

1-1-1987

The Rescue of the Thrift Institutions and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (FSLIC)

Hyman P. Minsky Ph.D.

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.bard.edu/hm_archive

Recommended Citation

Minsky, Hyman P. Ph.D., "The Rescue of the Thrift Institutions and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (FSLIC)" (1987). *Hyman P. Minsky Archive*. Paper 91.
http://digitalcommons.bard.edu/hm_archive/91

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Levy Economics Institute of Bard College at Bard Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Hyman P. Minsky Archive by an authorized administrator of Bard Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@bard.edu.

The Rescue of the Thrift Institutions and the FSLIC.

The current problems of the beleaguered thrift industry illustrate how ^{endogenous} inherent market forces that lead to financial innovation and financial fragility interact with inept ^{underwriting} regulation and intervention to create a financial crisis. ^{conditions conducive to}

Furthermore, the response of the regulators, analysts and Congress to these problems reflects the Smithian "priors" which ~~have come to~~ ^{now} dominate the generally-held theory ~~that~~ ^{defenses} concerning apt policy intervention.

The fragility of the ^{tenuous structure} United States savings and loan institutions and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance

Corporation (FSLIC) was ^{undermined by the sharply} revealed with rising interest rates ~~that~~ ^{followed the shift of the Federal Reserve to restrictive monetary action. On a number} in the late 1970's. Both asset restriction (to home ^{to restrict raise the rise in interest rates led to an unbalanced erosion of the} mortgages) and deposit rate ceilings (which were imposed on ^{equity below the thrifts. On a current income basis, the attractiveness of the} thrifts by the Interest Rate Adjustment Act of 1966)

^{spread between returns and the cost of money was widening away the} prevented thrifts from diversifying and shortening asset ^{their asset} maturities and from retaining deposits as interest rates rose. While thrifts were able to respond to the outflow of small deposits into money market mutual funds after the

introduction of Money Market Certificates in 1978 and Small ^{with some} Saver Certificates in 1980, disintermediation, continued to ^{which some had} be a problem in the early 1980's (Cooper and Fraser, p.3 and ^{revenue} p. 184) ~~Moreover, nothing was done to ease asset~~ ^{Direct} ~~restrictions on the thrifts.~~ [?] ~~dit~~

The ~~three~~ ^{the} major pieces of bank legislation in the 1980's attempted to address the plight of thrifts and to strengthen the position of the FSLIC. The first of these,

the Depository Institutions Deregulation and Monetary Control Act of 1980 (DIDMCA), eliminated deposit rate ceilings by 1986, allowed thrifts to issue interest-paying deposits, ~~and~~ to expand consumer loans, issue credit cards and offer trust services (C&F, p.116). But the reforms of 1980 were not sufficient. ~~Thrifts were unable to stay~~

~~afflict with~~ ^{eroded (unity)} The sharply rising interest rates of 1981-82. ^(m - k to m - lat) By 1982 many were technically insolvent. ^{II} In March of 1982,

Congress ~~passed~~ a Joint Resolution asserting that the full faith and credit of the U. S. government stood behind

federal deposit insurance liabilities (Kane, 1987). ^{Just what}

^{has been passed since then - see in Report as written by Congress and the} The Garn-St. Germain Depository Institutions Act of ^{administration}

1982, passed in October, was directed at both saving the thrift industry and speeding up ^{mean} deregulation (C&F, p. 127).

The act allowed ~~the~~ Federal deposit insurers greater discretion in resolving institution failures. They were permitted to arrange interstate mergers and acquisitions by non-financial corporations and to issue net worth

certificates to enhance the ^{book} capital of failing institutions. *

At the same time, the ^{and inside business staffed} inexperienced thrifts were permitted to venture into ^{financing activities} markets and ^{liability} instruments ^{that} previously were restricted to banks.

While Garn-St. Germain made it easier for the FSLIC to forestall and, hopefully, prevent the liquidation of thrifts with negative net worth, it also encouraged go-for-broke behavior by the (reconstructed) surviving institutions (Hanwick, 1986). This policy put at risk the solvency of

What are
me T
accounts to
Net Worth
ce h frs te

administration
drawn
The business
implies to
2. this
found
reduced

the FSLIC. The bet by the Congress and the FSLIC that rates would come down and revive the thrifts was lost when the fall in interest rates from 1984 to 1986 was accompanied by systemic declines in oil, ^{price} land and real estate prices that ^{cash flows that support the value of} devastated the asset ~~values~~ of many deposit institutions. In 1986, 347 out of 540 savings and loan associations reporting losses were insolvent (Schwartz, 1987). In 1987, ^{the Savings and Loan Association} 10 percent of ~~them~~ were insolvent and one third experienced losses. Sixty percent of the failed firms were in Texas. (Kester, 1987).

