July 26, 1995).

⁸⁴Exchange Act Release No. 36145 (Aug. 23, 1995), 60 FR 45200 (Aug. 30, 1995).

⁸⁵Exchange Act Release No. 35314 (Feb. 1, 1995), 60 FR 7241 (Feb. 7, 1995).

⁸⁶Exchange Act Release No. 36088 (Aug. 10, 1995), 60 FR 42930 (Aug. 17, 1995).

⁸⁷Exchange Act Release No. 35637 (Apr. 21, 1995), 60 FR 20891 (Apr. 28, 1995).

⁸⁸Exchange Act Release No. 36102 (Aug. 14, 1995), 60 FR 43626 (Aug. 22, 1995).

⁸⁹Exchange Act Release No. 35038 (Dec. 1, 1994), 59 FR 63652 (Dec. 8, 1994).

⁹⁰Exchange Act Release No. 35039 (Dec. 1, 1994), 59 FR 63656 (Dec. 8, 1994).

⁹¹Exchange Act Release No. 35040 (Dec. 1, 1994), 59 FR 63662 (Dec. 8, 1994).

⁹²17 CFR 240.17f-1 (1994).

⁹³Exchange Act Release No. 35341 (Feb. 8, 1995), 60 FR 8426 (Feb. 14, 1995).

⁹⁴Exchange Act Release No. 36324 (Sept. 29, 1995), 60 FR 52436 (Oct. 6, 1995).

⁹⁵Exchange Act Release No. 36323 (Sept. 29, 1995), 60 FR 52440 (Oct. 6, 1995).

⁹⁶Exchange Act Release No. 35121 (Dec. 19, 1994), 59 FR 66570 (Dec. 27, 1994).

⁹⁷Exchange Act Release No. 35751 (May 22, 1995), 60 FR 27997 (May 26, 1995).

⁹⁸Exchange Act Release No. 35059 (Dec. 7, 1994), 59 FR 64455 (Dec. 14, 1994).

⁹⁹Exchange Act Release No. 36076 (Aug. 9, 1995), 60 FR 42200 (Aug. 15, 1995).

¹⁰⁰Exchange Act Release No. 36211 (Sept. 8, 1995), 60 FR 48182 (Sept. 18, 1995).

¹⁰¹Exchange Act Release No. 36403 (Oct. 20, 1995), 60 FR 54898 (Oct. 26, 1995).

¹⁰²Exchange Act Release No. 35990 (July 19, 1995), 60 FR 38384 (July 26, 1995).

¹⁰³Exchange Act Release No. 35428 (Feb. 28, 1994), 60 FR 12583 (Mar. 7, 1995).

¹⁰⁴Exchange Act Release No. 35953 (July 11, 1995), 60 FR 36843 (July 18, 1995).

¹⁰⁵Exchange Act Release No. 35482 (Mar. 13 1995), 60 FR 14806 (Mar. 20, 1995).

¹⁰⁶Exchange Act Release No. 35132 (Dec. 21, 1994), 59 FR 67743 (Jan. 25, 1995).

¹⁰⁷Exchange Act Release No. 35198 (Jan. 6, 1995), 60 FR 3286 (Jan. 13, 1995).

¹⁰⁸Exchange Act Release No. 35787 (May 31, 1995), 60 FR 30324 (June 8, 1995).

¹⁰⁹Exchange Act Release No. 35557 (Mar. 31, 1995), 60 FR 17598 (Apr. 6, 1995).

¹¹⁰Exchange Act Release No. 36091 (Aug. 10, 1995), 60 FR 42931 (Aug. 17, 1995).

¹¹¹Exchange Act Release No. 36162 (Aug. 29, 1995), 60 FR 46138 (Sept. 5, 1995).

- ¹¹²Investment Company Act Release No. 20915 (Feb. 23, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2389.
- ¹¹³Investment Company Act Release No. 20916 (Feb. 23, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2487.
- ¹¹⁴Investment Company Act Release No. 20917 (Feb. 23, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2401.
- ¹¹⁵Investment Company Act Release No. 21259 (July 27, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 2793.
- ¹¹⁶Investment Company Act Release No. 21341 (Sept. 8, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 524.
- ¹¹⁷Investment Company Act Release Nos. 20874 (Feb. 1, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 1970 and 21332 (Sept. 1, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 0413.
- ¹¹⁸Investment Company Act Release No. 21217 (July 19, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 2513.
- ¹¹⁹Investment Company Act Release No. 21260 (July 27, 1995), 60 FR 39574 (Aug. 2, 1995).
- ¹²⁰*Frank Russell Investment Company*, Investment Company Act Release Nos. 21108 (June 2, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1503 (Notice), and 21169 (June 28, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 2105 (Order); *The Managers Funds and The Managers Funds, L.P.*, Investment Company Act Release Nos. 21354 (Sept. 13, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 692 (Notice), and 21412 (Oct. 11, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1439 (Order); *Consulting Group Capital Markets Funds and Smith Barney Mutual Funds Management Inc.*, Investment Company Act Release Nos. 21318 (Aug. 23, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 109 (Notice), and 21366 (Sept. 19, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 823 (Order); *Tiff Investment Program, Inc. and Foundation Advisers Inc.*, Investment Company Act Release Nos. 21268 (Aug. 3, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 2952 (Notice), and 21328 (Aug. 30, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 316 (Order).
- ¹²¹*Vanguard STAR Fund*, Investment Company Act Release Nos. 21372 (Sept. 22, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 983 (Notice), and 21426 (Oct. 18, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1630 (Order); *T. Rowe Price Spectrum Fund, Inc.*, Investment Company Act Release Nos. 21371 (Sept. 22, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 681 (Notice), and 21425 (Oct. 18, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1628 (Order).
- ¹²²*Vanguard Special Tax-Advantaged Retirement Fund, Inc.*, Investment Company Act Release Nos. 14153 (Sept. 12, 1984), 31 SEC Docket 437 (Notice), and 14361 (Feb. 7, 1985), 32 SEC Docket 549 (Order); *T. Rowe Price Spectrum Fund, Inc.*, Investment Company Act Release Nos. 17198 (Oct. 31, 1989), 44 SEC Docket 515 (Notice), and 17242 (Nov. 29, 1989), 44 SEC Docket 1751 (Order), *as amended by* Investment Company Act Release Nos. 18816 (June 29, 1992), 51 SEC Docket 1380 (Notice), and 18865 (July 25, 1992), 51 SEC Docket 2419 (Order).
- ¹²³H.R. 1495, 104th Cong., 1st Sess. (1995).
- ¹²⁴*PaineWebber Incorporated*, Investment Company Act Release Nos. 20755 (Dec. 6, 1994), 58 SEC Docket 589 (Notice), and 20819 (Jan. 4, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 1586 (Order); *Prudential Securities Incorporated*, Investment Company Act Release Nos. 20922 (Feb. 27, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2564 (Notice), and 20975 (Mar. 29, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 3097 (Order); *Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc.*, Investment Company Act Release Nos. 20931 (Mar. 1, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2581 (Notice), and 20976 (Mar. 29, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 3098 (Order); *Van Kampen American Distributors, Inc.*, Investment Company Act Release Nos. 21014 (Apr. 17, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 0438 (Notice), and 21073 (May 16, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1125 (Order).

- ¹²⁵SMC Capital, Inc. (pub. avail. Sept. 5, 1995).
- ¹²⁶Robertson Stephens Investment Trust (pub. avail. Aug. 24, 1995).
- ¹²⁷The T. Rowe Price Funds (pub. avail. July 31, 1995).
- ¹²⁸Templeton Russia Fund, Inc. (pub. avail. Apr. 18, 1995).
- ¹²⁹Citicorp Securities, Inc. (pub. avail. Aug. 4, 1995).
- ¹³⁰Salomon Brothers Inc. (pub. avail. May 26, 1995).
- ¹³¹MassMutual Institutional Funds (pub. avail. Sept. 28, 1995).
- ¹³²T. Rowe Price Investment Services (pub. avail. Sept. 8, 1995).
- ¹³³American Council of Life Ins. (pub. avail. June 20, 1995).
- ¹³⁴Investment Company Act Release No. 21221 (July 21, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 2608.
- ¹³⁵Investment Company Act Release No. 21216 (July 19, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 2459.
- ¹³⁶Investment Advisers Act Release No. 1469 (Feb. 14, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2279.
- ¹³⁷Thompson Advisory Group, L.P. (pub. avail. Sept. 26, 1995).
- ¹³⁸First Call Corporation (pub. avail. Sept. 6, 1995).
- ¹³⁹*The Regulation of Public Utility Holding Companies*, Report of the Division of Investment Management, United States Securities and Exchange Commission (June 1995).
- ¹⁴⁰*Exemption of Issuance and Sale of Certain Securities by Public Utility and Nonutility Subsidiary Companies of Registered Holding Companies*, Holding Co. Act Release No. 26311 (June 28, 1995). The Council of the City of New Orleans, which has jurisdiction over the retail rates of two public-utility subsidiary companies of Entergy Corporation, a registered holding company, has filed a petition for judicial review with the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Case No. 95-1434 (filed Aug. 24, 1995).
- ¹⁴¹*Exemption of Issuance and Sale of Certain Securities by Public Utility and Nonutility Subsidiary Companies of Registered Holding Companies*, Holding Co. Act Release No. 26312 (June 28, 1995).
- ¹⁴²*Exemption of Acquisition by Registered Public-Utility Holding Companies of Securities of Nonutility Companies Engaged in Certain Energy-Related and Gas-Related Businesses*, Holding Co. Act Release No. 26313 (June 28, 1995).
- ¹⁴³*CINergy Corporation*, Holding Company Act Release No. 26146 (Oct. 21, 1994).
- ¹⁴⁴*Southern Company*, Holding Company Act Release No. 26211 (Dec. 30, 1994).
- ¹⁴⁵*EUA Cogenex, Inc.*, Holding Company Act Release No. 26232 (Feb. 15, 1995).
- ¹⁴⁶*Central and South West Corporation*, Holding Company Act Release No. 26293 (May 18, 1995).
- ¹⁴⁷*The Columbia Gas System, Inc.*, Holding Company Act Release No. 26361 (Aug. 25, 1995).
- ¹⁴⁸Securities Act Release No. 33-7141 (Feb. 21, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2371 and Securities Act Release No. 33-7168 (May 11, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 0727.
- ¹⁴⁹Securities Act Release No. 33-7233 (Oct. 6, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1348.
- ¹⁵⁰Securities Act Release No. 33-7234 (Oct. 6, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1358.
- ¹⁵¹Securities Act Release No. 33-7183 (June 27, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1939.
- ¹⁵²Securities Act Release No. 33-7184 (June 27, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1968.
- ¹⁵³Securities Act Release No. 33-7185 (June 27, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1973.
- ¹⁵⁴Securities Act Release No. 33-7185 (June 27, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1973.
- ¹⁵⁵Securities Act Release No. 33-7188 (June 27, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1983.
- ¹⁵⁶Securities Act Release No. 33-7186 (June 27, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1977.

- ¹⁵⁷Securities Act Release No. 33-7187 (June 27, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1980.
- ¹⁵⁸Securities Act Release No. 7189 (June 27, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1991.
- ¹⁵⁹Securities Act Release No. 7189 (June 27, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1991.
- ¹⁶⁰Securities Act Release No. 7190 (June 27, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1998.
- ¹⁶¹Exchange Act Release No. 34-36356 (Oct. 11, 1995), 60 SEC Docket 1393.
- ¹⁶²Exchange Act Release No. 34-34514 (Aug. 10, 1994), 57 SEC Docket 0932.
- ¹⁶³Exchange Act Release No. 34-34681 (Sept. 16, 1994), 57 SEC Docket 1780.
- ¹⁶⁴Securities Act Release No. 33-7122 (Dec. 19, 1994), 58 SEC Docket 0865.
- ¹⁶⁵Securities Act Release No. 33-7101 (Oct. 13, 1994), 57 SEC Docket 2292.
- ¹⁶⁶Securities Act Release No. 33-7106 (Nov. 1, 1994), 57 SEC Docket 2748.
- ¹⁶⁷Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 94 (Apr. 18, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 463.
- ¹⁶⁸Proposed Statement of Financial Accounting Standards, "Consolidated Financial Statements: Policy and Procedures" (Oct. 16, 1995).
- ¹⁶⁹Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 121, "Accounting for the Impairment of Long-Lived Assets to be Disposed Of" (Mar. 1995).
- ¹⁷⁰Statement of Financial Accounting Standards, "Accounting for Stock-Based Compensation" (Oct. 1995).
- ¹⁷¹Proposed Statement of Financial Accounting Standards, "Accounting for Transfers and Servicing of Financial Assets and Extinguishments of Liabilities" (Oct. 24, 1995).
- ¹⁷²Compare S. 240, 104th Cong., 1st Sess. (1995) with H.R. 1058, 104th Cong., 1st Sess. (1995).
- ¹⁷³See generally, H.R. 2131, 104th Cong., 1st Sess. (1995).
- ¹⁷⁴Testimony of Arthur Levitt, Chairman, SEC, Concerning Municipal Bond and Government Securities Markets, Before the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs (Jan. 5, 1995).
- ¹⁷⁵See Directors, Management, and Auditors: Allies in Protecting Shareholder Interests, issued in 1995 by Public Oversight Board.
- ¹⁷⁶Statement of Position 94-6, "Disclosure of Certain Significant Risks and Uncertainties (Dec. 30, 1994).
- ¹⁷⁷ Proposed Statement of Position, "Environmental Remediation Liabilities" (June 30, 1995).
- ¹⁷⁸Report of the Special Committee on Financial Reporting, "Improving Business Reporting—A Customer Focus."
- ¹⁷⁹International Accounting Standard 32, "Financial Instruments: Disclosure and Presentation" (June 1995).
- ¹⁸⁰Exposure Draft E48, Financial Instruments (Jan. 1994).
- ¹⁸¹Draft Statement of Principles, Earnings Per Share (Oct. 1993).
- ¹⁸²Exposure Draft E50, Intangible Assets (June 1995).
- ¹⁸³Draft Statement of Principles, Reporting Financial Information by Segment (Sept. 1994).
- ¹⁸⁴Exposure Draft E49, Income Taxes (Oct. 1994)
- ¹⁸⁵Draft Statement of Principles, Presentation of Financial Statements (Mar. 1995).
- ¹⁸⁶ Issues Paper, Retirement Benefit and Other Employee Benefit Costs (Aug. 1995).
- ¹⁸⁷Release No. 33-7119 (Dec. 13, 1994).
- ¹⁸⁸Release No. 33-7117 (Dec. 13, 1994).

- ¹⁸⁹115 S. Ct. 1212 (1995).
- ¹⁹⁰115 S. Ct. 1061 (1995).
- ¹⁹¹115 S. Ct. 1447 (1995).
- ¹⁹²61 F.3d 938 (D.C. Cir. 1995).
- ¹⁹³115 S. Ct. 1212 (1995).
- ¹⁹⁴115 S. Ct. 1061 (1995).
- ¹⁹⁵115 S. Ct. 1447 (1995).
- ¹⁹⁶501 U.S. 350 (1991).
- ¹⁹⁷61 F.3d 938 (D.C. Cir. 1995).
- ¹⁹⁸No. 95 Cr. 166 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 24, 1995), 1995 WL 628312.
- ¹⁹⁹45 F.3d 7 (2d Cir. 1995).
- ²⁰⁰51 F.3d 623 (7th Cir. 1995).
- ²⁰¹17 C.F.R. 240.14(e)-3.
- ²⁰²52 F.3d 667 (7th Cir. 1995).
- ²⁰³*Swan v. SEC*, No. 95-1218 (D.D.C.), appeal pending, No. 95-5376 (D.C. Cir.).
- ²⁰⁴*SEC v. Worthen*, 74-202-N (S.D. Cal.).
- ²⁰⁵*SEC v. The Electronic Warehouse*, 689 F. Supp. 53 (D. Conn. 1988), aff'd per curiam, 891 F.2d 457 (1989), cert. denied, 496 U.S. 942 (1990).
- ²⁰⁶*SEC v. Price Waterhouse*, 41 F.3d 305 (2d Cir. 1994); *SEC v. Littler*, 874 F. Supp. 345 (D. Utah 1994); *SEC v. Grosby*, No. 1P921411 (S.D. Ind.); *SEC v. Adler*, CV 94-PT-2018-S (N.D. Ala.).
- ²⁰⁷*Hunter v. SEC*, 879 F. Supp. 494 (E.D. PA. 1995) *Daly v. SEC*, 95-S-285 (D. Colo.); *Kinlaw v. SEC*, No. 3-93-CV-2010-T (N.D. Tex.).
- ²⁰⁸*Colello v. SEC*, No. CV-94-6022-RAP (C.D. Ca.)
- ²⁰⁹*Sequoia Partners, L.P.*, Investment Company Act Release No. 20644 (Oct. 20, 1994), 57 SEC Docket 2547.
- ²¹⁰*Gaz Metropolitan, Inc. et al.*, Holding Company Act Release No. 26170 (Nov. 23, 1994), 53 SEC Docket 246.
- ²¹¹*Dan A. Druz*, Exchange Act Release No. 35202 (Jan. 9, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 1621.
- ²¹²*Patricia A. Johnson*, Exchange Act Release No. 35698 (May 10, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 863, appeal filed, No. 95-1340 (D.C. Cir.).
- ²¹³*Martin Herer Engelman, Peter Paul Kim, and Lawrence David Isen*, Exchange Act Release No. 35729 (May 18, 1995), 59 SEC Docket 1038, appeal filed, No. 95-70564 (9th Cir.).
- ²¹⁴*Atlanta-One, Inc., et al.*, Exchange Act Release No. 35455 (March 8, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2670, appeal filed, No. 95-70360 (9th Cir.).
- ²¹⁵*Hibbard, Brown & Co. et al.*, Exchange Act Release No. 35476 (March 9, 1995), 58 SEC Docket 2769, appeals filed, Nos. 95-1556 (D.C. Cir.) and 95-3270 (3d Cir.).
- ²¹⁶*In County of Orange*, No. 94-22272-JR (Bankr. C.D. CA).
- ²¹⁷*In re America West Airlines, Inc.*, No. 91-07505-PHX-RGM (Bankr. D. AZ).
- ²¹⁸*In re UDC Homes, Inc.*, No. 95-558 HSB (Bankr. D. DE).
- ²¹⁹*In re County of Orange*, No. 94-22272-JR (Bankr. C.D. CA).
- ²²⁰*In re House of Fabrics, Inc.*, No. SV 94-50060-KL, (Bankr. C.D. Cal).
- ²²¹*In re Baldwin Builders*, Nos. ND 95-13057 RR and ND 95-13058 RR (Bankr. C.D. CA).
- ²²²*In re Trans World Airlines, Inc.*, No. 95-43478-399 (Bankr. E.D. MO).
- ²²³*In re Diversified, Inc.*, No. 93-41173-293 (Bankr. N.D. OH).

²²⁴*In re Phar-Mor, Inc.*, No. 92-41599 through No. 92-41614 (Bankr. N.D. OH).

²²⁵*In re Bilzerian*, Nos. 93-486-CIV-T-24A and 94-635-CIV-T-24 E (M.D. FL).

²²⁶*In re Steven Weil*, No. 95-21570-BKC-RBR (Bankr. S.D. FL).

Table 1
**ENFORCEMENT CASES INITIATED BY THE COMMISSION
DURING FISCAL YEAR 1995 IN VARIOUS PROGRAM AREAS**

(Each case initiated has been included in only one category listed below, even though many cases involve multiple allegations and may fall under more than one category. The number of defendants and respondents is noted parenthetically.)

