Discussion of "Running Out of Time (Deposits)" by Dominik Supera

Vadim Elenev Johns Hopkins Carey Fischer-Shain Center Research Conference | September 2023

Evolution of Bank Balance Sheets

 $\overline{}$ ø œ. 4 Ņ 0 199⁰q1 1995q1 2000q1 2005q1 2010q1 1985q1 datetq Securities + Trading Cash Mortgages Other Loans C&I Loans

Assets

Deposits



Overview

- 1. Conventional wisdom: banks use deposits to back loans But digging under the hood a bit more:
 - Banks use time deposits to back business loans b/c they're
 - stable \leftarrow loans are illiquid
 - rate-sensitive ← business loans are floating rate i.e. short duration
 - They use savings deposits to back mortgages (and long-term securities)
 - More subject to liquidity shocks ← mortgages are easier to sell
 - Rate-insensitive (procyclical liquidity benefits or more sleepy depositors) ← mortgages are long duration
- 2. Household demand for deposits is cyclical in interest rates
 - Time deposits: procyclical | Savings deposits: counter-cyclical
 - 1980s-2010: decline in rates \rightarrow switch from time deposits (CDs) to savings deposits
 - Lead to decline in business lending by banks due to matching
- 3. Reduced investment, growth, dynamism of the kinds of firms that most rely on bank lending

Overview

1.	 Conventional wisdom: banks use dep But digging under the hood a bit more Banks use time deposits to back business long is stable ← loans are illiquid rate-sensitive ← business loans are floating rate They use savings deposits to back mortgage More subject to liquidity shocks ← mortgages Rate-insensitive (procyclical liquidity benefits 	 Important contribution to our understanding how banks work! Particularly the point about interest rate risk hedging Higher time deposit rate sensitivity wasn't obvious to me at all!
2.	 Household demand for deposits is cyc Time deposits: procyclical Savings deposit 1980s-2010: decline in rates → switch from 	Empirically convincing and theoretically grounded understanding of liquidity demand dynamics
3.	 Lead to decline in business lending by bank Reduced investment, growth, dynami bank lending 	 How crucial are banks to this story? How much has "dynamism" really decline?

Now that rates are rising...



Time Deposits and C&I Loans (Levels)



Savings Deposits and Securities (Cumulative Changes)



(Frictionless) Conceptual Framework

- Representative household with an endowment of 1
- Preferences u(c, d) over consumption and liquidity
- Chooses to allocate investment into production of consumption k and liquidity 1 k
- Production functions:
 - c = (1+r)k
 - d = 1 k
- Intertemporal interpretation: r is both
 - growth rate
 - interest rate



What if *r* drops?

- Lower growth / lower interest rate
- Lower *opportunity cost* of liquidity
- More liquidity *per unit of consumption*
- Declining growth prospects from 1980s to 2010s explain both
 - Lower interest rates
 - Lower investment
 - Rise in liquidity, e.g., shift from time to savings deposits
- Only assumption: existence of a production possibilities frontier



What if *r* drops?

- Lower growth / lower interest rate
- Lower *opportunity cost* of liquidity
- More liquidity *per unit of consumption*
- Declining growth prospects from 1980s to 2010s explain both
 - Lower interest rates
 - Lower investment
 - Rise in liquidity, e.g., shift from time to savings deposits
- Only assumption: existence of a production possibilities frontier
 - Not even its shape



Do banking frictions still matter?

- Frictionless model explains aggregate low-frequency patterns
 - Decline of r^* is a story with a 30-year horizon
- To see if banking frictions are a necessary part of the story, ask: what does the frictionless model FAIL to explain?
- Let's look at
 - Cross-sectional evidence
 - Evidence from higher (i.e., business cycle) frequency
 - Evidence from a 1970s policy reform

TD vs. C&I Shares Growths in Cross-Section



*Unless otherwise noted, I use the processed Call Reports dataset from Philipp Schnabl's website

My Replication*

Deltas Instead of Growth Rates



- Percentage point changes more intuitive than percentage changes in percent
- 10pp decline in the time deposit share associated with 0.5pp decline in C&I loans
 - Robust to time FEs, bank FEs, both, asset growth rates

Caveat to cross-sectional bank regressions: most banks are small

Smaller and smaller fraction of large banks control 90% of all bank assets



Is the cross-sectional relationship between time deposit declines and C&I loan declines driving aggregates?

