


Swiber Bond Scandal : who should the retail investors blame?

Description




The recent Swiber bond debacle has sparked off a new debate as to whether the Singapore government should save “accredited investors” – individuals who have at least S\$2 million in assets. Because they have more money than the average man, these “not-so-wealthy” individuals are being given more choices in investment products, including those that are deemed as more exotic, riskier or too complicated for laymen to understand.

But does being rich necessarily equate to being smart about your money?

Sadly, no. This is a tough lesson in personal finance to

[those who invested in Swiber bonds, who have each lost at least \\$200,000 or more, now that the company has defaulted on its bond repayments.](#) It is unlikely that these investors will get their money back.

As a result of this saga, people are crying out for the government to protect these accredited investors. Bloomberg reported on this piece with the headline of [“How Singapore’s Not-Really-Rich Have Been Burned By Swiber’s Bonds”](#). The argument is that many of Singapore’s “accredited” investors are given that label because of their property asset, which isn’t exactly a true reflection of their liquid wealth. But given competing interests, should the government be saving folks with over S\$2 million to their name, or focus their energy on helping the poor instead?



Remember that **no one except you truly have your best financial interests at heart.** This may come off as harsh, but it is better to learn this now than never.

With (tough) love,
Budget Babe

Category

1. Investing

default watermark