Program Area in Which a Civil Action or Administrative Proceeding Was Initiated	Civil Actions ^{1/}	Administrative Proceedings	Total	% of Total Cases
Securities Offering Cases				
(a) Non-regulated Entity	48 (182)	14 (32)	62 (214)	
(b) Regulated Entity	17 (82)	56 (83)	73 (165)	
Total Securities Offering Cases	65 (264)	70 (115)	135 (379)	28%
Broker-dealer Cases				
(a) Fraud Against Customer	18 (29)	49 (81)	67 (110)	
(b) Failure to Supervise	0 (0)	9 (9)	9 (9)	
(c) Government Securities	2 (4)	0 (0)	2 (4)	
(d) Books & Records	0 (0)	4 (6)	4 (6)	
(e) Other	2 (2)	12 (16)	14 (18)	
Total Broker-dealer Cases	22 (35)	74 (112)	96 (147)	20%
Issuer Financial Statement and Reporting Cases				
(a) Issuer Financial Disclosure	28 (91)	54 (84)	82 (175)	
(b) Issuer Reporting Other	0 (0)	2 (2)	2 (2)	
Total Issuer Financial Statement and Reporting Cases	28 (91)	56 (86)	84 (177)	17%
Other Regulated Entity Cases				
(a) Investment Advisers	13 (26)	37 (63)	50 (89)	
(b) Investment Companies	2 (8)	10 (23)	12 (31)	
(c) Transfer Agent	0 (0)	1 (1)	1 (1)	
Total Other Regulated Entity Cases	15 (34)	48 (87)	63 (121)	13%
Insider Trading Cases	29 (90)	6 (6)	35 (96)	7%
Contempt Proceedings	23 (55)	0 (0)	23 (55)	5%
Market Manipulation Cases	4 (7)	17 (35)	21 (42)	4%
Delinquent Filings				
(a) Issuer Reporting	1 (1)	1 (1)	2 (2)	
(b) Forms 3/4/5	1 (1)	7 (10)	8 (11)	
Total Delinquent Filings Cases	2 (2)	8 (11)	10 (13)	2%
Fraud Against Regulated Entities	3 (7)	5 (6)	8 (13)	2%
Corporate Control Cases	2 (11)	3 (8)	5 (19)	1%
Miscellaneous Disclosure/Reporting	1 (1)	5 (9)	6 (10)	1%
GRAND TOTAL	194 (597)	292 (475)	486 (1,072)	100%

^{1/} This category includes injunctive actions and civil and criminal contempt proceedings.

Table 2
FISCAL 1995 ENFORCEMENT CASES
LISTED BY PROGRAM AREA

<u>Name of Case</u>	<u>Release</u>	<u>Date Filed</u>
Broker-dealer: Books & Records		
<i>In the Matter of Richard Allerton, Jr., et al.</i>	34-34990	11/21/94
<i>In the Matter of George L. Tuttle, Jr., et al.</i>	34-35605	04/14/95
<i>In the Matter of Lehman Brothers Inc.</i>	34-36104	08/15/95
<i>In the Matter of Warren C. Trepp</i>	34-36288	09/28/95
Broker-dealer: Failure to Supervise		
<i>In the Matter of Daniel R. Wolfgram</i>	34-34887	10/25/94
<i>In the Matter of Dennis W. Reedy</i>	34-35216	01/11/95
<i>In the Matter of E. Ronald Lara</i>	34-35594	04/12/95
<i>In the Matter of Michael J. Spagnola</i>	34-35664	05/02/95
<i>In the Matter of Irving Stitsky</i>	34-35790	06/01/95
<i>In the Matter of H.D. Vest Investment Securities Inc.</i>	34-35946	07/10/95
<i>In the Matter of Walnut Street Securities, Inc.</i>	34-35975	07/17/95
<i>In the Matter of Thomas Risher</i>	34-36071	08/09/95
<i>In the Matter of John R. Moysey</i>	34-36247	09/19/95
Broker-dealer: Fraud Against Customer		
<i>In the Matter of Terence Patrick Mulrooney</i>	34-34833	10/13/94
<i>In the Matter of Laurie J. Candy</i>	34-34888	10/25/94
<i>In the Matter of Laurence M. Brown</i>	34-34905	10/27/94
<i>In the Matter of D.E. Wine Investments Inc.</i>	34-34942	11/04/94
<i>In the Matter of Philip L. Black</i>	34-34975	11/15/94
<i>SEC v. Michael B. Curran</i>	LR-14535	11/29/94
<i>In the Matter of John Albert DeCastro Day</i>	34-35069	12/08/94
<i>In the Matter of Joseph Kemprowski, et al.</i>	34-35058	12/08/94
<i>In the Matter of John T. Moran</i>	34-35064	12/08/94
<i>In the Matter of Joseph J. Barbato, et al.</i>	34-35105	12/16/94
<i>In the Matter of Kenneth Puckett</i>	34-35115	12/19/94
<i>SEC v. Stephen A. Gonsalves</i>	LR-14367	12/21/94
<i>In the Matter of BT Securities Corp.</i>	34-35273	12/22/94
<i>SEC v. Kenneth Schulte</i>	LR-14372	12/27/94
<i>In the Matter of Elizabeth Bamberg</i>	34-35163	12/28/94
<i>In the Matter of Craig Medoff, et al.</i>	34-35196	01/06/95
<i>In the Matter of Mathews, Holmquist & Associates, et al.</i>	34-35236	01/19/95
<i>In the Matter of Paul B. Holmquist</i>	34-35237	01/19/95
<i>In the Matter of Laurence S. Zimmerman</i>	34-35312	02/01/95

<u>Name of Case</u>	<u>Release No.</u>	<u>Date Filed</u>
<i>In the Matter of Bede F. Howard</i>	34-35336	02/07/95
<i>SEC v. Daniel L. Osborn</i>	LR-14407	02/07/95
<i>In the Matter of Southern California Securities Inc.</i>	34-35353	02/10/95
<i>In the Matter of James W. Bullard, Jr.</i>	34-35379	02/15/95
<i>In the Matter of Rita Barbato</i>	34-35383	02/16/95
<i>In the Matter of Stephen B. Phillips</i>	34-35384	02/16/95
<i>In the Matter of Thomas F. Bandyk</i>	34-35415	02/24/95
<i>SEC v. William Hampton</i>	NONE	03/15/95
<i>In the Matter of Robert Parker Adams</i>	34-35504	03/17/95
<i>SEC v. James McCurry, et al.</i>	LR-14450	03/24/95
<i>In the Matter of William J. Hampton</i>	34-35570	04/05/95
<i>In the Matter of Thomas P. Gilmartin Jr., et al.</i>	34-35973	04/19/95
<i>In the Matter of Mark J. Hamel, et al.</i>	34-35643	04/25/95
<i>In the Matter of Robert J. Raffa</i>	34-35644	04/25/95
<i>In the Matter of Stephan A. Gonsalves</i>	34-35718	05/15/95
<i>In the Matter of First Jersey Securities Inc., et al.</i>	34-35741	05/19/95
<i>In the Matter of Timothy A. Hills</i>	34-35791	06/01/95
<i>In the Matter of First Lauderdale Securities Inc., et al.</i>	34-35813	06/06/95
<i>In the Matter of Victor H. Strevel</i>	34-35858	06/19/95
<i>In the Matter of Preston C. Bynum</i>	34-35870	06/20/95
<i>SEC v. Samuel L. Williams</i>	LR-14554	06/23/95
<i>In the Matter of Biltmore Securities</i>	34-35900	06/27/95
<i>SEC v. Daniel C. Baxley</i>	LR-14665	07/10/95
<i>In the Matter of Samuel L. Williams</i>	34-35974	07/17/95
<i>In the Matter of M. Rimson & Co., Inc., et al.</i>	34-36054	08/03/95
<i>In the Matter of Thomas V. Ackerly</i>	34-36073	08/09/95
<i>In the Matter of Stuart, Coleman & Co., Inc., et al.</i>	34-36099	08/14/95
<i>In the Matter of Robert Matthew McGee</i>	34-36116	08/18/95
<i>SEC v. Victor Strevel</i>	LR-14664	08/22/95
<i>In the Matter of Michael Herbert Novick, et al.</i>	34-36144	08/23/95
<i>In the Matter of Daniel C. Baxley</i>	34-36152	08/25/95
<i>SEC v. John L. Fauls, III</i>	LR-14719	09/12/95
<i>SEC v. Qualified Pensions, Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14636	09/13/95
<i>In the Matter of Richard G. Wiwi, et al.</i>	34-36249	09/19/95
<i>SEC v. Robert M. Cochran, et al.</i>	LR-14644	09/20/95
<i>In the Matter of Mark Nicholas Savoca</i>	34-36261	09/21/95
<i>SEC v. Charles Zanford</i>	LR-14652	09/22/95
<i>SEC v. Wendell Jeffrey Lee</i>	LR-14659	09/27/95
<i>In the Matter of Calvin L. Word</i>	34-36286	09/28/95
<i>SEC v. Calvin L. Word, et al.</i>	LR-14662	09/28/95
<i>In the Matter of Richard A. Anders</i>	34-36287	09/28/95
<i>In the Matter of Daniel L. Zessinger</i>	34-36291	09/28/95
<i>SEC v. Stephen T. Strabala</i>	LR-14667	09/28/95
<i>SEC v. Robert Simpson</i>	NONE	09/29/95
<i>SEC v. Benjamin Rex Moses</i>	LR-14682	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Thomas J. Word, et al.</i>	34-36304	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Grant C. Ross</i>	34-36307	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Stephen T. Strabala</i>	34-36305	09/29/95

<u>Name of Case</u>	<u>Release No.</u>	<u>Date Filed</u>
Broker-dealer: Government Securities		
<i>SEC v. Steinhardt Management Co., Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14358	12/16/94
<i>SEC v. Terry D. Busbee, et al.</i>	LR-14387	01/23/95
Broker-dealer: Other		
<i>In the Matter of J. Edmund & Co., et al.</i>	34-34927	11/02/94
<i>SEC v. Stratton Oakmont</i>	LR-14355	12/14/94
<i>In the Matter of Robin Rushing, et al.</i>	34-35232	01/18/95
<i>In the Matter of Peter T. Frankel</i>	34-35458	03/08/95
<i>In the Matter of James P. Cahill</i>	34-35461	03/08/95
<i>In the Matter of Frank J. Romeo, Jr., et al.</i>	34-35460	03/08/95
<i>In the Matter of Ronald F. Milardo</i>	34-35456	03/08/95
<i>In the Matter of John D. O'Brien</i>	34-35457	03/08/95
<i>In the Matter of Alan E. Rosenthal</i>	34-35489	03/15/95
<i>In the Matter of Lai Sum Pang</i>	34-35521	03/22/95
<i>In the Matter of James Capel Inc.</i>	34-35648	04/26/95
<i>In the Matter of James E. Matuszewski</i>	34-35902	06/28/95
<i>SEC v. Stifel, Nicolaus & Co., Inc.</i>	LR-14587	08/03/95
<i>In the Matter of Joel J. Matcovsky</i>	34-36065	08/07/95
Contempt-Civil		
<i>SEC v. Dennis Santiago, et al.</i>	NONE	11/16/94
<i>SEC v. Steven G. Weil</i>	NONE	12/16/94
<i>SEC v. Teri Cooper, et al.</i>	NONE	12/27/94
<i>SEC v. Frank Custable, Jr., et al.</i>	NONE	01/17/95
<i>SEC v. Michael McIntyre</i>	LR-14497	01/19/95
<i>SEC v. Basic Energy & Affiliated Resources Inc.</i>	NONE	01/20/95
<i>SEC v. Sarah Delaney, et al.</i>	NONE	01/20/95
<i>SEC v. John Gallard</i>	LR-14485	02/28/95
<i>SEC v. John C. Trimpin</i>	NONE	03/15/95
<i>SEC v. Bankers Alliance Corp., et al.</i>	NONE	03/17/95
<i>SEC v. William B. Clark</i>	LR-14474	03/20/95
<i>SEC v. Fortune Plus Management</i>	NONE	03/27/95
<i>SEC v. Robert Vecchioni</i>	NONE	04/13/95
<i>SEC v. Frank Custable, et al.</i>	NONE	04/24/95
<i>SEC v. Frank Custable, Jr., et al.</i>	NONE	05/26/95
<i>SEC v. Oscar William Olson</i>	LR-14736	06/05/95
<i>SEC v. Karl L. Dahlstrom</i>	NONE	06/21/95
<i>SEC v. Oscar William Olson</i>	LR-14736	08/04/95
<i>SEC v. Danny Sterk, et al.</i>	LR-14663	08/04/95
<i>SEC v. Prime One Partners Corp., et al.</i>	NONE	08/15/95
<i>SEC v. Howard Addison</i>	NONE	09/07/95
<i>SEC v. Northport Associates Inc., et al.</i>	NONE	09/12/95
<i>SEC v. Jedi Group Ltd., et al.</i>	NONE	09/29/95

<u>Name of Case</u>	<u>Release No.</u>	<u>Date Filed</u>
Corporate Control		
<i>SEC v. Concord Assets Group Inc.</i>	LR-14398	02/02/95
<i>In the Matter of Arthur E. Fillmore</i>	34-36259	09/21/95
<i>SEC v. The Ventana Corp., et al.</i>	LR-14646	09/21/95
<i>In the Matter of Tristar Corp.</i>	34-36315	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Starion International Ltd., et al.</i>	34-36318	09/29/95

Delinquent Filings: Forms 3/4/5

<i>In the Matter of Porter C. McKinnon</i>	34-34874	10/20/94
<i>In the Matter of David L. Chandler</i>	34-34904	10/27/94
<i>In the Matter of Charles E. Fausel</i>	34-34964	11/10/94
<i>In the Matter of Allan J. McCorkle, et al.</i>	34-35075	12/09/94
<i>In the Matter of Floyd D. Wilkenson</i>	34-35665	05/02/95
<i>In the Matter of John D. Kuhns</i>	34-35794	06/01/95
<i>In the Matter of Janice A. Jones</i>	34-35856	06/19/95
<i>SEC v. David G. Eller</i>	LR-14628	09/06/95

Delinquent Filings: Issuer Reporting

<i>In the Matter of Norsul Oil & Mining Ltd.</i>	34-34989	11/21/94
<i>SEC v. Eutro Group Holding Inc.</i>	LR-14359	12/16/94

Fraud Against Regulated Entities

<i>In the Matter of Manufacturers & Traders Trust Co.</i>	34-34896	10/26/94
<i>In the Matter of Donna Tumminia, et al.</i>	34-35241	01/19/95
<i>SEC v. Michael J. Morse, et al.</i>	LR-14423	02/27/95
<i>In the Matter of Demitrios Julius Shiva</i>	34-36202	09/07/95
<i>In the Matter of Edward L. Scherer</i>	34-36290	09/28/95
<i>SEC v. Louis Bethune, et al.</i>	LR-14675	09/29/95
<i>SEC v. William P. Hoidas</i>	LR-14677	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Barclays Bank PLC</i>	34-35382	12/15/94

Insider Trading

<i>SEC v. Edward A. Cantor, et al.</i>	LR-14329	11/08/94
<i>In the Matter of Ann E. Hiles</i>	34-34994	11/22/94
<i>In the Matter of Thomas L. Greulich Sr.</i>	34-34995	11/22/94
<i>In the Matter of Robert T. McMahon</i>	34-34996	11/22/94
<i>SEC v. Jeffrey C. Morris, et al.</i>	LR-14381	12/06/94
<i>SEC v. Thomas J. Farrell, et al.</i>	LR-14319	12/08/94
<i>SEC v. William K. Fisher</i>	LR-14362	12/20/94
<i>SEC v. Lawrence M. Mathe</i>	LR-14369	12/21/94
<i>SEC v. Angelo A. Coronato, et al.</i>	LR-14391	01/24/95
<i>SEC v. Charles Brumfield, et al.</i>	LR-14408	02/09/95
<i>SEC v. Michael Borlinghaus, et al.</i>	LR-14429	03/06/95

<u>Name of Case</u>	<u>Release No.</u>	<u>Date Filed</u>
<i>SEC v. Richard A. Galanti</i>	LR-14445	03/22/95
<i>SEC v. Sheri I. Kleinbaum, et al.</i>	LR-14447	03/23/95
<i>SEC v. Jack Seibald, et al.</i>	LR-14449	03/28/95
<i>SEC v. Gilbert N. Schwartzberg, et al.</i>	LR-14454	03/30/95
<i>SEC v. Lawrence Ronald Freedman</i>	LR-14458	04/03/95
<i>SEC v. Stephen H. Wagner</i>	LR-14479	04/26/95
<i>SEC v. Herbert D. Conant</i>	LR-14525	05/19/95
<i>SEC v. Thomas F. Lanier, et al.</i>	LR-14507	05/23/95
<i>SEC v. Rathna Papa Rachuri, et al.</i>	LR-14510	05/24/95
<i>In the Matter of Vincent A. Mayer</i>	34-35783	05/31/95
<i>In the Matter of Eugene R. Ehmann</i>	34-35826	06/08/95
<i>SEC v. Frederick Augustus Moran, et al.</i>	LR-14532	06/15/95
<i>SEC v. Stefan Hislop, et al.</i>	LR-14533	06/19/95
<i>SEC v. Richard W. Woodward, et al.</i>	LR-14548	06/28/95
<i>SEC v. Stephen C. Leung</i>	LR-14551	06/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Danny Omar Cherif</i>	34-35935	07/05/95
<i>SEC v. Thomas H. Potts</i>	LR-14561	07/17/95
<i>SEC v. Jozef A.C. VanStratum</i>	LR-14599	08/09/95
<i>SEC v. Robert B. Frame, et al.</i>	LR-14614	08/24/95
<i>SEC v. Giovanni Malavasi</i>	LR-14626	09/06/95
<i>SEC v. Martyn I. Gefsky, et al.</i>	LR-14648	09/21/95
<i>SEC v. Richard J. Smith</i>	LR-14689	09/27/95
<i>SEC v. Nicholas Croce, et al.</i>	LR-14655	09/28/95
<i>SEC v. Robert J. Young, et al.</i>	LR-14661	09/29/95

Investment Adviser

<i>In the Matter of Chancellor Capital Management Inc., et al.</i>	IA-1447	10/18/94
<i>In the Matter of Gerald B. Unterman</i>	IA-1448	10/20/94
<i>In the Matter of Midwest Advisory Services Inc., et al.</i>	IA-1449	10/21/94
<i>SEC v. Galleon Capital Management, et al.</i>	LR-14315	10/31/94
<i>In the Matter of Credit Suisse Asset Management Inc.</i>	IA-1452	11/16/94
<i>In the Matter of Center for Financial Planning Inc.</i>	IA-1456	12/06/94
<i>SEC v. Sanjay Saxena, et al.</i>	LR-14348	12/08/94
<i>In the Matter of Gabelli & Company Inc.</i>	IA-1457	12/08/94
<i>In the Matter of Sheer Asset Management Inc., et al.</i>	IA-1459	01/03/95
<i>In the Matter of Louis Elwin Sharp</i>	IA-1463	01/11/95
<i>In the Matter of David Lee Ullom</i>	IA-1461	01/13/95
<i>In the Matter of Stock and Option Services Inc., et al.</i>	IA-1466	02/02/95
<i>SEC v. Financial Concepts Group International</i>	LR-14524	02/07/95
<i>In the Matter of H. David Grace, et al.</i>	IA-1467	02/07/95
<i>In the Matter of Thomas J. Bowes</i>	IA-1468	02/10/95
<i>SEC v. Jay DeForest Moore</i>	LR-14420	02/13/95

<u>Name of Case</u>	<u>Release No.</u>	<u>Date Filed</u>
<i>In the Matter of Kenneth Von Kohorn, et al.</i>	IA-1471	02/22/95
<i>SEC v. Nicholas A. Rudi, et al.</i>	LR-14421	02/23/95
<i>In the Matter of Mountain Capital Management Inc., et al.</i>	IA-1473	02/27/95
<i>In the Matter of Louis A. Acevedo</i>	IA-1479	03/14/95
<i>In the Matter of Meridian Investment Co., et al.</i>	IA-1484	04/18/95
<i>In the Matter of K. Lawrence Neill</i>	IA-1485	04/18/95
<i>In the Matter of Luis Corujo</i>	IA-1490	05/11/95
<i>In the Matter of Chubb Securities Corp.</i>	IA-1491	05/11/95
<i>In the Matter of Askin Capital Management, L.P., et al.</i>	IA-1492	05/23/95
<i>SEC v. John T. Nakoski</i>	LR-14515	05/30/95
<i>SEC v. Joseph Edwin Giewartowski, et al.</i>	LR-14520	05/30/95
<i>In the Matter of Coles Financial Services, Inc., et al.</i>	IA-1493	06/05/95
<i>In the Matter of Clarke Lanzen Skalla Investment Firm Inc , et al.</i>	IA-1501	06/16/95
<i>SEC v. Mark G. Daly, et al.</i>	LR-14534	06/19/95
<i>In the Matter of Herbert I. Glass</i>	IA-1503	06/22/95
<i>In the Matter of John T. Nakoski</i>	IA-1505	07/10/95
<i>In the Matter of Clariden Asset Management (NY) Inc., et al.</i>	IA-1509	07/10/95
<i>SEC v. Robert Burstein</i>	NONE	07/13/95
<i>In the Matter of Money Growth Institute Inc., et al.</i>	IA-1506	07/14/95
<i>In the Matter of Gary A. Smith</i>	IA-1508	07/17/95
<i>In the Matter of Robert J. Kuss</i>	IA-1509	07/26/95
<i>In the Matter of Robert Burstein</i>	IA-1511	07/28/95
<i>In the Matter of Carmen W. Elio, et al.</i>	IA-1513	07/31/95
<i>In the Matter of Harold M. Covert & Associates Inc., et al.</i>	IA-1515	08/17/95
<i>SEC v. James A. Pearce, et al.</i>	LR-14629	09/05/95
<i>In the Matter of William Roderick McCarty, Jr.</i>	IA-1519	09/13/95
<i>SEC v. Homer W. Forster</i>	LR-14313	09/22/95
<i>In the Matter of Stanley P. Kerry</i>	IA-1523	09/25/95
<i>In the Matter of Wayne B. Conwell, et al.</i>	IA-1524	09/26/95
<i>SEC v. Robert Pierce, et al.</i>	LR-14653	09/26/95
<i>In the Matter of Valicenti Advisory Services Inc., et al.</i>	IA-1528	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Account Management Corp., et al.</i>	IA-1529	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Van Kampen American Capital Asset Mgmt, Inc., et al.</i>	IA-1525	09/29/95
<i>SEC v. Keypoint Financial Corp.</i>	LR-14669	09/29/95

