



Financial Turmoil: Federal Reserve Policy Responses

Marc Labonte
Specialist in Macroeconomic Policy

April 9, 2009

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

RL34427

Summary

The Federal Reserve (Fed) has been central in the response to the current financial turmoil that began in August 2007. It has sharply increased reserves to the banking system through open market operations and lowered the federal funds rate and discount rate on several occasions. In December 2008, it formally shifted its primary focus away from targeting the federal funds rate, allowing it to fall close to zero.

As the crisis has deepened, the Fed's focus has shifted to providing liquidity directly to the financial system through new policy tools. Through new credit facilities, the Fed first expanded the scale of its lending to the banking system and then extended direct lending to non-bank financial firms. Lending to non-banks is a major departure from past policy, for it is the first time that financial institutions that are not member banks of the Federal Reserve System have been allowed to borrow directly from the Fed in over 50 years. As the crisis worsened, the Fed began providing credit directly to markets for commercial paper and asset-backed securities. As a result of these programs, the Fed's balance sheet increased by \$1.4 trillion at its peak in December 2008, falling modestly since then. The Fed's authority and capacity to lend is bound only by fears of the inflationary consequences, which have been partly offset by additional debt issuance by the Treasury. Inflation is unlikely to be a concern as long as the crisis persists, but once the financial system stabilizes, the Fed may have to scale back its assistance rapidly to avoid a rise in inflation.

In March 2008, JPMorgan Chase agreed to acquire Bear Stearns. As part of the agreement, the Fed made a \$28.82 billion loan to a limited liability corporation (LLC) it created to buy \$29.97 billion of assets from Bear Stearns. The Fed has also agreed to make loans and purchase assets through an LLC from the American International Group (AIG) worth more than \$120 billion. In November 2008, the Fed and federal government agreed to guarantee losses on \$306 billion of assets owned by Citigroup. In January 2009, a similar guarantee was made for \$118 billion of assets owned by Bank of America. In all of these agreements, the Fed is exposed to downside financial risk if the assets purchased or guaranteed fall in value.

The statutory authority for most of the Fed's recent actions is based on a clause in the Federal Reserve Act to be used in "unusual or exigent circumstances" that had not been invoked in more than 70 years. All loans are backed by collateral that reduces the risk of losses. Any losses borne by the Fed from its loans or asset purchases would reduce the profits it remits to the Treasury, making the effect on the federal budget similar to if the loans were made directly by Treasury. It is highly unlikely that losses would exceed its other profits and capital, and require revenues to be transferred to the Fed from the Treasury.

The primary policy issues raised by the Fed's actions are the issues of systemic risk and moral hazard. Moral hazard refers to the phenomenon where actors take on more risk because they are protected. The Fed's involvement in stabilizing Bear Stearns, AIG, and Citigroup stemmed from the fear of systemic risk (that the financial system as a whole would cease to function) if either were allowed to fail. In other words, the firms were seen as "too big (or too interconnected) to fail." The Fed's regulatory structure is intended to mitigate the moral hazard that stems from access to government protections. Yet Bear Stearns and AIG were not under the Fed's regulatory structure because they were not member banks in the Federal Reserve system.

Legislative proposals relating to the Fed include making the Fed a systemic risk regulator, requiring more disclosure of emergency activities, and lifting GAO audit restrictions on the Fed.

Contents

Introduction	1
Traditional Tools.....	2
Open Market Operations and the Federal Funds Rate	2
The Discount Window.....	4
New Tools.....	4
Term Auction Facility.....	5
Term Securities Lending Facility	6
What is a Primary Dealer?	6
Primary Dealer Credit Facility	7
Emergency Authority Under Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act	8
Term Asset-Backed Securities Loan Facility	8
Intervention in the Commercial Paper Market.....	10
Mortgage Backed Securities Purchase Program and Purchase of GSE Obligations.....	12
Swap Lines with Foreign Central Banks	13
Payment of Interest on Bank Reserves.....	14
Assistance to Individual Financial Institutions.....	15
The Fed’s Role in the JPMorgan Chase Acquisition of Bear Stearns	15
Assistance to American International Group (AIG).....	18
Initial Loan.....	18
Second Loan	18
Revision to Agreement on November 10, 2008.....	19
Revision to Agreement on March 2, 2009	20
Who Benefits From Assistance to AIG?	22
Legal Authority	22
Guarantee of Citigroup’s Assets.....	23
Guarantee of Bank of America’s Assets	23
Policy Issues	24
Cost to the Treasury	24
How Much Can the Fed Lend? Will the Fed Run Out of Money?.....	25
Why Have the Fed’s Actions Not Successfully Restored Financial Normalcy?.....	28
Lender of Last Resort, Systemic Risk, and Moral Hazard.....	30
Oversight, Transparency, and Disclosure of Emergency Programs	33
Effects on the Allocation of Capital	35
Is the Economy Stuck in a Liquidity Trap? The Use of Quantitative Easing at Zero	
Interest Rates.....	36
Stagflation?	38
Concluding Thoughts	39

Tables

Table 1. Use of Funds Raised by Liquidation of Bear Stearns Assets.....	17
Table 2. Summary of Outstanding Assistance to AIG	22

Table 3. Changes in the Fed's Balance Sheet from August 1, 2007 to Peak on December, 17 2008..... 25

Contacts

Author Contact Information 40

Introduction

On August 9, 2007, liquidity abruptly dried up for many financial firms and securities markets. Suddenly some firms were able to borrow and investors were able to sell certain securities only at prohibitive rates and prices, if at all. The “liquidity crunch” was most extreme for firms and securities with links to subprime mortgages, but it also spread rapidly into seemingly unrelated areas.¹ The Federal Reserve (Fed) was drawn into the liquidity crunch from the start. On August 9, it injected unusually large quantities of reserves into the banking system to prevent the federal funds rate from exceeding its target.

It has been observed that the most unusual aspect of the crisis is its persistence for more than a year. Over that time, the Fed has aggressively reduced the federal funds rate and the discount rate in an attempt to calm the waters. When this proved not to be enough, the Fed greatly expanded its direct lending to the financial sector through several new lending programs, some of which can be seen as adaptations of traditional tools and others which can be seen as more fundamental departures from the status quo.² Most controversially, in March 2008, the Fed was involved in the “bailout” of the investment bank Bear Stearns, which was not a member bank of the Federal Reserve system (because it was not a depository institution), and, therefore, not part of the regulatory regime that accompanies membership.³ In August, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the housing government-sponsored enterprises (GSEs) were taken into conservatorship by the government. On November 25, 2008, the Fed announced that it would make large-scale purchases of the direct obligations and mortgage-backed securities issued by Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and Ginnie Mae. In September, the investment bank Lehman Brothers filed for bankruptcy (it did not receive emergency government assistance) and the financial firm American International Group (AIG), which was also not a member bank, received a credit line from the Fed in order to meet its obligations. Additional aid to AIG was extended on three subsequent occasions. The Fed then began directly assisting the markets for commercial paper and asset-backed securities. Lending to non-members requires emergency statutory authority that had not previously been used in more than 70 years.⁴ More recently, the Fed and federal government has guaranteed losses on assets owned by Citigroup and Bank of America, respectively.

One of the original purposes of the Federal Reserve Act, enacted in 1913, was to prevent the recurrence of financial panics. To that end, the Fed has been given broad authority over monetary policy and the payments system, including the issuance of federal reserve notes as the national currency. As with any statutory delegations of authority, the Fed’s actions are subject to congressional oversight. Although the Fed has broad authority to independently execute monetary policy on a day-to-day basis, questions have arisen as to whether the unusual events of recent months raise fundamental issues about the Fed’s proper role, and what role Congress should play

¹ For more information see CRS Report RL34182, *Financial Crisis? The Liquidity Crunch of August 2007*, by Darryl E. Getter et al.

² Current amounts of Fed lending outstanding can be found at Federal Reserve, “Factors Affecting Reserve Balances of Depository Institutions,” statistical release H.4.1, updated weekly.

³ Many of the loans and new programs described below are operated through the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, under the authorization of the Board of Governors. This report uses the term Federal Reserve, and does not distinguish between actions taken by the Board and actions taken by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The Federal Reserve System is composed of the Board of Governors and twelve regional banks (one of which is the New York Fed).

⁴ Federal Reserve Bank of New York, “The Discount Window,” *Fedpoint*, August 2007.

in assessing those issues. This report reviews the Fed's actions since August 2007 and analyzes the policy issues raised by those actions.

Traditional Tools

The Fed, the nation's central bank, was established in 1913 by the Federal Reserve Act (38 Stat. 251). Today, its primary duty is the execution of monetary policy through open market operations to fulfill its mandate to promote stable economic growth and low and stable price inflation. Besides the conduct of monetary policy, the Federal Reserve has a number of other duties: it regulates financial institutions, issues paper currency, clears checks, collects economic data, and carries out economic research. Prominent in the current debate is one particular responsibility: to act as a lender of last resort to the financial system when capital cannot be raised in private markets to prevent financial panics. The next two sections explain the Fed's traditional tools, open market operations and discount window lending, and summarizes its recent use of those tools.

Open Market Operations and the Federal Funds Rate

Open market operations are carried out through the purchase and sale of U.S. Treasury securities in the secondary market to alter the reserves of the banking system.⁵ By altering bank reserves, the Fed can influence short-term interest rates, and hence overall credit conditions. The Fed's target for open market operations is the federal funds rate, the rate at which banks lend to one another on an overnight basis. The federal funds rate is market determined, meaning the rate fluctuates as supply and demand for bank reserves change. The Fed announces a target for the federal funds rate and pushes the market rate toward the target by altering the supply of reserves in the market through the purchase and sale of Treasury securities.⁶ More reserves increase the liquidity in the banking system and, in theory, should make banks more willing to lend, spreading greater liquidity throughout the financial system.

When the Fed wants to stimulate economic activity, it lowers the federal funds target, which is referred to as expansionary policy. Lower interest rates stimulate economic activity by stimulating interest-sensitive spending, which includes physical capital investment (e.g., plant and equipment) by firms, residential investment (housing construction), and consumer durable spending (e.g., automobiles and appliances) by households. Lower rates would also be expected to lead to a lower value of the dollar, all else equal. A depreciated dollar would stimulate exports and the output of U.S. import-competing firms. To reduce spending in the economy (called contractionary policy), the Fed raises interest rates, and the process works in reverse.

Central banks across the world, including Europe, Japan, and the United States acted quickly to restore liquidity to the financial system following August 9, 2007. On a normal day, the Fed

⁵ Some of the Fed's purchase and sale of Treasury securities are made outright, but most are made through repurchase agreements, which can be thought of as short-term transactions that are automatically reversed at the end of a predetermined period, typically lasting a few days. Since the Fed must constantly adjust the amount of bank reserves available to keep the federal funds rate near its target, repurchase agreements give the Fed more flexibility to make these adjustments.

⁶ For more information, see CRS Report RL30354, *Monetary Policy and the Federal Reserve: Current Policy and Conditions*, by Gail E. Makinen and Marc Labonte.

might need to buy or sell a couple billion dollars of Treasury securities to keep the federal funds rate within a few one-hundredths of a percent of its target. Suddenly on August 9, the federal funds rate approached 6%, and the Fed was forced to purchase \$24 billion of Treasury securities in order to add enough liquidity to bring the federal funds rate back down to its target of 5.25%. On August 10, the Fed needed to purchase an additional \$38 billion to keep the rate at its target, and issued a statement that began, “The Federal Reserve is providing liquidity to facilitate the orderly functioning of financial markets.” The European Central Bank provided 156 billion euros (\$215 billion) of liquidity to markets on August 9 and 10. Normalcy soon returned to the federal funds market, although other parts of the financial system remained illiquid. The Fed took similar actions on March 7, 2008, when it announced that it would be injecting up to \$100 billion in liquidity for at least 28 days through open market operations. It took similar actions again in September 2008.

How should the Fed’s actions in these instances be characterized? The Fed’s actions cannot be classified as a policy change since it left the federal funds target rate unchanged—in the August case for over a month.⁷ Nor can it be considered unusual that the Fed bought Treasury securities to keep the federal funds rate at its target—the Fed does this on a daily basis. What was unusual about the incidents was the magnitude of liquidity the Fed needed to add to keep the rate near its target.

On September 18, 2007, the Fed reduced the federal funds target rate by 0.5 percentage points to 4.75%, stating that the change was “intended to forestall some of the adverse effects on the broader economy that might otherwise arise from the disruptions in financial markets ...” Since then, the Fed has aggressively lowered interest rates several times. The Fed decides whether to change its target for the federal funds rate at meetings scheduled every six weeks. In normal conditions, the Fed would typically leave the target unchanged or change it by 0.25 percentage points. From September to March, the Fed lowered the target at each regularly scheduled meeting, by an increment larger than 0.25 percentage points at most of these meetings. It also lowered the target by 0.75 percentage points at an unscheduled meeting on January 21, 2008.

Although financial conditions had not returned to normal, the Fed kept the federal funds rate steady from April 30, 2008, until October 9, 2008, when it again reduced the federal funds rate, this time by 0.5 percentage points, to 1.5%. Unusually, this rate reduction was coordinated with several foreign central banks. On December 16, 2008, the Fed established a target range of 0% to 0.25% for the federal funds rate. This policy has been described by some as “quantitative easing,” because the quantity of reserves in the banking system is increased as additional liquidity is supplied beyond what is needed to meet the target rate.⁸ The new target range can be seen as an acknowledgment by the Fed that targeting interest rates had been subordinated to the goal of providing ample liquidity to the financial system for the time being. As long as the Fed was willing to create liquidity on demand, the federal funds rate was unlikely to meet its target; indeed, before the December announcement, the rate had been undershooting the target on a regular basis.

⁷ Although no change in the targeted rate was announced, the Fed allowed the actual federal funds rate to fall below 5% on most days over the next month.

⁸ For more information, see the section below, “Is the Economy Stuck in a Liquidity Trap? The Use of Quantitative Easing at Zero Interest Rates.”

The Discount Window

The Fed can also provide liquidity to member banks (depository institutions that are members of the Federal Reserve system) directly through discount window lending.⁹ Discount window lending dates back to the early days of the Fed, and was originally the Fed's main policy tool. (The Fed's main policy tool shifted from the discount window to open market operations several decades ago.) Loans made at the discount window are backed by collateral in excess of the loan value. A wide array of assets can be used as collateral, but they must generally have a high credit rating. Most discount window lending is done on an overnight basis. Unlike the federal funds rate, the Fed sets the discount rate directly through fiat.

During normal market conditions, the Fed has discouraged banks from borrowing at the discount window on a routine basis, believing that banks should be able to meet their normal reserve needs through the market. Thus, the discount window has played a secondary role in policymaking to open market operations. In 2003, the Fed made that policy explicit in its pricing by changing the discount rate from 0.5 percentage points below to 1 percentage point above the federal funds rate. A majority of member banks do not access the discount window in any given year. Since the beginning of the financial turmoil, the Fed has reduced the spread between the federal funds rate and the discount rate, although it has kept the spread positive. When the federal funds rate was allowed to fall to zero beginning in December 2008, the discount rate was set at 0.5%.

