



Leonard Clinton Williams III [REDACTED]@gmail.com>

Apr 28th, 2023, 6:08 PM

Re: NYT article on first republic

To: "Division, Criminal (CRM)" <Criminal.Division@usdoj.gov>, civil.feedback@usdoj.gov

The point I was getting to is that the federal reserve and others within the government need flexibility in addressing situations that could have a big effect the broader economy. They shouldn't have their hands tied behind their back and be forced to watch the world go down the tubes.

I think the best thing for first republic would be for the government to intervene, and I mean someone other than the FDIC. For sure, the FDIC needs to bail out every depositor if it fails. I believe that there has already been a guarantee issued that the FDIC will do that.

These government bailouts go against many tenets of our society. They are also extremely unfair to ordinary people, for whom there aren't a lot of bailouts or any at all. But what do you do?

The problem goes back to the fact that we can't predict what the economy will do. Things that are completely unexpected come up all of the time. So when you have laws and policies being written as if we know what will happen ahead of time, it's bound to cause problems.

I think a good solution would be to have policies that prevent bailouts and impose discipline on banks, but to also have policies that allow you to make exceptions on a broad range of policies when the economy is at stake. The government should be allowed to use discretion and do what is necessary.

There would be people who opposed this. There are people who would be angered, but I would direct them back to my original point. This is the hypothetical situation- We have some law that says what we can and cannot do. The economy of the whole world is at stake. We know what we need to do to fix it. We have the full power and ability to stop the economy from crashing. The problem is that previously written laws say we can't take the actions that we need to take. And so we just sit and watch the whole world crash.

This is relevant to my situation, because I thought that there would be some kind of think outside the box solution applied to it, in the event that somehow the conduct of the people at this bank posed a threat to the economy. I didn't have it worked out as to how their conduct could do this, but I thought that it might somehow be possible. But the sense that I have gotten is that the doj isn't allowed to think outside of the box or that you don't see it as an option.

Warmest Regards,

Clint Williams

(980)-[REDACTED]