Investment Company

<i>In the Matter of Concourse Capital Asset Management Inc., et al.</i>	IC-20698	11/15/94
<i>In the Matter of The Commercial Bank, et al.</i>	IC-20757	12/06/94

<u>Name of Case</u>	<u>Release No.</u>	<u>Date Filed</u>
<i>In the Matter of Smith Hayes Financial Services Corp., et al.</i>	IC-20876	02/02/95
<i>SEC v. John J. Kaweske</i>	LR-14399	02/06/95
<i>In the Matter of John Logan Wallace</i>	IC-20904	02/21/95
<i>In the Matter of Thomas M. Rogge</i>	IC-20908	02/22/95
<i>In the Matter of Kemper Financial Services, Inc., et al.</i>	IC-20936	03/02/95
<i>In the Matter of Leeb Investment Advisers, et al.</i>	IC-21671	05/02/95
<i>In the Matter of Thomas H. Richards</i>	IC-21114	06/06/95
<i>In the Matter of Cardinal Management Corp.</i>	IC-21384	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Roger W. Honour</i>	IC-21385	09/29/95
<i>SEC v. Michael Carnicle, et al.</i>	LR-14669	09/29/95

Issuer Financial Disclosure

<i>In the Matter of Philip A. Fitzpatrick, et al.</i>	AAER 617	10/20/94
<i>In the Matter of Rita C. Villa</i>	AAER 618	10/20/94
<i>In the Matter of Pantheon Industries Inc., et al.</i>	AAER 621	10/27/94
<i>SEC v. Joseph B. Hebb</i>	AAER 623	11/03/94
<i>In the Matter of Collins Industries Inc., et al.</i>	AAER 624	11/03/94
<i>In the Matter of C. Steven Bolen, CPA</i>	AAER 626	11/15/94
<i>SEC v. Abraham Gold, et al.</i>	AAER 631	11/29/94
<i>SEC v. Ernst Hiestand, et al.</i>	LR-14347	12/08/94
<i>In the Matter of Bernard Weiner, CPA, et al.</i>	AAER 633	12/19/94
<i>SEC v. First Capital Holdings</i>	AAER 634	12/19/94
<i>SEC v. Digitran Systems, Inc., et al.</i>	AAER 637	12/29/94
<i>In the Matter of Larry Uyeda</i>	AAER 638	01/09/95
<i>In the Matter of Ronald G. Sherry, CPA</i>	AAER 639	01/11/95
<i>In the Matter of Douglas P. Rosile, CPA</i>	AAER 641	01/19/95
<i>In the Matter of Harry Weinblatt</i>	AAER 642	01/30/95
<i>SEC v. Ross Freitas, et al.</i>	AAER 643	02/08/95
<i>In the Matter of L. Karl Denton, CPA</i>	AAER 644	02/15/95
<i>In the Matter of Thomas Milo Somers</i>	AAER 646	02/16/95
<i>SEC v. Sequoia Systems Inc., et al.</i>	AAER 647	02/16/95
<i>In the Matter of James Edward Palmer, et al.</i>	AAER 645	02/16/95
<i>In the Matter of Harry C. Berridge</i>	AAER 650	03/06/95
<i>SEC v. Network Equipment Technologies Inc.</i>	NONE	03/07/95
<i>SEC v. Victor G. Incendy, et al.</i>	AAER 656	03/10/95
<i>In the Matter of Douglas C. Hansen, CPA</i>	AAER 653	03/13/95
<i>SEC v. Martin Greenstein</i>	AAER 660	03/24/95
<i>In the Matter of Martin Greenstein, CPA</i>	AAER 659	04/03/95
<i>In the Matter of Ronald Effren, et al.</i>	AAER 661	04/07/95
<i>In the Matter of Arden Franklin, CPA</i>	AAER 662	04/12/95
<i>SEC v. Softpoint Inc., et al.</i>	AAER 666	04/27/95
<i>SEC v. Michael Monus, et al.</i>	AAER 667	05/02/95
<i>In the Matter of John G. Rangos, Sr.</i>	AAER 672	05/09/95
<i>In the Matter of William R. Nelson</i>	AAER 669	05/09/95

<u>Name of Case</u>	<u>Release No.</u>	<u>Date Filed</u>
<i>In the Matter of John J. Cushma, CPA</i>	AAER 670	05/09/95
<i>In the Matter of Dale O. Nolder, Jr.</i>	AAER 671	05/09/95
<i>SEC v. Chambers Development Co., Inc.</i>	AAER 673	05/09/95
<i>In the Matter of James A. Merriam</i>	AAER 674	05/11/95
<i>SEC v. Raynard M. Fenster, et al.</i>	AAER 676	05/30/95
<i>In the Matter of Kemper Corp., et al.</i>	AAER 677	06/06/95
<i>In the Matter of Marvin E. Basson, CPA</i>	AAER 678	06/13/95
<i>In the Matter of Ernest T. Szeker, Jr., et al.</i>	AAER 679	06/13/95
<i>In the Matter of Duane V. Midgley, CPA</i>	AAER 680	06/19/95
<i>In the Matter of Michael A. Pinto, CPA</i>	AAER 681	06/22/95
<i>In the Matter of Gordon N. Oakes, Jr., et al.</i>	AAER 682	06/22/95
<i>In the Matter of American Mobile Systems, Inc.</i>	AAER 683	06/26/95
<i>In the Matter of Warren L. Rawls, CPA</i>	AAER 684	06/27/95
<i>SEC v. Curtis A. Younts, Jr., et al.</i>	AAER 685	06/27/95
<i>SEC v. First National Entertainment Corp., et al.</i>	LR-14546	06/27/95
<i>SEC v. Barry R. Benjamin, et al.</i>	AAER 686	07/11/95
<i>SEC v. William J. Young</i>	AAER 687	07/20/95
<i>SEC v. The Keith Group of Companies Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14576	07/24/95
<i>In the Matter of Kurzwell Applied Intelligence Inc.</i>	AAER 689	07/25/95
<i>In the Matter of Tracy Spadaro Maynard, et al.</i>	AAER 690	07/25/95
<i>SEC v. Bernard F. Bradstreet, et al.</i>	LR-14571	07/26/95
<i>SEC v. ANW, Inc., et al.</i>	AAER 691	07/27/95
<i>In the Matter of Wendell L. Gunn</i>	AAER 692	08/03/95
<i>In the Matter of Edwin F. Schaeffer, et al.</i>	AAER 693	08/03/95
<i>SEC v. Malcolm Cheek, et al.</i>	AAER 694	08/03/95
<i>In the Matter of John J. French, CPA, et al.</i>	AAER 695	08/03/95
<i>In the Matter of Sound Advice Inc., et al.</i>	AAER 696	08/09/95
<i>In the Matter of TCF Financial Corp.</i>	AAER 697	08/10/95
<i>In the Matter of John McMillan</i>	AAER 699	08/14/95
<i>In the Matter of Bion Environmental Technologies Inc.</i>	AAER 700	08/16/95
<i>In the Matter of Robert W. Zak, Jr., CPA</i>	AAER 701	08/15/95
<i>SEC v. John S. Nadolski, et al.</i>	AAER 702	08/18/95
<i>In the Matter of Valley Systems, Inc.</i>	AAER 707	09/14/95
<i>SEC v. Nicholas J. Pace, et al.</i>	AAER 708	09/14/95
<i>In the Matter of Kerkhoff Industries, Inc., et al.</i>	34-36232	09/14/95
<i>In the Matter of Roger D. Gnowles</i>	AAER 711	09/18/95
<i>In the Matter of Lawrence R. Reich, CPA, et al.</i>	AAER 712	09/18/95
<i>SEC v. Gary L. Holman</i>	AAER 713	09/20/95
<i>SEC v. Ernest W. Grendi, et al.</i>	AAER 715	09/21/95
<i>In the Matter of P. Andrew Baker</i>	AAER 716	09/21/95
<i>SEC v. Excal Enterprises, Inc., et al.</i>	AAER 718	09/26/95
<i>In the Matter of Richard D. Russell</i>	AAER 719	09/26/95
<i>In the Matter of Terry R. Kuntz, et al.</i>	AAER 720	09/26/95
<i>SEC v. Met Capital Corp., et al.</i>	LR-14674	09/27/95
<i>In the Matter of Marvin Mears, et al.</i>	IC-21383	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Donald A. Vandenberg, CPA</i>	AAER 723	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Joseph E. Grendi, CPA, et al.</i>	AAER 724	09/29/95

<u>Name of Case</u>	<u>Release No.</u>	<u>Date Filed</u>
<i>In the Matter of John M. Waters</i>	AAER 726	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Roger Michael Rosenberg, et al.</i>	AAER 727	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Goody's Family Clothing Inc., et al.</i>	AAER 729	09/29/95

Issuer Reporting: Other

<i>In the Matter of The Cooper Companies</i>	34-35082	12/12/94
<i>In the Matter of Service Corporation International</i>	34-36237	09/15/95

Market Manipulation

<i>In the Matter of Cynthia Keefover</i>	34-34804	10/07/94
<i>In the Matter of F.N. Wolf & Co., Inc., et al.</i>	34-34892	10/25/94
<i>In the Matter of Robert Peckerman</i>	34-35152	12/27/94
<i>In the Matter of Leonard M. Tucker, et al.</i>	34-35262	01/23/95
<i>In the Matter of Steven R. Cloyes</i>	34-35290	01/30/95
<i>SEC v. Jeffrey C. Hays, et al.</i>	LR-14412	02/08/95
<i>In the Matter of Edward J. Barter</i>	34-35346	02/08/95
<i>In the Matter of Leo M. Eisenberg</i>	34-35545	03/02/95
<i>In the Matter of Paul Russo, et al.</i>	34-35586	04/10/95
<i>In the Matter of Stanley Berk</i>	34-35254	04/20/95
<i>In the Matter of Patrick A. Collins</i>	34-35645	04/25/95
<i>In the Matter of Victor M. Wexler</i>	34-35670	05/04/95
<i>In the Matter of Elliott B. Rosenberg, et al.</i>	34-35768	05/25/95
<i>In the Matter of Scott Bedford</i>	34-35887	06/23/95
<i>SEC v. Timothy Essaye</i>	LR-14572	07/26/95
<i>In the Matter of Paul Giles, et al.</i>	34-36118	08/18/95
<i>SEC v. Michael J. Markowski, et al.</i>	LR-14615	08/24/95
<i>In the Matter of Robert Francis Catoggio, et al.</i>	34-36262	09/21/95
<i>SEC v. Robert O. Glau, Jr.</i>	NONE	09/21/95
<i>In the Matter of Vincent Militano, et al.</i>	34-36312	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Harold W. Ross, et al.</i>	34-36322	09/29/95

Miscellaneous Disclosure/Reporting

<i>In the Matter of Charles E. Campbell, et al.</i>	34-34973	11/15/94
<i>In the Matter of Ferdinand Russo, et al.</i>	34-35081	12/12/94
<i>SEC v. Mal Yerasi</i>	LR-14514	05/30/95
<i>In the Matter of Thomas J. Blair, CPA</i>	34-36136	08/23/95

Offering Violations (By Non-Regulated Entities)

<i>SEC v. Paul J. Myers</i>	LR-14295	10/13/94
<i>SEC v. Frank S. Butler</i>	LR-14322	10/14/94
<i>SEC v. Fulcrum Holding Company Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14316	10/31/94
<i>SEC v. Basic Energy & Affiliated Resources Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14326	11/02/94

<u>Name of Case</u>	<u>Release No.</u>	<u>Date Filed</u>
<i>SEC v. John W. Walsh Jr., et al.</i>	LR-14353	12/14/94
<i>In the Matter of Frederick Entman, et al.</i>	34-35164	12/28/94
<i>SEC v. Saul Foos</i>	LR-14376	01/04/95
<i>SEC v. The Trust Group, Ltd., et al.</i>	LR-14382	01/17/95
<i>SEC v. Broadcast Associates-I, et al.</i>	LR-14388	01/23/95
<i>SEC v. Melbourne Capital Corp., et al.</i>	LR-14396	01/31/95
<i>SEC v. Edward V. Ellis, Sr.</i>	LR-14414	02/15/95
<i>SEC v. Jonathan N. Googel, et al.</i>	LR-14432	03/09/95
<i>SEC v. Bankers Alliance Corp., et al.</i>	LR-14427	03/22/95
<i>SEC v. Telecom Marketing Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14451	03/29/95
<i>SEC v. Gary F. Naiman</i>	LR-14463	04/06/95
<i>SEC v. Northwest Starscan, LP, et al.</i>	LR-14465	04/10/95
<i>SEC v. Michael Goodman, et al.</i>	LR-14471	04/14/95
<i>In the Matter of Command Credit Corp., et al.</i>	33-7162	04/19/95
<i>SEC v. Robert F. Harmon</i>	LR-14476	04/18/95
<i>SEC v. C'est Lestial Waters, Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14484	04/27/95
<i>SEC v. John Gallard, et al.</i>	LR-14485	05/02/95
<i>SEC v. Comcoa Ltd., et al.</i>	LR-14080	05/05/95
<i>SEC v. Panworld Minerals International Inc.</i>	LR-14606	05/10/95
<i>SEC v. Lee F. Pioske, et al.</i>	LR-14504	05/17/95
<i>SEC v. John G. Bennett, Jr., et al.</i>	LR-14503	05/18/95
<i>SEC v. Irwin Harry Bloch</i>	LR-14511	05/25/95
<i>SEC v. Personal Wealth Systems Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14688	05/30/95
<i>SEC v. Brian Walsh, et al.</i>	LR-14523	06/06/95
<i>SEC v. United Benefits Group, Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14589	06/06/95
<i>SEC v. Jeffrey Norton, et al.</i>	LR-14529	06/14/95
<i>SEC v. Harry G. Terezakis, et al.</i>	LR-14542	06/22/95
<i>In the Matter of Albert T. Devaul</i>	34-35936	07/05/95
<i>In the Matter of Global Link Capital Markets Inc., et al.</i>	33-7194	07/06/95
<i>SEC v. D'Acquisto Financial Group, Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14562	07/13/95
<i>SEC v. Ellis L. Deyon, et al.</i>	LR-14586	07/25/95
<i>SEC v. Sybaris Clubs International Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14577	07/26/95
<i>SEC v. Edward M. Beagan, et al.</i>	LR-14575	07/28/95
<i>In the Matter of Joseph Legrotte</i>	34-36036	07/31/95
<i>In the Matter of Sidney Gould</i>	34-36037	07/31/95
<i>SEC v. Daniel Odulo, et al.</i>	LR-14591	08/07/95
<i>SEC v. Ronald M. Zook, et al.</i>	LR-14594	08/07/95
<i>In the Matter of Brigit (Gitte) Mechlenburg</i>	34-36067	08/08/95
<i>SEC v. International Consulting & Management Ltd., et al.</i>	LR-14601	08/10/95
<i>SEC v. Jerome E. Pinckney, et al.</i>	LR-14660	08/24/95
<i>SEC v. Richard M. Lambert</i>	LR-14621	08/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Donald J. Stoecklein</i>	34-36177	09/01/95
<i>SEC v. The Better Life Club of America, Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14624	09/01/95
<i>In the Matter of William E. Cooper</i>	34-36214	09/11/95
<i>In the Matter of The Capital Fund, et al.</i>	33-7214	09/12/95
<i>SEC v. James P. McLaughlin</i>	LR-14685	09/13/95

<u>Name of Case</u>	<u>Release No.</u>	<u>Date Filed</u>
<i>SEC v. Bradley S. Hill</i>	LR-14697	09/13/95
<i>In the Matter of The Outer Space Development Co., et al.</i>	33-7217	09/18/95
<i>SEC v. Jamie Charles Spangler, et al.</i>	LR-14645	09/20/95
<i>SEC v. Robert Cord Beatty, et al.</i>	LR-14673	09/25/95
<i>In the Matter of Ronald Blaine</i>	34-36277	09/26/95
<i>SEC v. Lee F. Sutcliffe</i>	LR-14658	09/27/95
<i>In the Matter of Sidney Friedman, et al.</i>	33-7228	09/28/95
<i>SEC v. Balance For Life Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14656	09/28/95
<i>SEC v. Rufus L. Jackson, et al.</i>	LR-14657	09/28/95
<i>SEC v. Christopher M. Pederson</i>	LR-14672	09/28/95
<i>In the Matter of Stylex Homes Inc., et al.</i>	34-36299	09/29/95
<i>SEC v. Enviromint Holdings Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14683	09/29/95

Offering Violations (By Regulated Entities)

<i>SEC v. Future Vision Direct Marketing Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14287	10/03/94
<i>In the Matter of American Business Securities Inc., et al.</i>	34-37894	10/25/94
<i>SEC v. Jon D. Aldrich, et al.</i>	LR-14323	10/28/94
<i>In the Matter of Ronald Stephen Combs, et al.</i>	34-34910	10/28/94
<i>In the Matter of Deltec Asset Management Corp.</i>	33-7109	11/08/94
<i>In the Matter of Jeffrey D. Howes, et al.</i>	33-7115	12/02/94
<i>SEC v. Gemco Oil Development, Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14385	12/27/94
<i>In the Matter of Stephen A. Holloway, et al.</i>	34-35238	01/19/95
<i>SEC v. United Communications Ltd., et al.</i>	LR-14424	02/27/95
<i>In the Matter of Sanjay Saxena, et al.</i>	IA-1475	02/28/95
<i>In the Matter of Kenneth L. Weinberg, et al.</i>	34-35441	03/03/95
<i>In the Matter of Diane Burnell Kaechele</i>	34-35459	03/08/95
<i>SEC v. Pleasure Time Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14440	03/13/95
<i>In the Matter of Robert L. McAtee</i>	34-35496	03/15/95
<i>In the Matter of Charles Irvin</i>	34-35498	03/16/95
<i>In the Matter of William Moore</i>	34-35500	03/16/95
<i>In the Matter of John Martin Kealy</i>	34-35799	03/16/95
<i>In the Matter of Peter J. Curley</i>	34-35539	03/28/95
<i>In the Matter of Benjamin J. Sisti</i>	34-35540	03/28/95
<i>In the Matter of Jonathan N. Google</i>	34-35541	03/28/95
<i>In the Matter of Robert Johnston</i>	34-35562	04/04/95
<i>SEC v. American Interactive Group</i>	LR-14462	04/07/95
<i>In the Matter of James W. Cope</i>	34-35588	04/10/95
<i>SEC v. Myron Barry Michaels, et al.</i>	LR-14570	04/17/95
<i>In the Matter of Wayne E. Wood</i>	34-35610	04/17/95
<i>In the Matter of Ray S. Stoddard, et al.</i>	34-35611	04/17/95
<i>In the Matter of George R. Duke</i>	34-35612	04/17/95
<i>In the Matter of Delphoi Partners, et al.</i>	33-7165	04/26/95
<i>SEC v. Kenton Capital Ltd., et al.</i>	LR-14490	05/03/95
<i>In the Matter of Blythe Olin Selden</i>	IA-1489	05/04/95
<i>In the Matter of Louis F. Vargas</i>	34-35679	05/05/95