On August 17, 2007, the Fed took further actions to restore calm to financial markets when it reduced the discount rate from 6.25% to 5.75%. Since then, the discount rate has been lowered several times, typically at the same time as the federal funds rate. From 1959 to 2007, discount window lending outstanding never surpassed \$8 billion. Discount window lending (in the primary credit category) increased from a daily average of \$45 million outstanding in July 2007 to \$1,345 million in September 2007. Lending continued to increase to more than \$10 billion outstanding per day from May 2008, and has reached as high as \$90 billion, but was superseded in economic significance by the creation of the "Term Auction Facility" in December 2007 (discussed below).

New Tools

The Fed's traditional tools are aimed at the commercial banking system, but current financial turmoil has occurred outside of the banking system as well. The inability of traditional tools to calm financial markets since August 2007 has led the Fed to develop several new tools to fill perceived gaps between open market operations and the discount window.¹⁰

Traditionally, the lender of last resort function has focused on the banking system, and the Fed's relationship with the banking system, encompassing costs and privileges, is prescribed in detail by the Federal Reserve Act. Many of the new facilities are aimed at other parts of the financial system, however, and the Federal Reserve Act is largely silent on the Fed's authority outside the

⁹ For more background, see James Clouse, "Recent Developments in Discount Window Policy," *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, November 1994, p. 965.

¹⁰ The Fed has centralized information on the purpose, terms, and conditions of the facilities described in this section at the following Fed website: [<http://www.federalreserve.gov/monetarypolicy/bst.htm>].

banking system.¹¹ One exception is the broad emergency authority under Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act, which the Fed has frequently invoked since the financial crisis began.

Term Auction Facility

A stigma is thought to be attached to borrowing from the discount window. In good times, discount window lending has traditionally been discouraged on the grounds that banks should meet their reserve requirements through the marketplace (the federal funds market) rather than the Fed. Borrowing from the Fed was therefore seen as a sign of weakness, as it implied that market participants were unwilling to lend to the bank because of fears of insolvency. In the current turmoil, this perception of weakness could be particularly damaging since a bank could be undermined by a run based on unfounded, but self-fulfilling fears. Ironically, this means that although the Fed encourages discount window borrowing so that banks can avoid liquidity problems, banks are hesitant to turn to the Fed because of fears that doing so would spark a crisis of confidence. As a result, the Fed found the discount window a relatively ineffective way to deal with liquidity problems in the current turmoil. It created the supplementary Term Auction Facility (TAF) in response.¹²

Discount window lending is initiated at the behest of the requesting institution—the Fed has no control over how many requests for loans it receives. The TAF allows the Fed to determine the amount of reserves it wishes to lend out to banks, based on market conditions. The auction process determines the rate at which those funds will be lent, with all bidders receiving the lowest winning bid rate. The winning bid may not be lower than the prevailing federal funds rate. Determining the rate by bid provides the Fed with additional information on how much demand for reserves exists.

Any depository institution eligible for discount window lending can participate in the TAF. Auctions through the TAF have been held twice a month beginning in December 2007. The amounts auctioned have greatly exceeded discount window lending, which averages in the hundreds of millions of dollars outstanding daily in normal times and more than \$10 billion outstanding since May 2008. The TAF initially auctioned \$20 billion every two weeks, but this amount was increased on several occasions to as much as \$150 billion every two weeks, so that the daily loans outstanding have ranged from \$100 billion to \$450 billion since April 2008.¹³ Like discount window lending, TAF loans must be fully collateralized with the same qualifying collateral. As with discount window lending, the Fed faces the risk that the value of collateral would fall below the loan amount in the event that the loan was not repaid. For that reason, the amount lent diminishes as the quality of the collateral diminishes.

Loans mature in 28 days—far longer than overnight loans in the federal funds market or the typical discount window loan. (In July 2008, the Fed began making some TAF loans that matured

¹¹ The Fed made about 7,500 loans to non-banks each year under Section 13B of the Federal Reserve Act until that section of the act was repealed in 1959.

¹² For more information, see Olivier Armandier et al, “The Federal Reserve’s Term Auction Facility,” Federal Reserve Bank of New York, *Current Issues in Economics and Finance*, vol. 14, no. 5, July 2008; Charles Carlstrom and Sarah Wakefield, “The Funds Rate, Liquidity, and the Term Auction Facility,” Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, *Economic Trends*, December 14, 2007.

¹³ The dates, terms, and amounts of future TAF auctions can be accessed at <http://www.federalreserve.gov/monetarypolicy/tafschedule.htm>.

in 84 days.) Another motivation for the TAF may have been an attempt to reduce the unusually large divergence that had emerged between the federal funds rate and interbank lending rates for longer maturities. This divergence, which can be seen as a sign of how much liquidity had deteriorated in spite of the Fed's previous efforts, became much smaller after December. In subsequent periods of market stress, such as September 2008, the divergence reemerged. The evidence on the effectiveness of the TAF in reducing this divergence is mixed.¹⁴

The TAF program was announced as a temporary program (with no fixed expiration date) that could be made permanent after assessment. Given that the discount rate is set higher than the federal funds rate to discourage its use in normal market conditions, it is unclear what role a permanent TAF would fill, unless the funds auctioned were minimal in normal market conditions. A permanent TAF would seem to run counter to the philosophy governing the discount window that financial institutions, if possible, should rely on the private sector to meet their short-term reserve needs during normal market conditions.

Term Securities Lending Facility

For many years, the Fed has allowed primary dealers (see box for definition) to swap Treasuries of different maturities or attributes with the Fed on an overnight basis through a program called the System Open Market Account Securities Lending Program to help meet the dealers' liquidity needs. (While all Treasury securities are backed by the full faith and credit of the federal government, some securities are more liquid than others, mainly because of differences in availability.) Securities lending has no effect on general interest rates or the money supply since it does not involve cash, but can affect the liquidity premium of the securities traded. Since the loans were overnight and collateralized with other Treasury securities, there was very little risk for the Fed.

What is a Primary Dealer?

Primary dealers are about 20 large financial institutions who are the counterparties with which the Fed undertakes open market operations (buying and selling of Treasury securities). To be a primary dealer, an institution must, among other things, meet relevant Basel or SEC capital requirements and maintain a good trading relationship with the Fed.

On March 11, 2008, the Fed set up a more expansive securities lending program for the primary dealers called the Term Securities Lending Facility (TSLF). Under this program, up to \$200 billion of Treasury securities could be lent for 28 days instead of overnight (as of September 2008). Initially, loans could be collateralized with U.S. Treasuries, government "agency" debt (including debt issued by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac), mortgage-backed securities (MBS) issued by government agencies or private labels with an AAA/Aaa rating, agency commercial mortgage-backed securities, and agency collateralized mortgage obligations. On September 14, 2008, the Fed expanded acceptable collateral to include all investment-grade debt securities. Given the recent drop in MBS and other asset prices, this made the new lending program considerably more risky than the old one. But the scope for losses is limited by the fact that the loans are fully collateralized with a "haircut" (i.e., less money is loaned than the value of the

¹⁴ See James McAndrews et al, "The Effect of the Term Auction Facility on the London Inter-bank Offered Rate," Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Staff Report no. 335, July 2008; John Taylor and John Williams, "A Black Swan in the Money Market," Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, working paper 2008-04, April 2008.

collateral), and if the collateral loses value before the loan is due, the Fed can call for substitute collateral. The first auction on March 27 involved \$75 billion of securities. In August 2008, the program was expanded to allow the primary dealers to purchase up to \$50 billion of options (with prices set by auction) to swap for Treasuries through the TSLF. The TSLF was announced as a temporary facility. The facility was subsequently extended, most recently until the end of October 2009.

By allowing the primary dealers to temporarily swap illiquid assets such as MBS for highly liquid Treasuries, “[t]he TSLF is intended to promote liquidity in the financing markets for Treasury and other collateral and thus to foster the functioning of financial markets more generally,” according to the Fed.¹⁵ According to research from the New York Fed, the spreads between repos backed by GSE debt and MBS and repos backed by Treasuries fell from over 1 percentage point before the first TSLF auction to less than 0.2 percentage points by April 2008.¹⁶ Given the timing of the announcement—less than a week before the failure of one of its primary dealers, Bear Stearns—critics have alleged that the program was created, in effect, in an attempt to rescue Bear Stearns from its liquidity problems. As will be discussed below, the Fed would take much larger steps to aid Bear Stearns later the same week.

Primary Dealer Credit Facility

On March 16—a day too late to help Bear Stearns—the Fed announced the creation of the Primary Dealer Credit Facility (PDCF), a new direct lending program for primary dealers very similar to the discount window program for depository institutions. Loans are made through the PDCF on an overnight basis at the discount rate, limiting their riskiness. Acceptable collateral initially included Treasuries, government agency debt, and investment grade corporate, mortgage-backed, asset-backed, and municipal securities. Borrowing from the facility has been sporadic, with average daily borrowing outstanding above \$10 billion in the first three months, hitting zero in August 2008, and above \$50 billion following the financial deterioration in September 2008. On September 14, 2008, the Fed expanded acceptable collateral to include certain classes of equities. Many of the classes of eligible assets can and have fluctuated significantly in value. Fees will be charged to frequent users.

The program was announced as lasting six months, or longer if events warrant. The program is authorized under paragraph 3 of Section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act. The facility was subsequently extended, most recently until the end of October 2009.

Although the program shares some characteristics with the discount window, the fact that the program was authorized under paragraph 3 of Section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act suggests that there is a fundamental difference between this program and the Fed’s normal operations. The Fed is referred to as the nation’s central bank because it is at the center of the banking system—providing reserves and credit, and acting as a regulator, clearinghouse, and lender of last resort to the banking system. The privileges for banks that come from belonging to the Federal Reserve system—access to Fed credit—come with the costs of regulation to ensure that banks do not take

¹⁵ Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, press release, March 11, 2008.

¹⁶ Michael Fleming, Warren Hrung, and Frank Keane, “The Term Securities Lending Facility,” *Federal Reserve Bank of New York: Current Issues in Economics and Finance*, vol. 15, no. 2 (February 2009). The failure of Bear Stearns set off a period of market turbulence; the decline in spreads cited in this study may have been driven by the abatement of this turbulence.

excessive risks. Although the primary dealers are subject to certain capital requirements, they are not necessarily part of the banking system, and do not fall under the same “safety and soundness” regulatory structure as banks.

Emergency Authority Under Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act

The Fed has limited authority to assist non-member banks under the Federal Reserve Act. One exception where such authority is granted is under paragraph 3 of Section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act. It reads,

In unusual and exigent circumstances, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, by the affirmative vote of not less than five members, may authorize any Federal reserve bank ... to discount for any individual, partnership, or corporation, notes, drafts, and bills of exchange.... Provided, that before discounting any such note, draft, or bill exchange...the Federal reserve bank shall obtain evidence that such individual, partnership, or corporation is unable to secure adequate credit accommodations from other banking institutions...

It is noteworthy that this text allows emergencies to be identified by the Board of Governors and places few limits on what type of institution can receive financial assistance from the Fed or what form that assistance can take. The fact that the authority is justified only by unusual and exigent circumstances suggests that decisions made under 13(3), such as the creation of lending facilities, could not be made permanent under existing authority. Nevertheless, expiration dates have already been pushed back more than once for some new facilities. As will be discussed below, on a few occasions in 2008, Section 13(3) has been invoked to lend to an entity that the Fed created.

According to the New York Fed, this authority had not been used in about 70 years prior to the Bear Stearns incident. It has been invoked numerous times in 2008, including to authorize the Primary Dealer Credit Facility, the Fed’s role in the Bear Stearns merger, and the Fed’s extension of credit to AIG. Financial crises can spread quickly, and Section 13(3) makes a prompt response possible. But recent events have demonstrated that it vests the Fed with the ability to take large, wide-ranging actions without Congressional approval. (It has voluntarily sought and received Treasury approval in each instance.)

Section 13(3) was amended in October 2008. P.L. 110-343 requires the Fed to report to the House Financial Services Committee and the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee on its justification for exercising Section 13(3), the terms of the assistance provided, and regular updates on the status of the loan.

For more information, see Federal Reserve Bank of New York, “The Discount Window,” *Fedpoint*, Aug. 2007; David Fettig, “The History of a Powerful Paragraph,” Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, *The Region*, June 2008..

Term Asset-Backed Securities Loan Facility

In November 2008, the Fed created the Term Asset-Backed Securities Loan Facility (TALF) in response to problems in the market for asset-backed securities (ABS). According to the Fed,

New issuance of ABS declined precipitously in September and came to a halt in October. At the same time, interest rate spreads on AAA-rated tranches of ABS soared to levels well outside the range of historical experience, reflecting unusually high risk premiums.¹⁷

Data support the Fed’s view: issuance of non-mortgage asset backed securities fell from \$902 billion in 2007 to \$5 billion in the fourth quarter of 2008, according to the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association.

¹⁷ Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, press release, November 25, 2008.

The TALF is intended to stimulate the issuance of new securities backed by pools of the following assets:

- auto loans or leases, including motorcycles, recreational vehicles (including boats), and commercial, rental, and government fleets
- credit cards, consumer and corporate
- student loans, private and government guaranteed
- SBA-guaranteed small business loans
- business equipment loans, including retail and leases
- floorplan loans for inventories, including auto dealers
- mortgage servicing advances

The Fed announced that the TALF may later be expanded to other classes of ABS, such as mortgage-related securities. In March 2009, the Treasury announced that TALF may be expanded in the future to include commercial mortgage-backed securities, private-label residential mortgage-backed securities, and collateralized debt and loan obligations.

The Fed fears that if lenders cannot securitize these types of loans, less credit will be extended to consumers, and eventually households will be forced to reduce consumption spending, which would exacerbate the economic downturn. For a security to be eligible for use as collateral, its issuer (not the borrower) must follow the executive compensation policies under the Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP).¹⁸

Rather than purchase ABS directly, the Fed will make non-recourse loans to any private U.S. company or subsidiary with a relationship with a primary dealer to purchase recently issued ABS receiving the highest credit rating, using the ABS as collateral. The minimum loan size will be \$10 million. If the ABS lose value, the losses will be borne by the Fed and the Treasury (through the TARP program) instead of by the borrower. The Fed will lend less than the current value of the collateral, so the Fed would not bear losses on the loan until losses exceed the value of the “haircut” (different ABS receive different haircuts). The loans will have a term of up to three years, but can be renewed. Interest rates will be set at a markup over different maturities of LIBOR or the federal funds rate, depending on the type of loan and underlying collateral. The total amount lent will not exceed \$200 billion, although Treasury has expressed the desire that the Fed increase the amount to \$1 trillion. If expanded to \$1 trillion, TALF could potentially cover more ABS than were issued in all of 2007. Since the Fed is lending to non-banks, the facility is authorized under Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act. The first TALF loans were made on March 19, 2009. It is too soon to tell whether the program will succeed in reviving the ABS market – only \$4.7 billion was lent on March 19. The facility is scheduled to cease making new loans at the end of 2009.

