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THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, AS A MATTER OF
POLICY, DISCLAIMS RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY PRIVATE STATE-
MENT BY ANY OF ITS EMPLOYEES. THE VIEWS EXPRESSED HERE
ARE THOSE OF MR. FEDDERS AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT
THE VIEW OF THE COMMISSION, OR OF MR. FEDDERS' COLLEAGUES
ON THE STAFF OF THE COMMISSION.
I AM HONORED TO ADDRESS THIS CONFERENCE OF FELLOW SECURITIES ADMINISTRATORS AND THEIR GUESTS.

THIS CONFERENCE AFFORDS US AN OPPORTUNITY TO REFLECT UPON PROBLEMS IN THE SECURITIES INDUSTRY, AND TO DISCUSS NEW IDEAS AND CONCEPTS. BY COOPERATION WE WILL IMPROVE OUR RECORD OF SUBSTANTIAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS.

In my 85 days at the Commission, I have made an intensive review and assessment of the enforcement program. With recognition that my views have matured for less than a fiscal quarter, I will discuss three topics. First, my approach to enforcement. Second, areas that I believe require renewed enforcement vigilance. Finally, I will make several observations.
about specific aspects of the Commission's enforcement program.

**Enforcement Approach**

At the outset, I will speak briefly about my enforcement approach.

I do not want the Commission's enforcement program to be identified for what it is against. I want the program to be recognized for what it is for.

The Commission's purpose is to insure that the nation's capital markets operate with an integrity that promotes investor confidence. Our enforcement responsibility is to ferret out those who abuse the market system and who deceive investors. The Division of Enforcement is not in existence to discredit or impair our capital markets.
As Chairman John Shad has said: our securities markets are the best the world has ever known. The broadest, the most active, effective, efficient and the fairest. The prices of the vast majority of securities reflect publicly available information and investors' opinions of the prospects for the companies and the economy.

Public confidence in the integrity of our markets is essential to capital formation and to our nation's economic growth and stability. Our markets and even our economic stability can be jeopardized by attempts to abuse the system or to deceive investors. Although I believe that abuse and deception are the exceptions, they remain serious problems.
I agree with Chairman Shad's statement that most investors, brokers and business persons are honest. They want to compete in a fair environment. They want to see those who lie, cheat and steal investigated, prosecuted and sanctioned.

It is my firm intention that the Commission will continue to be active and effective in the enforcement of the securities laws. History tells us that times of economic turmoil spawn new abuses and new deceptions. Our enforcement program necessarily reflects the events and problems of the times in which we live. The Commission will be vigilant for those abuses that arise during our nation's current economic difficulties.
I can assure you that any conduct that violates the securities laws will be pursued vigorously.

Admittedly, the foregoing is somewhat general. My approach may be understood more fully if I move to a discussion of three areas which I believe require renewed enforcement vigilance.

Areas for Renewed Enforcement Vigilance

The areas are:

First, trading while in possession of material non-public information, or what is often called "insider trading." Second, the manipulation of the securities markets. Third, fraud by reporting companies.

By listing these specific enforcement programs, I do not mean to suggest that my predecessors or
prior Commissions ignored them. The record is to the contrary. From my selection of these areas, no one should assume that the Commission will be less vigorous when pursuing violations of other provisions of the securities laws. To do so would be folly. I mention these three areas because they are currently in the forefront.

Trading on Material Non-Public Information

The Commission remains deeply concerned about trading by persons in possession of material non-public information.

The Commission has brought over 40 cases in this area since January 1978. This is more insider trading cases than it brought from 1934 to 1978. Yet, more can and will be done in this area.
The Commission will intensify its efforts to prevent, detect and prosecute trading by persons in possession of inside information. The program to date has been successful in terms of the number of cases initiated, the relief obtained and the resultant communication of the Commission's view of insider trading. Yet, there remains widespread abuse of material non-public information by corporate insiders, their professional advisors, their tippees, and others. We will not shy away from cases based on circumstantial evidence if the relevant facts demonstrate that any person breached a trust, confidence or other duty owed to another person by effecting trades while in possession of inside information.
The insider trading issue has been intensified by the many substantial tender offers and business combinations which recently have taken place. We will carefully scrutinize trading activity preceding public announcement of such transactions.

All enterprises which have confidential information in their possession that may affect the securities trading markets have an affirmative obligation to safeguard such information. While no procedures can guarantee that individual employees will not take unfair advantage of their position, enterprises should establish policies and procedures regarding the protection of confidential information and take steps to ensure that all personnel are familiar with those policies, including
THE SERIOUS CONSEQUENCES THAT MAY RESULT FROM CONDUCT VIOLATING SUCH POLICIES.

The Commission welcomes the aid of all parties in its program against insider trading. We ask any person, particularly the state securities law administrators and members of the business and securities communities, to inform us of suspicious trading in securities.

