

Banks should not be too big to fail.

Why should the public have to prop up the banks?

Why should banks be “too big to fail”?

This concept is nonsense. Nowhere in business is anything too big to fail.

If they are viable so be it, if not, let them fail.

Do the banks prop up the people when they get into trouble?

It might be different if the banks paid back the money when they made a profit.

Do the banks pay back the bail in money when they have it?

Reckless gambling that leads to losses should not have to be worn by the public who are brought to severe poverty by the reckless investing of the banks.

No, to bailing out the banks when they get into trouble.

Yes, to glass steagall that protects the public from reckless investments.

There is something decidedly rotten in the way that the divide is growing between the haves and the have-nots. Slowly, or not so slowly, the number of poor and struggling in society is growing, while a select few at the top are gaining obscene wealth.

There needs to be some accountability for what is ethical rather than what can be gotten away with. Greed is not good when people are going homeless and not able to afford the basics to get by.

Accumulating money for the sake of it and accumulating massive wealth when the workers are suffering through lack of wealth is criminal. Such people show lack of ethics and lack of caring for their fellow man.

The public needs to be protected from the actions of these reckless investors, and the actions of the banks in high stakes gambling and devious plots to make a lot of money at the expense of the poorest and least able to afford it, workers and general public.

Down with the greed, and up with ethics and looking after the workers and general public.

Carole Hubbard
48 Woodmason Road,
Boronia, Vic, 3155 (Australia)