If the loans are not repaid, the Treasury will bear the first \$20 billion in total losses on the underlying collateral, and the Fed will bear any additional losses. The Treasury’s losses will be financed through the Troubled Assets Purchase Program (TARP), authorized by P.L. 110-343.

¹⁸ For more information, see CRS Report RL34730, *The Emergency Economic Stabilization Act and Current Financial Turmoil: Issues and Analysis*, by Baird Webel and Edward V. Murphy.

TALF has some similarities to TARP as it was originally envisioned, with the primary differences being that the Fed is lending to purchase rather than directly purchasing assets, and the assets backing the loans are newly or recently issued as opposed to “troubled” existing assets. Since the Treasury’s funds will finance loan losses rather than asset purchases, the \$20 billion will support a much larger volume of assets than would be possible through direct purchase via TARP.

In March 2009, Treasury announced a new Public-Private Partnership Investment Program (PPIP) within TARP.¹⁹ Under this program, private investors will receive matching capital from TARP to purchase up to \$500 billion to \$1 trillion of legacy loans and securities. These legacy securities are defined as asset-backed securities backed by mortgages and other assets. Treasury has announced that private partners will be able to use loans from TALF (and other sources) to finance the purchase of these legacy securities. Using TALF loans to finance all legacy securities under the PPIP will likely require an expansion in the size of TALF and the collateral it will accept.

Intervention in the Commercial Paper Market

Many large firms routinely issue commercial paper, which is short-term debt purchased directly by investors that matures in less than 270 days, with an average maturity of 30 days. There are three broad categories of commercial paper issuers: financial firms, non-financial firms, and pass-through entities that issue paper backed by assets. The commercial paper issued directly by firms tends not to be backed by collateral, as these firms are viewed as large and creditworthy and the paper matures quickly.

Individual investors are major purchasers of commercial paper through money market mutual funds and money market accounts. The Securities and Exchange Commission regulates the holdings of money market mutual funds, limiting their holdings to highly rated, short-term debt; thus, investors widely perceived money market mutual funds as safe and low risk. On September 16, a money market mutual fund called the Reserve Fund “broke the buck,” meaning that the value of its shares had fallen below face value. This occurred because of losses it had taken on short-term debt issued by Lehman Brothers, which filed for bankruptcy on September 15. Money market investors had perceived “breaking the buck” to be highly unlikely, and its occurrence set off a run on money market funds, as investors simultaneously attempted to withdraw an estimated \$250 billion of their investments.²⁰ This run greatly decreased the demand for new commercial paper. Firms rely on the ability to issue new debt to roll over maturing debt to meet their liquidity needs.

Fearing that disruption in the commercial paper markets could make overall problems in financial markets more severe, the Fed announced on September 19 that it would create the Asset-Backed Commercial Paper Money Market Mutual Fund Liquidity Facility (AMLF). This facility would make non-recourse loans to banks to purchase asset-backed commercial paper. Because the loans were non-recourse, the banks would have no further liability to repay any losses on the commercial paper collateralizing the loan. In its first week of operation, there were daily loans of

¹⁹ For more information, see CRS Report RL34730, *Troubled Asset Relief Program: Legislation and Treasury Implementation*, by Baird Webel and Edward V. Murphy.

²⁰ Figure cited in Chairman Ben Bernanke, “Financial Reform to Address Systemic Risk,” speech at the Council on Foreign Relations, March 10, 2009.

\$152 billion outstanding through the AMLF. The temporary facility was authorized under Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act and was subsequently extended until the end of October 2009.

Although the creation of the AMLF and the Treasury's temporary guarantee of money market mutual fund deposits had eased conditions in the commercial paper market, the market remained strained. For example, commercial paper outstanding fell from more than \$2 trillion outstanding in August 2007 to \$1.8 trillion on September 7, 2008, to \$1.6 trillion on October 1, 2008. The yield on 30-day, AA-rated asset-backed commercial paper rose from 2.7% on September 8, 2008, to 5.5% on October 7, 2008.

Because of the importance of commercial paper for meeting firms' liquidity needs, the Fed decided to take stronger action to ensure that the market was not disrupted.²¹ On October 7, it announced the creation of the Commercial Paper Funding Facility (CPFF), a special purpose vehicle (SPV) that would borrow from the Fed to purchase all types of three-month, highly rated U.S. commercial paper, secured and unsecured, from issuers. The interest rate charged by the CPFF was set at the three month overnight index swap plus 1 percentage point for secured corporate debt, 2 percentage points for unsecured corporate debt, and 3 percentage points for asset-backed paper. The CPFF can buy as much commercial paper from any individual issuer as that issuer had outstanding in the year to date. Any losses borne by the CPFF would ultimately be borne by the Fed. The Fed has hired the private company PIMCO to manage the SPV's assets. The facility is authorized under Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act, and was subsequently extended until October 2009.

At its peak, the CPFF has held over \$300 billion of commercial paper, and the AMLF has waned in importance. The Fed argued that the assurance that firms will be able to roll over commercial paper at the CPFF will encourage private investors to buy commercial paper again. Goldman Sachs reports that conditions in commercial paper markets improved significantly after the creation of the CPFF (although they remained worse than before the crisis), and in January 2009, the CPFF was holding far more commercial paper than the total that had been issued since its inception.²²

The CPFF is notable on several grounds. First, it is the first Fed standing facility in modern times with an ongoing commitment to purchase assets, as opposed to lending against assets. Technically, the Fed is lending against the assets of the SPV, but the SPV was created by the Fed and is controlled by the Fed.²³ Second, in the case of non-financial commercial paper, it is the first time in 50 years that the Fed is providing financial assistance to non-financial firms.²⁴ Third, in the case of commercial paper that is not asset backed, it is unusual for the Fed (through the SPV) to purchase uncollateralized debt. Indeed, the Federal Reserve Act would seem to rule out the direct purchase of uncollateralized debt.

²¹ Financial firms experiencing any disruption to their liquidity needs in the commercial paper market were already eligible to borrow from the Fed on a collateralized basis.

²² Andrew Tilton, "Fed Nursing the Money Markets Back to Health," Goldman Sachs U.S. Daily newsletter, January 8, 2009.

²³ The arrangement is similar to the Fed's creation of Maiden Lane limited liability corporations to purchase Bear Stearns' and AIG's assets (discussed below), but those involved one-time purchases.

²⁴ See David Fetting, "Lender of More Than Last Resort," Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, *The Region*, December 2002.

On October 21, 2008, the Fed announced the creation of the Money Market Investor Funding Facility (MMIFF), and pledged to lend it up to \$540 billion. The MMIFF will lend to private sector SPVs that invest in commercial paper issued by highly rated financial institutions. Each SPV will be owned by a group of financial firms and can only purchase commercial paper issued by that group. These SPVs can purchase commercial paper from money market mutual funds and similar entities facing redemption requests to help avoid runs such as the run on the Reserve Fund. (The Treasury has already guaranteed existing money market deposits to avoid further runs.) The Fed hopes that if money market mutual funds, in turn, do not have to worry about how to finance redemptions, they will become more willing to purchase commercial paper. Financial firms have an incentive to participate in these SPVs since mutual funds will be more willing to purchase an institution's commercial paper if it is able to sell it back to an SPV. To reduce the risk to the Fed, its lending will be equal to 90% of the value of the commercial paper the SPV purchases (the other 10% of financing will be provided by the money market fund), and done with recourse on an overnight basis at the discount rate. Since the SPVs are not member banks of the Federal Reserve System, the Fed authorized the MMIFF under Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act, and was subsequently extended until the end of October 2009. Upon winding down, the SPVs will receive a fixed profit, with any additional profits accruing to the Fed. As of April 2009, this facility has not yet been accessed.

Mortgage Backed Securities Purchase Program and Purchase of GSE Obligations

In July 2008, the stock prices of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the housing government sponsored enterprises (GSEs), came under increasing pressure, leading to fears that they would be unable to roll over debt and become illiquid. On July 13, 2008, the Fed authorized lending to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, two housing government sponsored enterprises (GSEs), but this authority was not used at that point. On September 7, 2009, Treasury placed the two housing GSEs into conservatorship.²⁵ On September 19, 2008, the Fed announced that it would purchase (for the first time since 1981) debt obligations of Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and the Federal Home Loan Banks through open market operations.

On November 25, 2008, the Fed announced it would purchase up to \$100 billion of direct obligations (e.g., bonds) issued by these institutions and up to \$500 billion of mortgage-backed securities (MBS) guaranteed by Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and Ginnie Mae, a government agency. GSE obligations will be purchased through auctions and MBS will be purchased on the Fed's behalf by private investment managers. On March 18, 2009 the Fed announced an increase in the purchase commitment of up to \$1.25 trillion in MBS and \$200 billion of GSE obligations. Adjustable rate MBS, collateralized mortgage obligations (CMOs), real estate mortgage investment conduits (REMICs), and mortgage derivatives would not be eligible for purchase under the program. Assets purchased under these programs will be held passively and long-term.

The Fed argued that these programs would “reduce the cost and increase the availability of credit for the purchase of houses ...”²⁶ Support to mortgage markets through these programs can be seen as indirect and selective, however. The Fed is not providing or purchasing mortgages directly, nor is it purchasing newly-issued MBS. By purchasing existing MBS from the secondary

²⁵ See CRS Report RS22950, *Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac in Conservatorship*, by Mark Jickling.

²⁶ Federal Reserve, press release, November 25, 2008.

market, the price should rise, and that may induce more MBS to be issued. If more MBS are issued, then the increased availability of credit to mortgage markets would be expected to cause mortgage rates to fall. Further, the Fed is accepting MBS issued by GSEs but not by private firms, despite the fact that the GSEs have issued more MBS in 2008 than before the crisis started, while private-label issuance has dried up almost entirely, according to data from the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association. Further, overall mortgage rates have been low during the crisis, but access has been limited to highly qualified lenders. Increasing the demand for GSE-issued MBS and GSE debt would be expected to primarily reduce already low mortgage rates, and increase borrower access only indirectly, at best. Mortgage rates fell noticeably after the Fed announced that the programs had begun, although the amounts of securities purchased by the Fed at that point were small.

These programs did not require the use of Section 13(3) emergency authority. Transactions involving agency debt are authorized under Section 13(13) and 14b of the Federal Reserve Act. The Fed's programs are similar to two Treasury programs, the GSE MBS Purchase Program and the GSE Credit Facility, already in place. Since the Treasury programs were authorized to provide the GSEs with unlimited financial assistance through the end of 2009, it is not clear why the Fed felt that the Treasury programs needed to be supplemented.²⁷

Swap Lines with Foreign Central Banks

In December 2007, the Fed announced the creation of temporary reciprocal currency agreements, known as swap lines, with the European Central Bank and the Swiss central bank. These agreements let the Fed swap dollars for euros or Swiss francs for a fixed period of time. Since September 2008, the Fed has extended similar swap lines to central banks in several other countries. In October 2008, it made the swap lines with certain countries unlimited in size. Interest is paid to the Fed on a swap outstanding at the rate the foreign central bank charges to its dollar borrowers. The temporary swaps are repaid at the exchange rate at the time of the original swap, meaning that there is no downside risk for the Fed if the dollar appreciates in the meantime (although the Fed also does not enjoy upside gain if the dollar depreciates). The swap lines are currently authorized through the end of October 2009. Except in the unlikely event that the borrowing country's currency becomes unconvertible in foreign exchange markets, there is no credit risk involved for the Fed.

The swap lines are intended to provide liquidity to banks in non-domestic denominations. For example, many European banks have borrowed in dollars to finance dollar-denominated transactions, such as the purchase of U.S. assets. Normally, foreign banks could finance their dollar-denominated borrowing through the private inter-bank lending market. As banks have become reluctant to lend to each other through this market, central banks at home and abroad have taken a much larger role in providing banks with liquidity directly. But normally banks can only borrow from their home central bank, and central banks can only provide liquidity in their own currency. The swap lines allow foreign central banks to provide needed liquidity in dollars. As such, the swap lines directly benefit foreign borrowers who need access to dollars. But the swap lines indirectly benefit the United States by promoting the use of the dollar as the "reserve" currency, which results in more seigniorage (earnings from currency) for the United States, as well as intangible benefits. Initially, the swap lines were designed to allow foreign central banks

²⁷ For more information on the Treasury programs, see CRS Report RS22950, *Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac in Conservatorship*, by Mark Jickling.

to U.S. dollars. In April 2009, the swap lines were modified so that the Fed could access foreign currency to provide to its banks as well.

Payment of Interest on Bank Reserves

Banks hold reserves to meet daily cash-flow needs and required ratios imposed by the Fed. At times before the federal funds target was reduced to zero in December 2008, the Fed faced conflicting goals—it sought to ensure that banks have enough reserves to remain liquid, but it also sought to maintain its target for the federal funds rate to meet its economic goals. The federal funds rate is the market rate in the private market where a bank with excess reserves lends them overnight to other banks. At times, ensuring that all banks have adequate reserves has resulted in an overall level of reserves in the market that has pushed the federal funds rate below its target. In other words, the only way for the Fed to make sure that each bank has enough reserves has been to oversupply the banking system as a whole with liquidity at the given federal funds target.

To avoid this problem, Congress authorized the Fed to pay interest on bank reserves in the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (H.R. 1424/P.L. 110-343). By setting an interest rate on bank reserves close to the federal funds rate, the Fed would in effect place a floor on the rate. In theory, the federal funds rate would not fall below the interest rate on reserves because banks would rather hold excess reserves to earn interest than lend them out to other banks at a lower interest rate.²⁸ Paying interest on reserves may also encourage banks to hold more reserves overall, which may somewhat reduce banks' liquidity problems during the current period of heightened uncertainty.

Paying interest on reserves does not encourage banks to increase overall lending to firms and households, however, because it increases the attractiveness of holding reserves. Thus, it is not a policy that stimulates the economy, at least in any direct sense; on the contrary, it prevents the increase in liquidity to banks from stimulating the economy by preventing the federal funds rate from falling.

The interest rate on excess reserves was initially set at 0.75 percentage points less than the federal funds rate. Immediately after the Fed began paying interest, the federal funds rate was still falling below the target, and some days was even below the interest rate on reserves. In response, the Fed subsequently reduced the spread between the interest rate on reserves and the federal funds rate, but the actual federal funds rate continued to fall below the target rate. When the Fed reduced the federal funds rate target to a range of 0% to 0.25% in December 2008, it set the interest rate paid on reserves to 0.25%, the high end of the target range. At that point, paying interest on reserves could no longer place a floor under the federal funds rate, the stated rationale for its authorization.

