

The
Economist

Financial reform in America

A decent start

A somewhat clumsy bill is hardly a panacea, though it fixes some important things

Jul 1st 2010



IT IS touted as the biggest overhaul of American finance since the Great Depression. The 2,319-page Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, now nearing the end of its odyssey through Congress, tackles almost every aspect of American finance from mortgage-backed securities to executive pay. Its success, however, rests on a simple question: does it make a financial crisis significantly less likely?

The reform does make progress in three critical areas: regulatory oversight, derivatives trading, and dealing with troubled banks that are too big to fail. Yet by itself, this bill, whose passage in the Senate is still not quite secure, is an incomplete remedy (see [article](#)). Much depends on whether American regulators implement its provisions. Congress left several meaty matters for later, including the crippled mortgage giants, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. And even more is at stake: how the Basel club of international banking supervisors compel banks to raise their buffer of capital and liquidity.

Start with what the bill gets right. Though the financial crisis was global, it originated in a uniquely fragmented financial system, overseen by a patchwork of federal and state regulators. Dodd-Frank missed its chance to eliminate that patchwork, but offers a decent alternative: it creates a council to advise regulators on emerging threats. It consolidates oversight of consumer financial products, from mortgages to credit cards, in a single agency. And big financial institutions that aren't banks can be yanked into the embrace of the Federal Reserve.

Though a secondary player in the crisis, derivatives are a perennial candidate for causing trouble because they add opacity and leverage to the financial system. Most derivatives that are traded dealer-to-dealer will be traded on public exchanges. That will lessen the risk that a dealer's failure brings down others. An extreme proposal to stop banks trading derivatives

been mercifully scaled back. (The Volcker rule, limiting banks' ability to trade on their own account, also seems likely to hurt Wall Street profits less than some feared.)

The most important provision is the resolution authority under which federal regulators can force any financial company whose failure threatens the financial system, and quickly pay off its creditors while imposing losses on shareholders and unsecured creditors. This is an improvement on the status quo. Such resolution authority already exists for banks, but for other companies like Lehman Brothers and American International Group, regulators face a dreadful choice of bailing out the company and its creditors or letting it go bankrupt. Yet in its zeal to protect taxpayers, Congress has made the resolution process so similar to bankruptcy that courts and lenders may still choose to abandon a troubled firm to avoid losses. Other steps are needed: for example, regulators should create a new ring-fenced group of creditors who would be exposed to losses in resolution. But the horrible truth is that the effectiveness of any such measures will be discovered only when a real crisis occurs.

Meanwhile there are two other ways to mitigate the risks flowing from banks that are so big to fail. One is to claw back the subsidy such firms enjoy in their borrowing, both to encourage them to shrink and to pay for the clean-up when they fail. Barack Obama has proposed a tax that would serve the purpose. Despite the failure of the G20 to agree on such a tax last year, America (and other countries) should press ahead. The other is to force financial institutions to have more capital and liquidity to make collapses less likely in the first place. Negotiations at Basel have slowed as Europeans fret that stiffening standards may slow lending and hinder economic recovery. Implementation should indeed not be rushed. Yet in the longer term such buffers are essential.

Still a work in progress

In America Dodd-Frank's actual impact will depend greatly on how regulators like the Federal Reserve and the new consumer agency enforce its provisions. The risks cut two ways. Banks and their lobbyists may persuade regulators to interpret the new rules in the friendliest possible way to Wall Street as they did before the crunch: the treatment of the ratings agencies, which seem to live on the edge of life, will be a good test. In the opposite direction, regulators may overreach—stifling innovation, which, for all its recent excesses, has over time been a force for good.

At the G20 Mr Obama boasted of "leading by example" on financial reform. In fact, Dodd-Frank is too idiosyncratically American and too incomplete to be a true template for others. And the hope that it would keep a financial crisis like the one the world just went through "from ever happening again" is bound to prove wrong. Yet imperfect though it is, the reform is proof that even government as fractious as America's can move with impressive speed when the motivation is strong enough.

Leaders

Copyright © The Economist Newspaper Limited 2010. All rights reserved.