Several commentators have suggested that insider trading cannot be effectively prevented. They are wrong. Others argue either that it is not worth preventing or that allowing insiders to trade while in possession of material non-public information will reward them for their entrepreneurial activities. They
MAINTAIN THAT SUCH TRADING LEADS TO EFFICIENT MARKETS, AND THAT IT IS NOT UNFAIR TO ANYONE.

THE SUGGESTIONS ARE REPUGNANT TO THE FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPT OF FAIRNESS ON WHICH A FREE MARKET SYSTEM DEPENDS. THEY DESERVE NO FURTHER RESPONSE.

MANIPULATION

I WILL TURN NEXT TO OUR ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS AGAINST THOSE WHO MANIPULATE THE SECURITIES MARKETS.

A CHIEF AIM OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 IS TO ELIMINATE MANIPULATIVE AND OTHER ABUSES IN THE SECURITIES MARKETS, AND TO ESTABLISH MARKETS WHERE PRICES ARE ESTABLISHED BY THE FREE AND HONEST BALANCING OF INVESTMENT DEMAND WITH INVESTMENT SUPPLY. MANIPULATION THREATENS THE INTEGRITY OF OUR CAPITAL MARKETS.
One type of violation high among our enforcement priorities is manipulative activities associated with the so-called "hot issue" market that has been centered in Denver. This market has been characterized by the promotion and sale of highly speculative stocks in initial offerings for a minimal price, followed by extremely active trading and rapid price increases caused by excessive demand in the after-market.

Serious abuses exist both in the offering sales practices and in the after-market activity. Disclosures in the prospectus point out the speculative risks involved. However, they often are consigned to oblivion by aggressive brokers. The abuses also include tie-in arrangements, delayed deliveries of securities and refusals to execute sell orders.
The practices artificially maintain or increase the price of the stock. The artificial price rise often fuels investor demand and causes an upward spiraling effect on both price and demand. These practices detract from an orderly marketplace. They contribute to market activities and prices which are not the result of the natural forces of supply and demand. The Commission will continue to work closely with the National Association of Securities Dealers to curb abuses which exist in the "hot issues" area.

Another area of potential enforcement action is intermarket manipulation. Listed option trading has made it possible for a manipulator to realize large gains on small manipulated movements in equity securities.
AS A RESULT OF THE LEVERAGE AFFORDED BY OPTIONS.

THE POTENTIAL FOR THIS MANIPULATIVE CONDUCT IS

PARTICULARLY GREAT WHEN ONE MAY REALIZE LARGE GAINS

BY "CAPPING" A STOCK BELOW A PARTICULAR EXERCISE

PRICE, OR BY "PEGGING" THE PRICE AT A LEVEL ABOVE

THE EXERCISE PRICE, NEAR THE EXPIRATION DATE OF THE

SERIES.

THE DIVISIONS OF ENFORCEMENT AND MARKET

REGULATION HAVE TAILORED THE COMMISSION’S MARKET

SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES TO ADDRESS MANIPULATIVE

ABUSES. WE WILL CONTINUE TO ENHANCE AND COORDINATE

THOSE SURVEILLANCE EFFORTS IN CONJUNCTION WITH

THOSE OF THE SELF-REGULATORY ORGANIZATIONS. THE

COMMISSION IS PROMOTING GREATER COOPERATION BETWEEN

THE EQUITIES EXCHANGES AND OPTIONS EXCHANGES SO
THAT INTERMARKET MANIPULATION CAN BE READILY DETECTED.

The Commission's objective of preserving market integrity and investor confidence will not be achieved unless there is an increase in enforcement presence through market related investigations, and a substantial increase in our capacity to follow-up on matters brought to our attention by state securities law administrators, self-regulatory organizations and others. This is particularly important with respect to trading abuses involving speculative securities and new issues, insider trading, improper selling practices, trading abuses in the securities of foreign issuers, and intermarket manipulative activity in options and the underlying securities.
Fraudulent Disclosure Practices

Now, I will discuss our program against fraud by reporting companies.

At the heart of the disclosure requirements of the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is the concept that all material information relating to a company should be fairly and accurately reported. The Commission will continue to devote significant enforcement efforts to the detection and suppression of fraud in this context.

This aspect of the nationwide enforcement program is increasingly important as the Commission continues its efforts to deregulate, to streamline the disclosure process and to expand the scope of exempt offerings.
A fundamental and essential companion to deregulation is strong enforcement. The Commission is committed to an enforcement policy which will prevent deregulation from lessening investor protection.

The Commission will give a high priority to investigating and prosecuting those who engage in fraud in reporting information about their companies.

I again caution you not to interpret my remarks as an indication that the Commission will be less vigorous in investigating and prosecuting other violations of the securities laws. Organized criminal activities in the markets, fraud by regulated entities, proxy and tender offer abuses and unscrupulous investment counselors, to name a few, will continue to be pursued.
GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Before I conclude, I will make several general observations about the Commission's nationwide enforcement program. The remarks should provide you with a further understanding of my approach.

First, the Commission alone cannot ferret out all those who abuse the capital markets and who deceive investors. We have limited resources. The size of our enforcement staff and budget is declining while the securities industry we police is expanding rapidly.