P.L. 110-343 gave the Fed permanent authority to pay interest on reserves. Once financial conditions return to normal, the liquidity benefits from paying interest will be less important (since banks will again be able to meet reserve needs through the federal funds market), and the primary remaining benefit would be a reduction in the volatility of the federal funds rate. The Fed previously intervened in the federal funds market on a daily basis to keep the market rate close to the target, sometimes unsuccessfully. The volatility partly resulted from banks devoting resources to activities that minimize reserves, such as “sweep accounts.”

²⁸ See Todd Keister et al, “Divorcing Money From Monetary Policy, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, *Economic Policy Review*, September 2008.

Paying interest on reserves reduces the Fed's profits, and thus reduces its remittances to the Treasury, thereby increasing the budget deficit, all else equal. It can be viewed as a transfer from the federal government to the banks, although in the long run, competition makes it likely that the banks will pass on the benefit to depositors in the form of higher interest paid on deposits. From Congress's perspective, the benefit of a less volatile target rate and less resources spent minimizing reserves would have to be weighed against the lost federal revenue, over time. The decision to pay interest on required, as well as excess, reserves also increases the cost of the policy without any additional benefit to liquidity or reduced volatility (because banks must keep required reserves even if no incentive is offered).

Assistance to Individual Financial Institutions

Over the course of the year, several financial firms that were deemed "too big to fail" received financial assistance from the Fed in the form of loans, troubled asset purchases, and asset guarantees. This assistance went beyond its traditional role of acting as a lender of last resort by providing loans to illiquid but solvent firms.²⁹ In a joint announcement in March 2009, the Treasury and Fed stated a desire in the long run to transfer assets acquired by the Fed (via the Maiden Lane LLCs) from Bear Stearns and the American International Group (AIG) to the Treasury.³⁰

The Fed's Role in the JPMorgan Chase Acquisition of Bear Stearns

The investment bank Bear Stearns came under severe liquidity pressures in early March, in what many observers have coined a non-bank run.³¹ On Friday, March 14, JPMorgan Chase announced that, in conjunction with the Federal Reserve, it had agreed to provide secured funding to Bear Stearns, as necessary. Through its discount window, the Fed agreed to provide \$13 billion of back-to-back financing to Bear Stearns via JPMorgan Chase. It was a non-recourse loan, meaning that the Fed had no general claim against JPMorgan Chase in the event that the loan was not repaid and the outstanding balance exceeded the value of the collateral. Bear Stearns could not access the discount window directly because, at that point, only member banks could borrow directly from the Fed. This loan was superseded by the events of March 16, and the loan was repaid in full on March 17.

On Sunday, March 16, after negotiations between the two companies, the Fed and the Treasury, JPMorgan Chase agreed to acquire Bear Stearns. As part of the agreement, the Fed will purchase up to \$30 billion of Bear Stearns' assets through Maiden Lane, a new Limited Liability

²⁹ This section discusses the special assistance that the troubled firms received from the Fed. The same firms may also have subsequently accessed Fed resources through its normal lending facilities. All lending through facilities is confidential, so knowledge of such activity is limited to self-reporting by the firms. For example, the CEO of JPMorgan Chase testified to Congress that Bear Stearns had borrowed an additional \$25 billion from the Fed. (Source: Kara Scannell and Sudeep Reddy, "Officials Say They Sought to Avoid Bear Bailout," *Wall Street Journal*, April 4, 2008, p. A1.) Similarly, AIG announced that it had accessed the Commercial Paper Funding Facility. (Source: "U.S. Treasury, Federal Reserve and AIG Establish Comprehensive Solution for AIG," AIG press release, November 10, 2008.)

³⁰ Federal Reserve and U.S. Treasury Department, "The Role of the Federal Reserve in Preserving Financial and Monetary Stability," *Joint Press Release*, March 23, 2009.

³¹ For more information, see CRS Report RL34420, *Bear Stearns: Crisis and "Rescue" for a Major Provider of Mortgage-Related Products*, by Gary Shorter.

Corporation (LLC) based in Delaware that it has created and controls. After the merger was completed, the loan was finalized on June 26, 2008. Two loans were made to the LLC: the Fed lent the LLC \$28.82 billion, and JPMorgan Chase made a subordinate loan to the LLC worth \$1.15 billion, based on assets initially valued at \$29.97 billion.³² The Fed's loan will be made at an interest rate set equal to the discount rate (2.5% when the terms were announced, but fluctuating over time) for a term of 10 years, renewable by the Fed.³³ JPMorgan Chase's loan will have an interest rate 4.5 percentage points above the discount rate.

Using the proceeds from that loan, the LLC will purchase assets from Bear Stearns worth \$29.97 billion at marked to market prices by Bear Stearns on March 14. The Fed reported that

The portfolio supporting the credit extensions consists largely of mortgage-related assets. In particular, it includes cash assets as well as related hedges. The cash assets consist of investment grade securities (i.e. securities rated BBB- or higher by at least one of the three principal credit rating agencies and no lower than that by the others) and residential or commercial mortgage loans classified as "performing". All of the assets are current as to principal and interest (as of March 14, 2008). All securities are domiciled and issued in the U.S. and denominated in U.S. dollars. The portfolio consists of collateralized mortgage obligations (CMOs), the majority of which are obligations of government-sponsored entities (GSEs), such as the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation ("Freddie Mac"), as well as asset-backed securities, adjustable-rate mortgages, commercial mortgage-backed securities, non-GSE CMOs, collateralized bond obligations, and various other loan obligations.³⁴

The CEO of JPMorgan Chase testified that JPMorgan Chase "kept the riskier and more complex securities in the Bear Stearns portfolio ... We did not cherry pick the assets in the collateral pool (for the LLC)."³⁵ These assets are owned by the LLC, which will eventually liquidate them to pay back the principal and interest owed to the Fed and JPMorgan Chase. The LLC's assets (purchased from Bear Stearns) are the collateral backing the loans from the Fed and JPMorgan Chase. A private company, BlackRock Financial Management, has been hired to manage the portfolio. Neither Bear Stearns nor JPMorgan Chase owes the Fed any principal or interest, nor are they liable if the LLC is unable to pay back the money the Fed lent it. The New York Fed explained that the LLC was created to "ease administration of the portfolio and will remove constraints on the money manager that might arise from retaining the assets on the books of Bear Stearns."³⁶ JPMorgan Chase and Bear Stearns did not receive the \$28.82 billion from the LLC until the merger was completed.³⁷

³² Federal Reserve Bank of New York, "New York Fed Completes Financing Arrangement Related to JPMorgan Chase's Acquisition of Bear Stearns," press release, June 26, 2008. A subordinate loan is one where the principal and interest are not repaid until after the primary loan is repaid. The originally announced terms of the loans were for up to \$29 billion from the New York Fed and \$1 billion from JPMorgan Chase. After more thoroughly reviewing the assets the LLC would receive, the Fed changed the terms of the loan.

³³ Federal Reserve Bank of New York, "Summary of Terms and Conditions Regarding the JPMorgan Chase Facility," press release, March 24, 2008. Many of the details of the loan, including the size, were not announced on March 16.

³⁴ Timothy Geithner, "Testimony Before the Senate Committee for Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs," April 3, 2008, Annex II.

³⁵ Jamie Dimon, *Testimony Before the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs*, April 3, 2008.

³⁶ Federal Reserve Bank of New York, "Summary of Terms and Conditions Regarding the JPMorgan Chase Facility," press release, March 24, 2008.

³⁷ Timothy Geithner, "Testimony Before the Senate Committee for Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs," April 3, 2008, p. 17.

It was announced that the Fed is planning to begin liquidating the assets after two years. The assets will be sold off gradually, “to minimize disruption to financial markets and maximize recovery value.”³⁸ As the assets are liquidated, interest will continue to accrue on the remaining amount of the loan outstanding. Thus, in order for the principal and interest to be paid off, the assets will need to appreciate enough or generate enough income so that the rate of return on the assets exceeds the weighted interest rate on the loans (plus the operating costs of the LLC). **Table 1** shows how the funds raised through the liquidation will be used. Any difference between the proceeds and the amount of the loans is profit or loss for the Fed, not JPMorgan Chase. Because JPMorgan Chase’s \$1.15 billion loan was subordinate to the Fed’s \$28.82 billion loan, if there are losses on the total assets, the first \$1.15 billion of losses will be borne, in effect, by JPMorgan Chase, however. As of November 2008, the value of the assets had already been written down by nearly \$3 billion, exceeding the maximum losses borne by JPMorgan Chase.³⁹ The interest on the loan will be repaid out of the asset sales, not by JPMorgan Chase.

Table 1. Use of Funds Raised by Liquidation of Bear Stearns Assets

Payments from the liquidation will be made in the following order:

- (1) operating expenses of the limited liability corporation
 - (2) \$29 billion principal owed to the Federal Reserve
 - (3) interest due to the Federal Reserve on the \$29 billion loan
 - (4) \$1 billion principal owed to JPMorgan Chase
 - (5) interest due to JPMorgan Chase on \$1 billion subordinated note
 - (6) non-operating expenses of the limited liability corporation
 - (7) remaining funds accrue to Federal Reserve
-

Source: Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Note: Each category must be fully paid before proceeding to the next category.

The CEO of JPMorgan Chase testified that “we could not and would not have assumed the substantial risks of acquiring Bear Stearns without the \$30 billion facility provided by the Fed.”⁴⁰ The primary risk was presumably that the value of mortgage-related assets would continue to decline. Had the transaction been crafted as a typical discount window loan directly to JPMorgan Chase, JPMorgan Chase would have been required to pay back the principal and interest, and it (rather than the Fed) would have borne the full risk of any depreciation in value of Bear Stearns’ assets.

The Fed’s statutory authority for its role in both Bear Stearns transactions comes from paragraph 3 of Section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act. In his testimony, New York Fed President Timothy Geithner stated that the Fed did not have authority to acquire an equity interest in Bear Stearns or JPMorgan Chase.⁴¹ Yet the LLC controlled by the Fed acquired assets from Bear Stearns, and the

³⁸ Federal Reserve Bank of New York, “Statement on Financing Arrangement of JPMorgan Chase’s Acquisition of Bear Stearns,” press release, March 24, 2008.

³⁹ Federal Reserve, *Factors Affecting Reserve Balances of Depository Institutions*, press release H.4.1, September 11, 2008. Information on the portfolio will be updated quarterly and announced through this press release.

⁴⁰ Jamie Dimon, *Testimony Before the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs*, April 3, 2008.

⁴¹ Timothy Geithner, “Testimony Before the Senate Committee for Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs,” April 3, 2008, p. 13.

profits or losses from that acquisition will ultimately accrue to the Fed. It is unclear why the Fed decided to create and lend to a LLC to complete the transaction, rather than engaging in the transaction directly. Although the Fed did not buy Bear Stearns' assets directly, there are certainly important policy questions raised by the Fed's creation and financing of an LLC in order to buy Bear Stearns' assets. Typically, the Fed lends money to institutions and receives collateral in return to reduce the risk of suffering a loss. When the loan is repaid, the collateral is returned to the institution. In this case, the Fed made a loan, but to a LLC they created and controlled, not to a financial institution. From the perspective of JPMorgan Chase or Bear Stearns, the transaction was a sale (to the LLC), not a loan, regardless of whether the Fed or the LLC was the principal.

Assistance to American International Group (AIG) ⁴²

Initial Loan

On September 16, 2008, the Fed announced, after consultation with the Treasury Department, that it would lend up to \$85 billion to the financial institution American International Group. AIG had experienced a significant decline in its stock price and was facing immediate demands for \$14 billion to \$15 billion in collateral payments due to recent downgrades by credit rating agencies, according to press reports.⁴³ The Fed and Treasury feared that AIG was also "too big to fail" because of the potential for widespread disruption to financial markets that would result.

The Fed announced that AIG could borrow up to \$85 billion from the Fed over the next two years. On September 18, the Fed announced that it had initially lent \$28 billion to AIG.⁴⁴ The interest rate on the funds drawn is 8.5 percentage points above the London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR), a rate that banks charge to lend to each other. AIG will also have to pay a (lower) interest rate on any funds that it does not draw from the facility. In return, the government will receive warrants that, if exercised, would give the government a 79.9% ownership stake in AIG. The Fed will name three independent trustees to oversee the firm for the duration of the loan.

The lending facility is backed by the assets of AIG's non-regulated subsidiaries (but not the assets of its insurance company). In other words, the Fed can seize AIG's assets if the firm fails to honor the terms of the loan. This reduces the risk that the Fed (and ultimately, taxpayers) will suffer a loss. The risk still remains that if AIG turned out to be insolvent, its assets would be insufficient to cover the amount it had borrowed from the Fed. Since AIG has been identified as too big to fail, it is unclear how its assets could be seized in the event of non-payment without precipitating failure.

Second Loan

On October 8, the Fed announced that it was expanding its assistance to AIG and swapping cash for up to \$37.8 billion of AIG's investment-grade, fixed-income securities. These securities, belonging to AIG's insurance subsidiaries, had been previously lent out and unavailable as

⁴² This section was prepared with Baird Webel, specialist in Financial Economics. For more information, see CRS Report R40438, *Ongoing Government Assistance for American International Group (AIG)*, by Baird Webel.

⁴³ See, for example, "U.S. to Take Over AIG in \$85 Billion Bailout; Central Banks Inject Cash as Credit Dries Up," *Wall Street Journal*, September 17, 2008, pp. A1-A6.

⁴⁴ Federal Reserve, "Factors Affecting Reserve Balances," press release H.4.1, September 18, 2008.

collateral at the time of the original agreement. It has been reported that as AIG's loans matured, AIG realized losses on investments it had made with the collateral and some counterparties stopped participating in the lending program.⁴⁵ As a result, AIG needed liquidity from the Fed to cover these losses and counterparty withdrawals.

Although this assistance resembles a typical collateralized loan (the Fed receives assets as collateral, and the borrower receives cash), the Fed characterized the agreement as a loan of securities from AIG to the Fed in exchange for cash collateral. It appears the arrangement was structured this way because New York insurance law prevents AIG from using the securities as collateral in a loan.⁴⁶ The terms of the agreement are unavailable at this time.

Revision to Agreement on November 10, 2008

On November 10, 2008, the Federal Reserve and the U.S. Treasury announced a restructuring of the federal intervention to support AIG. As evidenced by the additional borrowing after the September 16 loan, AIG had continued to see cash flow out of the company, particularly to post collateral for the credit default swaps that were arguably the primary cause of the financial problems in the company. The revised agreement points to the tension between making the terms of the assistance undesirable enough to deter other firms from seeking government assistance in the future, compared to making the terms of assistance so punitive that it exacerbates the financial problems of the recipient firm. It also points to the fact that once a firm has been identified as too big to fail, government assistance to the firm can become open-ended, as the original amounts offered were quickly revised upward.

The November 10 restructuring eased the payment terms for AIG and had three primary parts: (1) a \$40 billion direct capital injection, (2) restructuring of the \$85 billion loan, and (3) a \$52.5 billion purchase of troubled assets.