<u>Name of Case</u>	<u>Release No.</u>	<u>Date Filed</u>
<i>SEC v. Marc M. Joseph, et al.</i>	LR-14494	05/05/95
<i>In the Matter of William Edwin Somdahl</i>	34-35728	05/18/95
<i>In the Matter of Joseph Michael Haddad, Jr.</i>	34-35770	05/25/95
<i>In the Matter of Michael J. Murphy</i>	34-35825	06/08/95
<i>In the Matter of Paul C. Keiley, et al.</i>	34-35841	06/13/95
<i>In the Matter of Lloyd D. Pankey, et al.</i>	34-35851	06/16/95
<i>In the Matter of Richard Kevin Gerson</i>	34-35871	06/20/95
<i>SEC v. Wealth International Network, et al.</i>	LR-14552	07/06/95
<i>In the Matter of Lee F. Pioske</i>	34-35948	07/10/95
<i>In the Matter of William J. Moriarty</i>	34-35949	07/10/95
<i>SEC v. Amtel Communications Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14713	07/17/95
<i>In the Matter of David C. Wiley</i>	34-35986	07/18/95
<i>In the Matter of Carmen J. Librandi</i>	34-36024	07/26/95
<i>In the Matter of Milton Puryear</i>	IA-1514	08/01/95
<i>SEC v. Michael W. Crawford, et al.</i>	LR-14583	08/01/95
<i>In the Matter of Kinlaw Securities Corp., et al.</i>	34-36048	08/02/95
<i>In the Matter of Thomas V. Ackerly</i>	34-36073	08/09/95
<i>SEC v. Gene Block</i>	LR-14598	08/09/95
<i>SEC v. International Breeders, Inc., et al.</i>	LR-14607	08/14/95
<i>In the Matter of Derek Vaughn States</i>	34-36143	08/23/95
<i>In the Matter of Gus Zoppi, et al.</i>	34-36161	08/28/95
<i>In the Matter of William P. Cadelori</i>	34-36170	08/30/95
<i>In the Matter of Peter W. Woodbridge</i>	34-36184	09/05/95
<i>SEC v. Joy L. Bouwkamp, et al.</i>	LR-14631	09/06/95
<i>In the Matter of Terry T. Steen, et al.</i>	34-36190	09/06/95
<i>In the Matter of Robert Lee Gunther, et al.</i>	34-36192	09/06/95
<i>In the Matter of Charles Joseph Bazarian</i>	34-36191	09/06/95
<i>In the Matter of Jesse M. Townsley, Jr., et al.</i>	34-36201	09/07/95
<i>In the Matter of Danny G. Pinkerton, et al.</i>	34-36217	09/11/95
<i>In the Matter of Peter F. Olsen</i>	34-36218	09/11/95
<i>In the Matter of Raymond Charles Gross, et al.</i>	34-36221	09/13/95
<i>In the Matter of Jesse J. Hunt, Jr., et al.</i>	34-36243	09/18/95
<i>In the Matter of Anthony A. Benincasa</i>	34-36273	09/25/95
<i>SEC v. Jody M. Felterman</i>	LR-14654	09/26/95
<i>In the Matter of Michael S. Goodman</i>	34-36279	09/26/95
<i>In the Matter of Russell G. Koch, et al.</i>	34-36282	09/26/95
<i>In the Matter of Jerome L. Casperson</i>	34-36289	09/28/95
<i>In the Matter of Jody M. Felterman</i>	34-36294	09/28/95
<i>In the Matter of Robert I. Moses</i>	34-36297	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Kenneth Mitchell Wiggins, Jr.</i>	34-36298	09/29/95
<i>In the Matter of Thomas S. Drysdale</i>	34-36300	09/29/95
<i>SEC v. Harvey P. Tabb, et al.</i>	LR-14671	09/29/95

Transfer Agent

<i>In the Matter of The Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A.</i>	34-38784	10/04/95
--	----------	----------

Table 3
 INVESTIGATIONS OF POSSIBLE VIOLATIONS OF THE ACTS
 ADMINISTERED BY THE COMMISSION

Pending as of October 1, 1994	1,424
Opened in Fiscal Year 1995	436
Total	1,860
Closed in Fiscal Year 1995	329
Pending as of September 30, 1995	1,531
Formal Orders of Investigation	
Issued in Fiscal Year 1995	245

Table 4
 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED
 DURING FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1995

Broker-dealer Proceedings	149
Investment Adviser, Investment Company and Transfer Agent Proceedings	77
Stop Order Proceedings	46
Rule 2(e) Proceedings	19

Suspensions of Trading in Securities in Fiscal Year 1995	5

Table 5
INJUNCTIVE ACTIONS

Fiscal Year	Actions Initiated	Defendants Named
1986	163	488
1987	144	373
1988	125	401
1989	140	422
1990	186	557
1991	171	503
1992	156	487
1993	172	571
1994	197	620
1995	171	549

Right to Financial Privacy

Section 21(h) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [15 U.S.C. 78u(h)(6)] requires that the Commission “compile an annual tabulation of the occasions on which the Commission used each separate subparagraph or clause of [Section 21(h)(2)] or the provisions of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 [12 U.S.C. 3401-22 (the RFPA)] to obtain access to financial records of a customer and include it in its annual report to the Congress.” During the fiscal year, the Commission made nine applications for judicial orders pursuant to Section 21(h)(2). Set forth below are the number of occasions on which the Commission obtained customer records pursuant to the provisions of the RFPA:

Section 1104 (Customer Authorizations)	7
Section 1105 (Administrative Subpoenas)	487
Section 1107 (Judicial Subpoenas)	27

Table 6
TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS

**Persons Subject to, Acts Constituting, and
Basis for, Enforcement Action**

Sanction

Any person

Violation of the federal securities laws.

Cease-and-desist order, which may also require a person to comply or take steps to effect compliance with federal securities laws; accounting and disgorgement of illegal profits. (Securities Act, Section 8A; Exchange Act, Section 21C(a); Investment Company Act, Section 9(f); Investment Advisers Act, Section 203(k)).

**Broker-dealer, municipal securities dealer,
government securities dealer, transfer
agent, investment adviser or associated
person**

Willful violation of securities laws or rules; aiding or abetting such violation; failure reasonably to supervise others; willful misstatement or omission in filing with the Commission; conviction of or injunction against certain crimes or conduct.

Censure or limitation on activities; revocation, suspension or denial of registration; bar or suspension from association (Exchange Act, Sections 15(b)(4)-(6), 15B(c)(2)-(5), 15(C)(c)(1)-(2), 17A(c)(3)-(4); Investment Advisers Act, Section 203(e)-(f)).

Civil penalty up to \$100,000 for a natural person or \$500,000 for any other person; accounting and disgorgement of illegal profits. Penalties are subject to other limitations depending on the nature of the violation. (Exchange Act, Section 21B; Investment Company Act, Section 9; Investment Advisers Act, Section 203).

Temporary cease-and-desist order, which may, in appropriate cases, be issued *ex parte*. (Exchange Act, Section 21C).

Registered securities association

Violation of or inability to comply with the Exchange Act, rules thereunder, or its own rules; unjustified failure to enforce compliance with the foregoing or with rules of the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board by a member or person associated with a member.

Suspension or revocation of registration; censure or limitation of activities, functions, or operations (Exchange Act, Section 19(h)(1)).

Member of registered securities association, or associated person

Entry of Commission order against person pursuant to Exchange Act, Section 15(b); willful violation of securities laws or rules thereunder or rules of Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board; effecting transaction for other person with reason to believe that person was committing violations of securities laws.

Suspension or expulsion from the association; bar or suspension from association with member of association (Exchange Act, Section 19(h)(2)-(3)).

National securities exchange

Violation of or inability to comply with Exchange Act, rules thereunder or its own rules; unjustified failure to enforce compliance with the foregoing by a member or person associated with a member.

Suspension or revocation of registration; censure or limitation of activities, functions, or operations (Exchange Act, Section 19(h)(1)).

Member of national securities exchange, or associated person

Entry of Commission order against person pursuant to Exchange Act, Section 15(b); willful violation of securities laws or rules thereunder, effecting transaction for other person with reason to believe that person was committing violation of securities laws.

Suspension or expulsion from exchange; bar or suspension from association with member (Exchange Act, Section 19(h)(2)-(3)).

Registered clearing agency

Violation of or inability to comply with Exchange Act, rules thereunder, or its own rules; failure to enforce compliance with its own rules by participants.

Suspension or revocation of registration; censure or limitation of activities, functions, or operations (Exchange Act, Section 19(h)(1)).

Participant in registered clearing agency

Entry of Commission order against participant pursuant to Exchange Act, Section 15(b)(4); willful violation of clearing agency rules; effecting transaction for other person with reason to believe that person was committing violations of securities laws.

Suspension or expulsion from clearing agency (Exchange Act, Section 19(h)(2)).

Securities information processor

Violation of or inability to comply with provisions of Exchange Act or rules thereunder.

Censure or limitation of activities; suspension or revocation of registration (Exchange Act, Section 11A(b)(6)).

Any person

Willful violation of Securities Act, Exchange Act, Investment Company Act or rules thereunder; aiding or abetting such violation; willful misstatement in filing with Commission.

Temporary or permanent prohibition against serving in certain capacities with registered investment company (Investment Company Act, Section 9(b)).

Officer or director of self-regulatory organization

Willful violation of Exchange Act, rules thereunder or the organization's own rules; willful abuse of authority or unjustified failure to enforce compliance.

Removal from office or censure (Exchange Act, Section 19(h)(4)).

Principal of broker-dealer

Officer, director, general partner, ten-percent owner or controlling person of a broker-dealer for which a SIPC trustee has been appointed.

Bar or suspension from being or becoming associated with a broker-dealer (SIPA, Section 14(b)).

Securities Act registration statement

Statement materially inaccurate or incomplete.

Stop order refusing to permit or suspending effectiveness (Securities Act, Section 8(d)).

Person subject to Sections 12, 13, 14 or 15(d) of the Exchange Act or associated person

Failure to comply with such provisions or having caused such failure by an act or omission that person knew or should have known would contribute thereto.

Order directing compliance or steps effecting compliance (Exchange Act, Section 15(c)(4)).

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12 of the Exchange Act

Noncompliance by issuer with Exchange Act or rules thereunder.

Denial, suspension of effective date, suspension or revocation of registration (Exchange Act, Section 12(j)).

Public interest requires trading suspension.

Summary suspension of over-the-counter or exchange trading (Exchange Act, Section 12(k)).

Registered investment company

Failure to file Investment Company Act registration statement or required report; filing materially incomplete or misleading statement or report.

Suspension or revocation of registration (Investment Company Act, Section 8(e)).

Company has not attained \$100,000 net worth 90 days after Securities Act registration statement became effective.

Stop order under Securities Act; suspension or revocation of registration (Investment Company Act, Section 14(a)).

Attorney, accountant, or other professional or expert

Lack of requisite qualifications to represent others; lacking in character or integrity; unethical or improper professional conduct; willful violation of securities laws or rules, or aiding and abetting such violation.

Permanent or temporary denial of privilege of appearing or practicing before the Commission (17 CFR Section 201.102(e)(1)).

Attorney suspended or disbarred by court; expert's license revoked or suspended; conviction of a felony or of a misdemeanor involving moral turpitude.

Automatic suspension from appearance or practice before the Commission (17 CFR Section 201.102(e)(2)).

Securities violation in Commission-instituted action; finding of securities violation by Commission in administrative proceedings.

Temporary suspension from practicing before the Commission; censure; permanent or temporary disqualification from practicing before the Commission (17 CFR Section 201.102(e)(3)).

Member or employee of Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board

Willful violation of Exchange Act, rules thereunder, or rules of the Board; abuse of authority.

Censure or removal from office (Exchange Act, Section 15B(c)(8)).

CIVIL PROCEEDINGS IN FEDERAL DISTRICT COURTS

Persons Subject to, Acts Constituting, and Basis for, Enforcement Action**Sanction**

Any person

Engaging in or about to engage in acts or practices violating securities laws, rules or orders thereunder (including rules of a registered self-regulatory organization).

Injunction against acts or practices constituting violations (plus other equitable relief under court's general equity powers) (Securities Act, Section 20(b); Exchange Act, Section 21(d); Holding Company Act, Section 18(e); Investment Company Act, Section 42(d); Investment Advisers Act, Section 209(d); Trust Indenture Act, Section 321).

Noncompliance with provisions of the laws, rules, or regulations under Securities Act, Exchange Act, or Holding Company Act, orders issued by Commission, rules of a registered self-regulatory organization, or undertaking in a registration statement.

Writ of mandamus, injunction, or order directing compliance (Securities Act, Section 20(c); Exchange Act, Section 21(e); Holding Company Act, Section 18(f)).

Violating the securities laws or a cease-and-desist order (other than through insider trading).

Civil penalty up to \$100,000 for a natural person or \$500,000 for any other person or, if greater, the gross gain to the defendant. Penalties are subject to other limitations dependent on nature of violation. (Securities Act, Section 20(d); Exchange Act, Section 21(d) (3); Investment Company Act, Section 42(e); Investment Advisers Act, Section 209(e)).

Trading while in possession of material non-public information in a transaction on an exchange or from or through a broker-dealer (and transaction not part of a public offering); aiding and abetting or directly or indirectly controlling the person who engages in such trading.

Maximum civil penalty: three times profit gained or loss avoided as a result of transaction (Exchange Act, Section 21A(a)-(b)).

Violating Securities Act Section 17(a)(1) or Exchange Act section 10(b), when conduct demonstrates substantial unfitness to serve as an officer or director.

Prohibition from acting as an officer or director of any public company. (Securities Act, Section 20(e); Exchange Act, Section 21(d)(2)).

Issuer subject to Section 12 or 15(d) of the Exchange Act; officer, director, employee or agent of issuer; stockholder acting on behalf of issuer

Payment to foreign official, foreign political party or official, or candidate for foreign political office, for purposes of seeking the use of influence in order to assist issuer in obtaining or retaining business for or with, or directing business to, any person.

Maximum civil penalty: \$10,000 (Exchange Act, Section 32(c)).

Securities Investor Protection Corporation

Refusal to commit funds or act for the protection of customers.

Order directing discharge of obligations and other appropriate relief (SIPA, Section 11(b)).

National securities exchange or registered securities association

Failure to enforce compliance by members or persons associated with its members with the Exchange Act, rules or orders thereunder, or rules of the exchange or association.

Writ of mandamus, injunction or order directing such exchange or association to enforce compliance (Exchange Act, Section 21(e)).

Registered clearing agency

Failure to enforce compliance by its participants with its own rules.

Writ of mandamus, injunction or order directing clearing agency to enforce compliance (Exchange Act, Section 21(e)).

Issuer subject to Section 15(d) of 1934 Act

Failure to file required information, documents or reports.

Forfeiture of \$100 per day (Exchange Act, Section 32(b)).

Registered investment company

Name of company or of security issued by it deceptive or misleading.

Injunction against use of name (Investment Company Act, Section 35(d)).

Officer, director, member of advisory board, adviser, depositor, or underwriter of investment company

Engage in act or practice constituting breach of fiduciary duty involving personal misconduct.

Injunction against acting in certain capacities for investment company and other appropriate relief (Investment Company Act, Section 36(a)).

CRIMINAL PROSECUTION BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Persons Subject to, Acts Constituting, and Basis for, Enforcement Action

Sanction

Any person

Willful violation of securities laws or rules thereunder; willful misstatement in any document required to be filed by securities laws or rules; willful misstatement in any document required to be filed by self-regulatory organization in connection with an application for membership or association with member.

Maximum penalties: \$1,000,000 fine and ten years imprisonment for individuals, \$2,500,000 fine for non-natural persons (Exchange Act, Sections 21(d), 32(a)); \$10,000 fine and five years imprisonment (or \$200,000 if a public utility holding company for violations of the Holding Company Act) (Securities Act, Sections 20(b), 24; Investment Company Act, Sections 42(e), 49; Investment Advisers Act, Sections 209(e), 217; Trust Indenture Act, Sections 321, 325; Holding Company Act, Sections 18(f), 29).

Issuer subject to Section 12 or 15(d) of the Exchange Act; officer or director of issuer; stockholder acting on behalf of issuer; employee or agent subject to the jurisdiction of the United States

Issuer - \$2,000,000; officer, director, employee, agent or stockholder - \$100,000 and five years imprisonment (issuer may not pay fine for others) (Exchange Act, Section 32(c)).

Payment to foreign official, foreign political party or official, or candidate for foreign political office for purposes of seeking the use of influence in order to assist issuer in obtaining or retaining business for or with, or directing business to, any person.

Foreign Restricted List

The Securities and Exchange Commission maintains and publishes a Foreign Restricted List, which is designed to put broker-dealers, financial institutions, investors and others on notice of possible unlawful distributions of foreign securities in the United States. The list consists of names of foreign companies whose securities the Commission has reason to believe have been, or are being offered for public sale in the United States in possible violation of the registration requirement of Section 5 of the Securities Act of 1933 (Securities Act). The offer and sale of unregistered securities deprives investors of all the protections afforded by the Securities Act, including the right to receive a prospectus containing the information required by the Act for the purpose of enabling the investor to determine whether the investment is suitable. While most broker-dealers refuse to effect transactions in securities issued by companies on the Foreign Restricted List, this does not necessarily prevent promoters from illegally offering such securities directly to investors in the United States by mail, by telephone, and sometimes by personal solicitation. The following foreign corporations and other foreign entities comprise the Foreign Restricted List.

1. Aguacate Consolidated Mines, Incorporated (Costa Rica)
2. Alan MacTavish, Ltd. (England)
3. Allegheny Mining and Exploration Company, Ltd. (Canada)
4. Allied Fund for Capital Appreciation (AFCA, S.A.) (Panama)
5. Amalgamated Rare Earth Mines, Ltd. (Canada)
6. American Industrial Research S.A., also known as Investigation Industrial Americana, S.A. (Mexico)
7. American International Mining (Bahamas)
8. American Mobile Telephone and Tape Co., Ltd. (Canada)
9. Antel International Corporation, Ltd. (Canada)
10. Antoine Silver Mines, Ltd. (Canada)
11. ASCA Enterprisers Limited (Hong Kong)
12. Atholl Brose (Exports) Ltd. (England)
13. Atholl Brose Ltd. (England)
14. Atlantic and Pacific Bank and Trust Co., Ltd. (Bahamas)
15. Bank of Sark (Sark, Channel Islands, U.K.)
16. Briar Court Mines, Ltd. (Canada)
17. British Overseas Mutual Fund Corporation Ltd. (Canada)
18. California & Caracas Mining Corp., Ltd. (Canada)
19. Caprimex, Inc. (Grand Cayman, British West Indies)
20. Canterra Development Corporation, Ltd. (Canada)
21. Cardwell Oil Corporation, Ltd. (Canada)
22. Caribbean Empire Company, Ltd. (British Honduras)
23. Caye Chapel Club, Ltd. (British Honduras)
24. Central and Southern Industries Corp. (Panama)
25. Cerro Azul Coffee Plantation (Panama)
26. Cia. Rio Banano, S.A. (Costa Rica)
27. City Bank A.S. (Denmark)
28. Claw Lake Molybdenum Mines, Ltd. (Canada)
29. Claravella Corporation (Costa Rica)
30. Compressed Air Corporation, Limited (Bahamas)