We are in the process of adjusting our strategy to maximize our resources.
As part of its nationwide enforcement strategy, the Commission will strengthen its working relationship with those organizations for which the Commission has oversight responsibility. These include the securities industry self-regulatory organizations: the securities exchanges, the N.A.S.D. and others. These organizations must improve their vetting and surveillance capabilities and enforcement programs.

The Commission also will expand its working relationship with the North American Securities Administrators Association and the respective state securities administrators. We will assist the states in their enforcement programs.
To meet the challenges of the 1980s, the states and the Commission must cooperate even more than we do now. We must concentrate our respective enforcement efforts in those areas where we each excel.

The Commission will share whatever expertise we have on case management techniques. We will help you develop and coordinate multi-state enforcement efforts and, where appropriate, provide you with access to our files and information gathering resources.

In addition to its cooperation with state securities law administrators, the Commission will continue to maintain close liaison with the Department of Justice, the various U.S. Attorney's offices, other law enforcement authorities, as well as certain state regulatory agencies such as the Gaming Commissions.
FOR THE STATES OF NEVADA AND NEW JERSEY. MOREOVER,
the Commission works closely with other federal
agencies as well as foreign and local authorities
in order to share information and coordinate activities
of mutual concern.

In appropriate circumstances the Commission
will refer its files to the Department of Justice
or state criminal departments with an affirmative
request for prosecution. When appropriate, the
enforcement staff will render assistance to
prosecutorial authorities.

If we are successful in our cooperative efforts,
more of those who abuse the system will be investigated,
prosecuted and sanctioned. Together we will have a
GREATER IMPACT AND SERVE AS A GREATER DETERRENT TO
SECURITIES FRAUD AND MARKET ABUSE. WE WILL MULTIPLY
THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OUR LIMITED RESOURCES. A TRUE
NATIONWIDE ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM WILL DEVELOP.

A second objective is to improve the Commission's
INVESTIGATIVE ABILITIES IN ORDER TO REACH THE MERITS OF
each case promptly. Achieving this goal will require
IMPROVEMENTS OF OUR ENFORCEMENT CAPABILITIES. We hope
to REACH A DETERMINATION MORE QUICKLY WHETHER TO
INITIATE AN ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDING OR TO CLOSE AN
INVESTIGATION WITHOUT ACTION.

Third, I share Chairman Shad's desire to encourage
voluntary disclosure. Recently, he said that "In order
to encourage voluntary corporate compliance, the
Commission will give consideration to efforts of companies which promptly correct erroneous or inadequate disclosure and take other appropriate remedial actions."

The Commission’s objective is compliance with the law. Obviously, voluntary disclosure will not be a self-immunizing process. The Commission has always taken into consideration voluntary disclosure efforts in formulating its enforcement determinations. Such considerations will continue. Of course, the nature of certain violations will affect the degree of consideration accorded.

Fourth, the Commission will take steps to insure that conduct which threatens the integrity of its investigatory processes is prosecuted. We will scrutinize
CLOSELY SITUATIONS IN WHICH PERJURY, DESTRUCTION OF DOCUMENTS OR OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE IS SUSPECTED WITH A VIEW TOWARD REFERRING SUCH MATTERS TO PROSECUTORIAL AUTHORITIES. ALSO, WE WILL SEEK PROMPT ENFORCEMENT OF OUR INVESTIGATIVE SUBPOENAS WHEREVER APPROPRIATE.

FIFTH, I HAVE INITIATED INFORMAL, UNSTRUCTURED MEETINGS WITH SECURITIES PRACTITIONERS. A VARIETY OF TOPICS ARE DISCUSSED, INCLUDING THE INITIATION, CONDUCT AND CLOSING OF ENFORCEMENT INVESTIGATIONS. I WILL BENEFIT FROM THE KNOWLEDGE, EXPERIENCE AND CONSTRUCTIVE COMMENTS OF THOSE WITH WHOM I MEET. THE LEGAL PROFESSION, AS WELL AS THE ACCOUNTING PROFESSION, CAN HELP THE COMMISSION ACCOMPLISH ITS MISSION.
My final topic is the growing number of suits being filed against members of the Commission's enforcement staff. If the staff is engaged in misconduct, the Commission will suffer the consequences. Staff misconduct is rare. It is not condoned. We are improving our professionalism and controls to avoid mistakes. On the other hand, some of the suits are frivolous and only dilatory tactics. Some are designed to divert attention from the underlying substantive issues.

The Commission is committed to vigorously defending its staff members. In those cases where we believe the charges are frivolous, I will encourage the Commission to consider seeking sanctions against plaintiffs for frivolous litigation and moving for our defense costs. We will do what is necessary to prevent the staff from unnecessarily becoming the focus of litigation.
CONCLUSION

Now, permit me a final point.

Enforcement is an honorable undertaking. The enforcement efforts of the Commission and the states must be supported and encouraged because they improve our nation's capital markets and economic stability.

The federal and state employees engaged in enforcement activities are extremely capable and professional. We know the importance of our mission. We will not be deterred.