Limiting to just these banks

Business/Fed Fund Cycles

- Can the simple model explain co-movements over the cycle?
 - Possibly, depending on link between rates and growth
- ✓ Expected rate hikes: If expected growth ↑ → rates ↑, then
 - Investment ↑, relative liquidity ↓
 - MP shocks: if rate ↑ → expected growth ↓, then
 - Investment ↓, relative liquidity ↑



Business/Fed Fund Cycles

- Can the simple model explain co-movements over the cycle?
 - Possibly, depending on link between rates and growth
- ✓ Expected rate hikes: If expected growth ↑ → rates ↑, then
 - Investment ↑, relative liquidity ↓
- MP shocks: if rate $\uparrow \rightarrow$ expected growth \downarrow , then
 - Investment ↓, relative liquidity ↑

A Additional Figures and Tables

Figure A1: Monetary policy and bank balance sheet items: Local projections with monetary policy shocks



Rejected by data?

How "contractionary" are MP shocks?

• Nakamura and Steinsson's information effect: unexpected rate hikes raise growth expectation

Recall: then

- Investment ↑, relative liquidity ↓
- Consistent with the frictionless model









Responses of Expected Output Growth and Output Gap to a Contractionary Shock

1970s Deregulation

- Repeal of interest rate ceilings on two types of time deposits in 1978q3 and 1979q3
 - Increase in share of time deposits
 - Increase in share of C&I loans
 - Holds in the cross-section too

Figure 4: Deregulation of small time deposits



1970s Deregulation

- Repeal of interest rate ceilings on two types of time deposits in 1978q3 and 1979q3
 - Increase in share of time deposits
 - Increase in share of C&I loans
 - Holds in the cross-section too
- "Shock" is *opportunity* to issue time deposits
 - Decision to do it is endogenous
 - Cross-sectional variation in TD growth may reflect lending opportunities

Figure 4: Deregulation of small time deposits



1970s Deregulation: Aggregates Convincing!

- Could the rise in lending just reflect the end of financial repression?
 - Financial repression: lots of high NPV projects don't get funded because banks are too small (fin friction but not related to TD→C&I matching)
 - Now money flowing into banks
 - Projects finally get funded
- But: total deposits actually shrink!
 - Deposits just get reallocated from savings to time deposits!
 - Close to "ideal" experiment!
 - Why?
- How much does this one episode teach us?

Figure 4: Deregulation of small time deposits



Is Business Dynamism Declining?

- Overall investment has declined from 1980s to 2010s
- How much is funding supply vs. demand? I.e.,
 - due to banks lending less because they can't match loans with enough time deposits?
 - Vs. running out of good ideas
- Compare more vs. less bank dependent firms
 - Unrated firms
 - New firms
- Fewer new firms, fewer employees at new firms



Is Business Dynamism Declining? Maybe not!

- But NOT less value created
 - Barkai and Panageas (2023)
- Total exit values of new firms have only been higher during the dot-com boom
 - Otherwise, recent cohorts create more value than previous ones
- Relationship between labor intensity and bank finance dependence of new firms?



To conclude...

- I really liked the paper and learned a lot reading it about how banks work
- Oh, and by the way, there's a full-fledged DSGE model with financial frictions rationalizing the empirical findings too
- Suggestions for the next draft (or next paper?)
 - Explore real effects of the time deposit <-> C & I loan matching further
 - Add a data appendix
 - Lots of judgment calls needed when working with call reports data, esp. over time