31. Continental and Southern Industries, S.A. (Panama)
32. Crossroads Corporation, S.A. (Panama)
33. Darien Exploration Company, S.A. (Panama)
34. Derkglen, Ltd. (England)
35. De Veers Consolidated Mining Corporation, S.A. (Panama)
36. Doncannon Spirits, Ltd. (Bahamas)
37. Durman, Ltd., formerly known as Bankers International Investment Corporation (Bahamas)
38. Empresa Minera Caudalosa de-Panama, S.A. (Panama)
39. Ethel Copper Mines, Ltd. (Canada)
40. Euroforeign Banking Corporation, Ltd. (Panama)
41. Finansbanker a/s (Denmark)
42. First Liberty Fund, Ltd. (Bahamas)
43. General Mining S.A. (Canada)
44. Global Explorations, Inc. (Panama)
45. Global Insurance Company, Limited (British West Indies)
46. Globus Anlage-Vermittlungsgesellschaft MBH (Germany)
47. Golden Age Mines, Ltd. (Canada)
48. Hebilla Mining Corporation (Costa Rica)
49. Hemisphere Land Corporation Limited (Bahamas)
50. Henry Ost & Son, Ltd. (England)
51. Hotelera Playa Flamingo, S.A.
52. Intercontinental Technologies Corp. (Canada)
53. International Communications Corporation (British West Indies)
54. International Monetary Exchange (Panama)
55. International Trade Development of Costa Rica, S.A.
56. Ironco Mining & Smelting Company, Ltd. (Canada)
57. James G. Allan & Sons (Scotland)
58. Jojoba Oil & Seed Industries, S.A. (Costa Rica)
59. Jupiter Explorations, Ltd. (Canada)
60. Kenilworth Mines, Ltd. (Canada)
61. Klondike Yukon Mining Company (Canada)
62. KoKanee Moly Mines, Ltd. (Canada)
63. Land Sales Corporation (Canada)
64. Los Dos Hermanos, S.A. (Spain)
65. Lynbar Mining Corp. Ltd. (Canada)
66. Massive Energy Ltd. (Canada)
67. Mercantile Bank and Trust & Co., Ltd. (Cayman Island)
68. Multireal Properties, Inc. (Canada)
69. J.P. Morgan & Company, Ltd., of London, England (not to be confused with J.P. Morgan & Co., Incorporated, New York)
70. Norart Minerals Limited (Canada)
71. Normandie Trust Company, S.A. (Panama)
72. Northern Survey (Canada)
73. Northern Trust Company, S.A. (Switzerland)
74. Northland Minerals, Ltd. (Canada)
75. Obsco Corporation, Ltd. (Canada)
76. Pacific Northwest Developments, Ltd. (Canada)
77. Pan-Alaska Resources, S.A. (Panama)
78. Panamerican Bank & Trust Company (Panama)
79. Pascars Oils Ltd. (Canada)
80. Paulpic Gold Mines, Ltd. (Canada)

81. Pyrotex Mining and Exploration Co., Ltd. (Canada)
82. Radio Hill Mines Co., Ltd. (Canada)
83. Rancho San Rafael, S.A. (Costa Rica)
84. Rodney Gold Mines Limited (Canada)
85. Royal Greyhound and Turf Holdings Limited (South Africa)
86. S.A. Valles & Co., Inc. (Philippines)
87. San Salvador Savings & Loan Co., Ltd. (Bahamas)
88. Santack Mines Limited (Canada)
89. Security Capital Fiscal & Guaranty Corporation, S.A. (Panama)
90. Silver Stack Mines, Ltd. (Canada)
91. Societe Anonyme de Refinancement (Switzerland)
92. Strathmore Distillery Company, Ltd. (Scotland)
93. Strathross Blending Company Limited (England)
94. Swiss Caribbean Development & Finance Corporation (Switzerland)
95. Tam O'Shanter, Ltd. (Switzerland)
96. Timberland (Canada)
97. Trans-American Investments, Limited (Canada)
98. Trihope Resources, Ltd. (West Indies)
99. Trust Company of Jamaica, Ltd. (West Indies)
100. United Mining and Milling Corporation (Bahamas)
101. Unitrust Limited (Ireland)
102. Vacationland (Canada)
103. Valores de Inversion, S.A. (Mexico)
104. Victoria Oriente, Inc. (Panama)
105. Warden Walker Worldwide Investment Co. (England)
106. Wee Gee Uranium Mines, Ltd. (Canada)
107. Western International Explorations, Ltd. (Bahamas)
108. Yukon Wolverine Mining Company (Canada)

Self-Regulatory Organizations: Expenses, Pre-tax Income, and Balance Sheet Structure¹

In 1994, the total revenues of all self-regulatory organizations (SROs) with marketplace jurisdiction rose approximately \$80.0 million, an increase of approximately 7% from 1993. The New York Stock Exchange (NYSE), the National Association of Securities Dealers (NASD), the American Stock Exchange (AMEX), and the Chicago Board Options Exchange (CBOE) accounted for 86% of total SRO revenues, up from 85% in 1993. Revenues were earned primarily from listing or issuer fees, trading fees, and market data fees. For example:

- the NYSE reported total revenue of \$452 million, an increase of 2% from 1993, of which 40% consisted of listing fees, 20% consisted of trading fees, and 15% consisted of market data fees;
- the NASD reported total revenue of \$372 million, an increase of 12% from 1993, of which 21% consisted of issuer fees and 36% consisted of trading and market data fees; and
- the AMEX reported total revenue of \$144 million, an increase of 10% from 1993, of which 11% consisted of listing fees.

The following SROs also reported increases in revenues:

- the Boston Stock Exchange (BSE) reported a \$846,000 increase (6%) to \$14.9 million;
- the CBOE reported a \$16.7 million increase (21%) to \$97.7 million;
- the Pacific Stock Exchange (PSE) reported a \$3.3 million increase (8%) to \$46.8 million; and
- the Philadelphia Stock Exchange (PHLX) reported a \$1.8 million increase (5%) to \$40.6 million.

The Chicago Stock Exchange (CHX)² reported a \$298,000 decrease (.42%) to \$69.8 million. The Cincinnati Stock Exchange (CSE) reported total revenues of \$3.6 million for the six months ended June 30, 1994, as compared to its reported revenues of \$6.1 million for the entire year ended December 31, 1993.

The CBOE experienced the largest percentage increase in total revenues, 21%, while the NASD reported the largest dollar volume increase in total revenues, \$39.9 million.

¹After the close of its fiscal year ending December 31, 1993, the CSE adopted a fiscal year ending June 30. The amounts included in this report representing total revenues, total expenses, total pre-tax income, total liabilities, total assets, and total net worth for all SROs in 1994 include financial information based on CSE's June 30, 1994 fiscal year-end. Thus, comparisons between the financial analysis provided in the SEC's 1994 Annual Report and this report may be misleading.

²The CHX adopted its current name in 1993. Previously, it was known as the Midwest Stock Exchange.

The total expenses of all marketplace SROs were \$1.1 billion in 1994, an increase of \$94.6 million (10%) over 1993. The NASD incurred the largest dollar volume increase in expenses, \$65.9 million (24%). Five additional SROs incurred increases in expenses as follows:

- the AMEX incurred a \$9.4 million increase (8%);
- the BSE incurred a \$824,132 increase (6%);
- the NYSE incurred a \$23.7 million increase (7%);
- the PHLX incurred a \$3.7 million increase (10%); and
- the PSE incurred a \$242,000 increase (1%).

Two SROs incurred decreases in expenses:

- the CBOE incurred a \$4.3 million decrease (5%); and
- the CHX incurred a \$3.0 million decrease (4%).

The remaining SRO, the CSE, reported expenses of \$2.0 million for the six months ended June 30, 1994, as compared to its reported expenses of \$4.2 million for the entire year ended December 31, 1993.

Due to an increase in aggregate expenses, aggregate pre-tax income of the marketplace SROs fell to \$154.5 million in 1994, a decline of \$15 million (9%) from 1993. The CBOE experienced the largest dollar volume and largest percentage increase in pre-tax income, \$20.9 million and 3,228%, respectively. The PSE also showed a large percentage increase in pre-tax income, 181%. The remaining SROs reported pre-tax income in 1994, with the exception of the PHLX which reported a pre-tax loss of \$923,000. The CSE reported pre-tax income of \$1.4 million for the six months ended June 30, 1994, as compared to its reported pre-tax income of \$1.9 million for the year ended December 31, 1993.

The total assets of all marketplace SROs amounted to approximately \$1.9 billion in 1994, an increase of \$184 million (11%) over 1993. The NYSE showed the largest dollar volume increase in total assets, \$88.8 million (12%), while the AMEX reported the largest percentage increase in total assets, 14% (\$17.1 million). The NASD, CHX, and CBOE also reported large increases in total assets, equalling \$43.9 million (11.6%), \$31.2 million (12.0%), and \$8.8 million (10.4%), respectively. The PHLX, BSE, and PSE reported decreases of \$352,000 (.45%), \$3.2 million (16%), and \$1.4 million (4%), respectively. The CSE reported total assets of \$5.2 million as of June 30, 1994, as compared to its reported total assets of \$5.7 million as of December 31, 1993.

In 1994, the total liabilities of marketplace SROs increased \$94.3 million (11%) over the 1993 level. The NYSE showed the greatest dollar volume increase in liabilities, \$44.8 million (12%), while the AMEX reported the greatest percentage increase, 32% (\$9.3 million). Increases in liabilities also were reported by the CHX (\$29.9 million or 13%), the PHLX (\$1.4 million or 3%), and the NASD (\$22.8 million or 21%). Of the SROs reporting financial information for a 12-month period, the CBOE reported the largest dollar volume decline in liabilities, \$4.7 million (18%), while the BSE reported the greatest percentage decrease, \$3.7 million (27%). The PSE reported a decline in liabilities of \$4.2 million (26%). The CSE reported liabilities of \$1.3 million as of June 30, 1994, as compared to its reported liabilities of \$2.7 million as of December 31, 1993.

The aggregate net worth of the marketplace SROs rose \$90.1 million in 1994 to \$922.6 million, an increase of 11% over 1993. Of the SROs reporting financial information for a 12-month period, the CBOE incurred the largest percentage increase in net worth, 23% (\$13.5 million), while the largest dollar volume increase in net worth was reported by the NYSE, \$44.0 million (13%). The PSE also reported a substantial increase in net worth of \$2.8 million (13%). Other marketplace SROs also experienced positive growth in net worth, with the AMEX reporting an increase of \$7.8 million (9%); the NASD reporting an increase of \$21.1 million (8%); the BSE reporting an increase of \$555,000 (9%); and the CHX reporting an increase of \$1.3 million (6%). The PHLX reported a decrease in net worth of \$1.7 million (7%). The CSE reported a total net worth of \$3.9 million as of June 30, 1994, as compared to its reported net worth of \$3.0 million as of December 31, 1993.

Clearing agency results have been presented in two charts by their respective types: depositories and clearing corporations. Aggregate clearing agency service revenue decreased almost 2%, to \$476 million, in calendar year 1994. Interest income increased 48%, or by almost \$32 million. All clearing agencies adjust fee structure and refunds of fees to provide participants with attractively priced services, to meet expenses and to provide the amount of earnings which they desire to retain.

All service revenues at depositories totaled over \$287 million, down 9% or \$29 million. This included a decrease of almost \$25 million by Depository Trust Company (DTC). Only Philadelphia Depository Trust Company recorded an increase, which was 6%, or \$600,000. Total depository pre-tax income was up only \$84,000, or 1%.

The depositories continued to expand their base for service revenues by increasing the number of shares on deposit and the face value of debt securities in custody. This was made possible by the further expansion of depository-eligible issues and the desire of participants to avail themselves of depository services. At year-end there were more than 1.2 million depository eligible issues. In general, eligibility for all types of securities increased. For example, more than 95% of the principal amount of all outstanding municipal bonds and notes were in the depository system. At the end of 1994, the total value of securities in the depository system approached \$8 trillion, of which DTC alone controlled over \$7.7 trillion.

Service revenue of clearing corporations increased to over \$188 million, up 13%. MBS Clearing Corporation's pre-tax earnings increased \$5.7 million, up 269%. The Midwest Clearing Corporation reported a gain of \$227,000 compared to a loss of \$953,000 in 1993. The Options Clearing Corporation's pre-tax gain was \$5.2 million, up 186%. The Stock Clearing Corporation of Philadelphia showed a loss of \$173,000, compared to a gain of \$632,000 the previous year. The Government Securities Clearing Corporation was up 131%, or \$2 million, to \$3.6 million. Total pre-tax income was \$23 million, up 105%, for all clearing corporations.

The aggregate shareholders' equity of all clearing corporations and depositories rose to \$116 million in 1994, up 4%. Participant clearing fund contributions, which provide protection to the clearing agencies in the

event of a participant default, increased by \$95 million, or 4%, to almost \$2.8 billion. Should a participant default and its losses exceed its deposit, the entire participants' fund of the clearing agency may be assessed on a pro rata basis.

CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL INFORMATION OF SELF-REGULATORY ORGANIZATIONS
1991 – 1994
(\$ in Thousands)

	AMEX 1/	BSE 2/	CBOE 3/	CHX 1/	CSE 4/*	NASD 1/	NYSE 1/	PHLX 1/	PSE 1/	Total
Total Revenues										
1991	\$100,983	12,822	77,497	71,141	3,710	215,593	374,521	32,987	39,737	\$ 928,991
1992	\$114,489	13,589	70,435	73,794	4,578	264,274	418,390	37,583	41,879	\$1,039,011
1993	\$131,024	14,055	80,997	70,134**	6,057**	332,126**	445,037	38,808	43,457	\$1,161,695
1994	\$143,555	14,901	97,663	69,836	3,603	371,987	452,279	40,636	46,799	\$1,241,259
Total Expenses										
1991	\$103,286	12,606	75,262	74,522	3,697	185,672	317,419	34,177	38,912	\$ 845,553
1992	\$111,810	12,753	71,330	70,771	3,917	223,476	343,097	37,359	39,892	\$ 914,404
1993	\$119,744	13,031	80,349	71,920**	4,157**	275,014**	348,412	37,864	41,747	\$ 992,238
1994	\$129,123	13,855	76,096	68,911	2,175	340,929	372,140	41,559	41,989	\$1,086,778
Pre-Tax Income (Loss)										
1991	\$ (2,303)	216	2,235	(3,381)	12	29,921	57,102	(1,190)	825	\$ 83,437
1992	\$ 2,679	836	(895)	3,023	661	40,798	75,293	224	1,987	\$ 124,607
1993	\$ 11,280	1,024	648	(1,786)**	1,900	57,112	96,625	944	1,710	\$ 169,457
1994	\$ 14,432	1,046	21,567	925	1,427	31,058	80,139	(923)	4,810	\$ 154,481
Total Assets										
1991	\$104,263	22,610	104,545	431,902	3,065	255,241	549,416	108,736	42,716	\$1,622,494
1992	\$104,801	19,419	84,916	594,581	3,745	295,915	611,228	83,863	38,977	\$1,837,445
1993	\$118,410	19,405	84,902	259,790**	5,666	378,863	719,824	77,434**	37,682	\$1,701,975
1994	\$135,498	16,247	93,730	290,973	5,169	422,775	808,600	77,082	36,292	\$1,886,367
Total Liabilities										
1991	\$ 23,404	17,572	45,093	405,633	1,780	70,280	304,879	85,313	23,531	\$ 977,485
1992	\$ 22,634	14,397	26,393	574,155	1,990	75,899	325,850	60,279	18,537	\$1,120,134
1993	\$ 29,436	13,738	25,805	238,317	2,675	110,252	360,515	52,455**	16,286	\$ 869,478
1994	\$ 38,760	10,025	21,148	268,209	1,310	133,033	425,312	53,851	12,079	\$ 963,728
Net Worth										
1991	\$ 80,859	5,038	59,452	26,269	1,285	184,961	244,537	23,423	19,185	\$ 645,009
1992	\$ 82,167	5,022	58,523	20,426	1,755	220,016	285,378	23,584	20,440	\$ 717,311
1993	\$ 88,974	5,667	59,097	21,473	2,991	268,611	339,309	24,979	21,396	\$ 832,497
1994	\$ 96,738	6,222	72,582	22,764	3,859	289,742	383,288	23,231	24,213	\$ 922,639

1/ Fiscal year ending December 31.

2/ Fiscal year ending September 30

3/ Fiscal year ending June 30

4/ Fiscal year ending June 30 as of 1994. Previously, CSE used a Fiscal Year Ending December 31.

* Amounts for 1994 are based on consolidated statements for the six months ended June 30, 1994.

** These amounts have been reclassified to conform with the 1994 presentation.

Table 8
SELF-REGULATORY ORGANIZATIONS — CLEARING CORPORATIONS
1994 REVENUES and EXPENSES 1/
 (\$ in Thousands)

	Boston Stock Exchange Clearing Corporation 9/30/94 2/	Delta Government Options Corporation 12/31/94 3/	Government Securities Clearing Corporation 12/31/93 4/	International Securities Clearing Corporation 12/31/94 5/	MBS Clearing Corporation 12/31/94 6/	Midwest Clearing Corporation 12/31/94	National Securities Clearing Corporation 12/31/94	Options Clearing Corporation 12/31/94	Pacific Clearing Corporation 12/31/94 7/	Stock Clearing Corporation of Philadelphia 12/31/94	Total
Revenues											
Clearing Services	\$ 4,869	\$ 1,140	\$ 14,082	\$ 2,079	\$ 16,098	\$ 8,962	\$ 86,497	\$ 44,336	\$ 6,392	\$ 3,985	\$ 188,441
Interest	341	290	2,124	124	375	105	5,792	1,043	18		10,211
Other	228			3,000	0			8,186	4	405	11,823
Total Revenues 8/	\$ 5,439	\$ 1,430	\$ 16,206	\$ 5,203	\$ 16,473	\$ 9,067	\$ 92,289	\$ 53,566	\$ 6,414	\$ 4,390	\$ 210,476
Expenses											
Employee Costs	\$ 1,785	\$ 303	\$ 3,003	\$ 1,593	\$ 1,621	\$ 2,487	\$ 18,370	\$ 22,028	\$ 780	\$ 2,871	\$ 54,842
Data Processing and Communications Costs	988	16	6,579	1,697	351	182	46,358	9,997	1,012	485	67,664
Occupancy Costs	471	17	361	310	1,112	375	2,894	4,341	158	163	10,203
Contracted Services Cost	322			11			12,254		786		13,373
All Other Expenses	1,152	622	2,702	1,427	5,589	5,796	9,778	12,000	1,014	1,044	41,125
Total Expenses	\$ 4,718	\$ 959	\$ 12,645	\$ 5,038	\$ 8,673	\$ 8,840	\$ 89,654	\$ 48,366	\$ 3,750	\$ 4,563	\$ 187,206
Excess of Revenues Over Expenses 9/	\$ 720	\$ 471	\$ 3,561	\$ 165	\$ 7,800	\$ 227	\$ 2,635	\$ 5,200	\$ 2,664	\$ (173)	\$ 23,269
Shareholders' Equity	\$ 2,279	\$ 7,415	\$ 11,019	\$ 113	\$ 1,051	\$ 1,884	\$ 22,887	\$ 14,930	\$ 6,110	\$ 1,996	\$ 69,684
Clearing Fund	\$ 609	\$ 0	\$ 468,331	3,510	\$ 387,280	\$ 6,922	\$ 540,736	\$ 396,778	\$ 1,722	\$ 4,554	\$ 1,810,442

1/ Although efforts have been made to make the presentations comparable, any single revenue or expense category may not be completely comparable between any two clearing agencies because of (i) the varying classification methods employed by the clearing agencies in reporting operating results and (ii) the grouping methods employed by the SEC's staff due to these varying classification methods. Individual amounts are shown to the nearest thousand. Totals are the rounded result of the underlying amounts and may not be the arithmetic sums of the parts.

2/ The Boston Stock Exchange Clearing Corporation is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Boston Stock Exchange and received operational and other services from its parent.

3/ The Delta Government Options Clearing Corporation has a surety bond of \$100 million in lieu of a clearing fund. Costs of \$400,000 for this instrument are included in the other expense category.

4/ Effective in May 1988, the National Securities Clearing Corporation (NSCC) sold 81% of the Government Securities Clearing Corporation (GSCC) to certain of its participants. At that time, NSCC entered into an agreement with GSCC to provide various support services and office facilities. The equity interest in GSCC is included in NSCC's results.

5/ The International Securities Clearing Corporation is a wholly owned subsidiary of the NSCC and received operational and other services from its parent.

6/ On August 12, 1994, the Chicago Stock Exchange sold the MBS Clearing Corporation to NSCC. The fair value of net assets exceeded the purchase by \$4,738,000. Fixed assets were reduced by \$1,488,000 in 1994 and the remaining \$3,250,000 excess will be amortized to operations on a straight line basis over three years.

7/ The Pacific Stock Exchange (PSE) has an agreement with NSCC to settle trades of PSE specialists through PSE's membership in NSCC. This may expose PSE to off-balance-sheet risk in the event a specialist fails. PSE established a clearing fund in 1994 and monitors capital compliance to mitigate this risk. PSE members' equity of \$24 million is available for reimbursement of liabilities incurred by the Pacific Clearing Corporation.

8/ Revenues are net of refunds which have the effect of reducing a clearing agency's base fee rates.

9/ This is the result of operations and before the effect of income taxes, which may significantly impact a clearing agency's net income.

