

Opinion | 14 May 2020

No negative rates

US Fed's Powell says "no" once more to negative rates, but is this all that is unsettling the markets?



Source: Shutterstock

Markets looking nervy

The S&P500 fell further overnight setting us up for a risk-off tone in Asia today. Yesterday, I wrote that the equity market is hard to knock down, and stays resilient right up to the point where it is standing on the abyss and realizes there is no safety net any longer. I'm still not sure we are at that point yet. The last 48 hours have given us nothing new to digest. But then again, this crisis feels like more of a marathon than a sprint, and just maybe there are some runners out there who aren't built for the relentless slog that battered earnings and a painfully slow recovery will offer, irrespective of the amount of fiscal stimulus and virtually free money sloshing around the system.

Moreover, I'm no technical analyst, but even I can see how well the latest sell-off, recovery and renewed downturn are mapping onto Fibonacci levels, and unless I'm very much mistaken, we are sitting just above the bottom of a double top. Equity futures suggest that we will hold these levels, which could set up markets for more buying on dips. But the mood, which is so important for the equity sphere, seems to be changing perceptibly. This morning's newswire headlines are full of comments from top investors sounding pessimistic on the outlook for stocks, as well they might. The facts of the matter support a much lower market than is in fact the case. But the market mood has been by far the more important factor than (for example) the more than 30 million jobs lost in

Opinion | 14 May 2020

recent months, and that mood is what we should continue to monitor because moods are not substantial - they are built of fairy dust and can evaporate for no apparent reason.

No to negative rates

One factor that might not be helping market sentiment is the continued rejection of negative rates by the Fed. <u>James Knightley in New York has written in more detail here on the Fed's latest</u> economic assessment.

In a virtual conference with the Pieterson Institute yesterday, Fed chair, Jerome Powell, once more indicated that the Fed was not considering negative interest rates as an option. Personally, I'm with Powell on this. But I was a little surprised to see a number of research papers from some well known US banks and fund management companies suggesting that negative rates for the \$4tr US Money Market industry might not be the disaster it sounds to me. Much of this is based on the experience of similar funds in Europe. And I'm not sure the comparison holds, given the much more important role played by Money market mutual funds (MMFs) in market liquidity provision in the US. I will write at greater length on this shortly, but for balance, here is a positive note on negative rates from Kenneth Rogoff as part of our "Think Outside" series, which I totally disagree with. So who are you going to believe? Rogoff or me? Don't answer that.

I'd add that it is not even clear if it is legal for the Fed to pay a negative rate on its reserves, as this paper <u>from the St Louis Fed note</u>s.

The St Louis Fed paper also quotes former Fed Chair, Ben Bernanke, who argues that the mere possibility of negative rates could have the effect of keeping the expected path of short-term rates more negative than otherwise. This could be right out of the playbook from the Reserve Bank of New Zealand's Governor, Adrian Orr, who yesterday expanded New Zealand's QE programme and also kept the door open to other policy moves, including negative rates. We don't think he will implement such a policy, but it probably doesn't hurt to have the market thinking that he might, especially if it helps keep yields over the entire yield curve low and the NZD soft.

Today in Asia Pacific

Australian labour market data is out later this morning, and it will look quite horrible. Anything between a few hundred thousand to a million job losses in April is the market view, so its really just a question of degree. But as the Reserve Bank of Australia has already pulled back from its QE programme slightly, and with copious fiscal stimulus in the pipeline, its hard to see this having a big market impact, aside from any temporary knocks to the AUD and government bond yields that may follow a weaker than expected number.

In the Philippines, Nicky Mapa notes: "The cabinet revised official economic projections for 2020 and 2021 in the wake of the Covid-19 outbreak with GDP expected to drop to -2.0 to -3.4% in 2020 before rebounding sharply to 7.1-8.1% in 2021. Government officials also expect the budget deficit to widen sharply to -8.1% of GDP on the projected drop off in revenue collection and increases in spending to offset the economic downturn. Bond yields have remained subdued due to BSP's aggressive rate cuts and benign inflation (April inflation at 2.2%) but we expect the Treasury to begin issuing longer-dated bonds once the 2-month lockdown is lifted to help finance the planned fiscal rescue bill".

Opinion | 14 May 2020 2

Author

Robert Carnell

Regional Head of Research, Asia-Pacific robert.carnell@asia.inq.com

Disclaimer

This publication has been prepared by the Economic and Financial Analysis Division of ING Bank N.V. ("ING") solely for information purposes without regard to any particular user's investment objectives, financial situation, or means. ING forms part of ING Group (being for this purpose ING Group N.V. and its subsidiary and affiliated companies). The information in the publication is not an investment recommendation and it is not investment, legal or tax advice or an offer or solicitation to purchase or sell any financial instrument. Reasonable care has been taken to ensure that this publication is not untrue or misleading when published, but ING does not represent that it is accurate or complete. ING does not accept any liability for any direct, indirect or consequential loss arising from any use of this publication. Unless otherwise stated, any views, forecasts, or estimates are solely those of the author(s), as of the date of the publication and are subject to change without notice.

The distribution of this publication may be restricted by law or regulation in different jurisdictions and persons into whose possession this publication comes should inform themselves about, and observe, such restrictions.

Copyright and database rights protection exists in this report and it may not be reproduced, distributed or published by any person for any purpose without the prior express consent of ING. All rights are reserved. ING Bank N.V. is authorised by the Dutch Central Bank and supervised by the European Central Bank (ECB), the Dutch Central Bank (DNB) and the Dutch Authority for the Financial Markets (AFM). ING Bank N.V. is incorporated in the Netherlands (Trade Register no. 33031431 Amsterdam). In the United Kingdom this information is approved and/or communicated by ING Bank N.V., London Branch. ING Bank N.V., London Branch is authorised by the Prudential Regulation Authority and is subject to regulation by the Financial Conduct Authority and limited regulation by the Prudential Regulation Authority. ING Bank N.V., London branch is registered in England (Registration number BR000341) at 8-10 Moorgate, London EC2 6DA. For US Investors: Any person wishing to discuss this report or effect transactions in any security discussed herein should contact ING Financial Markets LLC, which is a member of the NYSE, FINRA and SIPC and part of ING, and which has accepted responsibility for the distribution of this report in the United States under applicable requirements.

Additional information is available on request. For more information about ING Group, please visit http://www.ing.com.

Opinion | 14 May 2020 3