

Life Insurers Gain Ground in Legislative Fix

December 22, 2014

The U.S. House of Representatives recently voted to pass legislation (H.R. 5461) intended to clarify capital standards for insurance companies under the supervision of the Federal Reserve Board. The bill, sponsored by Republicans, but with broad support on both sides of the aisle, aims to alleviate the unintended "bankcentric" capital standards the Dodd-Frank Act's "Collins Amendment" imposed on life insurance companies. The Act clarifies the Federal Reserve Board's authority to develop insurance-specific standards for life insurers deemed Systematically Important Financial Institutions (SIFIs). The Fed has already declared AIG and Prudential SIFIs, with other life insurers on notice of their likely SIFI designation forthcoming. While the Collins Amendment was intended to provide the Fed discretion in setting appropriate life insurance and bank capital standards from the outset, the Fed interpreted the amendment to require uniform bank-centric standards for all SIFIs, creating unintended, potentially detrimental consequences to SIFI life insurers. Not surprisingly, life insurance companies, led by the American Council of Life Insurers (ACLI), have made clarifying the Collins Amendment their top regulatory priority. The Senate unanimously agreed to this legislative fix earlier this summer. The House, however, bundled this non-controversial issue with three more contentious Dodd-Frank issues, impacting the bill's chances for success in the Senate's upcoming session. The ACLI nonetheless applauds the House's passage of H.R. 5461, and will continue to advocate for the bill's approval.

Related Practices

Life, Annuity, and Retirement Litigation

Related Industries

Life, Annuity, and Retirement Solutions

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our Contact Us form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.