Loan Restructuring

The initial \$85 billion loan facility from the Federal Reserve was reduced to \$60 billion, for a time period extended to five years, and the financial terms are eased considerably. Specifically, the interest rate on the amount outstanding is reduced by 5.5 percentage points (to Libor plus 3%) and the fee on undrawn funds is reduced by 7.75 percentage points (to 0.75%).

Purchase of Troubled Assets

While P.L. 110-343 provided for the government purchase of troubled assets, the purchases related to AIG are being done by limited liability corporations (LLCs) created and controlled by the Federal Reserve. This structure is similar to that created by the Federal Reserve to facilitate the purchase of Bear Stearns by JPMorgan Chase in March 2008. There are two LLCs set up for AIG—one for residential mortgage-backed securities (RMBS) and one for collateralized debt obligations (CDO).

⁴⁵ Liam Pleven et al, "AIG Bailout Hit By New Cash Woes," *Wall Street Journal*, October 9, 2008, p. A1.

⁴⁶ N.Y. Ins. Law, Sec. 1410.

The RMBS LLC will be lent up to \$22.5 billion by the Federal Reserve and \$1 billion from AIG to purchase RMBS from AIG's securities lending portfolio. The AIG loan is subordinated and AIG will bear the first \$1 billion in losses should there be future losses on these securities. AIG and the Federal Reserve will "share" in any future gains, though it is unclear exactly how such gains would be shared. The previous \$37.8 billion loan securities lending loan facility is to be repaid and terminated with the proceeds from this LLC plus additional AIG funds if necessary.

The CDO LLC will be lent up to \$30 billion from the Federal Reserve and \$5 billion from AIG to purchase CDOs on which AIG has written credit default swaps. The \$5 billion loan from AIG is subordinated and AIG will bear the first \$5 billion in future losses on these securities. AIG and the Federal Reserve will "share" in any future gains, though it is unclear exactly how such gains would be shared. The Federal Reserve also indicates that the credit default swaps will be unwound at the same time that the CDOs are purchased. Many credit default swaps, however, are purchased by entities not holding the underlying CDOs; it is unclear how, or if, such credit default swaps written by AIG will be addressed.

Direct Capital Injection

Through the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP), the Treasury purchased \$40 billion in preferred shares of AIG. In addition to \$40 billion in preferred shares, the Treasury also receives warrants for common shares equal to 2% of the outstanding AIG shares. TARP was authorized by Congress in H.R. 1424/P.L. 110-343 and the Capital Purchase Program (CPP) under TARP was first announced by Treasury Secretary Paulson on October 14, 2008. AIG would be the first announced non-bank to receive TARP funds. The \$40 billion in preferred AIG shares now held by the Treasury are slated to pay a 10% dividend per annum, accrued quarterly.⁴⁷ Participation in TARP triggers restrictions on executive pay as required by Congress, including a restriction on "golden parachutes" and a requirement for clawbacks on previously provided bonuses in the case of accounting irregularities. According to the November 10, 2008, AIG filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission, the amount of shares held in trust for the benefit of the U.S. Treasury will be reduced by the shares and warrants purchased under TARP, so the total equity interest currently held by the U.S. government equals 77.9% plus warrants to purchase another 2%. The warrants equal to 77.9% of AIG equity were exercised and transferred to the government on March 4, 2009.

Revision to Agreement on March 2, 2009

On March 2, 2009, the Treasury and Fed announced another revision of the financial assistance to AIG. On the same day, AIG announced a loss of more than \$60 billion in the fourth quarter of 2008. In response to the poor results and ongoing financial turmoil, the ratings agencies were reportedly considering further downgrading AIG, which would most likely have resulted in further significant cash demands due to collateral calls.⁴⁸ According to the Treasury, AIG "continues to face significant challenges, driven by the rapid deterioration in certain financial markets in the last two months of the year and continued turbulence in the markets generally."

⁴⁷ Full details of the preferred shares can be found on the Treasury website at <http://ustreas.gov/press/releases/reports/111008aigtermsheet.pdf>.

⁴⁸ See, for example, "A.I.G. Reports Loss of \$61.7 Billion as U.S. Gives More Aid," *New York Times*, March 2, 2009, p. A1.

The revised assistance is intended to “enhance the company’s capital and liquidity in order to facilitate the orderly completion of the company’s global divestiture program.”⁴⁹

The revised assistance includes:

- Exchange of the existing \$40 billion in preferred shares purchased through the TARP program for preferred shares that “more closely resemble common equity,” thus improving AIG’s financial position. Dividends paid on these new shares will remain at 10%, but will be non-cumulative and only be paid as declared by AIG’s Board of Directors. Should dividends not be paid for four consecutive quarters, the government has the right to appoint at least two new directors to the Board.
- Commitment of up to \$30 billion in additional preferred share purchases from TARP.
- Reduction of interest rate on the existing Fed loan facility by removing the current floor of 3.5% over the LIBOR portion of the rate. The rate will now simply be three month LIBOR plus 3%, which is approximately 4.25%.
- Limit on Fed revolving credit facility will be reduced from \$60 billion to \$25 billion.
- Up to \$34.5 billion of the approximately \$38 billion outstanding on the Fed credit facility will be repaid by asset transfers from AIG to the Fed. Specifically, (1) \$8.5 billion in ongoing life insurance cash flows will be securitized by AIG and transferred to the Fed; and (2) approximately \$26 billion in preferred interests in two of AIG’s large life insurance subsidiaries will be issued to the Fed. This effectively transfers a majority stake in these companies to the Fed, but the companies will still be managed by AIG.

The current assistance is summarized in **Table 2**. In addition to the new assistance, AIG announced that it was forming a new holding company to include its primary property/casualty insurance subsidiaries. Since the first assistance in September 2008, AIG has sought to sell subsidiaries to repay the loans and reduce its holdings to a core property/casualty business. Such sales have been difficult during the ongoing financial turmoil. By effectively transferring the two life insurance subsidiaries to the Fed and gathering property casualty subsidiaries in a new holding company, AIG is arguably progressing toward this goal.

⁴⁹ U.S. Treasury, “U.S. Treasury and Federal Reserve Board Announce Participation in AIG Restructuring Plan,” Press Release dated March 2, 2009.

Table 2. Summary of Outstanding Assistance to AIG

Program	Maximum Announced Amount of Government Assistance	Amount Advanced by Government in March 2009	Recompense to the Government/Value of Current Holdings
TARP Share Purchase	\$70 billion	\$40 billion	10% dividend; warrants for 2% of AIG equity
Current Federal Reserve Loan	\$25 billion (after Mar. 2 restructuring completed)	\$43.6 billion	3 month LIBOR+3%; 77.9% of AIG equity
Retired Federal Reserve Loan	\$34.5 billion	\$0 (transactions yet to occur)	\$8.5 billion securities/ \$26 billion equity
Maiden Lane II	\$22.5 billion	\$18.8 billion	\$18.4 billion
Maiden Lane III	\$30 billion	\$24.3 billion	\$27.6 billion

Source: Federal Reserve, U.S. Treasury, AIG 10-K Annual Statement

Notes: Dividend paid on shares under TARP is subject to the AIG board approval. AIG can also access up to \$15.3 billion of Fed credit via the Commercial Paper Funding Facility under the normal terms and conditions of that facility.

Who Benefits From Assistance to AIG?

While billions of dollars in government assistance have gone to the AIG, in many cases, one can argue that AIG has essentially acted as an intermediary for this assistance. In short order after drawing on government assistance, substantial funds have flowed out of AIG to entities on the other side of AIG's financial transactions, such as securities lending or credit default swaps. If AIG had been allowed to fail and had entered bankruptcy, as was the case with Lehman Brothers, then these counterparties in many cases would have been treated as unsecured creditors and seen their claims reduced.

Seen from this view, the true beneficiaries of the billions in federal assistance that have flowed to AIG has not been AIG itself, but these counterparties. On March 15, 2009, AIG released information detailing the counterparties to many of its transactions.⁵⁰ The released information detailed \$52.0 billion of direct support to AIG that went to AIGFP related transactions, \$29.6 billion in Maiden Lane III CDS-related transactions, and \$43.7 billion in payments to securities lending counterparties.

Legal Authority

All Fed assistance to AIG is authorized under Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act, the same emergency authorization used for Bear Stearns. This authorization was needed because the Fed cannot normally lend to a financial firm that is neither primarily a depository institution (although it owns a small thrift) nor a primary dealer.

⁵⁰ See http://www.aig.com/aigweb/internet/en/files/Counterparties_tcm385-153017.pdf/.

Guarantee of Citigroup's Assets

Similar to Bear Stearns and AIG, Citigroup faced a sudden drop in its stock price in late 2008. Its stock price fell from \$23 per share on October 1, 2008, to \$3.77 on November 21, 2008, amidst investor concern about its losses. Stepping in before a potential run began, the Federal Reserve and federal government announced on November 23 that they would purchase an additional \$20 billion of Citigroup preferred shares through TARP and guarantee a pool of up to \$306 billion of Citigroup's assets. (The assets were valued at \$301 billion when the agreement was finalized on January 16, 2009.) Citigroup announced that the assets guaranteed include mortgages, consumer loans, corporate loans, asset backed securities, and unfunded lending commitments.⁵¹ The guarantee is in place for 10 years for residential assets and five years for non-residential assets. Citigroup will exclusively bear up to the first \$29 billion of losses on the pool. Any additional losses will be split between Citigroup and the government, with Citigroup bearing 10% of the losses and the government bearing 90%. The first \$5 billion of any government losses will be borne by the Treasury using TARP funds; the next \$10 billion will be borne by the FDIC; any further losses will be borne by the Fed through a non-recourse loan. Citigroup will pay the federal government a fee for the guarantee in the form of \$7 billion in preferred stock with an 8% dividend rate and warrants to purchase common stock worth \$2.7 billion at the time of the agreement. The assets will remain on Citigroup's balance sheet, and Citigroup will receive the income stream generated by the assets and any future capital gains.

In the cases of Bear Stearns and AIG, management was replaced and shareholders equity was diluted to limit moral hazard problems associated with receiving government assistance.⁵² Similar steps were not taken in the case of Citigroup.

Guarantee of Bank of America's Assets

On January 16, 2009, the federal government and the Federal Reserve announced that they would purchase an additional \$20 billion of Bank of America preferred shares through TARP and guarantee a pool of up to \$37 billion of Bank of America's assets and derivatives with maximum potential future losses of up to \$81 billion. The guarantee would remain in place for 10 years for residential mortgage-related assets and five years for all other assets. Bank of America will bear up to the first \$10 billion of losses on the assets, with any subsequent losses split 90% by the government and 10% by Bank of America. The government's share of the next \$10 billion of losses will be borne jointly by the FDIC and the Treasury, and any further losses will be borne by the Fed. It was announced that the assets being guaranteed were largely acquired during Bank of America's acquisition of Merrill Lynch. Bank of America will pay the federal government a fee for the guarantee in the form of \$4 billion in preferred stock with an 8% dividend rate and warrants to purchase common stock worth \$2.4 billion at the time of the agreement. As part of the agreement, Bank of America was prohibited from paying dividends on common stock for three years.

The assets will remain on Bank of America's balance sheet, and Bank of America will receive the income stream generated by the assets and any future capital gains. Bank of America can further

⁵¹ Citigroup, "Citigroup and U.S. Government Reach Definitive Agreement on Loss Sharing Program," press release, January 16, 2009.

⁵² For a full discussion, see the section below entitled "Lender of Last Resort, Systemic Risk, and Moral Hazard".

limit its cost and the benefit to the government by opting out of the guarantee early at its discretion.

In the cases of Bear Stearns and AIG, management was replaced and shareholders equity was diluted to limit moral hazard problems associated with receiving government assistance.⁵³ Similar steps were not taken in the case of Bank of America. On the other hand, the government has tried to encourage healthy financial firms to merge with troubled firms, and it may have felt that harsh terms on an agreement to guarantee assets that were in part acquired from Bank of America's takeover of Merrill Lynch would have discouraged future mergers. It has been reported that the asset guarantees to Bank of America were motivated by a desire to prevent them from withdrawing from their uncompleted merger agreement with Merrill Lynch.⁵⁴

Policy Issues

Cost to the Treasury

Unlike all other institutions, currency (Federal Reserve notes) is the Fed's primary liability. Along with its holdings of Treasury securities, its assets are the loans it makes (through the discount window and the new programs detailed above) and the private assets it hold through LLCs (e.g., for AIG and the Bear Stearns takeover). It earns profits on its assets that are largely remitted to the Treasury. Its loans and asset purchases are financed by increasing its liabilities (Federal Reserve notes), and the financing does not necessarily result in any inherent cost for the Treasury. Indeed, if the loans are repaid, they would increase the profits of the Fed, which in turn would increase the Fed's remittances to the Treasury.⁵⁵ Even if the loans are not repaid, they are fully collateralized (in some cases, over collateralized), so the Fed would not suffer losses unless the collateral had lost value. In addition, some of the loans discussed above are made with recourse, which means that borrowers are still liable if the collateral loses value.

The Fed had net income of \$38.8 billion and remitted \$34.9 billion to the Treasury in 2008. In the past, most of the Fed's net income has derived from the interest on its Treasury securities holdings, not its loans. The earnings and any losses the Fed took on its loans would increase or reduce its net income, respectively. If loan losses caused an overall net loss, the Fed's capital (the excess of its assets compared with its liabilities) would be reduced. The Fed had capital equal to about \$40 billion at end of 2008, half of which was paid-in capital of member banks and the other half was surplus. The Fed has not had an annual net operating loss since 1915. However, the Fed's assets became more risky in 2008 due to the shift in its assets from U.S. Treasuries to direct loans and due to the increase in its assets and liabilities relative to its capital. For example, in October 2008, the Fed's capital would be depleted if its realized net losses were equal in value to 3.5% of its holdings of securities (U.S. Treasuries, loans, and other private securities).

Thus, any potential losses on loans to the Fed would not involve taxpayer dollars flowing to the Fed unless the losses exceeded the sum of its other earnings and its capital and the Treasury

⁵³ For a full discussion, see the section below entitled "Lender of Last Resort, Systemic Risk, and Moral Hazard".

⁵⁴ See, for example, Deborah Solomon, "Bailout Man Turns the Screws," *Wall Street Journal*, April 7, 2009, p. A1.

⁵⁵ Assuming that the interest rate on the loans exceeded the rate of return on the Treasuries that the Fed would have purchased if the loans had not occurred.

decided it did not want the Fed to operate as technically insolvent. However, even if the losses did not result in insolvency, any losses could result in a smaller remittance of earnings to the Treasury than would have occurred had the Fed not made the loans. Therefore, the ultimate cost to the government is the same whether loans to the financial sector are made through the Fed or the Treasury. The Fed has reported to Congress that it does not expect there to be losses on any of the actions it has undertaken under its emergency authorities, but it has not provided details as to how it reached that conclusion. Although the Fed has taken steps to minimize the risk that recent activities will result in losses, Members of Congress have raised the question of whether taxpayers should be exposed to additional fiscal risks without congressional approval, particularly since some of the Fed’s actions have similarities to those authorized under TARP.