Table 9
SELF-REGULATORY ORGANIZATIONS—DEPOSITORIES
1994 REVENUES and EXPENSES 1/
(\$ in Thousands)

	Depository Trust Company 12/31/94	Midwest Securities Trust Company 12/31/94	Participants Trust Company 12/31/94	Philadelphia Depository Trust Company 12/31/94	Total
<u>Revenues</u>					
Depository Services	\$227,127	\$30,764	\$18,753	\$10,613	\$287,257
Interest	72,665	1,667	11,913	1,021	87,266
Other		0		365	365
Total Revenues 2/	<u>299,792</u>	<u>32,431</u>	<u>30,666</u>	<u>11,998</u>	<u>374,887</u>
<u>Expenses</u>					
Employee Costs	\$175,116	16,589	10,412	6,490	208,607
Data Processing and Communications Costs	35,208	2,158	6,191	632	44,189
Occupancy Costs	42,902	3,116	6,018	411	52,447
All Other Expenses	45,682	10,068	4,045	3,920	63,715
Total Expenses	<u>\$298,908</u>	<u>31,931</u>	<u>26,666</u>	<u>11,454</u>	<u>368,959</u>
<u>Excess of Revenues</u>					
Over Expenses 3/	\$884	\$500	\$4,000	\$544	\$5,928
Shareholders' Equity	\$19,385	\$4,429	\$19,073	\$3,649	\$46,536
Participant's Fund	\$667,196	\$7,305	\$273,352	\$752	\$948,605

1/ Although efforts have been made to make the presentations comparable, any single revenue or expense category may not be completely comparable between any two clearing agencies because of (i) the varying classification methods employed by the clearing agencies in reporting operating results and (ii) the grouping methods employed by the Commission staff due to these varying classification methods. Individual amounts are shown to the nearest thousand. Totals are the rounded result of the underlying amounts and may not be the arithmetic sums of the parts.

2/ Revenues are net of refunds which have the effect of reducing a clearing agency's base fee rates.

3/ This is the result of operations and before the effect of income taxes, which may significantly impact a clearing agency's net income.

Certificate Immobilization

Book-entry deliveries continued to outdistance physical deliveries in the settlement of securities transactions among depository participants of the Depository Trust Company (DTC). This tendency is illustrated in Table 10, CERTIFICATE IMMOBILIZATION TRENDS. The table captures the relative significance of the mediums employed, in a ratio of book-entry deliveries to certificates withdrawn from DTC. The figures include Direct Mail by Agents and municipal bearer bonds. In 1994, the total certificates withdrawn decreased almost 6% from 1993, while the number of book-entry deliveries increased over 7%. In 1994, the ratio was almost 12 times the 1982 ratio of 2.3 book-entry deliveries rendered for every certificate withdrawn.

Table 10

CERTIFICATE IMMOBILIZATION TRENDS					
Depository Trust Company					
(Including Bearer Certificates)					
	1994	1991	1988	1985	1982
Book-entry Deliveries					
at DTC (in thousands)	105,500	73,200	62,800	53,600	35,900
Total of All Certificates					
Withdrawn (in thousands)	3,899	6,314	9,100	11,300	15,700
Book-entry Deliveries per					
Certificates Withdrawn	27.1	11.6	6.9	4.7	2.3

Investment Companies and Investment Advisers

The tables below show the number of registered investment companies and investment advisers and the amount of assets under management. All figures are reported for fiscal year-end.

Number of Active Registrants						
	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	% Change <u>1991-95</u>
Investment Companies	3,660	3,850	4,300	4,530	4,900	33.9%
Investment Company Portfolios	16,000*	18,700	21,200	22,486	23,139	44.6%
Investment Advisers	17,500	18,000	20,000	21,600	22,000	25.7%

*Estimate

Assets Under Management (\$ in billions)						
	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	% Change <u>1991-95</u>
Investment Companies	\$1,400	\$1,800	\$2,400	\$2,500	\$3,062	118.7%
Investment Advisers	\$5,400	\$8,100	\$9,600	\$9,600	\$10,600	96.3%

The number of registered investment companies increased more than 8% during 1995. Many investment companies combine several separate portfolios or investment series in one investment company registration statement. The number of portfolios generally ranges from three to ten. However, some unit investment trusts group as many as 1,320 separate portfolios under one Investment Company Act registration. The number of portfolios increased almost 3% during 1995. Investment company assets increased more than 22%.

Section 13(f)(1) Reports

Section 13(f)(1) of the Exchange Act and Rule 13f-1 require "institutional investment managers" exercising investment discretion over accounts holding certain equity securities with a fair market value of at least \$100 million to file quarterly reports on Form 13F. For the quarter ending June 30, 1995, 1,231 managers filed Form 13F reports, for total holdings of approximately \$3.08 trillion.

Exemptions

Section 12(h) Exemptions

Section 12(h) of the Exchange Act authorizes the Commission to grant a complete or partial exemption from the registration provisions of Section 12(g) or from the disclosure or insider reporting/trading provisions of the Exchange Act where such exemption is consistent with the public interest and the protection of investors. Four applications were pending at the beginning of 1995 and four applications were filed during the year. Requested relief was granted to four applicants.

Exemptions for Foreign Private Issuers

Rule 12g3-2 provides various exemptions from the registration provisions of Section 12(g) of the Exchange Act for the securities of foreign private issuers. An important exemption is that contained in subparagraph (b), which provides an exemption for certain foreign issuers that furnish to the Commission on a current basis the material specified in the rule. Such material includes that information about which investors ought reasonably to be informed and which the issuer has: (1) made or is required to make public pursuant to the law of the country in which it is incorporated or organized; (2) filed or is required to file with a stock exchange on which its securities are traded and which was made public by such exchange; or (3) distributed or is required to distribute to its securityholders. Periodically, the SEC publishes a list of those foreign issuers that appear to be current under the exemptive provision. The most current list contains a total of 1,221 foreign issuers.

Corporate Reorganizations

During 1995, the SEC entered its appearance in 13 reorganization cases filed under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code involving companies with aggregated stated assets of about \$4.2 billion and about 100,000 public investors. Counting these new cases, the Commission was a party in a total of 173 Chapter 11 cases during the year. In these cases, the stated assets totalled approximately \$80 billion and involved almost one million public investors. During 1995, 78 cases were concluded through confirmation of a plan of reorganization, dismissal, or liquidation, leaving 95 cases in which the Commission was a party at year-end.

Table 11
REORGANIZATION PROCEEDINGS UNDER CHAPTER 11
OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE IN WHICH
THE SEC ENTERED APPEARANCE

Debtor	District		F.Y. Opened	F.Y. Closed
Action Auto Stores ^{1/}	E. A.	MI	1990	1995
ADI Electronics	E. D.	NY	1987	1995
AIA Industries, Inc.	E. D.	PA	1984	1995
Aileen, Inc	S D	NY	1994	
Al Copeland Enterprises, Inc	W. D	TX	1991	1995
Alexander's Inc.	S. D	NY	1992	
Allegheny International, Inc. ^{1/}	W. D.	PA	1988	1995
Alliant Computer Systems Corp.	E. D.	MA	1992	
Amdura Corporation ^{1/}	D.	CO	1990	1995
American Microtel, Inc.	D.	NV	1995	
American West Airlines, Inc. ^{1/}	D.	AZ	1991	1995
Anglo Energy, Inc. ^{1/}	S. D	NY	1988	1995
Appletree Markets, Inc. ^{1/}	S. D.	TX	1992	1995
Baldwin Builders	C D.	CA	1995	
Banyon Corp. ^{2/}	S D	NY	1991	1995
Barton Industries Inc.	W D.	OK	1991	
Bay Financial Corp , et al	D	MA	1990	1995
B-E Holdings, Inc.	E. D	WI	1994	
Beker Industries Corp. ^{1/}	S. D.	NY	1986	1995
Bonneville Pacific Corporation	D	UT	1992	
Branch Industries, Inc.	S. D	NY	1985	1995
Camera Enterprises, Inc., et al	D	MA	1989	1995
Cambridge Biotech Corp.	DM		1994	
Carter Hawley Hale Stores Inc.	C D.	CA	1991	
Cascade International Inc.	S D.	FL	1992	
Citywide Securities Corp ^{4/}	S D.	NY	1985	1995
Chyron Corporation	E. D.	NY	1991	1995
Coated Sales, Inc.	S D.	NY	1988	1995

Table 11 — continued
REORGANIZATION PROCEEDINGS UNDER CHAPTER 11
OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE IN WHICH
THE SEC ENTERED APPEARANCE

Debtor	District	F.Y Opened	F.Y Closed
College Bound, Inc	S D	FL 1993	
Columbia Gas System, Inc	D	DE 1991	
Commonwealth Equity Trust ^{1/}	E.D.	CA 1994	1995
Conston Corporation	E.D.	PA 1990	1995
Continental Information Systems ^{1/}	S.D	NY 1989	1995
Core Mineral, Inc ^{3/}	W D.	TX 1995	1995
County of Orange (Chapter 9)		C.D. CA	1995
CPT Corp.	D	MN 1991	
Crazy Eddie, Inc , et al	S.D	NY 1989	
Crompton Co., Inc	S D	NY 1985	1995
Dakota Minerals, Inc	D.	WY 1986	
Damson Oil Co.	S D.	TX 1991	
Dest Corp.	N.D.	CA 1989	
Diversified Industries, Inc. ^{1/}	E.D.	MI 1993	1995
Drexel Burnham Lambert Group, Ltd ^{1/}	S.D	NY 1990	1995
Eagle Clothes, Inc	S D	NY 1989	1995
Eagle-Pitcher Industries, Inc. ^{1/}	S D.	OH 1991	
Eastern Air Lines, Inc , et al	S.D	NY 1989	
E.L. Fitzgerald ^{4/}	N.D.	FL 1993	
Enterprise Technologies, Inc	S D	TX 1984	
Envirofact, Inc	S D.	FL. 1994	
Everex Systems, Inc ^{1/}	N C	CA 1993	1995
F & C International, Inc ^{1/}	S D	OH 1993	1995
F & M Distributor Inc	E.D	MI 1995	
Fed. Depart /Allied Stores et al.	S.D	OH 1990	1995
Financial News Network, Inc	S D.	NY 1991	1995
First City Bancorporation of Texas	N.D.	TX 1994	
First Republicbank Corp.	N.D.	TX 1989	
Future Communications, Inc.	W D	OH 1994	
Gantos, inc. et. al ^{1/}	W.D.	MI 1994	1995
General Technologies Group	E.D	NY 1990	1995
Gulf USA Corporation, et al.	D	ID 1994	
Hal, Inc ^{1/}	D	HI 1994	1995
Hannover Corporation of America ^{4/}	M D.	LA 1993	
Harry Schrieber ^{4/}	D.	CO 1993	
Healthcare International, Inc. ^{1/}	W.D.	TX 1992	1995
Helionetics, Inc	C D.	CA 1986	
Hexcel Corporation ^{1/}	N D	CA 1994	1995
Hills Department Stores ^{1/}	S.D.	NY 1991	1995
House of Fabrics Inc.		C.D. CA	1995

Table 11 — continued
REORGANIZATION PROCEEDINGS UNDER CHAPTER 11
OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE IN WHICH
THE SEC ENTERED APPEARANCE

Debtor	District		F.Y Opened	F Y Closed
In re SportsTown, Inc	N D	GA	1995	
Inflight Services, Inc	S.D.	NY	1987	1995
Infotechnology Inc 1/	S.D.	NY	1991	1995
Integra-A Hotel and Restaurant Co.	D	CO	1993	
Integrated Resources, Inc.1/	S D	NY	1990	1995
Intelogic Trace, Inc.1/	W.D	TX	1994	1995
Inter American Homes, Inc , et al.	D.	NJ	1990	1995
International Trading, Inc	N D	GA	1994	
Jamesway Corporation	S D.	NY	1993	1995
JWP, Inc.	S D.	NY	1994	
Kaiser Steel Corp	D	CO	1987	
King of Video, Inc.	D	NV	1989	
Kurzweil Music Systems Inc 1	D.	MA	1990	1995
Laventhol & Horwath 1/	S D	NY	1991	1995
Leslie Fay Companies, Inc.	S D.	NY	1993	
Library Bureau Inc	N.D	NY	1993	
LifeCo Investment	D.	GA	1995	
Lomas Financial Corp.1/	S.D.	NY	1990	
Lone Star Industries, Inc.1/	S.D.	NY	1991	1995
MacGregor Sporting Goods, Inc. 1995		D NJ		1989
Mallard Coach Co 1/	W.D	IL	1993	1995
Marathon Office Supply, Inc.	C.D	CA	1988	
Marcade Group Inc	S.D	NY	1993	1995
Martech USA, Inc 2/	D	AK	1994	1995
Maxicare Health Plus Inc 1/	C.D.	CA	1989	
McLean Industries, Inc	S D.	NY	1987	1995
MCorp (MCorp Financial, Inc & MCorp Management)	S.D.	TX	1989	
McCrorry Parent Corp 1995		S.D NY		1992
Media Vision Technology, Inc	N.D	CA	1994	
Megafoods Stores, Inc	D.	AZ	1995	
MEI Diversified, Inc.	D	DE	1994	1995
Meridian Reserve, Inc.	W D	OK	1989	
Merry-Go-Round Enterprises, Inc	D.	MD	1994	
Midland Capital Corp	S D.	NY	1986	1995
Midwest Communications Corp.	E D.	KY	1991	
Monarch Capitol Corp	D.	MA	1991	
National Financial Realty Trust1/	S.D.	IN	1990	1995
National Gypsum Company	N.D.	TX	1991	
New Valley Corp	S.D.	NY	1994	

Table 11 — continued
 REORGANIZATION PROCEEDINGS UNDER CHAPTER 11
 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE IN WHICH
 THE SEC ENTERED APPEARANCE

Debtor	District	F.Y. Opened	F.Y. Closed
Newmark & Lewis	S D	NY 1991	1995
Nutri Bevco, Inc.2/	S D.	NY 1988	1995
NVF Company	D	DE 1994	
O'Brien Environmental Energy, Inc.	D	NJ 1995	
Occidental Development Fund III4/	C D	CA 1989	
Occidental Development Fund IV4/	C D	CA 1989	
Occidental Development Fund V4/	C D	CA 1989	
Oliver's Stores	E.D	NY 1987	1995
OLR Development Fund LP	C D.	CA 1989	
OLR Development Fund II LP	C D.	CA 1989	
Orbitron Capitol Corp	W T	TX 1995	
PanAm Corporation	S D.	NY 1991	
Penn Pacific	E D	OK 1994	
Phar-Mor, Inc.	N D	OH 1994	
Premier Benefit Capitol Trust4/	M D.	FL 1993	
Premium Sales Corporation4/	M D.	FL 1993	
Public Service Co of New Hampshire	D.	NH 1988	
QMax Technology Group, Inc 1/	S.D	OH 1989	1995
QT&T, Inc.	E D.	NY 1987	
Qubix Graphic Systems1/	N D.	CA 1987	1995
Ramtek Corporation	N D	CA 1989	
Reserve Rent-a-Car	D	OH 1993	
Residential Resources Mortgage Investment Corporation	D.	AZ 1989	
Revco D.S. Inc 4/	N.D.	OH 1988	1995
R.H. Macy & Co. Corp 1/	S D	NY 1992	1995
Rose's Stores, Inc	E.D	NC 1994	1995
Rymer Foods, Inc.	N.D	ILL 1993	
Sahlen & Associates1/	S.D.	NY 1989	1995
Sam S Brown Jr.4/	W D	GA 1993	
Saratoga Standardbreds, Inc.	N D	NY 1990	1995
Schepps Food Stores, Inc	S D.	TX 1992	1995
Seatrain Lines, Inc 1/		S.D NY 1981	
Sharon Steel Corp.1/	W.D	PA 1987	1995
SIS Corporation	N.D.	OH 1989	
Sorg Incorporated, et al.1/	S.D.	NY 1989	1995
Southland Corporation	N D	TX 1991	
Spectrum Information Technologies, Inc	E D	NY 1995	
Spencer Cos., Inc.	D	MA 1987	
Spring Meadows Associates4/	C D.	CA 1988	1995
Standard Oil and Exploration of Delaware, Inc	W D	MI 1991	

Table 11 — continued
 REORGANIZATION PROCEEDINGS UNDER CHAPTER 11
 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE IN WHICH
 THE SEC ENTERED APPEARANCE

Debtor	District		F.Y. Opened	F Y Closed
Statewide Bancorp	D.	NJ	1991	1995
Sterling Optical Corp.	S.D.	NY	1992	
Swanton Corp.	S D.	NY	1985	
Systems for Health Care, Inc	N D	IL	1988	1995
Telstar Satellite Corp. of America ^{4/}	C D.	CA	1989	
The Centennial Group, Inc	C D.	CA	1992	
The Circle K	D	AZ	1990	
The First Connecticut Small Business Investments Company	D.	CT	1991	
The Group, Inc	D	NV	1990	
The Lionel Corp ^{1/}	S D	NY	1991	
The Regina Co	D	NJ	1989	1995
Tidwell Industries, Inc.	N D	AL	1986	
Todd Shipyards Corp ^{1/}	D	NJ	1988	1995
Towle Manufact /Rosemar Silver	S.D.	NY	1990	1995
Trans World, Inc.	E D	MO	1995	1995
Traweck Investment Fund No 22, Ltd ^{4/}	C D	CA	1988	
Traweck Investment Fund No. 21, Ltd.	C D	CA	1988	
Trump Taj Mahal Funding, Inc ^{1/}	D	NJ	1991	1995
TSL Holdings, Inc	S D.	CA	1993	
UDC Homes, Inc	D.	DE	1995	
USA Classic Inc	S.D.	NY	1994	
Value Merchants	E D	WI	1994	
Wedgestone Financial	D	MA	1991	
Wedtech Corp.	S D	NY	1987	1995
Westworld Community Healthcare, Inc	C.D	CA	1987	
Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. ^{1/}	W D	PA	1985	1995
Zale Corporation, Inc ^{1/}	N D	TX	1992	1995
Zenox, Inc ^{1/}	D.	NH	1993	1995
Total Cases Opened (FY 1995)			13	
Total Cases Closed (FY 1995)				78

^{1/} Plan of reorganization confirmed

^{2/} Debtor liquidated under Chapter 7

^{3/} Chapter 11 case dismissed

^{4/} Debtor's securities not registered under Section 12(g) of the Exchange Act

The Securities Industry

Revenues, Expenses, and Selected Balance Sheet Items

Broker-dealers that are registered with the Commission earned a pre-tax profit of \$3.5 billion in calendar year 1994. This was \$9.5 billion less than that earned the previous year. The pre-tax return on equity capital of 6.5% was one of the worst of the last ten years.

A sharp rise in interest rates during most of 1994 was the most important factor behind the poor profitability. The resulting decline in bond prices contributed to proprietary trading losses at securities firms as the values of their bond inventories fell. Securities firms earned \$20.2 billion in their trading and investment accounts in 1994, a decline of over \$5 billion from last year.

Rising interest rates also discouraged debt offerings. Interest rates that were high relative to the recent past made refinancings of debt particularly unattractive. The market for new mortgage-backed securities, for example, practically disappeared in 1994. The volume of new issues of equity also fell sharply in 1994. The volume of IPOs and that of seasoned issues of common and preferred stock all fell by over 30%. As a result, underwriting revenues fell by \$4.4 billion to \$6.8 billion.

The agency business remained profitable in 1994. Exchange volume set a new record, and securities commissions of \$19.9 billion in 1994 were unchanged from 1993's record level. The volume of margin debt outstanding increased in 1994, and combined with rising interest rates, resulted in a \$1.4 billion increase in margin interest to \$4.7 billion. The poor return from bond mutual funds in 1994 discouraged investments in these instruments. As a result, revenues from retailing mutual funds declined \$1.2 billion to \$6.9 billion.

"All other revenues" are comprised primarily of interest income from securities purchased under agreements to resell and fees from handling private placements, mergers, and acquisitions. These revenues grew by over \$13 billion in 1994 to \$54.3 billion. Merger and acquisition activity was exceptional in 1994, with the volume of announced deals second only to that in 1988. The average value of reverse repurchase agreements on the balance sheets of broker-dealers also increased in 1994, and combined with higher interest rates, contributed to higher revenues.

Expenses rose 14% to \$109.2 billion in 1994, primarily due to higher interest expenses. Interest expenses, the largest expense item in 1994, increased by \$13.6 billion (51%). Employee compensation fell slightly (by 4%) to \$37.6 billion. Total assets rose by \$12 billion to \$1,252 billion. Equity capital fell by \$108 million to \$53.8 billion.

