# AMERICAN BANKER

Welcome, CATHERINE GHIGLIERI | Log Out

Search American Banker

for

About the Banking Group

Friday, February 27, 2009, as of 10:55 AM EST



Today's Paper | Tools & Data | Topics | AB / TV | My Account | Custom Email | Feedback | Contact | RSS

AMERICAN BANKER
BANK TECH. NEWS
U.S. BANKER
Cards/Payments
Community Banking
Markets
Mortgages
National/Global
Retail Delivery
Technology
Viewpoints

Regulatory
Wealth
Management

Washington/

Mobile Banker
News by State
Blogs & Scans

Special Reports

Company Index Resources

Customer Service
Advertise/Media Kit

Conferences

CareerZone

Marketplace White Papers

Banker of the Year/

Best in Banking Financial Services

Executive Forum

The FinTech 100

The Innovators

25 Most Powerful Women in Banking

Advertisement

# **Viewpoint: Use Receivership to Restore Confidence**

American Banker | Friday, February 27, 2009

By Catherine A. Ghiglieri and Robert M. Krasne

Print Email Reprints Feedback

Much has been written about the need for the nascent Obama administration to craft a comprehensive bailout package to promote confidence in our banking system and calm the roiling markets. All the plans discussed so far have been so complicated that even administration officials cannot explain them in a way that promotes confidence in the banking system by the American public.

We propose a more simplified plan that would re-establish the long-term viability of our banking system, reaffirm our commitment to the capitalist principles of risk and reward, and likely even prove less costly than many alternatives. Furthermore, it can re-establish our mortgage market and assuage Americans' concerns that too much focus and too many resources are being dedicated to Wall Street, rather than Main Street.

The essential element of the plan is set forth in the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, which enables the various bank regulators — or, if they fail to act, the <u>FDIC</u> — to take control of banks that are insolvent or nearly insolvent by putting them into receivership or conservatorship.

By putting banks facing capital or liquidity crises into receivership or conservatorship, the federal government, through the FDIC, would be promoting the least costly solution to the financial problems those institutions face. Instead of trying to prop them up by purchasing illiquid or unmarketable 'assets' at illusory prices, we would be stripping deposits and good assets out of the troubled institutions and leaving the impaired assets and off-balance-sheet liabilities behind for the FDIC to liquidate in an orderly manner, enabling it to maximize asset values over time and to minimize the potential losses.

The troubled banks would be sanitized in the future; the government would not be buying assets below investment grade to bail out institutions and covering the losses in off-balance-sheet entities or notional accounts of indeterminate size. Boards and managers of failed or near-failing institutions would be replaced, so they could do no further damage. And equity investors in insolvent institutions would lose their investments. This would re-establish the idea that shareholders cannot win on the way up and be protected by the government on the way down, promoting more engaged investors and more active corporate governance.

Ultimately, the FDIC would sell the newly sanitized institutions, thereby reaffirming the American approach to banking since the Great Depression — protect depositors first and attract private capital second. IndyMac is a good example of how well this works. The FDIC attracted more than a billion dollars of capital within six months after taking it over from private investors.

However, this process should not come without restrictions. We suggest that no sanitized bank be part of a bank holding company that engages in any form of investment banking; that the sanitized banks have mortgage origination functions that would underwrite conventional loans (in compliance with old <u>Fannie Mae</u> guidelines); and that the sanitized banks do not participate in the purchase of synthetic securities without regulatory approval. (Perhaps that approach should be taken for all insured institutions.)

The greatest difference between what we propose and where the administration and Congress appear to be heading is the focus of the respective plans.

Though the government appears properly focused on ensuring adequate capital in our nation's banks, they are trying to do so as the banks continue to hold assets and remain exposed to liabilities whose size cannot be readily determined in these turbulent financial times. Because the values cannot be readily determined for certain of the banks' assets or

#### **CURRENT TOPICS**

- Bank Failures
- Mortgage Policy
- The Pursuit of the Underbanked

Advertisement



 FDIC Weighs Special Fee to Rebuild Reserves

- Removing Bad Assets Good Place to Start
- 3. Durbin Poses Possible Deal on Cramdown
- 4. JPM a Rare Firm with Free Capital
- 5. New Tool in the Survival Kit: Bonuses
- 6. The Future Shape of Payments is Anything But Flat
- Tarp Repay, Stress Test: JPM Seeks Comfort Zone
- 8. Banks Post \$26B Loss in 4Q
- 9. To Get More Tarp, Obama Needs Facts
- B of A Chief: Criticized Deals Look Like '09 Boon

Advertisement

contingent liabilities, capital cannot be calculated with any certainty either.

By contrast, we propose stripping the more volatile assets and potential nondeposit liabilities out of the banks and quantifying the potential capital shortfall according to the formula of total deposits minus stable or marketable assets. The Obama administration is attempting to find solutions to the many ills of the banking system. They need only look at the tried and true regulatory policies of the past to find a framework that would work just fine for the current banking crisis.

These policies would take us back to where we need to be: finding safety for depositors, imposing good corporate governance on directors, and requiring a true risk/reward analysis for shareholders.

Ms. Ghiglieri is the president of Ghiglieri & Co., a bank consulting firm in Austin, and a former Texas banking commissioner. Mr. Krasne is an adjunct professor at the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University and a principal of Krasne Group Inc., a consulting firm in Washington.

More articles in National/Global

## **WEB SEMINARS**

Financial Services and Web 2.0

March 17, 2009, 11:00AM ET

Predictable Revenue Streams in Unpredictable Times

March 18, 2009, 02:00PM ET

Leading Analyst to Make Recommendations for Driving Customer Retention

Available on Demand

Leading Analyst Research: Choosing Rich Internet Application (RIA) Framework

Available on Demand

More Web Seminars

### RESEARCH VAULT

**Green Banking Study** 

Publisher: Informa Research Services, Inc.

2009 Identity Fraud Survey Report (FULL VERSION): Identity Fraud on the Rise But Consumer Costs Plummet as Protections Increase

Publisher: Javelin Strategy & Research

Top Performing Tier 1 Banks: How 11 Institutions Sustained Success

Publisher: Bradway Research LLC

More Research Papers

#### UPCOMING EVENTS

14th Annual Best Practices in Retail Financial Services Symposium

March 15 - 17, 2009 Naples, FL

3rd Annual Mortgage Servicing Conference

April 6 - 7, 2009 Westlake, Texas More Upcoming Events

Green Banking?

Think you're really

ready for the

mobile future?

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND WEB 2.0: New Tools to Attract, Retain and Service Online Customers WEB SEMINAR REGISTER TODAY

About | Advertise/Media Kit | CareerZone | Contact | Inquire | Marketplace | Register | RSS | Site Map | Subscribe | White Papers

American Banker | Bank Technology News | Credit Union Journal | U.S. Banker



Privacy Policy | Subscriber Agreement & Terms of Use

© 2009 American Banker and SourceMedia, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

SourceMedia is an Investcorp company. Use, duplication, or sale of this service, or data contained herein, except as described in the Subscription Agreement, is strictly prohibited.

Visit other SourceMedia sites:

Select Site