How Much Can the Fed Lend? Will the Fed Run Out of Money?

As a result of the Fed’s new facilities and activities, its balance sheet has increased significantly, from \$874 billion on August 1, 2007, a date shortly before the financial system first experienced turmoil, to \$2,312 billion at its peak on December 17, 2008, an increase of 165%. **Table 3** shows the increase in the balance sheet by category over that period. Since the size of the balance sheet peaked in December 2008, there has been a modest decline in the overall size of the balance sheet, and some larger changes in the composition of the balance sheet. For example, there has been a significant increase in the Fed’s holdings of mortgage backed securities and GSE debt, and a significant decrease in lending to primary dealers, holdings of commercial paper, and swaps with central banks. The Fed also began lending through the TALF in March 2009.

Table 3. Changes in the Fed’s Balance Sheet from August 1, 2007 to Peak on December, 17 2008

billions of dollars

Assets		Liabilities and Capital	
Treasury Securities ^a	-\$340	Federal Reserve Notes	+\$64
MBS/GSE Debt	+\$18 ^b	Bank Reserves at Fed	+\$785
Lending to Banks	+\$538	Treasury Cash Deposits at Fed	+\$475
Lending to Primary Dealers	+\$47 ^b	Other	+\$103
Lending to/Assets Purchased for AIG	+\$82 ^b		
Lending for/Purchase of Commercial Paper	+\$346 ^b		
Assets Purchased from Bear Stearns	+\$27 ^b		
Swaps with Foreign Central Banks	+\$572 ^b	Total Liabilities	+\$1,427
Other	+\$148	Capital	+\$11
Total Assets	+\$1,438	Total Liabilities and Capital	+\$1,438

Source: CRS calculations based on Federal Reserve Board of Governors, “Factors Affecting Reserve Balances,” Data Release H.4.1, Tables 1 and 7, various dates

Notes: GSE = government sponsored enterprise, MBS = mortgage-backed securities, ABS = asset backed securities, AIG = American International Group. See text for details.

- a. Includes +\$176 billion of Treasury securities temporarily swapped for private securities with Primary Dealers.
- b. Item equaled zero in August 2007.

When the Fed makes loans or purchases assets, the asset side of its balance sheet expands; this must be matched by an increase in its liabilities. As direct loans from the Fed have multiplied, some observers have questioned at what point the Fed's lending power will be exhausted. The Fed cannot "run out of money" to lend because it controls the monetary base (federal reserve notes and bank reserves), through which it expands or contracts the amount of money outstanding to buy and sell assets and extend loans. There are no statutory limits on the size of the money supply or currency outstanding (and, thus, how much it can loan); the ultimate constraint on the Fed's willingness to expand the monetary base in order to expand its activities comes from the part of its congressional mandate requiring stable prices (i.e., a low and stable rate of price inflation.) If the Fed allows the money supply to grow too rapidly, then price inflation will become uncomfortably high (discussed in the section below on "Stagflation?").

Earlier in the financial crisis, the Fed was concerned about inflation rising. For example, in the 12 months ending in August 2008, inflation (as measured by the consumer price index) had risen to 5.4%—significantly higher than the Fed's self-identified "comfort zone." To keep inflation from rising, the Fed sought to keep its balance sheet from growing in order to offset the effects of its activities on the money supply. One way to keep its balance sheet from growing would be by reducing its other assets. For example, it could "sterilize" its new loans or asset purchases through contractionary open market operations, namely, the sale of Treasury securities. In practice, before September 2008, the Fed kept the monetary base relatively constant by selling enough Treasury securities to offset the additional loans it made. (When the Fed sells Treasury securities, it removes the money it receives in the sale from circulation.) Thus, as loans outstanding have risen, the Fed's holdings of Treasury securities have declined, by \$340 billion through December 17, 2008. For example, in September 2007, 88% of its assets were Treasury securities held outright and less than 1% were loans to the financial system. On December 17, 2008, 28% of its assets were Treasury securities, 32% were loans, 17% were private securities (mostly commercial paper), and 25% were currency swaps with foreign central banks.

If sterilization through the sale of Treasury securities had continued, the Fed would eventually have held too few Treasury securities to be able to conduct open market operations.⁵⁶ As seen in **Table 3**, the overall increase in the Fed's balance sheet at its peak was \$1.4 trillion, more than the \$816 billion holdings of Treasury securities it held before the crisis started, and \$475 billion of it has held since September 2008.

The Treasury announced the Supplementary Financing Program on September 17, 2008 as an alternative method for the Fed to increase its assistance to the financial sector without increasing the amount of money in circulation.⁵⁷ Under this program, the Treasury has temporarily auctioned more new securities than it needs to finance government operations and deposited the proceeds at the Fed. (The increase in the money supply does not affect inflation because the money received by the Treasury is held at the Fed and not allowed to circulate in the economy.) Ultimately, the program will not affect the Treasury's fiscal position, however, because it will increase the profits of the Fed, which are then remitted to the Treasury. By December 17, 2008, the Treasury had borrowed and increased its deposits at the Fed by \$475 billion. Since then, Treasury deposits have

⁵⁶ It should be noted that a portfolio of Treasury securities is only needed to tighten monetary policy. Expansionary monetary policy involves the purchase of Treasury securities.

⁵⁷ The program also supplies more Treasuries to investors when there is excess demand because of a "flight to quality." The Treasuries issued under the program are indistinguishable to investors from regularly-issued securities.

fallen, but remain substantial. Congress authorized this borrowing only indirectly by raising the statutory debt limit, in P.L. 110-343 and other subsequent legislation.

The fact that the Fed has been “sterilizing” the effects of its loans on the money supply (entirely until September 2008, and partially since then) limits the effects of those loans on financial conditions. In essence, the Fed has two methods for providing the financial system with liquidity—open market operations or direct loans. The Fed has increased the role of direct loans to directly meet individual financial institutions’ liquidity needs. But the Fed was offsetting the effects of the direct loans on the money supply to meet its goals for inflation. Thus, the loans do not provide additional overall monetary stimulus to the economy when sterilized. Since the Fed was sterilizing the loans because of its concerns with inflation, the utility of sterilization is fundamentally a question of whether the Fed has achieved the proper balance between stabilizing the financial sector and providing price stability, two topics that are discussed below.

As commodity prices fell later in 2008, the inflation rate also fell. The Fed became less concerned about inflation rising, and more concerned about the further deterioration in financial and economic conditions. After conditions deteriorated in September 2008, the Fed further increased its direct assistance to the financial system, but no longer fully sterilized those activities. As a result, the Fed’s balance sheet and the monetary base have expanded rapidly, as demonstrated in **Table 3**. The monetary base doubled from August to December 2008 – an unprecedented rise.⁵⁸ Normally, this would trigger a rapid increase in inflation. The main force preventing such an increase is the rapid increase in bank reserves held at the Fed during that period. Bank reserves increased from \$44 billion in August to \$802 billion on December 17, 2008, as banks tried to shore up their balance sheets to avoid runs on their deposits or stock. In normal financial conditions, banks would lend out money they received from the Fed, and through a process referred to by economists as the “money multiplier,” a \$1 increase in the monetary base would lead to a much larger increase in the overall money supply. But if banks hold the money received from the Fed in bank reserves instead of lending it out, the money multiplier process will not occur, so the growth in the overall money supply will be smaller. Thus, the large increase in the monetary base since September 2008 has not been matched by a corresponding increase in the overall money supply.⁵⁹

Once financial conditions return to normal, banks may desire to rapidly reduce their reserve holdings and increase their lending. At that point, the Fed would have to sharply reduce the monetary base in order to prevent a rapid increase in the money supply. To do so, it would have to reduce both its assets and liabilities. Some of the Fed’s outstanding assets can be reduced relatively quickly, at least in theory.⁶⁰ For example, since the Fed’s loans are generally short-term, it can wind down some lending facilities relatively quickly once financial firms can find private borrowing alternatives. But the Fed has pledged to purchase certain assets and hold them long-term, including up to \$1.45 trillion of GSE debt and MBS and up to \$0.2-\$1 trillion of three-year TALF loans. It is not clear how these assets could be reduced quickly if the Fed became concerned about rising inflation.

⁵⁸ By comparison, the monetary base rose 2% over the four previous months.

⁵⁹ The fact that the Fed began paying interest on bank reserves during this period could be interpreted as a policy to encourage banks to increase their reserve holdings, and thus another policy tool to achieve sterilization.

⁶⁰ For Chairman Bernanke’s views on this issue, see Chairman Ben Bernanke, “The Crisis and the Policy Response,” speech at London School of Economics, January 13, 2009.

With an eye to the potential long-run inflationary effects of the growth in the Fed's balance sheet, the Fed and Treasury announced in March 2009 that they would seek "legislative action to provide additional tools the Federal Reserve can use to sterilize the effects of its lending or securities purchases on the supply of bank reserves." Many analysts interpreted this statement to express the desire for the Fed to gain authority to issue its own bonds. Returning to the balance sheet in **Table 3**, the Fed must match an increase in assets with an increase in liabilities. The only liability it can currently issue are federal reserve notes that increase the monetary base. If the Fed were granted new authority to issue bonds, they could then expand their liabilities without increasing the monetary base and increasing inflationary pressures. Then, there would no longer be any statutory limit or check on the Fed's ability to directly allocate credit, provided it met the broad guidelines of Section 13(3). Proponents argue that the issuance of Fed bonds would remove any market fears that the Fed was not committed to price stability, thereby boosting Fed credibility and potentially making monetary policy more effective.

Critics argue that credit allocation should be determined by the market or democratically elected officials, not an unelected body. If Congress intended for the government to allocate credit, they argue, it could pass legislation authorizing the Treasury to do so.⁶¹ They fear that the ability to issue bonds, coupled with the use of emergency authority for the first time since the Great Depression, would enable a vast expansion in the Fed's powers. Another consideration is that if the Fed funded its operations through bonds rather than currency, its profits and remittances to the Treasury would decline. Other critics point to unresolved questions such as: 1) how investors would view Fed bonds relative to Treasury bonds; if Fed bonds were preferred, would the Treasury's ability to borrow to finance federal deficits be inadvertently undermined? and 2) could the market undermine future Fed policies or initiatives by driving down the price of its debt?

Why Have the Fed's Actions Not Successfully Restored Financial Normalcy?

The Fed's actions since 2007 have been primarily focused on restoring liquidity to the financial system—lending to financial firms to convert their illiquid assets into cash or U.S. Treasury securities. But as financial conditions have deteriorated in spite of increasing Fed intervention, it has become apparent that the problems facing financial firms are not exclusively related to liquidity.

The crux of the firms' problem stems from the large losses on some of their assets, particularly mortgage-related assets.⁶² This has caused a number of problems for the firms related to *capital adequacy*, which is the difference between the value of their assets and the value of their liabilities. First, losses and write-downs associated with those assets have reduced the firms' existing capital. The International Monetary Fund estimates overall losses of \$1.4 trillion on U.S. securities (some of which are held by foreigners) as of October 2008, requiring banks worldwide to raise an additional \$675 billion of capital.⁶³ Second, in the current environment, investors and

⁶¹ If Congress wanted to allow the Fed to temporarily maintain a large balance sheet without inflationary consequences but did not want to authorize the Fed to issue bonds, it could raise the debt limit to enable an expansion of the Supplementary Financing Program.

⁶² For more information, see CRS Report RS22963, *Financial Market Intervention*, by Edward V. Murphy and Baird Webel.

⁶³ International Monetary Fund, *Global Financial Stability Report*, Oct. 2008.

creditors are demanding that firms hold more capital relative to assets than before so that firms can better withstand any future losses.

Third, the losses to date have impaired the firms' ability to raise enough new capital. Firms can raise new capital through retained earnings, which have been greatly reduced for many firms by the poor performance of their assets, or by issuing new capital (equity) and selling it to new investors. But in current market conditions, investors have been reluctant to inject new capital into struggling firms. Part of the explanation for this is that current losses have made the firms less profitable. But another part of the reason is that investors fear that there will be further losses in the future that would reduce the value of their investment, and perhaps even cause the firm to become insolvent. Uncertainty about future losses is partly caused by the opacity surrounding the assets that have been declining in value, which makes it hard for investors to determine which assets remain overvalued and which are undervalued. The result for companies such as Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers, AIG, Washington Mutual, and Wachovia was a downward spiral in their stock price, which had two self-reinforcing characteristics. First, there was little demand for existing stock since its worth would either be diluted by new capital (raised privately or through government intervention) or lost in insolvency. Second, new capital could not be attracted because the fall in stock value had left the market capitalization of the firms so low. If a firm's capital is completely depleted, there is no longer a buffer between its assets and liabilities, and it becomes insolvent.

Many large financial firms, including the firms that have failed, are heavily dependent on short-term borrowing to meet their current obligations. As financial conditions have worsened, some of the firms that have had the problems described above have had problems accessing short-term borrowing markets that in normal conditions could be taken for granted. In an atmosphere where creditors cannot perceive which firms have insufficient capital, they become unwilling to lend for even short intervals. This is the essence of the *liquidity* problem—although the firms' assets may exceed their liabilities, without access to short-term borrowing, the firm cannot meet its current obligations because it cannot convert its assets into cash quickly enough (at least not if it wishes to avoid “fire sale” prices).

The Fed has always been the “lender of last resort” in order for banks to avoid liquidity problems during financial turmoil. To borrow from the Fed, a financial firm must post collateral. In essence, this allows the firm to temporarily convert its illiquid assets into cash, enabling the firm to meet its short-term obligations without sacrificing its assets. The Fed has always lent to commercial banks (depository institutions) through the discount window. As discussed above, it has extended liquidity to non-bank financial firms in 2008 through new lending facilities.

Borrowing from the Fed increases liquidity but it does not change a firm's capital position since it now has a liability outstanding to the Fed. So borrowing from the Fed cannot solve the problems of undercapitalization that some firms currently face. Indeed, the Fed will generally not lend to firms that are not creditworthy because it wants to provide liquidity only to firms that are solvent, and thus able to repay.⁶⁴

H.R. 1424, which was signed into law on October 3 (P.L. 110-343), created the Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP). The Treasury has announced it would initially use TARP funds to

⁶⁴ In addition, the Fed faces some statutory limitations on lending to undercapitalized banks under normal circumstances. See, for example, Section 10B of the Federal Reserve Act.

address the capital adequacy problem directly by providing \$250 billion in capital to banks directly through preferred share purchases by TARP.⁶⁵

If TARP proves insufficient to restore financial calm, some have asked whether there is any program that the Fed could operate to address the financial firms' capital adequacy problems. All of the Fed's standing lending facilities involve collateralized lending, and as discussed above, any program involving collateralized lending would not change a firm's capital position. According to one legal analysis, there is no express statutory authority for the Fed to purchase corporate bonds, mortgages, or equity.⁶⁶ But the Fed's assistance in the Bear Stearns merger with JPMorgan Chase took a form that has some similarities to the TARP proposal. In the case of Bear Stearns, the Fed created a limited liability corporation called Maiden Lane, and lent Maiden Lane \$28.82 billion. Maiden Lane used the proceeds of that loan and another loan from JPMorgan Chase to purchase mortgage-related assets from Bear Stearns. Thus, although the Fed created and controlled Maiden Lane, the assets were purchased and held by Maiden Lane, not the Fed. Similar to TARP, Maiden Lane plans to hold the assets until markets recover, and then sell the assets to repay its loans to the Fed and JPMorgan Chase. Maiden Lane was created under the Fed's Section 13(3) emergency authority.⁶⁷

The Fed was presumably granted broad emergency powers under Section 13(3) so that it had the flexibility to deal with unforeseen circumstances. Nonetheless, too broad of a reading of its powers could provoke displeasure in Congress or legal challenges. Creating TARP within the Treasury through legislation rather than the Fed through emergency powers avoided the argument whether such a program extended beyond the Fed's intended role.