Table 12
UNCONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL INFORMATION FOR BROKER-DEALERS
 1990 – 1994 ^{1/}
 (\$ in Millions)

	1990	1991	1992	1993 ^r	1994 ^p
Revenues					
Securities Commissions	\$ 12,032.2	\$ 14,209.7	\$ 16,248.9	\$ 19,904.8	\$ 19,889.6
Gains (Losses) in Trading and Investment Accounts	15,746.5	22,641.3	21,838.3	25,427.2	20,216.6
Profits (Losses) from Underwriting and Selling Groups	3,728.3	6,592.6	8,299.7	11,248.7	6,848.0
Margin Interest	3,179.4	2,771.1	2,689.6	3,235.2	4,670.0
Revenues from Sale of Investment Company Shares	3,241.6	4,176.3	5,950.1	8,115.3	6,880.6
All Other Revenues	33,428.3	34,498.5	35,557.4	40,912.6	54,268.6
Total Revenues	\$ 71,356.2	\$ 84,889.5	\$ 90,584.0	\$ 108,843.7	\$ 112,773.4
Expenses					
Registered Representatives' Compensation (Part II Only) ^{2/}	\$ 8,267.2	\$ 9,911.7	\$ 12,111.1	\$ 14,696.0	\$ 13,707.6
Other Employee Compensation and Benefits	12,512.8	14,444.1	17,066.9	20,931.3	20,559.5
Compensation to Partners and Voting Stockholder Officers	2,150.6	2,560.5	2,892.9	3,498.0	3,333.4
Commissions and Clearance Paid to Other Brokers	2,959.4	3,200.5	3,722.1	5,337.8	5,335.5
Interest Expenses	28,093.1	27,511.8	24,576.3	26,615.6	40,251.7
Regulatory Fees and Expenses	564.3	577.1	639.2	629.7	628.0
All Other Expenses ^{2/}	16,018.6	18,027.9	20,459.0	24,096.7	25,430.1
Total Expenses	\$ 70,566.1	\$ 76,233.6	\$ 81,467.4	\$ 95,805.1	\$ 109,245.9
Income and Profitability					
Pre-tax Income	\$ 790.1	\$ 8,655.9	\$ 9,116.6	\$ 13,038.6	\$ 3,527.5
Pre-tax Profit Margin	1.1	10.2	10.1	12.0	3.1
Pre-tax Return on Equity	2.2	23.6	22.0	26.7	6.5
Assets, Liabilities and Capital					
Total Assets	\$657,226.5	\$787,716.3	\$ 978,635.0	\$ 1,240,159.8	\$ 1,251,782.8
Liabilities					
(a) Unsubordinated Liabilities	607,803.0	732,290.2	916,545.3	1,160,456.0	1,169,163.3
(b) Subordinated Liabilities	15,090.8	16,347.1	18,155.8	25,787.6	28,811.1
(c) Total Liabilities	622,893.8	748,637.3	934,701.1	1,186,243.6	1,197,974.4
Ownership Equity	\$ 34,332.7	\$ 39,079.1	\$ 43,933.9	\$ 53,916.2	\$ 53,808.4
Number of Firms	8,437	7,763	7,793	7,674	7,631

Figures may not add due to rounding

r = revised

p = preliminary

^{1/} Calendar, rather than fiscal, year data is reported in this table.

^{2/} Registered representatives' compensation for firms that neither carry nor clear is included in "other expenses" as this expense item is not reported separately on Part IIA of the FOCUS Report

Source: FOCUS Report

Table 13
**UNCONSOLIDATED ANNUAL REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR BROKER-DEALERS
 DOING A PUBLIC BUSINESS**
 1990 - 1994 ^{1/}
 (\$ in Millions)

	1990	1991	1992	1993 ^r	1994 ^p
<u>Revenues</u>					
Securities Commissions	\$11,659.7	\$13,710.8	\$15,499.7	\$ 19,341.1	\$ 19,255.8
Gains (Losses) in Trading and Investment Accounts	14,869.5	21,371.7	20,790.7	24,042.5	18,916.4
Profits (Losses) from Underwriting and Selling Groups	3,728.0	6,591.4	8,202.8	11,248.6	6,844.7
Margin Interest	3,158.8	2,732.4	2,651.7	3,229.1	4,652.7
Revenues from Sale of Investment Company Shares	3,241.6	4,176.2	5,851.9	8,115.3	6,869.9
All Other Revenues	32,578.0	33,746.8	34,745.5	40,086.3	53,096.0
Total Revenues	\$69,235.6	\$82,329.3	\$87,742.2	\$106,062.9	\$109,635.6
<u>Expenses</u>					
Registered Representatives' Compensation (Part II only) ^{2/}	\$ 8,245.3	\$ 9,900.6	\$11,791.1	\$ 14,671.9	\$ 13,685.6
Other Employee Compensation and Benefits	12,209.2	14,066.5	16,601.4	20,514.9	20,080.5
Compensation to Partners and Voting Stockholder Officers	1,983.5	2,376.4	2,695.5	3,293.4	3,097.2
Commissions and Clearance Paid to Other Brokers	2,796.2	3,003.2	3,500.0	5,083.3	5,064.3
Interest Expenses	27,630.6	27,088.1	24,235.8	26,222.9	39,583.4
Regulatory Fees and Expenses	509.4	511.2	580.0	573.3	534.8
All Other Expenses ^{2/}	15,580.4	17,457.5	19,777.9	23,548.2	24,831.8
Total Expenses	\$68,954.4	\$74,403.4	\$79,181.7	\$ 93,908.0	\$106,877.6
<u>Income and Profitability</u>					
Pre-tax Income	\$ 281.2	\$ 7,925.9	\$ 8,560.5	\$ 12,154.9	\$ 2,757.9
Pre-tax Profit Margin	0.4	9.6	9.8	11.5	2.5
Pre-tax Return on Equity	0.9	23.3	22.2	26.5	5.4
Number of Firms	5,424	5,115	5,091	5,139	5,237

Figures may not add due to rounding.

r = revised

p = preliminary

^{1/} Calendar, rather than fiscal, year data is reported in this table.

^{2/} Registered representatives' compensation for firms that neither carry nor clear is included in "other expenses" as this expense item is not reported separately on Part IIA of the FOCUS Report.

Source: FOCUS Report

Table 14
**UNCONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEET FOR BROKER-DEALERS
DOING A PUBLIC BUSINESS**
YEAR-END, 1990 – 1994 1/
(\$ in Millions)

	1990	1991	1992	1993 ^r	1994 ^p
Assets					
Cash	\$ 10,968.1	\$ 10,351.2	\$ 11,024.4	\$ 13,128.1	\$ 13,501.9
Receivables from Other					
Broker-dealers	118,413.1	161,484.4	216,793.7	289,168.0	342,028.3
Receivables from Customers	37,177.8	50,861.1	49,333.5	68,526.1	66,911.6
Receivables from Non-customers	1,157.7	2,126.1	4,326.7	6,412.5	7,258.2
Long Positions in Securities and Commodities	208,166.3	245,164.5	294,294.5	363,864.3	317,627.1
Securities and Investments not Readily Marketable	1,190.2	1,863.9	2,376.0	4,124.4	4,486.5
Securities Purchased Under Agreements to Resell (Part II only) 2/	237,235.6	272,226.1	350,487.8	439,431.4	437,805.6
Exchange Membership	332.3	313.4	315.3	323.1	348.3
Other Assets 2/	26,014.3	23,521.2	26,502.9	30,615.8	33,818.9
Total Assets	\$640,655.5	\$767,911.8	\$955,454.8	\$1,215,593.8	\$1,223,786.3
Liabilities and Equity Capital					
Bank Loans Payable	\$ 18,342.2	\$ 24,905.6	\$ 33,908.8	\$ 41,991.9	\$ 34,709.0
Payables to Other Broker-dealers	46,038.9	63,291.9	68,569.0	105,115.2	130,759.9
Payables to Non-customers	7,510.5	13,730.6	6,607.7	10,836.0	11,921.5
Payables to Customers	55,549.7	71,977.5	70,089.7	90,942.9	98,534.4
Short Positions in Securities and Commodities	104,690.0	113,000.9	157,295.6	199,509.5	196,810.1
Securities Sold Under Repurchase Agreements (Part II only) 2/	320,773.3	385,655.1	500,714.1	607,827.1	591,185.5
Other Non-subordinated Liabilities 2/	40,973.2	43,738.8	59,534.8	83,124.4	80,846.8
Subordinated Liabilities	14,763.0	15,464.1	17,726.5	25,370.6	28,495.4
Total Liabilities	\$608,640.8	\$731,764.6	\$914,446.1	\$1,164,717.6	\$1,173,262.7
Equity Capital	\$ 32,014.6	\$ 36,147.3	\$ 41,008.7	\$ 50,876.2	\$ 50,523.6
Number of firms	5,424	5,115	5,091	5,139	5,237

Figures may not add due to rounding

r = revised

p = preliminary

1/ Calendar, rather than fiscal, year data is reported in this table.

2/ Resale agreements and repurchase agreements for firms that neither carry nor clear are included in "other assets" and "other non-subordinated liabilities," respectively, as these items are not reported separately on Part IIA of the FOCUS Report.

Source. FOCUS Report

Carrying and Clearing Firms

Data for carrying and clearing firms that do a public business is presented here to allow for more detail. Reporting requirements for firms that neither carry nor clear are less detailed. Data aggregation of these two types of firms results in loss of detail.

Carrying and clearing firms are those firms that clear securities transactions or maintain possession or control of customers' cash or securities. This group produced 82 percent of the securities industry's total revenues in calendar year 1994.

Brokerage activity accounted for about 24 cents of each revenue dollar in 1994, about the same as the level in 1993. Securities commissions remained the most important component, producing 15 cents of each dollar of revenue. Margin interest generated about five cents of each dollar of revenue, while revenues from mutual fund sales accounted for about four cents.



The dealer side produced 61 cents of each dollar of revenue in 1994, down from 65 cents in 1993. Eighteen cents came from trading and investments, a decrease from 24 cents in 1993. Seven cents came from underwriting, down from twelve cents in 1993. Thirty-six cents came from other securities-related revenues, an increase from twenty-nine cents in 1993. This revenue item is comprised primarily of interest income from securities purchased under agreements to resell and fees from handling private placements, mergers, and acquisitions.

Expenses accounted for 98 cents of each revenue dollar in 1994, resulting in a pre-tax profit margin of two cents per revenue dollar, about nine cents lower than that in 1993. Interest expense was the most important expense item, accounting for 42 cents of each revenue dollar in 1994 compared to 29 cents in 1993. Employee-related expenses—compensation received by registered representatives, partners and other employees—consumed 33 cents of each revenue dollar in 1994, compared to 37 cents in 1993.

Total assets of broker-dealers carrying and clearing customer accounts were \$1,192 billion at year-end 1994, a one percent increase from 1993. Relative to other assets, the value of inventory on the books of broker-dealers declined during 1994, reflecting at least in part the decline in bond prices that took place over the course of the year. Broker-dealer receivables increased.

Total liabilities also increased by about one percent to \$1,150 billion in 1994. Owners' equity fell two percent to \$41.8 billion.

Table 15
Securities Industry Dollar in 1994
For Carrying/Clearing Firms



Figures may not sum to 100% due to rounding

Note Includes information for firms doing a public business that carry customer accounts or clear securities transactions

SOURCE: FOCUS REPORTS

Table 16
**UNCONSOLIDATED REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR
 CARRYING/CLEARING BROKER-DEALERS 1/**
 (\$ in Millions)

	1993 ^r		1994 ^p		Percent Change 1992-1993
	Dollars	Percent of Total Revenues	Dollars	Percent of Total Revenues	
Revenues					
Securities Commissions	\$ 14,178.0	16.0%	\$ 13,991.5	15.1%	-1.3%
Gains (Losses) in Trading and Investment Accounts	21,241.0	23.9	16,810.0	18.1	-20.9
Profits (Losses) from Under- Writing and Selling Groups	10,531.8	11.9	6,254.6	6.7	-40.6
Margin Interest	3,229.1	3.6	4,652.7	5.0	44.1
Revenues from Sale of Invest- ment Company Shares	4,630.5	5.2	4,110.2	4.4	-11.2
Miscellaneous Fees	4,159.5	4.7	4,771.3	5.1	14.7
Revenues from Research	24.5	0.0	32.5	0.0	32.7
Other Securities Related Revenues	25,753.9	29.0	33,602.5	36.3	30.5
Commodities Revenues	1,216.1	1.4	2,030.6	2.2	67.0
All other Revenues	3,732.0	4.2	6,406.9	6.9	71.7
Total Revenues	\$ 88,696.4	100.0%	\$ 92,662.9	100.0%	4.5%
Expenses					
Registered Representatives' Compensation (Part II Only)	\$ 14,671.9	16.5%	\$ 13,685.6	14.8%	-6.7%
Other Employee Compensation and Benefits	15,826.2	17.8	15,172.6	16.4	-4.1
Compensation to Partners and Voting Stockholder Officers	2,019.9	2.3	1,911.1	2.1	-5.4
Commissions and Clearance Paid to Other Brokers	2,705.4	3.1	3,178.7	3.4	17.5
Communications	2,720.5	3.1	3,006.9	3.2	10.5
Occupancy and Equipment Costs	3,467.2	3.9	3,523.1	3.8	1.6
Data Processing Costs	1,192.0	1.3	1,343.0	1.4	12.7
Interest Expenses	25,853.1	29.1	38,896.0	42.0	50.5
Regulatory Fees and Expenses	472.3	0.5	416.2	0.4	-11.9
Losses in Error Accounts and Bad Debts	309.9	0.3	399.8	0.4	29.0
All Other Expenses	9,470.6	10.7	9,429.7	10.2	-0.4
Total Expenses	\$ 78,709.1	88.7%	\$ 90,962.8	98.2%	15.6%
Income and Profitability					
Pre-tax Income	\$ 9,987.3	11.3%	\$ 1,700.1	1.8%	-83.0%
Pre-tax Profit Margin	11.3		1.8		
Pre-tax Return on Equity	25.6		4.0		
Number of Firms	825		786		

Figures may not add due to rounding

r = revised

p = preliminary

1/ Calendar, rather than fiscal, year data is reported in this table

Note: Includes information for firms doing a public business that carry customer accounts or clear securities transactions

Source: FOCUS Report

Table 17
UNCONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEET FOR CARRYING/CLEARING
BROKER-DEALERS 1/
(\$ in Millions)

	Year-end 1993 ^r		Year-end 1994 ^p		Percent Change 1993-1994
	Dollars	Percent of Total Assets	Dollars	Percent of Total Assets	
Assets					
Cash	\$ 12,026.8	1.0%	\$ 12,391.9	1.0%	3.0%
Receivables from Other Broker-dealers	280,434.0	23.7	334,632.6	28.1	19.3
(a) Securities Failed to Deliver	17,625.3	1.5	21,979.1	1.8	24.7
(b) Securities Borrowed	235,654.7	19.9	295,398.7	24.8	25.4
(c) Other	27,154.0	2.3	17,254.8	1.4	-36.5
Receivables from Customers	68,526.1	5.8	66,911.6	5.6	-2.4
Receivables from Non-customers	6,038.5	0.5	6,769.7	0.6	12.1
Long Positions in Securities and Commodities	347,154.4	29.4	300,784.9	25.2	-13.4
(a) Bankers Acceptances, Certificates of Deposit and Commercial Paper	10,578.4	0.9	9,508.3	0.8	-10.1
(b) U.S. and Canadian Government Obligations	221,185.6	18.7	189,061.0	15.9	-14.5
(c) State and Municipal Government Obligations	17,085.7	1.4	15,487.4	1.3	-9.4
(d) Corporate Obligations	67,040.5	5.7	58,502.9	4.9	-12.7
(e) Stocks and Warrants	22,273.5	1.9	19,925.6	1.7	-10.5
(f) Options	1,472.5	0.1	1,949.6	0.2	32.4
(g) Arbitrage	5,025.7	0.4	4,265.4	0.4	-15.1
(h) Other Securities	2,136.1	0.2	1,719.6	0.1	-19.5
(i) Spot Commodities	356.5	0.0	365.0	0.0	2.4
Securities and Investments Not Readily Marketable	3,833.7	0.3	4,204.9	0.4	9.7
Securities Purchased Under Agreements to Resell (Part II Only)	439,431.4	37.2	437,805.6	36.7	-0.4
Exchange Membership	287.2	0.0	307.5	0.0	7.1
Other Assets	24,928.3	2.1	28,048.1	2.4	12.5
Total Assets	\$1,182,660.4	100.0%	\$1,191,856.8	100.0%	0.8%
Liabilities and Equity Capital					
Bank Loans Payable	\$ 41,863.4	3.5%	\$ 34,572.3	2.9%	-17.4%
Payables to Other Broker-dealers	94,337.9	8.0	122,340.0	10.3	29.7
(a) Securities Failed to Receive	17,370.5	1.5	23,311.6	2.0	34.2
(b) Securities Loaned	64,423.5	5.4	79,634.1	6.7	23.6
(c) Other	12,543.9	1.1	19,394.3	1.6	54.6
Payables to Non-customers	10,092.2	0.9	11,628.9	1.0	15.2
Payables to Customers	90,942.9	7.7	98,534.4	8.3	8.3
Short Positions in Securities and Commodities	189,723.5	16.0	185,842.8	15.6	-2.0
Securities Sold Under Repurchase Agreements (Part II Only)	607,827.1	51.4	591,185.5	49.6	-2.7
Other Non-subordinated Liabilities	80,899.3	6.8	78,694.0	6.6	-2.7
Subordinated Liabilities	24,277.8	2.1	27,289.3	2.3	12.4
Total Liabilities	1,139,964.1	96.4	1,150,087.3	96.5	0.9
Equity Capital	\$ 42,696.3	3.6%	\$ 41,769.5	3.5%	-2.2%
Number of Firms	825		786		

Figures may not add due to rounding.

r = revised

p = preliminary

1/ Calendar, rather than fiscal, year data is reported in this table

Note: Includes information for firms doing a public business that carry customer accounts or clear securities transactions.

Source: FOCUS Report

Securities Traded on Exchanges

Market Value and Volume

The market value of equity and option transactions (trading in stocks, options, warrants, and rights) on registered exchanges totaled \$3.0 trillion in 1994. Of this total, approximately \$2.8 trillion, or 95%, represented the market value of transactions in stocks, rights and warrants; \$139 billion, or 5%, were options transactions (including exercises of options on listed stocks).

The value of equity and option transactions on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) was \$2.5 trillion, up 9.0% from the previous year. The market value of such transactions on the American Stock Exchange (Amex) decreased 0.01% to \$82.6 billion and increased 6.2% to \$391.0 billions on all other exchanges. The volume of trading in stocks (excluding rights and warrants) on all registered exchanges totaled 90.5 billion shares, a 9.3% increase from the previous year, with 85.0% of the total accounted for by trading on the NYSE.

The volume of options contracts traded (excluding exercised contracts) was 281.4 million contracts in 1994, 21.0% greater than in 1993. The market value of these contracts increased 25.7% to \$94.5 billion. The volume of contracts executed on the Chicago Board Options Exchange increased 30.8% to 183.9 million. Option trading on the Amex and Pacific Stock Exchange rose 1.4% and 27.9% respectively while option trading on the Philadelphia Stock Exchange decreased 0.3%.

NASDAQ (Share Volume and Dollar Volume)

NASDAQ share volume and dollar value information has been reported on a daily basis since November 1, 1971. At the end of 1994, there were 5,761 issues in the NASDAQ system, as compared to 5,391 a year earlier and 3,050 at the end of 1980.

Share volume for 1994 was 74.4 billion, as compared to 66.5 billion in 1993 and 6.7 billion in 1980. This trading volume encompasses the number of shares bought and sold by market makers plus their net inventory changes. The dollar volume of shares traded in the NASDAQ system was \$1.45 trillion during 1994, as compared to \$1.35 trillion in 1993 and \$68.7 billion in 1980.

Share and Dollar Volume by Exchange

Share volume on all registered stock exchanges totaled 90.5 billion, an increase of 9.3% from the previous year. The New York Stock Exchange accounted for 85% of the 1994 share volume; the American Stock Exchange, 5%; the Chicago Stock Exchange, 4%; and the Pacific Stock Exchange, 2%.

The dollar value of stocks, rights, and warrants traded was \$2.8 trillion, 7.9% higher than the previous year. Trading on the New York Stock Exchange contributed 88% of the total. The Chicago Stock Exchange and Pacific Stock Exchange contributed 4% and 2%, respectively. The American Stock Exchange accounted for 2% of dollar volume.

