

# The Case against the Dodd Bill

---

The printable version is no longer supported and may have rendering errors. Please update your browser bookmarks and please use the default browser print function instead.

This is an opinion item.

**Author(s)** National Review editorial board

**Source** National Review

**Date** April 26, 2010

**URL** <http://article.nationalreview.com/432504/the-case-against-the-dodd-bill/the-editors>

**Quote**

“ The sophisticated creditors of non-banks, however, neither need nor deserve a bailout. The Dodd bill would not require the FDIC to impose losses on these creditors; it only expresses a “strong presumption” that such losses would be imposed. As structured, this authority would allow the government to bail out non-bank creditors, and worse, to play favorites among them, just as we saw when the Obama administration gift-wrapped large stakes in the automakers for its union allies at the expense of secured creditors.” ”

Add or change this opinion item's references

This item argues against the position Act should be passed on the topic Restoring American Financial Stability Act.

---

Retrieved from "[https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=The\\_Case\\_against\\_the\\_Dodd\\_Bill&oldid=11791](https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=The_Case_against_the_Dodd_Bill&oldid=11791)"

---

**This page was last edited on April 27, 2010, at 19:36.**

All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License.