Lender of Last Resort, Systemic Risk, and Moral Hazard

Since its early days, one of the Fed's main roles has been to act as a lender of last resort to the banking system when private sources of credit become unavailable. It does so by lending through the discount window and its new lending facilities. The lender of last resort function can be seen from the perspective of an individual institution or the financial system as a whole.⁶⁸ From the perspective of the individual institution, discount window lending is meant to provide funds to institutions that are illiquid (cannot meet current obligations out of current cash flow) but still solvent (assets exceed liabilities) when they cannot access funds from the private market. Discount window lending was unable to end bank runs, however—bank runs did not cease until the creation of federal deposit insurance. The experience of the Great Depression suggested that bank runs placed intolerably high costs on the financial system as a whole, as they led to widespread bank failures.⁶⁹ Discount window lending is not meant to help insolvent institutions, with one exception explained below.

⁶⁵ For more information, see CRS Report RL34730, *The Emergency Economic Stabilization Act and Current Financial Turmoil: Issues and Analysis*, by Baird Webel and Edward V. Murphy.

⁶⁶ David Small and James Clouse, "The Scope of Monetary Policy Actions Authorized under the Federal Reserve Act," Federal Reserve, FEDS working paper no. 2004-40, July 2004, p. 29.

⁶⁷ The Fed also created the Term Asset Backed Liquidity Facility (TALF) to lend to private investors to purchase illiquid assets of the same types that TARP was originally intended to purchase. TALF is also aimed at improving liquidity, and does not affect the capital adequacy problem directly, however.

⁶⁸ For more information, see CRS Report RS21986, *Federal Reserve: Lender of Last Resort Functions*, by Marc Labonte.

⁶⁹ In this context, it is interesting to note that the Bear Stearns failure has been described as a non-bank run, meaning (continued...)

Access to Fed lending facilities and deposit insurance creates *moral hazard* for financial institutions—they can take on more risk than the market would otherwise permit because of the government safety net. To limit moral hazard, institutions with depository insurance and access to the discount window are subject to a safety and soundness regulatory regime that includes capital requirements, reserve requirements, bank examinations, and so on.

The exception to the rule that insolvent institutions cannot access Fed lending facilities is when the institution is deemed “too big to fail.” Institutions that are too big to fail are ones that are deemed to be big enough that their failure could create *systemic risk*, the risk that the financial system as a whole would cease to function smoothly.⁷⁰ For example, failure could lead to systemic instability through “contagion” effects where the losses to creditors and counterparties imposed by the bankruptcy system drove those creditors and counterparties into insolvency. A systemic risk episode could impose heavy costs on the overall economy, as the bank panics of the Great Depression demonstrated. Although too big to fail institutions are not offered explicit guarantees, it can be argued that they have implicit guarantees since the government would not be willing to allow a systemic risk episode. This accentuates the moral hazard problem described above. There is no official governmental classification of which financial institutions are too big to fail, presumably since maintaining uncertainty over which institutions are too big to fail could help reduce the moral hazard problem. But the lack of official designation arguably creates a vacuum in terms of policy preparedness. (Making the problem more complex, as one report described the situation, “Officials grimly concluded that while Bear Stearns isn’t too big to fail, it was too interconnected to be allowed to fail in just one day.” It is unclear how to judge which institutions are too interconnected to fail.)⁷¹

As the cases of Bear Stearns, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and AIG illustrate, some of the modern-day financial institutions that are too big to fail are not depository institutions that fall under the strict regulatory umbrella that accompanies membership in the Federal Reserve system. Nevertheless, all received direct or indirect assistance from the Fed. This highlights the shift in financial activity from a bank-dominated financial system at the time of the Fed’s creation to a system whose health now depends on many types of institutions. The Fed was set up to be a lender of last resort to only the banking system. In the current crisis, it has been able to extend its lender of last resort functions to non-bank financial institutions only because of its Section 13(3) emergency powers. A policy issue going forward is whether the extension of these functions should be made permanent, and if so, what types of regulatory safeguards should accompany it. Because Section 13(3) is intended for responding to unanticipated emergencies, it grants authority that is broader and more open-ended than the Fed’s normal authority.

It is possible that part of the reason these institutions failed is because they took on excessive risks in the belief that they were too big to fail. Although that theory can be debated, it is clearer that the precedent of the Fed’s role in the Bear Stearns acquisition may strengthen the perception of other institutions and investors that any financial firm, regardless of whether it is a depository institution, will be bailed out in the future if it is too big to fail, or merely too interconnected to

(...continued)

Bear Stearns was undermined because it was shunned by its counterparties and investors, analogous to a bank being shunned by its depositors. The defining characteristic of a run is that the fear of failure becomes self-fulfilling since it deprives an institution of the resources it needs to avoid failure.

⁷⁰ For more information, see CRS Report RL34412, *Containing Financial Crisis*, by Mark Jickling.

⁷¹ Greg Ip, “Central Bank Offers Loans to Brokers, Cuts Key Rate,” *Wall Street Journal*, March 17, 2008, p. A1.

fail. If so, it could be argued that the Bear Stearns episode may have increased moral hazard going forward. The government's decision not to intervene to prevent the failure of the investment bank Lehman Brothers in September 2008, but to subsequently assist AIG, Citigroup, and Bank of America may have created further market uncertainty regarding which institutions the government views as too big to fail. Lehman Brothers was larger than Bear Stearns and involved in similar business activities. Others have argued that the failure of Lehman Brothers set off a wave of unrest in money markets (see above), interbank lending markets, and the market for credit default swaps that would make the government unlikely to allow any large institution to fail in the future.⁷²

The government assistance to Bear Stearns, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and AIG all include clauses that significantly reduced the value of existing shareholder equity. This was partly justified in terms of reducing moral hazard—investors would be reluctant to buy equity in too big to fail companies that were taking excessive risks if the government demanded a reduction in existing shareholder value. But government assistance in all of these cases made creditors and other counterparties whole. In these cases, the moral hazard problem manifests itself in a willingness of creditors to lend to, and counterparties to transact with, a firm they know to be taking excessive risks, thereby potentially allowing the firm to take more risks. More recent government assistance to Citigroup and Bank of America was provided without similar measures to replace management or dilute shareholders. (Warrants to purchase some common stock were issued but have not yet been exercised.) Market participants may view this decision as a signal that the government is no longer placing emphasis on avoiding moral hazard.

The current situation raises three broad points about systemic risk. First, risk is at the foundation of all financial intermediation. Policymakers may wish to curb excessive risk taking when it leads to systemic risk, but too little financial risk would also be counterproductive for the economy. (Indeed, some would argue that part of the underlying problem for the financial system as a whole at present is that investors are currently too risk averse.) Second, many analysts have argued that part of the reason that so much financial intermediation has left the commercial banking system is to avoid the costs of regulation.⁷³ This point applies to future regulatory changes as well. An attempt to increase regulation on banks could lead more business to move to hedge funds, for example. Third, financial markets have become significantly more complex and fast-moving in recent years. Many of the financial instruments with which Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers, and AIG were involved did not exist until recently. For regulation to be effective in this environment, it faces the challenge of trying to keep up with innovation. If used prudently, many of these innovations can reduce risk for individual investors. Yet the Bear Stearns example implies that innovation may also lead to more interconnectivity, which increases systemic risk.

Going forward, policymakers must determine whether new regulation is needed to limit moral hazard since there may be no credible way to maintain a policy that prohibits the rescue of future institutions that are too big to fail even if such a policy were desired. There are two main policy

⁷² Chairman Bernanke argued that the Fed did not have the authority to assist Lehman Brothers because Lehman Brothers could not offer the Fed adequate collateral for a loan of the size needed, which according to Bernanke, would have been much larger than the assistance for Bear Stearns. See Ben Bernanke, "Current Economic and Financial Conditions," speech at the National Association for Business Economic Annual Meeting, October 7, 2008.

⁷³ This problem in relation to investment banking has to some degree been overtaken by events, as none of the five largest investment banks still exist in their original form. Lehman Brothers has entered bankruptcy, Bear Stearns and Merrill Lynch have merged with commercial banks, and Goldman Sachs and Morgan Stanley have reorganized as bank holding companies that are regulated by the Fed.

proposals endorsed by many policymakers, including the Treasury and Chairman Bernanke, in response to systemic risk that may involve the Fed.⁷⁴ First, that Congress create a receivership or conservatorship process for non-bank financial firms. This would allow the government to wind down institutions that are too big to fail while using public funds to prevent contagion effects spreading to creditors or counterparties. Critics argue that this places too much discretion in policymakers' hands compared to the traditional bankruptcy process. It remains to be determined whether the Treasury or Fed would take firms into receivership or conservatorship if this proposal were adopted. Second, that Congress create a systemic risk regulator that would be responsible for identifying and eliminating sources of systemic risk across the financial system. Critics argue that a systemic risk regulator would have been unlikely to have been more successful at preventing the current crisis than current regulators since warning signs were either missed or downplayed. It remains to be determined whether a new entity would be created within the Treasury with these responsibilities, or whether they would be given to the Fed. Arguments for assigning systemic risk regulatory responsibilities with the Fed include the fact that these responsibilities overlap with – and could potentially improve its performance of – its existing macroeconomic stability responsibilities and lender of last resort responsibilities. The political independence of the Fed could be seen as an argument for or against making it the systemic risk regulator.

Oversight, Transparency, and Disclosure of Emergency Programs

Because profits and losses borne by the Fed ultimately get passed on to taxpayers (see “Cost to the Treasury”), some Members of Congress have argued that more information about the Fed's emergency activities should be made available to the public. The Fed has not been subject to many of the oversight and reporting requirements applied to the Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP), although the amount of direct assistance outstanding from the Fed exceeds TARP to date.

The Fed has provided detailed information to the public on the general terms and eligibility of its borrowers and collateral by class for each crisis-response program.⁷⁵ It has also provided a rationale for why each crisis program has been created, and an explanation of the goals the program is meant to accomplish. The Emergency Economic Stabilization Act (P.L. 110-343) requires the Fed to report to the House Financial Services Committee and the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee on its justification for exercising Section 13(3), the terms of the assistance provided, and regular updates on the status of the loan. But the Fed has kept confidential the identity of the borrowers from its facilities, the collateral posted in specific transactions, the terms of specific transactions, and the results of specific transactions or facilities (i.e., what profits or losses they have posted).

As historical precedent, the Fed has had a longstanding policy of keeping the identity of banks that borrow from its discount window confidential. Those calling for more disclosure note that the new Fed programs place the Fed in a more expansive role and are potentially riskier than the

⁷⁴ For Treasury's views on these issues, see U.S. Treasury, “Treasury Outlines Framework for Regulatory Reform,” press release, March 26, 2009. For Chairman Bernanke's views on these issues, see Chairman Ben Bernanke, “Financial Reform to Address Systemic Risk,” speech at the Council on Foreign Relations, March 10, 2009.

⁷⁵ All of the information outlined in this paragraph can be accessed at the following Fed website: [<http://www.federalreserve.gov/monetarypolicy/bst.htm>].

discount window, and, unlike the discount window, were not explicitly endorsed by legislation (many were authorized under emergency authority).

The Fed has argued that allowing the public to know which firms are accessing its facilities could undermine investor confidence in the institutions receiving aid because of a perception that recipients were weak or unsound. A loss of investor confidence could potentially lead to destabilizing runs on the institution's deposits, debt, or equity. If institutions feared that this would occur, the Fed argues, then the institutions would be wary of participating in the Fed's programs, which, in the aggregate, would retard economic recovery. A historical example supporting the Fed's argument would be the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC) in the Great Depression. When the RFC publicized to which banks it had given loans, those banks typically experienced depositor runs.⁷⁶ A more recent example may provide evidence against the Fed's argument, however – there is little sign that banks that have received TARP funds under the Capital Purchase Program have suffered a loss in investor confidence or are not participating in TARP because of fears of the effects on investor confidence. Arguments about investor confidence are arguably less compelling when applied to publicly disclosing collateral held by the Fed.

There are several different approaches to expanding disclosure or oversight:

- Congress could remove the Government Accountability Office's (GAO's) restrictions on conducting investigations of the Fed for Congress. While GAO can audit the Fed's non-monetary policy functions, the Federal Banking Agency Audit Act of 1978 (31 USC 714(b)) restricts GAO from auditing certain Fed activities: 1) transactions with foreign central banks or governments; 2) "deliberations, decisions, or actions on monetary matters, including discount window operations, reserves of member banks, securities credit, interest on deposits, and open market operations;" and 3) "transactions made under the direction of the Federal Open Market Committee."⁷⁷ While the act does not specifically mention activities under the Fed's emergency authority, those activities would presumably fall under the second group of restrictions.⁷⁸ H.R. 1207 removes the audit restrictions and requires GAO to perform an audit of the Fed.
- Congress could require the Fed to disclose more information on the identities of borrowers, the collateral accepted, or the terms and results of transactions. Congress requires the Fed to make some general policy reports, but does not typically require the Fed to disclose this type of specific information. Indeed, much of the information about monetary policy that the Fed currently makes public is done so on a voluntarily basis. The Senate FY2010 Budget Resolution (S.Con.Res. 13) allowed for future legislative action that, if adopted, would require the Fed to disclose information on the nature and amounts of collateral accepted by the Fed, and, for each entity that has received credit from the Fed

⁷⁶ James Butkiewicz, "The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Gold Standard, and the Banking Panic of 1933," *Southern Economic Journal*, vol. 66, no. 2, Oct. 1999, p. 271.

⁷⁷ See U.S. General Accounting Office, *Federal Reserve System Audits*, GAO/T-GGD-94-44, October 27, 1993.

⁷⁸ Removing the GAO audit restrictions would not necessitate that GAO disclose the identities of borrowers from the Fed, unless it was explicitly instructed to do so. Members of Congress could demand access to GAO's working papers, however, and make that information public.

since March 2008, information on its identity, the amount of assistance received, and its use of the assistance.