Table 18
MARKET VALUE OF EQUITY/OPTIONS SALES ON U.S. EXCHANGES 1/
 (\$ in Thousands)

	Total Market Value	Stocks 2/	Warrants	Rights	Equity Options		Non-Equity Options 3/	
					Traded	Exercised		
All Registered Exchanges for Past Six Years								
Calendar Year:	1989	2,004,034,088	1,844,768,135	2,970,784	28,052	40,423,407	79,492,403	36,351,306
	1990	1,746,868,559	1,611,667,363	4,930,237	200,475	27,218,738	51,058,035	51,793,712
	1991	1,899,984,720	1,776,031,389	1,849,922	272,762	27,104,021	45,714,219	49,012,406
	1992	2,148,790,741	2,031,942,219	658,074	83,842	26,585,937	39,172,724	45,590,003
	1993	2,728,667,287	2,609,854,352	584,699	65,339	33,779,350	42,983,539	41,400,009
	1994	2,956,599,170	2,816,810,031	678,024	183,095	35,883,322	44,457,669	58,587,028
Breakdown of 1994 Data by Registered Exchanges								
All Registered Exchanges								
Exchanges:	AMEX	82,673,145	55,951,633	416,324	145,867	10,447,859	12,931,850	2,779,613
	BSE	36,872,755	36,872,755	0	0	0	0	0
	CHIC 4/	98,356,396	98,318,981	37,415	0	0	0	0
	CSE	47,222,504	47,222,504	0	0	0	0	0
	NYSE	2,482,966,504	2,481,586,134	203,581	36,798	496,828	632,284	10,878
	PSE	70,435,788	58,988,445	17,594	430	5,121,713	6,251,605	56,000
	PHLX	51,077,359	37,860,449	3,110	0	2,783,836	4,821,838	5,608,126
	CBOE	86,994,718	9,129	0	0	17,033,086	19,820,092	50,132,411

Figures may not sum due to rounding.

1/ Data on the value and volume of equity security sales is reported in connection with fees paid under Section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 as amended by the Securities Acts Amendments of 1975. It covers odd-lot as well as round-lot transactions.

2/ Includes voting trust certificates, certificate of deposit for stocks, and American Depositary Receipts for stocks but excludes rights and warrants.

3/ Includes all exchange trades of call and put options in stock indices, interest rates, and foreign currencies

4/ The Chicago Stock Exchange was formerly the Midwest Stock Exchange. The name change took effect on June 11, 1993.

Table 19
VOLUME OF EQUITY/OPTIONS SALES ON U.S. SECURITIES EXCHANGES 1/
(in Thousands)

		Stocks 2/ (Shares)	Warrants (Units)	Rights (Units)	Equity Options		Non-Equity Options 3/ (Contracts)
					Traded (Contracts)	Exercised (Contracts)	
All Registered Exchanges for Past Six Years							
Calendar Year	1989	54,238,571	166,233	11,986	141,840	14,586	85,161
	1990	53,337,731	384,985	23,371	111,426	11,150	98,470
	1991	58,025,434	200,028	65,179	104,851	9,851	93,923
	1992	65,462,698	184,205	58,133	106,485	8,689	95,490
	1993	82,808,842	166,223	81,172	131,726	9,973	100,871
	1994	90,481,798	171,462	133,343	149,933	10,544	131,448
Breakdown of 1994 Data by All Registered Exchanges							
All Registered Exchanges							
Exchanges.	AMEX*	4,300,414	112,448	90,354	44,811	2,959	3,783
	BSE*	1,263,076	0	0	0	0	0
	CHIC 4/	3,525,676	0	0	0	0	0
	CSE*	1,288,475	0	0	0	0	0
	NYSE*	76,665,325	53,021	42,449	2,269	209	32
	PSE	2,146,986	4,945	540	20,862	1,499	68
	PHLX*	1,289,792	1,048	0	13,016	1,303	12,606
	CBOE*	2,054	0	0	68,975	4,574	114,960

Figures may not sum due to rounding

* Data of those exchanges marked with asterisk covers transactions cleared during the calendar month, clearance usually occurs within five days of the execution of a trade. Data of other exchanges covers transactions effected on trade dates falling within the reporting month

1/ Data on the value and volume of equity security sales is reported in connection with fees paid under Section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 as amended by the Securities Acts Amendments of 1975. It covers odd-lot as well as round-lot transactions.

2/ Includes voting trust certificates, certificate of deposit for stocks, and American Depository Receipts for stocks but excludes rights and warrants.

3/ Includes all exchange trades of call and put options in stock indices, interest rates, and foreign currencies.

4/ The Chicago Stock Exchange was formerly the Midwest Stock Exchange. The name change took effect on June 11, 1993.

Source: SEC Form R-31 and Options Clearing Corporation Statistical Report

Table 20
SHARE VOLUME BY EXCHANGES 1/
(In Percentage)

Year	Total Share Volume (in Thousands)	NYSE	AMEX	CHIC	PSE	PHLX	BSE	CSE	Others 2/
1945	769,018	65.87	21.31	1.77	2.98	1.06	0.66	0.05	6.30
1950	893,320	76.32	13.54	2.16	3.11	0.97	0.65	0.09	3.16
1955	1,321,401	68.85	19.19	2.09	3.08	0.85	0.48	0.05	5.41
1960	1,441,120	68.47	22.27	2.20	3.11	0.88	0.38	0.04	2.65
1961	2,142,523	64.99	25.58	2.22	3.41	0.79	0.30	0.04	2.67
1962	1,711,945	71.31	20.11	2.34	2.95	0.87	0.31	0.04	2.07
1963	1,880,793	72.93	18.83	2.32	2.82	0.83	0.29	0.04	1.94
1964	2,118,326	72.81	19.42	2.43	2.65	0.93	0.29	0.03	1.44
1965	2,671,012	69.90	22.53	2.63	2.33	0.81	0.26	0.05	1.49
1966	3,313,899	69.38	22.84	2.56	2.68	0.86	0.40	0.05	1.23
1967	4,646,553	64.40	28.41	2.35	2.46	0.87	0.43	0.02	1.06
1968	5,407,923	61.98	29.74	2.63	2.64	0.89	0.78	0.01	1.33
1969	5,134,856	63.16	27.61	2.84	3.47	1.22	0.51	0.00	1.19
1970	4,834,887	71.28	19.03	3.16	3.68	1.63	0.51	0.02	0.69
1971	6,172,668	71.34	18.42	3.52	3.72	1.91	0.43	0.03	0.63
1972	6,518,132	70.47	18.22	3.71	4.13	2.21	0.59	0.03	0.64
1973	5,899,678	74.92	13.75	4.09	3.68	2.19	0.71	0.04	0.62
1974	4,950,842	78.47	10.28	4.40	3.48	1.82	0.86	0.05	0.64
1975	6,376,094	80.99	8.97	3.97	3.26	1.54	0.85	0.13	0.29
1976	7,129,132	80.05	9.35	3.87	3.93	1.42	0.78	0.44	0.16
1977	7,124,640	79.71	9.56	3.96	3.72	1.49	0.66	0.64	0.26
1978	9,630,065	79.53	10.65	3.56	3.84	1.49	0.60	0.16	0.17
1979	10,960,424	79.88	10.85	3.30	3.27	1.64	0.55	0.28	0.23
1980	15,587,986	79.94	10.78	3.84	2.80	1.54	0.57	0.32	0.21
1981	15,969,186	80.68	9.32	4.60	2.87	1.55	0.51	0.37	0.10
1982	22,491,935	81.22	6.96	5.09	3.62	2.18	0.48	0.38	0.07
1983	30,316,014	80.37	7.45	5.48	3.56	2.20	0.65	0.19	0.10
1984	30,548,014	82.54	5.26	6.03	3.31	1.79	0.85	0.18	0.04
1985	37,187,567	81.52	5.78	6.12	3.66	1.47	1.27	0.15	0.03
1986	48,580,524	81.12	6.28	5.73	3.68	1.53	1.33	0.30	0.02
1987	64,082,996	83.09	5.57	5.19	3.23	1.30	1.28	0.30	0.04
1988	52,665,654	83.74	4.95	5.26	3.03	1.29	1.32	0.39	0.02
1989	54,416,790	81.33	6.02	5.44	3.34	1.80	1.64	0.41	0.02
1990	53,746,087	81.86	6.23	4.68	3.16	1.82	1.71	0.53	0.01
1991r	58,290,641	82.01	5.52	4.66	3.59	1.60	1.77	0.86	0.01
1992r	65,705,037	81.34	5.74	4.62	3.19	1.72	1.57	1.83	0.01
1993	83,056,237	82.90	5.53	4.57	2.81	1.55	1.47	1.17	0.00
1994	90,786,603	84.55	4.96	3.88	2.37	1.42	1.39	1.42	0.01

r= revised

1/ Share volume for exchanges includes stocks, rights and warrants, calendar, rather than fiscal, year data is reported in this table

2/ Includes all exchanges not listed individually

Source: SEC Form R-31

Table 21
DOLLAR VOLUME BY EXCHANGES 1/
(In Percentage)

Year	Total Dollar Volume (\$ in Thousands)	NYSE	AMEX	CHIC	PSE	PHLX	BSE	CSE	Others 2/
1945	\$ 16,284,552	82.75	0.81	2.00	1.78	0.96	1.16	0.06	0.48
1950	21,808,284	85.91	6.85	2.35	2.19	1.03	1.12	0.11	0.44
1955	38,039,107	86.31	6.98	2.44	1.90	1.03	0.78	0.09	0.47
1960	45,309,825	83.80	9.35	2.72	1.94	1.03	0.60	0.07	0.49
1961	64,071,623	82.43	10.71	2.75	1.99	1.03	0.49	0.07	0.53
1962	54,855,293	86.32	6.81	2.75	2.00	1.05	0.46	0.07	0.54
1963	64,437,900	85.19	7.51	2.72	2.39	1.06	0.41	0.06	0.66
1964	72,461,584	83.49	8.45	3.15	2.48	1.14	0.42	0.06	0.81
1965	89,549,093	81.78	9.91	3.44	2.43	1.12	0.42	0.08	0.82
1966	123,697,737	79.77	11.84	3.14	2.84	1.10	0.56	0.07	0.68
1967	162,189,211	77.29	14.48	3.08	2.79	1.13	0.66	0.03	0.54
1968	197,116,367	73.55	17.99	3.12	2.65	1.13	1.04	0.01	0.51
1969	176,389,759	73.48	17.59	3.39	3.12	1.43	0.67	0.01	0.31
1970	131,707,946	78.44	11.11	3.76	3.81	1.99	0.67	0.03	0.19
1971	186,375,130	79.07	9.98	4.00	3.79	2.29	0.58	0.05	0.24
1972	205,956,263	77.77	10.37	4.29	3.94	2.56	0.75	0.05	0.27
1973	178,863,622	82.07	6.06	4.54	3.55	2.45	1.00	0.06	0.27
1974	118,828,270	83.63	4.40	4.90	3.50	2.03	1.24	0.06	0.24
1975	157,256,676	85.20	3.67	4.64	3.26	1.73	1.19	0.17	0.14
1976	195,224,812	84.35	3.88	4.76	3.83	1.69	0.94	0.53	0.02
1977	187,393,084	83.96	4.60	4.79	3.53	1.62	0.74	0.75	0.01
1978	251,618,179	83.67	6.13	4.16	3.64	1.62	0.61	0.17	0.00
1979	300,475,510	83.72	6.94	3.83	2.78	1.80	0.56	0.35	0.02
1980	476,500,688	83.53	7.33	4.33	2.27	1.61	0.52	0.40	0.01
1981	491,017,139	84.74	5.41	5.04	2.32	1.60	0.49	0.40	0.00
1982	603,094,266	85.32	3.27	5.83	3.05	1.59	0.51	0.43	0.00
1983	958,304,168	85.13	3.32	6.28	2.86	1.55	0.66	0.16	0.04
1984	951,318,448	85.61	2.26	6.57	2.93	1.58	0.85	0.19	0.00
1985	1,200,127,848	85.25	2.23	6.59	3.06	1.49	1.20	0.18	0.00
1986	1,707,117,112	85.02	2.56	6.00	3.00	1.57	1.44	0.41	0.00
1987	2,286,902,788	86.79	2.32	5.32	2.53	1.35	1.33	0.35	0.00
1988	1,587,950,769	86.81	1.96	5.46	2.62	1.33	1.34	0.49	0.00
1989	1,847,766,971	85.49	2.35	5.46	2.84	1.77	1.56	0.54	0.00
1990	1,616,798,075	86.15	2.33	4.58	2.77	1.79	1.63	0.74	0.00
1991	1,778,154,074	86.20	2.31	4.34	3.05	1.54	1.72	0.83	0.01
1992	2,032,684,135	86.47	2.07	4.28	2.87	1.70	1.52	1.09	0.00
1993	2,610,504,390	87.21	2.08	4.10	2.38	1.52	1.35	1.37	0.00
1994	2,817,671,150	88.08	2.01	3.49	2.09	1.34	1.31	1.68	0.00

1/ Dollar volume for exchanges includes stocks, rights and warrants, calendar, rather than fiscal, year data is reported in this table

2/ Includes all exchanges not listed individually.

Source SEC Form R-31

Table 22
SECURITIES LISTED ON EXCHANGES 1/
December 31, 1994

154

EXCHANGE Registered.	COMMON		PREFERRED		BONDS		TOTAL SECURITIES	
	Number	Market Value (in Millions)	Number	Market Value (in Millions)	Number	Market Value (in Millions)	Number	Market Value (in Millions)
Domestic Securities								
American	854	\$ 84,918	70	\$ 1,554	95	\$ 7,870	1,019	\$ 94,341
Boston	169	2,918	8	20	0	0	177	2,938
Cincinnati	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chicago 2/	12	535	3	25	0	0	15	560
New York	2,288	4,184,480	522	56,314	1,931	2,330,918	4,741	6,571,712
Pacific	15	526	7	329	25	1,076	47	1,931
Philadelphia	5	24	39	371	7	93	51	488
Total	3,343	\$4,273,401	649	\$58,613	2,058	\$2,339,957	6,050	\$6,671,970

Includes Foreign Stocks.

EXCHANGE	COMMON		PREFERRED		BONDS		TOTAL SECURITIES	
	Number	Market Value (in Millions)	Number	Market Value (in Millions)	Number	Market Value (in Millions)	Number	Market Value (in Millions)
Foreign Securities								
New York	213	\$200,296	37	\$7,194	210	\$118,286	460	\$325,776
American 3/	83	24,065	1	428	4	621	88	25,114
Boston	5	93	0	0	1	7	6	101
Pacific	1	19	0	0	0	0	1	19
Philadelphia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	302	\$224,473	38	\$7,622	215	\$118,914	555	\$351,009

NA = Not Available

1/ Excludes securities that were suspended from trading at the end of the year and securities that, because of inactivity, had no available quotes

2/ Market values were not available for four issues.


3/ Includes companies traded on the American Stock Exchange Emerging Company Marketplace

Table 23
VALUE OF STOCKS LISTED ON EXCHANGES
(\$ in Billions)

As of Dec 31	New York Stock Exchange	American Stock Exchange	Exclusively On Other Exchanges	Total
1938	\$ 47.5	\$ 10.8		\$ 58.3
1940	46.5	10.1		56.6
1941	41.9	8.6		50.5
1942	35.8	7.4		43.2
1943	47.6	9.9		57.5
1944	55.5	11.2		66.7
1945	73.8	14.4		88.2
1946	68.6	13.2		81.8
1947	68.3	12.1		80.4
1948	67.0	11.9	3.0	81.9
1949	76.3	12.2	3.1	91.6
1950	93.8	13.9	3.3	111.0
1951	109.5	16.5	3.2	129.2
1952	120.5	16.9	3.1	140.5
1953	117.3	15.3	2.8	135.4
1954	169.1	22.1	3.6	194.8
1955	207.7	27.1	4.0	238.8
1956	219.2	31.0	3.8	254.0
1957	195.6	25.5	3.1	224.2
1958	276.7	31.7	4.3	312.7
1959	307.7	25.4	4.2	337.3
1960	307.0	24.2	4.1	335.3
1961	387.8	33.0	5.3	426.1
1962	345.8	24.4	4.0	374.2
1963	411.3	26.1	4.3	441.7
1964	474.3	28.2	4.3	506.8
1965	537.5	30.9	4.7	573.1
1966	482.5	27.9	4.0	514.4
1967	605.8	43.0	3.9	652.7
1968	692.3	61.2	6.0	759.5
1969	629.5	47.7	5.4	682.6
1970	636.4	39.5	4.8	680.7
1971	741.8	49.1	4.7	795.6
1972	871.5	55.6	5.6	932.7
1973	721.0	38.7	4.1	763.8
1974	511.1	23.3	2.9	537.3
1975	685.1	29.3	4.3	718.7
1976	858.3	36.0	4.2	898.5
1977	776.7	37.6	4.2	818.5
1978	822.7	39.2	2.9	864.8
1979	960.6	57.8	3.9	1,022.3
1980	1,242.8	103.5	2.9	1,349.2
1981	1,143.8	89.4	5.0	1,238.2
1982	1,305.4	77.6	6.8	1,389.7
1983	1,522.2	80.1	6.6	1,608.8
1984	1,529.5	52.0	5.8	1,587.3
1985	1,882.7	63.2	5.9	1,951.8
1986	2,128.5	70.3	6.5	2,205.3
1987	2,132.2	67.0	5.9	2,205.1
1988	2,366.1	84.1	4.9	2,455.1
1989	2,903.5	100.9	4.6	3,009.0
1990	2,692.1	69.9	3.9	2,765.9
1991	3,547.5	90.3	4.3	3,642.1
1992	3,877.9	86.4	5.9	3,970.2
1993	4,314.9	98.1	7.2	4,420.2
1994	4,240.8	86.5	4.7	4,332.0

Source: SEC Form 1392

Table 24
APPROPRIATED FUNDS vs FEES* COLLECTED



* Excludes disgorgements from fraud actions.

Table 25
BUDGET ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATIONS
\$(000)

Action	Fiscal 1989		Fiscal 1990		Fiscal 1991		Fiscal 1992		Fiscal 1993		Fiscal 1994		Fiscal 1995	
	Positions	Money	Positions	Money	Positions	Money	Positions	Money	Positions	Money	Positions	Money	Positions	Money
Estimate Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget	2,604	\$170,064	2,763	\$199,597	2,952	\$219,516	3,027	\$249,082	3,083	\$260,852	2,940	\$274,803	3,039	\$297,376
Action by the Office of Management and Budget Amount Allowed by the Office of Management and Budget	- 184	- 9,139	- 312	-30,890	- 354	-27,131	-109	-23,290	-143	-11,091	-165	-19,447	+133	+8,624
Action by the House of Representatives	2,420	160,925	2,451	168,707	2,598	192,385	2,918	225,792	2,940	249,761	2,775	255,356	3,172	306,000
Subtotal	- 153	- 25,704 ^{1/}	- 184	- 26,067 ^{1/}				- 68,307		-92,276		-197,500 ^{4/}	-133	-9,126
Subtotal	2,267	135,221	2,267	142,640			2,918	157,485	2,940	157,485		57,856	3,039	296,874
Action by the Senate	+ 153	+ 14,779	+ 184	+ 26,067				+68,307		+92,276		+197,500	+133	+7,708
Subtotal	2,420	150,000	2,451	168,707	2,598	192,385	2,918	225,792	2,940	249,761	2,775	255,356	3,172	304,582
Action by Conferees	- 153	- 7,360				-4,900				+3,474		+4,961	-133	-7,177
Annual Appropriation	2,267	142,640	2,451	168,707	2,598	187,485 ^{2/}	2,918	225,792	2,940	253,235	2,775	260,317	3,039	297,405
Supplemental Appropriation						1,600								
Sequestration / Other				-2,074		-2								-568
Use of prior year unobligated Balances											+50	+8,833		+3,600
Total Funding Level	2,267	142,640	2,451	166,633	2,598	189,083	2,918	225,792	2,940	253,235 ^{3/}	2,825	269,150	3,039	\$300,437

^{1/} Funds excluded from bill due to an absence of an enacted authorization

^{2/} Includes assumption of \$30 million in 1933 Securities Act 6(b) offset fees collected by the Securities and Exchange Commission

^{3/} Pending the possible enactment of legislation amending the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, the SEC's 1993 appropriation included authorization to collect and spend an additional \$16 million in new fees for the direct costs of registration, inspection, and related activities. Such legislation was not passed in 1993

^{4/} Funding reduced to \$57,856 million based on an assumption that fee language would be later enacted in permanent legislation to provide SEC an additional \$197,500 million in offsetting collections, thereby funding the SEC in full at \$255,356 million

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

