

Discussion of Perez,  
“Sovereign Debt, Domestic Banks and the  
Provision of Public Liquidity”

Alessandro Dovis

Penn State

New Faces in International Economics Conference

# Introduction

- ▶ How government support debt without commitment?

After a default:

- ▶ Reputation cost: Cannot access market
- ▶ Reduced form “output cost”
- ▶ Newer literature: Deeper model of output cost
  - ▶ Important for disciplining the model
  - ▶ Examples:
    - ▶ Disruption in trade
    - ▶ Disruption in domestic credit markets
- ▶ This paper: Output cost arises from
  - ▶ Reduction net-worth financial intermediaries
  - ▶ Loss of liquidity services associated w/ gov't debt

# Outline

- ▶ Review mechanism in model
- ▶ Main comment:
  - ▶ Loss of liquidity services: Credible?
- ▶ Minor comments:
  - ▶ Government debt vs external debt
  - ▶ Scope and role of regulating banks asset holdings

## Main Ingredients

- ▶ Benevolent government borrow from foreign lenders
  - ▶ Insurance and difference in discount factors
  - ▶ Cannot commit
- ▶ Net worth of financial sector (banks) state variable
  - ▶ Friction channeling funds from hhs to financial sector
- ▶ Public debt provides liquidity services
  - ▶ Only asset other than productive investment
  - ▶ Banks with bad investment opportunities invest in government debt
  - ▶ Do not raise wage: allow productive firms to invest more

## Losses in Event of Default

- ▶ Reputation cost: Exclusion from int'l credit markets
- ▶ Reduction aggregate net-worth of financial intermediaries

$$N = \iota B^d + \int_{[z^*, \bar{z}]} R(z)l(z)$$

- ▶ Loss in liquidity services
  - ▶ Price exogenous and given by  $\zeta(1 + r^*)$  with  $\zeta \in [0, 1)$
  - ▶ Government issuance such it it meets demand

## Losses in Event of Default

- ▶ Reputation cost: Exclusion from int'l credit markets
- ▶ Reduction aggregate net-worth of financial intermediaries

$$N = \iota B^d + \int_{[z^*, \bar{z}]} R(z)l(z)$$

- ▶ Loss in liquidity services
  - ▶ Price exogenous and given by  $\zeta(1 + r^*)$  with  $\zeta \in [0, 1)$
  - ▶ Government issuance such it it meets demand
- ▶ First two effects well-understood
- ▶ Focus on liquidity part: How to think about  $\zeta$ ?

## Closed Economy: Woodford

Assume  $z \in [\underline{z}, \bar{z}]$  so efficient allocation calls for  $z^* = \bar{z}$

## Closed Economy: Woodford

Assume  $z \in [\underline{z}, \bar{z}]$  so efficient allocation calls for  $z^* = \bar{z}$

▶ Ramsey outcome:

In steady state government “satiates” liquidity demand

- ▶ No wedge between deposit rate and return on capital
- ▶ Efficient production:  $z^* = \bar{z}$
- ▶ If  $z < \bar{z}$  invest in government debt
- ▶ If  $z = \bar{z}$  efficient (aggregate) scale feasible



## Closed Economy: Woodford

Assume  $z \in [\underline{z}, \bar{z}]$  so efficient allocation calls for  $z^* = \bar{z}$

- ▶ Ramsey outcome:

In steady state government “satiates” liquidity demand

- ▶ No wedge between deposit rate and return on capital
  - ▶ Efficient production:  $z^* = \bar{z}$
  - ▶ If  $z < \bar{z}$  invest in government debt
  - ▶ If  $z = \bar{z}$  efficient (aggregate) scale feasible
- ▶ Ramsey outcome is credible
    - ▶ Sustained as MPE of policy game (limit of finite horizon)
    - ▶ Government has no incentive to renege and not repay debt

## Closed Economy: Woodford

Assume  $z \in [\underline{z}, \bar{z}]$  so efficient allocation calls for  $z^* = \bar{z}$

- ▶ Ramsey outcome:

In steady state government “satiates” liquidity demand

- ▶ No wedge between deposit rate and return on capital
- ▶ Efficient production:  $z^* = \bar{z}$
- ▶ If  $z < \bar{z}$  invest in government debt
- ▶ If  $z = \bar{z}$  efficient (aggregate) scale feasible

- ▶ Ramsey outcome is credible

- ▶ Sustained as MPE of policy game (limit of finite horizon)
- ▶ Government has no incentive to renege and not repay debt

- ▶ Natural lower bound on government utility

- ▶ Caveat: non-distortionary taxation

## Why Loss of Liquidity Services?

- ▶ Outcome after default:
  - ▶ Price exogenous and given by  $\zeta(1 + r^*)$  with  $\zeta \in [0, 1)$
  - ▶ Government issuance such it it meets demand
- ▶ Not SPE of policy game: punishment not credible
- ▶ Better than alternative (exogenous output cost)
  - ▶ Discipline via holdings of financial sector after default
- ▶ But closed economy MPE may be better theoretical benchmark

## Role of Government Debt for Liquidity Provision

- ▶ Government debt only asset other than production technology available to firms
- ▶ What about foreign assets?
  - ▶ Data: After default large net export, i.e. accumulation of foreign assets

## Government Debt vs External Debt

What is the empirical counterpart of gov't debt in the model?

If government debt then

- ▶ “Public” current account not strongly countercyclical as current account
- ▶  $\text{corr}(\Delta (\text{external}) \text{ Public Debt}, \text{GDP})$  typically negative
- ▶ This may be relevant for quantitative exercise

# Role of Financial Repression

Financial repression: regulation of banks portfolio

- ▶ Forcing banks to hold more gov't debt may be optimal because it provides commitment device
  - ▶ Chari, Dovis and Kehoe (2014)
  - ▶ Internalizing an “externality”
- ▶ Very large role for financial repression here
  - ▶ Optimal minimal holdings gov't debt: 45% of net-worth
- ▶ Conjecture: Due to very low discount factor
  - ▶ Raise lots of external debt to front-load consumption
- ▶ Why  $\beta$  low? Match counter cyclicity of CA
- ▶ If public CA not countercyclical  $\Rightarrow$  higher  $\beta$  ...

## Multiple Equilibria and Role of Regulation

- ▶ Government chooses total debt  $B$  but price depends on composition: banks vs foreign lenders
- ▶ Is price unique given  $B$ ?
  - ▶ If low share held by domestic bank then  $q^b$  is low
  - ▶ Self-fulfilling?
- ▶ So regulation of banks portfolio can be used to rule out inferior equilibria
  - ▶ Not only implement better outcomes by providing commitment device

# Conclusion

- ▶ Great paper
- ▶ Role of government debt as liquidity provision and incentive to repay for government