

**Looking to the 1990s:
What is Ahead for the Financial Service Industry**

by W. Lee Hoskins

COPY
SENT 8-21-90

I. Introduction

- A. Recent developments in the thrift and banking industries have made regulators acutely aware of the dangers of providing a large federal safety net
 - 1. the financial exposure of taxpayers is at the mercy of bank and thrift managers
 - 2. the safety net has allowed bank and thrift managers to take on more risk
- B. The regulated sector is growing more slowly than the unregulated sector
- C. Fundamental reform of the industry is past due and I recommend the following reforms
 - 1. changing the deposit insurance contract to encourage depositor discipline
 - 2. adopting mandatory solvency-based closure rules
 - 3. developing better information systems
 - 4. separating the insurance, receivership, and supervisory functions of the FDIC

II. Deposit Insurance System & Regulation

- A. Rationale for deposit insurance
 - 1. Federal deposit insurance has a long and controversial history
 - 2. Initial fears that deposit insurance would be costly and would subsidize poorly-managed banks eventually panned out in the last decade
- B. An intricate system of rules and regulations were put into place to protect the insurance fund (taxpayers) and to guard against subsidies to poorly managed banks
- C. To restore proper market discipline, federal deposit insurance coverage must be more correctly priced or limited
 - 1. at the very least, \$100,000 per account should be strictly observed -- protection should not be extended to uninsured claimants when handling a failure
 - 2. at the Cleveland Fed, we believe that the current statutory limit should be reduced
 - a. for those who desire more protection, co-insurance could exist above the reduced limit
 - b. a reduction would be quite consistent with the major objective of insurance -- protection of depositors from catastrophic loss
 - 1. the \$2,500 limit that was originally enacted (1934), is worth about \$25,000 when adjusted for inflation today
 - 2. moreover, the average insured deposit account is about \$12,000 in banks and about \$8,000 in thrifts

III. Closure and the "Too Big To Fail" Doctrine

- A. Strict enforcement of the deposit insurance ceiling means that we do not extend insurance to uninsured depositors and other creditors
 - 1. exceptions are not made for size of institution or type of charter
 - 2. the "TBTF" doctrine must be done away with
- B. Failure of any organization carries many negative connotations, but what does it really mean?
 - 1. assets are relocated and put to more efficient use
 - 2. allowing failure removes the need for taxpayers to bail out an unhealthy institution
 - 3. threat of failure strengthens market forces and discipline

IV. The Development of Better Information Systems

- A. Market value accounting systems should be implemented
 - 1. market value estimates of assets and liabilities would be a better indication of solvency than GAAP and RAP
 - 2. regulators' closure rules should be based on market value of capital
- B. Regulatory agencies should move from suppression to timely dissemination of information
 - 1. FIRREA is a step in this direction
 - 2. banks and thrifts ought to have the right to release their examination ratings and reports to the public
 - 3. annual audits by independent accounting firms should be required and made public

V. Separating Supervisory, Insurance, and Receivership Functions

- A. Separation of insurance and supervisory functions is necessary for prompt closure
 - 1. removes possible conflicts between the two functions
 - 2. insurance serves as a check on overall regulatory laxity
- B. Other changes
 - 1. deposit insurer must have the right to immediately terminate insurance coverage for new deposits when it determines an institution is being operated in an unsafe and unsound manner
 - 2. deposit insurer must have ability to charge differential premiums based on risk

VI. Loosening of the Regulatory Reins

- A. Only after reform of deposit insurance and the allowance of failure for badly-managed institutions can market incentives be expected to perform

- B. Only then, can managers in the financial services industry be freed from restrictive rules and regulations
 - 1. managers and shareholders alike would be forced to more carefully weigh risks and share in the outcomes of their decisions
 - 2. the ability to attract and maintain deposits would be based on the quality of business decisions, not on a deposit insurance subsidy of taxpayers

- C. Role of government authorities would change
 - 1. government authorities would not be enforcers of rules and restrictions, instead they would monitor and supervise in order to ensure that prescribed financial condition guidelines were being observed
 - 2. government authorities would not only supervise, but would also help disseminate information so that markets can make well-informed decisions