By early 1987, FSLIC was unable to ^{fund} ~~continue to~~ either a payoff ^{of} depositors or ~~finance~~ purchase and assumption packages for insolvent thrifts (Kester, 1987). The 1982

Joint Resolution guaranteeing the deposits of thrifts by Congress, ^{was} ~~no doubt,~~ ^{the fact} helped to prevent a collapse of the thrift industry and averted a major financial crisis at this

time. ¹⁹⁸⁷ ~~Finally~~ In August, Congress passed a ^{refunding} bailout plan ^{for} F.S.L.C.

To reassure the public, Congress confirmed its full faith and credit guarantee of "all insured deposits" in Title IX of the Competitive Equality Banking Act of 1987 (CEBA). (cite act)

The CEBA was a direct response to the imminent failure ^{to fund the payments of its insurance obligation} of the FSLIC, Title III of CEBA created the Financing Corporation whose purpose is to ^{fund insurance payments} ~~raise cash~~ for the FSLIC.

~~An infusion of funds from~~ The Federal Home Loan Bank Board ^{is to} ~~is to be used by~~ the Financing Corporation to purchase zero coupon Treasury securities. These securities will ^{which is to be used} ~~back~~ the

how? supportable? cabinet?

infuse funds to

finance

which will use the funds to
either pay you or make benefit
to the IRS

payment of
the

principal on the \$10.8 billion in debt securities that the

Financing Corporation is empowered sell to the public. These

proceeds of which are to be invested in the FSLIC. Interest on the
payments due on these securities are to come from

assessments on the surviving thrifts. While the backing

with Treasury securities guaranteed the principal, the bill

provides no insurance of the interest payments to debt

holders, exposing them to interest rate risk. Why the

Congress chose this circuitous, and more costly, route to

"bailout" the FSLIC is not known, but it is likely that

concerns about the rising budget deficit and the desire the

provide a "market" solution are at its core.

The developing crisis of the thrift industry and the

FSLIC reflects many of the problems created by inept

responses to market innovation and evolution by the

regulators. The liabilities of the thrifts were made more

rate sensitive without concomittant flexibility in asset

composition. The deposit insurer, aided and abetted by

Congress, then encouraged go for broke behavior in order to

reduce the short run costs of resolving the crisis in the

thrift industry precipitated by rising interest rates. But

in the long run, the costs will be higher and the damage to

the industry greater than had Congress come up with the funds

money today to promptly liquidate insolvent thrifts. If the

thrifts don't recover, there inevitably will be a depositor

payoff either by the FSLIC or Congress. Solvent thrifts are

being made to pay for this rescue and at the same time

new and... assessment
see

Citation

my interpretation
of comments.
(also see
see Kase
Raymond
Hornbeck)

Holder of these assets are
by default an interest
rate. This
and with...
imposes
additional
costs
to the
system
to pay
the
thrifts

before the market which had determined
setup institutional arrangements that by often new
Congress, then encouraged go for broke behavior in order to

need for such as

in the

Facting as...
or by the

moderate
to measure

Solvent and profitable thrifts

required to compete in a deregulated market. They are likely to pay the ~~large~~ exit fees and leave the system after the one year moratorium imposed by CEBA has expired. This response will reduce the ^{funding base for the bonds of} ~~cash flow~~ of the FSLIC and the Financing Corporation.

~~But the error is in concluding that the inept responses~~

by Congress and the regulators are the cause of the crisis in the thrift industry and the FSLIC, Had the thrifts been free of asset restrictions, interest rate ceilings, and deposit insurance protection, perhaps they would have been ^{not} less vulnerable to interest rate fluctuations or the

does not stand security

systemic declines in oil, real estate and farm prices. ^{given these} ~~basic structure of borrowing that led to the evaporation of the cash flows~~ (Bank positions in the early 1930's do not confirm this conjecture True? Supportable?) ^{to measure} But ~~deposit insurers~~ ^{and}

Set up by regulation; not by their own volition

the institutions they insure, cannot weather system-wide and contagious losses. Systemic failures cannot be contained by ^{unless there is a willingness to absorb deep depositions} letting them run their course. Nor can the costs of ~~these~~

oil real estate bank lost their support their assets

making service cash flow shabby
pile of - their unsupportable cash commitments upon a weak structure

failures be avoided by cosmetic arrangements that merely ~~serve to put off the inevitable.~~ But ~~apt~~ intervention that

recognizes the need to establish new initial conditions, ^{or} that is, the need to payoff depositors, liquidate insolvent

thrifts and scale back deposit insurance coverage, ^{even present potential for loss} may reduce the long run cost and speed the transition to a more robust industry.

I can argue this is due to the regulation that the corrupted thrift would behave to avoid systematic units.

For evaluation to trust at end of p. 10

Merger debt crisis being resolved like some cog!

Deposit strips zero plus

PU of ~~income~~ very heavily guaranteed.