- Congress could create specific oversight boards or committees that focus on the Federal Reserve. Currently, regular Congressional oversight of the Fed is done at a general level through semi-annual hearings with the House Financial Services Committee and the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee. There is no routine, specific oversight of the Fed's crisis-response actions, and no group with monetary policy expertise evaluating the Fed's actions for Congress.

The main argument against increasing Fed oversight or disclosure would be that it could be perceived to reduce the Fed's operational independence from Congress. Most economists believe that the Fed's independence to carry out day-to-day decisions about monetary policy without Congressional input strengthens the Fed's credibility in the eyes of the private sector that it will follow policies that maximize price and economic stability. Greater credibility is perceived to strengthen the effectiveness of monetary policy on the economy. This independence is seen as consistent with the democratic process because the Fed's mandate to pursue price and economic stability has been given to it by Congress, and choosing the interest rate policies best able to achieve these goals is viewed as relatively technocratic and non-political in nature.⁷⁹ The Fed's unprecedented response to the financial crisis moves it into new policy areas involving decisions that are arguably more political in nature, such as deciding which financial actors should be eligible to access Fed credit. While few policymakers argue for total independence or total disclosure and oversight, the policy challenge is to strike the right balance between the two.

Effects on the Allocation of Capital

In normal conditions, the Fed primarily influences economic conditions through the purchase and sale of U.S. Treasury securities on the secondary market. This enables the Fed to influence overall economic conditions without favoring any particular financial firm or asset, thus minimizing its effect on the market allocation of capital.

As the Fed has shifted to an increasing reliance on more direct intervention in the financial system since 2008, its actions have had growing consequences for the allocation of private capital. Its actions can affect the allocation of capital by favoring certain classes or types of assets over others or by favoring certain financial firms or types of firms over others.

As discussed above, assisting Bear Stearns and AIG after their mistakes may encourage inefficiently high risk taking by other firms that are deemed "too big to fail." Punitive conditions attached to the assistance mitigate but do not eliminate these effects.⁸⁰ Allowing primary dealers to temporarily swap their illiquid assets for Treasuries protects those who invested poorly. The Fed has attempted to push down yields on certain assets that it feels have become inefficiently high (e.g., through the Term Asset Backed Securities Lending Facility), but it may be that at the height of the boom yields on these assets had become inefficiently low because investors underestimated their riskiness. The Fed's efforts could eventually reintroduce inefficient underpricing of risk. By purchasing commercial paper, the Fed has increased the relative demand

⁷⁹ See CRS Report RL31056, *Economics of Federal Reserve Independence*, by Marc Labonte.

⁸⁰ For example, the decision to make creditors whole in the case of Bear Stearns and AIG reduces incentives for creditors to curb lending to other institutions deemed "too big to fail."

for those assets, which confers an advantage to those firms that can access that market, which are generally large and have high credit ratings. Likewise, the Fed is purchasing GSE obligations and GSE-guaranteed MBS, but not similar securities issued by private firms. This gives the GSEs a funding advantage over private competitors.

In a time when liquidity is scarce, access to Fed borrowing confers an advantage on banks and primary dealers over other types of institutions. It may also arguably retard the process of weeding out bad institutions, since reputation is needed to access private liquidity, but not Fed liquidity. On the other hand, during a panic both good and bad firms can be shut out of credit markets. Liquidity has positive externalities that means it would be underprovided by the private sector if it were not provided by the government. When financial markets are not functioning, credit allocation is an incidental but unavoidable side effect of liquidity provision. But some of the Fed's efforts, such as seeking authority to pay interest on bank reserves or possibly issue its own bonds, could be interpreted as signaling that the Fed intends to go beyond allocating credit for the sole purpose of providing liquidity because these initiatives allow the Fed to extend more credit than is needed for liquidity purposes.

The Fed's short-term goal is to avoid the downward spiral in conditions that could lead to a panic, causing serious disruptions to the credit intermediation process for all firms, prudent or otherwise. But in the long run, once financial stability has been restored, these distortions to the market allocation of capital could result in economic inefficiencies. There is also a risk that the Fed's activities could "crowd out" private lenders and investors in the market for bank reserves, private-label MBS, and commercial paper, leading to less robust private markets. Even if some of the Fed's current programs are allowed to expire, if investors believed that they would be revived during the next downturn, capital allocation and incentives would remain altered.

Is the Economy Stuck in a Liquidity Trap? The Use of Quantitative Easing at Zero Interest Rates

Some economists have argued that the Fed's recent string of newly created programs points to increasing desperation on its part to "right the ship." Although monetary policy is credited with having contributed to an unusual degree of economic stability since at least the mid-1980s, some argue that it has been rendered ineffective by the current outlook. The argument is that lower interest rates will not boost spending because the economy is stuck in a credit crunch in which financial institutions are unwilling to lend to creditworthy borrowers because of balance sheet concerns. Following September 2008, banks greatly increased their reserve holdings, which could potentially be a troubling sign of a credit crunch. The capital of financial firms has been depleted by investment losses. In turn, financial firms are said to be hoarding capital and unable to access credit markets because of fears of future losses. Borrower demand may increase in response to lower rates, but as long as institutions are trying to rebuild their balance sheets, they will remain reluctant to extend credit. This problem is sometimes referred to as a "liquidity trap." Liquidity traps are rare in modern times, but the decade of economic stagnation suffered by Japan in the 1990s after the bursting of its financial bubble is cited as an example. Interest rates were lowered to almost zero in Japan, and the economy still did not recover quickly.⁸¹

⁸¹ While the term liquidity trap was often applied to Japan, it is theoretically defined as a situation where household demand for money becomes so great that normal sized changes in the money supply do not affect interest rates. Under this strict definition, it is not clear that Japan, or any other economy, has ever experienced a liquidity trap.

There are some problems with this line of reasoning at present. First, liquidity traps are seen as an extreme form of recession, but while the U.S. economy has entered a recession, it has only been a deep recession since the fourth quarter of 2008. Second, liquidity traps are most likely to occur when overall prices of goods and services are falling (called *deflation*). The Fed cannot reduce the federal funds rate below zero. When prices are falling, real interest rates are higher than nominal interest rates, so it is more likely that a very low nominal interest rate would still be too high in real terms to stimulate economic activity. But inflation has been above average in 2008, although lower more recently.⁸² Inflation would not be expected to be persistently high if the economy were in a liquidity trap. Third, monetary policy always suffers lags between a reduction in interest rates and corresponding increases in economic activity, so the full effects of recent policy steps have not yet been felt.

Most importantly, it would be wrong to conclude that the Fed has had no further policy options available to stimulate the economy since December 2008, when the Fed reduced the federal funds rate target to a range of 0% to 0.25%. At this point, the potential for further stimulus via traditional monetary policy channels had been exhausted, since the federal funds rate cannot be reduced below zero. But in a 2004 study, Ben Bernanke (a Fed Governor at the time) and co-authors laid out policy options for how the Fed could further stimulate the economy once interest rates reached zero. In that study, the authors note that “nothing prevents the central bank from adding liquidity to the system beyond what is needed to achieve a policy rate of zero, a policy that is known as quantitative easing.”⁸³ By that definition, the Fed has engaged in “quantitative easing” since September 2008 - instead of adjusting the monetary base to meet the interest rate target, the Fed has adjusted the monetary base to meet the financial sector’s liquidity needs.⁸⁴ Since the Fed has only one tool, it cannot meet more than one target at once. As a result, once the Fed began focusing on meeting the financial sector’s liquidity needs, it began missing its interest rate target by growing margins.⁸⁵ In December 2008, the Fed began providing so much liquidity that the interest rate target often fell close to zero. But many different levels of Fed direct lending (and corresponding monetary base) are compatible with a zero federal funds rate. Once the federal funds rate hits zero, there is nothing stopping the Fed from further increases in lending that would have further expansionary effects on the economy. It could also engage in quantitative easing without direct lending by purchasing U.S. Treasury securities. On March 18, 2009, the Fed announced it was willing to purchase up to \$300 billion of longer-term Treasury securities for quantitative easing.⁸⁶

⁸² Asset prices have been falling lately, but they are not included in standard measures of inflation, which measures the prices of goods and services.

⁸³ Ben Bernanke, Vincent Reinhart, and Brian Sack, “Monetary Policy Alternatives at the Zero Bound: An Empirical Analysis,” Federal Reserve Board, *Finance and Economic Discussion Series 2004-48*, 2004, p. 17. Other options for stimulus at zero short-term interest rates include buying longer-term assets to push down longer-term interest rates.

⁸⁴ In a recent speech, Chairman Bernanke referred to the Fed’s policies as credit easing, rather than quantitative easing. He identifies quantitative easing as a policy where the central bank sets a growth rate for the monetary base and provides liquidity to achieve that growth rate. Under what he calls credit easing, the Fed has allowed the growth in the monetary base to be determined by the financial sector’s demand for liquidity. He notes that both policies result in the growth of the central bank’s balance sheet and the monetary base. See Chairman Ben S. Bernanke, *Speech at the Stamp Lecture*, London School of Economics, London, England, January 13, 2009.

⁸⁵ This occurred since financial firms were meeting their liquidity needs directly from the Fed, there was no longer adequate demand to borrow reserves in the private federal funds market, and the federal funds rate fell close to zero.

⁸⁶ If the Fed begins purchasing Treasury securities and the Treasury continues the Supplementary Financing Program, these two programs would cancel each other out. The purchase of Treasury securities would increase liquidity by taking Treasury securities out of circulation and replacing them with additional currency, while the Supplementary Financing program would decrease liquidity by taking currency out of circulation and replacing it with additional Treasury (continued...)

While a liquidity trap cannot be ruled out, it is premature to conclude the economy is stuck in one at this point in time. Liquidity traps are a threat when monetary policy has been kept too tight, but the Fed has eased monetary policy aggressively since the crisis began.

Stagflation?

Other critics have argued that the Fed has created the opposite problem of a liquidity trap—rising inflation due to excessive liquidity. They argue that the economy has entered a period of stagflation, where falling or negative economic growth is accompanied by high or rising inflation.⁸⁷

Typically, one would expect an economic slowdown to be accompanied by a decline in the inflation rate. Excess capacity in the capital stock and rising unemployment would force firms and workers to lower their prices and wage demands, respectively. But critics believe the economy is in a situation where a modest but persistent increase in inflation in recent years has led individuals to come to expect higher inflation, and factor that expectation into their price and wage demands. Couple those higher inflation expectations with rising commodity prices and the recent unusual large liquidity injections by the Fed, and critics argue that inflation will rise even if the economy slows. They point to the experience of the 1970s, when inflationary expectations became so ingrained that inflation continued to rise despite a fairly deep recession, as a potential parallel to the current situation.

Data suggest that the fear of stagflation is premature—inflation remains relatively low at present. It is true that in the long run inflation is primarily a monetary phenomenon, and if the Fed's recent monetary stance were maintained for too long, it would not be consistent with stable inflation. Under normal conditions, the doubling of the monetary base between August and December 2008 would have led to a sharp increase of inflation, but this did not occur because of the even greater increase in bank reserves held at the Fed. But in the near term, if unemployment and excess capacity rose, that would be expected to take much of the pressure off of the inflation rate. This can be seen in the example of Japan, where the Bank of Japan allowed the monetary base to increase by more than 10% per year after 2001, without inflation ever reaching high levels because of economic sluggishness. Furthermore, commodity prices fell in the second half of 2008, reversing the immediate upward pressure on prices. Ironically, if the Fed's actions succeed in reviving the economy, then the probability that its actions would boost inflation would increase. If banks began lending out the funds they are now holding as reserves, the money supply and inflation would rise rapidly. The key to maintaining a stable inflation rate is finding the proper balance between the disinflationary pressures of the slowdown and the inflationary pressures of quantitative easing. The large amounts of liquidity that the Fed has added to the system must be removed soon enough that inflation does not rise, but not so soon that a nascent financial recovery is stubbed out. Removing all of the liquidity is complicated by the fact that the Fed has used some of it to buy assets it has pledged to hold long term. Given the uncertainty facing policymakers at present, finding the proper balance is extremely difficult.⁸⁸

(...continued)

securities.

⁸⁷ See CRS Report RL34428, *Understanding Stagflation and the Risk of Its Recurrence*, by Brian W. Cashell and Marc Labonte.

⁸⁸ For more information, see CRS Report RL34562, *Slow Growth or Inflation? The Federal Reserve's Dilemma*, by (continued...)

Concluding Thoughts

Although turmoil plagues financial markets periodically, the current episode is notable for its breadth, depth, and persistence. It is difficult to make the case that the Fed has not responded to the current turmoil with alacrity and creativity. The Fed's inability to restore normalcy is not necessarily a sign that its policy decisions have been wrongheaded—the Fed can provide the financial sector with additional liquidity, but it cannot force institutions to use that liquidity to expand their lending or investing.

The Fed's response has raised statutory issues that Congress may wish to consider in its oversight capacity. Namely, the Fed's role in the Bear Stearns acquisition, the assistance to AIG, Citigroup, and Bank of America, the creation of the Primary Dealer Credit Facility (a sort of discount window for a group of non-member banks), and its intervention in the commercial paper market involved emergency authorities that had not been used in more than 70 years. This authority was needed because the actions involved financial institutions that were not member banks of the Federal Reserve System (i.e., depository institutions). But because the authority is broad and open-ended, the Fed's actions under this authority are subject to few legal parameters. The authority allows lending to non-member banks, but some of the loans in the Bear Stearns and AIG agreements were to LLCs that the Fed created and controls, and are being used to purchase Bear Stearns' and AIG's assets. These actions raise an important issue—if financial institutions can receive some of the benefits of Fed protection, in some cases because they are “too big to fail,” should they also be subject to the costs that member banks bear in terms of safety and soundness regulations, imposed to limit the moral hazard that inevitably results from Fed and FDIC (Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation) protections? In response, proposals have been made to create a conservatorship/receivership process for non-bank financial firms and a systemic risk regulator. Either of these functions could be located in the Fed or Treasury.

Some policymakers have begun to question whether an institution largely independent from the elected branches of government should be able to (indirectly) place significant taxpayer funds at risk by providing the financial sector with hundreds of billions of dollars of assistance through use of its emergency powers. Furthermore, without Congressional input, hundreds of billions of dollars of borrowing by the Treasury (through the Treasury Supplementary Financing Program) has allowed the Fed to increase its lending capacity without detrimental effects on inflation. But as long as there is no government program to systematically manage financial difficulties at too big to fail institutions, the Fed is the only institution that can step in quickly enough to cope with problems on a case-by-case basis. While some had believed TARP provided the type of systemic approach that would allow the Fed to return to a more traditional role, the Fed's subsequent creation of lending facilities to support the commercial paper market, mortgage market, and asset-backed securities market suggests that TARP cannot cover all unforeseen contingencies. It has been proposed to couple Fed and TARP money in order for TARP to have an impact beyond the \$700 billion authorized by Congress.

(...continued)

Brian W. Cashell and Marc Labonte.

Author Contact Information

Marc Labonte
Specialist in Macroeconomic Policy
mlabonte@crs.loc.gov, 7-0640